

1  
2  
3  
4 VIRGINIA OIL AND GAS BOARD

5  
6 HEARING OF FEBRUARY 21, 1995

7  
8 9:00 A.M.

9  
10 AT THE SOUTHWEST VIRGINIA

11 4-H CENTER

12 ABINGDON, VIRGINIA  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19  
20 -----  
Appalachian Court Reporting Services, Inc.

21 P. O. Box 833

22 Abingdon, Virginia

23 (703) 676-2244

24 ID# 54-1495140  
25

1

2

3

4

5

ITEM

6

7

I

8

II

9

BOARD DISCUSSION OF REGS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

INDEX

PAGE

2

4

23



February 21, 1995

This matter came on to be heard on this the 21st day of February, 1995 before the Virginia Gas and Oil Board at the Southwest Virginia 4-H Center, Hillman Highway, Abingdon, Virginia pursuant to Section 45.1-361.19.B and 45.1-361.22.B of the Code of Virginia.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good morning. My name is Benny Wampler and I'm Deputy Director for the Department of Mines, Minerals and Energy. I'll ask Dennis start by introducing himself.

(MEMBERS INTRODUCED.)



ITEM I

1  
2  
3 MR. CHAIRMAN: We have on the agenda today two cases. The  
4 first is a petition from Equitable Resources Exploration  
5 for rehearing of docket number VGOB-93/03/16-0345 for V-  
6 2691. This is today's docket number VGOB-94/08/16-0461  
7 and it was continued from January. We'd ask the parties  
8 that wish to address the Board to come forward at this  
9 time.

10 MR. KAISER: Mr. Chairman and members of the Board, Jim Kaiser  
11 on behalf of Equitable Resources Exploration. We're  
12 going to once again ask that item be continued and I'll  
13 once again give you an update on that because I know the  
14 Board has an interest in the matter. This will probably  
15 be the last time we continue it. If we cannot get the  
16 case settled with Mr. Yeary by the March docket my guess  
17 is we will probably withdraw from this application at  
18 that time. I'm not 100 percent sure of that, but we've  
19 still got one sentence -- it's really two sentences and  
20 one paragraph of a non-surface use lease. We're trying  
21 to negotiate with him and it's a deal killer for us and  
22 we're not being able to move him much on it at this  
23 point. So I do have a meeting scheduled with him for  
24 either Thursday or Friday to try again and we'll keep our  
25 fingers crossed and hopefully we'll go forward with that



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

one in March. But we are prepared to hear Item II now.  
MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. That will be continued to March.



ITEM II

1  
2  
3 MR. CHAIRMAN: The next item on the agenda is a petition from  
4 Equitable Resources Exploration for an order modifying a  
5 prior order VGOB/94/09/20/-0474. That is today's docket  
6 number VGOB-95/02/21-0492. We'd ask the parties that  
7 wish to address the Board in this matter to come forward  
8 at this time.

9 MR. KAISER: Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, Jim Kaiser on  
10 behalf of Equitable Resources Exploration. Our witnesses  
11 in this matter will be Mr. George Heflin and Mr. Bob  
12 Dahlin. By way of introduction this is a modification of  
13 a prior order. This well was originally pooled in  
14 September of 1994. The effective date of the order was  
15 November 9th, 1994. In light of our continuing due  
16 diligence we have located some additional heirs of James  
17 Day in Tract 3 and two additional parties. We will be  
18 attempting with this application to modify the interest  
19 of changed in those Day heirs and tracts or anywhere  
20 else. We'll be attempting to pool the interest of Anna  
21 White and Victoria Mullins and Worley Mullins, husband  
22 and wife. Would you swear the witnesses?

23 COURT REPORTER: (Swears witnesses.)

24 MR. KAISER: Our first witness will be Mr. Heflin.  
25



1                                    GEORGE B. HEFLIN

2       a witness who, after having been duly sworn, was examined and  
3       testified as follows:

4  
5                                    DIRECT EXAMINATION

6  
7       BY MR. KAISER:

8       Q.     Mr. Heflin, could you state your name, who you are  
9               employed by and in what capacity?

10      A.     George B. Heflin, Equitable Resources Exploration, lease  
11               supervisor.

12      Q.     And do your responsibilities include the lands involved  
13               here and in the surrounding area?

14      A.     Yes, they do.

15      Q.     Are you familiar with Equitable's application for the  
16               modification of a prior order for EREX well VC-3225, this  
17               application being dated February 17th, 1995?

