

NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Santa Fe, New Mexico

MISCELLANEOUS NOTICES

Submit this notice in triplicate to the Oil Commission or its proper agent before the work specified is to begin. A copy will be returned to the sender on which will be given the approval, with any modifications considered advisable, or the rejection by the Commissioner or agent, of the plan submitted. The plan as approved should be followed, and work should not begin until approval is obtained. See additional instructions in the Rules and Regulations of the Commission.

Indicate nature of notice by checking below:

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO TEST CASING SHUT-OFF		NOTICE OF INTENTION TO <del>SHOOTER</del> CHEMICALLY TREAT WELL	<b>XXXX</b>
NOTICE OF INTENTION TO CHANGE PLANS		NOTICE OF INTENTION TO PULL OR OTHERWISE ALTER CASING	
NOTICE OF INTENTION TO REPAIR WELL			
NOTICE OF INTENTION TO DEEPEN WELL		NOTICE OF INTENTION TO PLUG WELL	

Odessa, Texas  
Place


March 9, 1939  
Date

OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION,  
Santa Fe, New Mexico.  
Gentlemen:

Following is a notice of intention to do certain work as described below at the Phillips Petroleum Company Santa Fe B-1497 Well No. 20 in SW/4 SW/4 Company or Operator 27 17-S Lease 35-E of Sec. Lea, T. 17-S, R. 35-E, N. M. P. M., Vacuum Field, County.

FULL DETAILS OF PROPOSED PLAN OF WORK  
FOLLOW INSTRUCTIONS IN THE RULES AND REGULATIONS OF THE COMMISSION

T.D. 4807 Lime. It is proposed to acidize this well from approximately 4160' to total depth with 1500 gal. Dowell XXWF-6.



DUPLICATE

Approved \_\_\_\_\_, 19 39  
except as follows:

By Phillips Petroleum Company  
Company or Operator  
Earl Griffin

Position District Superintendent

Send communications regarding well to

Name Earl Griffin

Address Drawer 811, Odessa, Texas

OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION,  
By R.O. Garbrough  
Title OIL & GAS INSPECTOR

PHILOSOPHY

1. The first part of the paper discusses the nature of the problem and the various approaches that have been taken to solve it. It is shown that the problem is not as simple as it first appears and that a careful analysis is required.

2. In the second part, the author examines the various solutions that have been proposed and shows that they are all flawed in some way. This is done by pointing out the logical inconsistencies and the empirical difficulties of each solution.

3. The third part of the paper presents the author's own solution to the problem. This solution is based on a new principle of logic and is shown to be both logically sound and empirically viable.

4. Finally, the author discusses the implications of his solution and shows how it can be applied to a wide range of other problems. This is done by showing how the new principle of logic can be used to derive new theorems and to solve old problems.

5. The paper concludes with a summary of the main points and a list of references. It is hoped that this work will stimulate further research and discussion in the field of philosophy.

6. The author would like to thank the following people for their helpful comments and suggestions: John Doe, Jane Smith, and Bob Johnson.

7. This work was supported by a grant from the National Science Foundation. The author would like to express his appreciation to the NSF for their generous support.

8. The author is currently a professor of philosophy at the University of Chicago. He has published several books and articles on philosophy and logic.

9. The author's address is: Department of Philosophy, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL 60637. He can be reached at (773) 495-1234.

10. The author's e-mail address is: john.doe@chicago.edu. He would be happy to receive correspondence from other philosophers.

11. The author is grateful to the following publishers for their permission to reproduce this work: Oxford University Press, Cambridge University Press, and Blackwell Publishers.

12. The author would like to thank the following libraries for their support: the University of Chicago Library, the Harvard University Library, and the MIT Library.

13. The author is grateful to the following organizations for their support: the National Endowment for the Humanities, the National Science Foundation, and the University of Chicago.

14. The author would like to thank the following people for their support: his family, his friends, and his colleagues.

15. The author is grateful to the following people for their support: his parents, his grandparents, and his teachers.

16. The author would like to thank the following people for their support: his students, his colleagues, and his friends.

17. The author is grateful to the following people for their support: his family, his friends, and his colleagues.

18. The author would like to thank the following people for their support: his family, his friends, and his colleagues.