18      A.     Yes, I am.

19      Q.     Does EREX have a permit for well VC-3225?

20      A.     Yes. The permit is dated October 7th, 1994.

21      Q.     Is Equitable seeking to force pool the drilling rights  
22               underlying the drilling and spacing unit as depicted at  
23               Exhibit A of the application for modification?

24      A.     Yes, we are.

25      Q.     And does Equitable own drilling rights in the unit



1 involved here?

2 A. That's correct.

3 Q. Does this location for the well fall within the Board's

4 order for the Roaring Fork field rules?

5 A. Yes, it does.

6 Q. What is the interest of Equitable in the unit at this

7 time?

8 A. At this time we have 96.792979 percent of the unit

9 leased.

10 Q. And that's of the gas estate?

11 A. That's of the gas estate.

12 Q. And what are the unleased interests in the gas estate at

13 this time?

14 A. The unleased interests are 3.207021 percent.

15 Q. So rounded off 3.21 percent of the gas estate is unleased

16 at this time?

17 A. That's correct.

18 Q. What about the coal estate?

19 A. The coal estate is 100 percent leased.

20 MR. KAISER: At this time I'd like to hand out our final

21 Exhibit B for this well and then I'll have Mr. Heflin go

22 through and explain what interests have been modified and

23 what additional leases have been picked up and what

24 additional parties we seek to force pool.

25 (PAUSE.)



1 Q. (Mr. Kaiser continues.) Mr. Heflin, are all the unleased  
2 parties set out at this revised Exhibit b?

3 A. Yes, they are.

4 Q. Prior to filing this application for modification were  
5 efforts made to contact each of the respondents and an  
6 attempt made to work out an agreement regarding the  
7 development of the unit involved?

8 A. Yes, they were.

9 Q. Subsequent to the filing of the application have you  
10 continued to attempt to reach an agreement with the  
11 unleased respondents listed at Exhibit B?

12 A. That's correct.

13 Q. As a result of these efforts have you acquired other  
14 leases from these respondents listed as unleased owners?

15 A. Uh --

16 Q. Have you acquired other leases subsequent to the original  
17 order that was entered in November of 1994?

18 A. Yes, we have.

19 Q. At this time in addition to identifying those parties if  
20 you would explain how the interest in Tract 3 have been  
21 modified by the location of additional heirs and the  
22 additional parties that we're seeking to force pool?

23 A. I'd like to start with Page 3 of 12 under the James M.  
24 Day heirs, Tract 3. In further research of the James M.  
25 Day heirs we've corrected interest in this tract and also



1 reviewed some of the life estates and determined what  
2 interest that they have and we've set out the life estate  
3 remaindermen in, for example, the Bell Day Callhoun heirs  
4 and Jim Day. That's the only change you'll see on that  
5 page. On Page 4 of 12 we did the same thing for Katherine  
6 White, widow, life estate, Lois Miller, Ray White,  
7 Anita Brooks, James White, Clova White, Della White. We  
8 also have leased at this time her life estate interest  
9 where in the other hearing we didn't have her leased.  
10 MR. CHAIRMAN: Can I interrupt you just a second? On Page 5  
11 of 12 I believe you said Clova White and we have --  
12 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I jumped down. Clova Kinser.  
13 MR. CHAIRMAN: That's fine. I just wanted to make sure.  
14 THE WITNESS: Sorry about that.  
15 A. (The witness continues.) We also found Anna White who  
16 wasn't on the other exhibit -- or found the name Anna  
17 White. We are unable at this time to locate her. So  
18 she'll be shown as unknown. John White was on the other  
19 exhibit. We've leased him and his real name is Rayden.  
20 R-A-Y-D-E-N. We made that correction on the new exhibit  
21 and we've picked that lease up since the last hearing.  
22 On Page 6 of 12 we located Victoria Chisenhall Mullins  
23 and Worley Mullins. And since we submitted the revised  
24 exhibit that we've given to you today you'll notice that  
25 she's leased also. That changed the interests. Everyone



1 in the tract's interests were somewhat effected because  
2 of the new additional people and interests involved.  
3 That pretty well summarizes Tract 3. On Page 7 of 12,  
4 Tract 9, in the original forced pooling we had Robert  
5 Short and Flossy Short. They sold that piece of property  
6 to Donald Wayne Clark and Darendra Clark and we've noted  
7 that on the exhibit. On Page 10 of 12, Margaret Holling-  
8 sworth, I think in the original exhibit we submitted we  
9 had Margaret Honeycut Emory. Her name and address both  
10 have changed since the original exhibit and we've since  
11 taken a lease from her as well. And that pretty well  
12 summarizes all of the changes to the revised exhibit.

13 MS. RIGGS: I have a question. In terms of the modification  
14 which of the parties shown on Exhibit B are going to be  
15 entitled to make a new election? How are you identifying  
16 the parties that are being noticed as opposed to those  
17 who are entitled to make an election under the modifi-  
18 cation or is everybody who's unleased in Exhibit B going  
19 to be entitled to a new election?

20 MR. KAISER: No. We would take the position that only those  
21 people whose interests changed in Tract 3 would be  
22 entitled to a new election.

23 MS. RIGGS: So there's nobody other than the heirs of James M.  
24 Day that are being given elections under the  
25 modification.



1 MR. KAISER: That's correct. And obviously only the unleased  
2 parties of those -- we have leased some of those add-  
3 itional heirs as Mr. Heflin pointed out. We did,  
4 however, provide notice to everybody who's unleased whose  
5 interests changed period which would be the same thing.

6 MR. CHAIRMAN: What about Tract 9 with the Clarks?

7 THE WITNESS: They were -- subject to the lease with Robert  
8 and Flossy Short when they sold the property to the  
9 Clarks they sold it fee -- their surface inner minerals  
10 and therefore they were subject to the lease that we had  
11 with the Shorts. We contacted them and discussed the  
12 matter with them.

13 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Questions, members of the Board? Do you  
14 have anything further of this witness?

15 MR. KAISER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Just as further clarification  
16 for Ms. Riggs, that would appear to me -- I think we've  
17 probably got five parties that will receive elections in  
18 Tract 3.

19 MS. RIGGS: Do you want to identify them? It might be easier  
20 in the order to name them then to try to refer to the  
21 exhibit.

22 MR. KAISER: Yeah. I think it will be. I'd be more than  
23 happy to do that. It would be on Page 3 of 12, Jim and  
24 Pam Day. On Page 4 of 12, Ruth Robinette Smith. On Page  
25 5 of 12, Hazel and Johnny Craft. On Page 6 of 12, Randy



1 and Gwyn Chisenhall. Also on Page 6, Terry and Regina  
2 Chisenhall.

3 Q. (Mr. Kaiser continues.) Mr. Heflin, were any efforts  
4 made to determine if the individual respondents were  
5 living or deceased or their whereabouts and if deceased  
6 were efforts made to determine the name and addresses and  
7 whereabouts of the successors to any deceased individual  
8 respondents?

9 A. There was.

10 Q. Were reasonable and diligent efforts made and sources  
11 checked to identify and location unknown heirs, to  
12 include primary sources such as deed records, probate  
13 records, assessors records, treasurers records and  
14 secondary sources such as telephone directories, city  
15 directories, family and friends?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. In your professional opinion was due diligence exercised  
18 to locate each of the respondents named herein?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. Are the addresses set out in revised Exhibit B to the  
21 application the last known addresses for the respondents?

22 A. That's correct.

23 Q. With the exception of those parties which you are hereby  
24 dismissing from this proceeding are you requesting this  
25 Board to force pool all other unleased interests listed



1 at revised Exhibit B?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. Does Equitable seek to force pool the drilling rights of  
4 each individual respondent if living and if deceased the  
5 unknown successor or successors to any deceased individu-  
6 al respondent?

7 A. Yes, we are.

8 Q. Is Equitable seeking to force pool the drilling rights of  
9 the person designated as trustee if acting in capacity  
10 of trustee, and if not acting in such capacity is  
11 Equitable seeking to force pool the drilling rights of  
12 the successor of such trustee?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Mr. Heflin, are you familiar with the fair market value  
15 of drilling rights in the unit involved here and in the  
16 surrounding area?

17 A. Yes, I am.

18 Q. Would you advise the Board as to what those are?

19 A. \$5 acre consideration, five year term, one-eighth  
20 royalty.

21 Q. Did you gain your familiarity by acquiring oil and gas  
22 leases, coalbed methane leases and other agreements  
23 involving the transfer of drilling rights in the unit  
24 involved here and in the surrounding area?

25 A. That's correct.



1 Q. In your opinion do the terms you have testified to  
2 represent the fair market value of and the fair and  
3 reasonable compensation to be paid for drilling rights  
4 within this unit?

5 A. Yes, they do.

6 Q. Do you recommend that respondents listed at revised  
7 Exhibit B who remain unleased be allowed the following  
8 options with respect to their ownership interests within  
9 the unit; 1) Participation. 2) A cash bonus of \$5 per net  
10 mineral acre plus a one-eighth of eight-eighths royalty.  
11 3) In lieu of the cash bonus and one-eighth of eight-  
12 eighths royalty share in the operation of the well on a  
13 carried basis as a carried operator under the following  
14 conditions: Such carried operator shall be entitled to  
15 the share of production from the tracts pooled accruing  
16 to his interest but exclusive of any royalty or over-  
17 riding royalty reserved in any leases, assignments  
18 thereof or agreements relating thereto of such tracts but  
19 only after the proceeds allocable to his share equal A)  
20 300 percent of the share of such costs allocable to the  
21 interest of the carried operator of a leased tract or  
22 portion thereof, or B) 200 percent of the share of such  
23 costs allocable to the interest of the carried operator  
24 of an unleased tract or portion thereof?

25 A. Yes.



1 Q. Do you recommend the order provide that the elections by  
2 respondents be in writing and sent to the applicant at  
3 Equitable Resources Exploration, P.O. Box 1983, Kings-  
4 port, Tennessee, 37662, attention George Heflin, regulat-  
5 ory?

6 A. That's correct.

7 Q. And should this be the address for all communications  
8 with the applicant concerning the forced pooling order?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. Do you recommend that the forced pooling order provide  
11 that if no written election is properly made by a  
12 respondent then such respondent shall be deemed to have  
13 elected to cash royalty option in lieu of participation?

14 A. That's correct.

15 Q. Should the unleased respondents be given 30 days from the  
16 date of the order to file written elections?

17 A. Yes, they should.

18 Q. If an unleased respondent elects to participate should  
19 that respondent be given 45 days from the latter of the  
20 date of the mailing or to pay applicant for respondent's  
21 proportionate share of well costs?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. Does the applicant expect the party electing to partici-  
24 pate to pay in advance that party's share of completed  
25 well costs?



- 1 A. That's correct.
- 2 Q. Should the applicant be allowed 60 days following the
- 3 recording date of the order and thereafter annually on
- 4 that date until production is achieved to pay or tender
- 5 any cash bonus becoming due under the forced pooling
- 6 order?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. Do you recommend the forced pooling order provide that if
- 9 a respondent elects to participate but fails to pay the
- 10 respondent's proportionate share of well costs satis-
- 11 factory to the applicant for payment of well costs the
- 12 respondent's election to participate should be treated as
- 13 having been withdrawn and void and such respondent should
- 14 be treated just as if no initial election had been filed
- 15 under the forced pooling order?
- 16 A. That's correct.
- 17 Q. Do you recommend the forced pooling order provide that
- 18 where a respondent elects to participate but defaults in
- 19 regard to the payment of well costs any cash sum becoming
- 20 payable to such respondent be paid within 60 days after
- 21 the last date on which such respondent could have paid or
- 22 made satisfactory arrangements for the payment of well
- 23 costs?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. Do you recommend that the order provide that if a



1 respondent refuses to accept any payment, including any  
2 payment due under said order or any payment of royalty or  
3 cash bonus or said payment cannot be paid to a party for  
4 any reason or there is title defect in the respondent's  
5 interest or in the event of conflicting claims to the  
6 coalbed methane that operator pay into an escrow account  
7 created by this Board into which all costs or proceeds  
8 attributable to conflicting interests shall be held for  
9 the respondent's benefit until such funds can be paid to  
10 the party by order of this Board or until the title  
11 defect or conflicting claim is resolved to the operator's  
12 satisfaction?

13 A. That's correct.

14 Q. Who should be named the operator under this forced  
15 pooling order?

16 A. Equitable Resources Exploration.

17 MR. KAISER: That's all I have of this witness at this time,  
18 Mr. Chairman.

19 MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions, members of the Board?

20 (Witness stands aside.)

21 MR. KAISER: If I could ask for just a couple of minutes  
22 before -- I want to make sure I gave Ms. Riggs the proper  
23 names.

24 MS. RIGGS: I have a question about that, too.

25 MR. KAISER: If you'll bear with me we'll go back through



1           those five individuals.

2       MS. RIGGS: The two I had questions about is I thought I heard  
3           you say that you added Anna White.

4       MR. KAISER: Yes, but she is unknown.

5       MS. RIGGS: She would still have a right of election although  
6           she will be deemed to have leased if she doesn't come  
7           forward. So we need to add her.

8       MR. KAISER: I'm sorry. You're right.

9       MS. RIGGS: What about Burton Day estate? That's the other  
10           unleased. Did that interest change or were they --

11      MR. KAISER: Yes, it did. So that's another one. Let me  
12           check and make sure the other five I gave you --

13      MS. RIGGS: Those are all unleashed and the two that were  
14           unleased that weren't named are the two I just gave you.

15      MR. KAISER: Right.

16      MS. RIGGS: So those seven are all the unleashed shown under  
17           Tract 3?

18      MR. KAISER: Right. I just wanted to make sure the other  
19           five, though -- if they were unleashed under the prior  
20           order and their interest did not change -- of course, I  
21           guess it would have had to of changed.

22      MS. RIGGS: It would have to if you added parties, I would  
23           think.

24      MR. KAISER: I just want to make sure of that.

25      MS. RIGGS: Yeah.



1 MR. KAISER: Ruth Robinette did change. So there will be  
2 seven parties to receive elections under the modification  
3 per that order. Mr. Chairman, I don't have any further  
4 questions of Mr. Heflin at this time.

5 MR. CHAIRMAN: Call your next witness.

6 MR. KAISER: I'd call Mr. Dahlin at this time who has been  
7 sworn.

8  
9 ROBERT A. DAHLIN, II

10 a witness who, after having been previously sworn, was  
11 examined and testified as follows:

12  
13 DIRECT EXAMINATION

14  
15 BY MR. KAISER:

16 Q. Would you please state your name, who you're employed by  
17 and in what capacity?

18 A. My name is Robert A. Dahlin, II and I'm employed by EREX  
19 as a production specialist.

20 Q. Have you ever testified before the Virginia Gas and Oil  
21 Board and have your qualifications as an expert witness  
22 previously been accepted by the Board?

23 A. Yes, I have.

24 Q. Do your responsibilities include the lands involved here  
25 and in the surrounding area?



1 A. Yes, sir.

2 Q. Are you familiar with the proposed exploration and  
3 development of the unit here under the applicant's plan  
4 of development?

5 A. Yes, I am.

6 Q. What is the total depth of the proposed well under the  
7 applicant's plan of development?

8 A. 2,060 feet.

9 Q. Will this be sufficient to include formations consist  
10 with the well work permit?

11 A. Yes, it will.

12 Q. And will this be sufficient to penetrate and test the  
13 common sources of supply in the subject formations?

14 A. Yes, it will.

15 Q. What are the estimated reserves of the unit?

16 A. 350 million cubic foot of gas.

17 Q. Are you familiar with the well costs for the proposed  
18 initial unit well under applicant's plan of development?

19 A. I am.

20 Q. Has an AFE been reviewed and submitted to the Board?

21 A. Yes, it has.

22 Q. Was this AFE prepared by an engineering department  
23 knowledgeable in the preparation of AFEs and knowledge in  
24 regard to well costs in this area?

25 A. Yes.



1 Q. Does this AFE represent a reasonable estimate of the well  
2 costs of the proposed unit well under the applicant's  
3 plan of development?

4 A. Yes, it does.

5 Q. Could you please state both the dry hole costs and the  
6 completed well costs for the Board?

7 A. The dry hole costs are \$65,444 and completed well costs  
8 are \$179,000.

9 Q. Does this AFE include a reasonable charge for super-  
10 vision?

11 A. Yes, it does.

12 Q. In your professional opinion, Mr. Dahlin, will the  
13 granting of this application be in the best interest of  
14 conservation, prevention of waste and the protection of  
15 correlative rights?

16 A. Yes, sir, it would.

17 Q. Does this AFE anticipate multiple completion?

18 A. Yes, it does.

19 MR. KAISER: I have no further questions of this witness at  
20 this time, Mr. Chairman.

21 MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions, members of the Board? Mr. Dahlin,  
22 when you make these estimates -- I know we've talked  
23 about it some in the past, but how are they made? How  
24 are these estimates accumulated each time for each well?  
25 Are they based on any actual costs that you're incurring?



1 THE WITNESS: Yes, they are. We periodically review our  
2 status revised and currently to reflect the current bids  
3 for service companies and as they change those change.  
4 Also we're under order of the Board to provide actual  
5 costs for the wells. And I was current with that up  
6 until this month. What I've been doing is reviewing any  
7 additional costs as they come in and change the registra-  
8 tion and -- let's see. I believe our wording was  
9 registration and completion is how the Board ordered.  
10 And we haven't had continuing changes in those categories  
11 up until last month. This month I don't know because our  
12 accountant quit on us. I haven't been able to reallocate  
13 those duties. I'm unaware of where we stand as of right  
14 now, but those will be accumulated and sent to Mr.  
15 Fulmer.

16 MR. CHAIRMAN: Absent any Board orders or anything, do you as  
17 a business practice maintain actual costs that you're  
18 incurring on the wells?

19 THE WITNESS: Yes.

20 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any other questions, members of the  
21 Board.

22 MR. KAISER: That's a good question, Mr. Chairman. That  
23 surprised me last Wednesday when somebody represented  
24 that they didn't.

25 MR. CHAIRMAN: I just thought I'd explore that a little bit.



1 MR. KAISER: I have nothing further, Mr. Chairman, of this  
2 witness at this time.

3 (Witness stands aside.)

4 MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you have anything further?

5 MR. KAISER: No, nothing further.

6 MR. LEWIS: I make a motion that we grant this application.

7 MR. CHAIRMAN: A motion to approve.

8 MR. HARRIS: Second.

9 MR. CHAIRMAN: A motion and a second. Any further discuss-  
10 ion? All in favor signify by saying yes. (ALL AFFIRM.)  
11 Opposed say no. (NONE.) It's a unanimous approval.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25



1 MR. CHAIRMAN: We've got some business to take care of. We're  
2 going to discuss the Gas and Oil Regulations. We also  
3 have that on the agenda to talk about today. You're  
4 welcome to sit in on that if you want to. We'll take  
5 five minutes and let me get a little better organized  
6 here.

7 (AFTER A BRIEF RECESS, THE HEARING CONTINUED AS FOLLOWS:)

8 MR. CHAIRMAN: It doesn't have anything to do with the rules  
9 but has to do with -- just to share with you an order  
10 from the State Corporation Commission for the Virginia  
11 Gas Storage Company. They come to the Board and have a  
12 field test going on for storage of gas underground and  
13 they now have a SCC order for noting and hearing that for  
14 the present time establishes life dual jurisdiction  
15 because they're under order of the Board and then they're  
16 also coming under State Corporation Commission juris-  
17 diction. Now, it's there intent to get themselves  
18 established -- I'm not trying to misrepresent this -- as  
19 a utility. And when they become a utility then they will  
20 probably come back before the Board and ask the Board to  
21 dissolve it's order and allow them to come under SCC's  
22 jurisdiction. I'm not representing that they're going  
23 to do that -- I'm not representing to you that that's  
24 what they plan to do and I'm certainly not trying to  
25 interject my thoughts in what they should or may do. I'm



1           just trying to inform you that this is going on. Do you  
2           want to say anything, Sandy?

3   MS. RIGGS: I think you're going to get into the regulatory  
4           review and what the feeling was with --

5   MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

6   MS. RIGGS: Well, that didn't come -- yeah, that was in the  
7           Board regs.

8   MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. I'll talk about that. If you have any  
9           questions -- because I'm just doing this informally.  
10          This is just to keep you apprised of what some of the  
11          things that are going on since our last meeting.

12   MR. KELLY: What's the status of coming with storage regs?

13   MS. RIGGS: That's what I asked him, was he going to get to  
14          that.

15   MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. I'll get into that and you all may want  
16          to ask questions. I'm bouncing around a little bit on  
17          you to begin with here. But Mr. J.C. Franks at one time  
18          addressed the Board and he titles this, I guess, maybe  
19          like a company, Franks Coal, and I don't know if he has a  
20          company or not. But he's written Tom Fulmer and I in  
21          asking us to be aware of some of his concerns. Here  
22          again, I'm just making you aware of this concern. I'm  
23          not asking the Board to take any action. I'm just making  
24          sure that as you have future cases you might be aware of  
25          some of the kind of things that get brought to our



1 attention. Mr. Franks has a lease and he has brought to  
2 the Board concern about the Board's field rules in the  
3 past and he has alleged that the rules are favorable to  
4 the companies and not favorable to the people that own  
5 the gas and that there's a lot of area where the person  
6 that owns the gas is not compensated. He goes through  
7 his lease in this particular document and talks about --  
8 he doesn't make any direct challenge to the Board order  
9 but it appears that he's saying that the order interferes  
10 with his lease in some manner. That's how I read it  
11 anyway, that he's saying that the lease expressly  
12 prohibits deduction of taxes for PGP, yet they may  
13 include these are part of their costs. He's talking  
14 about other kinds of things that he had in his lease  
15 versus the Board order. I don't know how the Board ever  
16 issues an order that -- of course, our orders are not  
17 designed to interfere with leases, private lease agree-  
18 ments with companies. That's the bottom line. So I  
19 would say to the extent that that's been construed to  
20 have done this it's the position of the Board that the  
21 Board's order didn't grant nor take away any lease rights  
22 of individual parties.

23 MS. RIGGS: I think the statute specifically says that, that  
24 it won't.

25 MR. CHAIRMAN: That it cannot.



1 MS. RIGGS: Right.

2 MR. CHAIRMAN: So I don't have anything further on that. If  
3 you have any questions -- I just here again want to make  
4 you aware. Now, to go to the regulations; I'm going to  
5 hand you a document entitled First Draft which is the Gas  
6 and Oil Board Regulations edited for the written comment  
7 that was received by the Department on behalf of the  
8 Board following the initial announcement that the Board's  
9 going to reconsider it's regulations. This is part of  
10 Governor Allen's order to insure that regulations are  
11 reviewed for simplicity and clarity and to have the least  
12 interference with business development. I'm going to  
13 hand you a document entitled Second Draft of the same  
14 regulation that incorporates the comments that the Board  
15 received through a public meeting that we had on the  
16 regulations last week. This is going to be the most  
17 recent edited version of the regulations incorporating  
18 all comments that we've received to date. On the agenda  
19 next month we will have these regulations for the Board's  
20 consideration and approval so that they may advance in  
21 the Governor's review process. I'm willing to spend  
22 whatever time and do this in whatever manner you find  
23 most helpful. What I plan to do is to walk you through  
24 this draft -- this second draft and point out changes.  
25 If you have any different way you want to do that please



1           let me know.

2       MR. HARRIS: Benny, I do have a real quick question. After  
3           the cover sheet, the table of contents, items 17, 18 and  
4           some on the other pages are marked out. What's --

5       MR. CHAIRMAN: As we get into this it's proposed deletion of  
6           those sections.

7       MR. HARRIS: Okay. I wanted to know what that meant.

8       MR. CHAIRMAN: On Page 1 of the definitions -- of course,  
9           you're not going to see it when you turn in there. We  
10          had attempted to and had recommendation to use the term  
11          "claimant" and define it. We have stricken that. On  
12          Page 2 we've stricken the meets and bounds because we're  
13          really not using those now and we have used only the term  
14          "mine development plan" in the definition rather than "or  
15          registered operations plans" because the Board regulation  
16          only refers to the mine development plan in the Board  
17          section in the law only refers to mine development plan.  
18          The Department regulations and other places in the  
19          statute refer to registered operations plans. The  
20          changes that you see on Page 3 all deal -- the first one  
21          up there in B1, "If the 30th day falls on a weekend or a  
22          legal holiday the deadline shall be the prior business  
23          day", this is to insure that we have the full 30 days  
24          prior to the date of the hearing. Some of this may not  
25          make sense -- we've been doing it, but it was to clean up



1 the language so that it said that.

2 MR. KELLY: Are these changes that have been -- this is all a  
3 result of input from

4 MR. KAISER: From BOGA and then the public hearing.

5 MR. CHAIRMAN: From the written comments received in the  
6 public meeting. These are all proposed changes. The  
7 document I've presented to you today, referred to as  
8 Second Draft, would be the document that we're bring to  
9 you as a product of the work group meeting and discussion  
10 that would be represented to the Board asking the Board  
11 to approve that at next meeting -- not this meeting but  
12 next meeting to move forward in the Governor's review.

13 MR. KELLY: We assume this -- purporting this is what we want

14 MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. That's right.

15 MS. RIGGS: In the context of the Yeary appeal because you're  
16 working -- prior business day gives you the full 30,  
17 right? That's right. It's when it's the next that you  
18 get cut short on that because if it's on a weekend and  
19 you go to the Monday --

20 MR. KAISER: You may lose.

21 MS. RIGGS: You may lose a day and that's how we got in the  
22 Yeary situation.

23 MR. KAISER: Well, the Yeary situation was also in February --  
24 I think it was in March is part of what happened, too.

25 MS. RIGGS: Okay. So it is prior, not next.



1 MR. KAISER: And that's what you've been doing.

2 MR. CHAIRMAN: Uh-huh.

3 MS. RIGGS: Because you're working from the deadline back as  
4 opposed to here forward.

5 MR. KAISER: And it's happened in the last six months where  
6 it's actually been 32 or 33 days because of this exact  
7 situation. This just clarifies exactly what the regula-  
8 tion is.

9 MS. RIGGS: All right.

10 MR. CHAIRMAN: On Page 4 4A is deleted -- the old 4A. And  
11 that reference is already in the law. It's not necessary  
12 to repeat it. Part of our review for minimizing the  
13 regulations is to not repeat unless you have a specific  
14 purpose, things that are already in the statute. So  
15 that's deleted. On what was old 4A now the new 4A -- we  
16 had considerable discussion, as I said, about using  
17 claimant and deleting coal and mineral owner and then as  
18 we referred back to statute we believe that we're bound  
19 to have consistent language there to insure that the  
20 hearing exceptions to statewide spacing and everything  
21 have all the parties identified specifically. On Page 5,  
22 the language has been changed there to identify what  
23 would be in the notice specifically, what's required for  
24 the mailing. This was to insure that there wasn't a  
25 misinterpretation, that the entire packet had to go out



1 with the notice.

2 MS. RIGGS: Yeah. I think the way it's been done is the  
3 actual application that the Board gets is mailed to each  
4 and every party instead of a notice which summarizes what  
5 that application is about. And this is to clarify that  
6 they don't -- you use to have to actually attach the  
7 application. Now you don't have to actually attach the  
8 application but you must give a notice that contains the  
9 important features of the application.

10 MR. CHAIRMAN: And tell them how they can go about getting an  
11 entire application.

12 MS. RIGGS: Getting an actual copy if they want it.

13 MR. CHAIRMAN: So this will reduce substantially the copying  
14 and mailing costs and things like that and still provide  
15 the information. Under B6, specifically there, there is  
16 a change to refer to the plat showing the size and shape  
17 of the unit, the location of the unit shall be shown in  
18 accordance with the various sections of the Code -- and  
19 I'm paraphrasing this. Proposed unit shall also be  
20 located by taking a measured distance in feet from the  
21 unit to the nearest 2.5 minute longitude line to the east  
22 and nearest 2.5 to the north. All that language is to  
23 get away from the requirement of the state plane co-  
24 ordinates and all this. After considerable discussion  
25 it was a group consensus that this is something that's



1 much more workable.

2 MR. HARRIS: Did you say get away from the state plane?

3 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. To get away from requiring that state  
4 plane coordinate specifically, but to have everything  
5 related to longitude and latitude.

6 MR. FULMER: One of the problems with this section -- it's in  
7 the Gas and Oil Regulations -- is the fact that this Code  
8 section is in existence, the only one in existence.  
9 However, this thing has been updated twice, three times  
10 on the methodology of using the state plane coordinates  
11 system and it's accuracy. So you would be continually  
12 going back and changing this thing as they come up with  
13 new types of technology to determine what the exact  
14 coordinates are. This gives you two options. You can  
15 still use the state plane or you can use the measured  
16 distance. And that's kind of like -- it gives you the  
17 two options to you.

18 MR. CHAIRMAN: On Page 6, highlighting specifically down in  
19 Item G -- it looks like that should be F. Other appli-  
20 cants for a hearing to modify a forced pooling order  
21 shall provide notice in accordance with Section 45.1-  
22 361.19 of the Code of Virginia to each respondent rather  
23 than person having an interest in the unit, each respond-  
24 ent named in the order to be modified whose interest may  
25 be affected by the proposed modification. That's so that



1       you don't have people thinking that something could  
2       impact them when, in fact, it's not going to impact them.  
3       If it's going to impact them then they're going to  
4       receive the notice. On Page 7, here again the changes as  
5       we discussed under 5C are to take into consideration they  
6       can have the state plane coordinate system or another  
7       coordinate system based on longitude and latitude.

8       MR. HARRIS: Let me ask one quick question. You had said  
9       early that -- about not repeating and I notice we do  
10      repeat here. We use the same language, in fact, showing  
11      in accordance with the Virginia Coordinate System of 1927  
12      as defined. And that other section we just looked at had  
13      the same language. Is that necessary to repeat that  
14      again?

15     MS. RIGGS: I think the reason that's done is because it's not  
16     in our Gas and Oil Act. It's pulled from another section  
17     of the Code that a person might not have --

18     MR. CHAIRMAN: He's talking about repeating it twice.

19     MR. HARRIS: Because it was repeated within this.

20     MS. RIGGS: Within the regulation you mean?

21     MR. HARRIS: Yes.

22     MS. RIGGS: One under field rules and one under pooling  
23     orders, I guess?

24     MR. HARRIS: One under B6, notice of hearing, Page 5. That  
25     large paragraph in the middle of Page 5 and then on Page



1           7 we have essentially the same thing.

2 MS. RIGGS: You could say the plat referred to paragraph of  
3 whatever above and reference it back.

4 MR. HARRIS: I just thought I heard you make a comment about  
5 not repeating.

6 MR. KAISER: I guess you could say in 4B6.

7 MS. RIGGS: Right.

8 MR. HARRIS: Yeah. But I mean I don't know --

9 MR. CHAIRMAN: Please bring out anything like that. We'll  
10 take a look and see whether or not that causes any  
11 problems. If it doesn't and it can reduce regulation  
12 then we should do it.

13 MR. HARRIS: Will there be people reading 5 without reading 4?

14 MR. CHAIRMAN: That's what we'll have to look at.

15 MS. RIGGS: Well, you can reference it back. Just saying  
16 using the coordinates system described in Paragraph 4B6  
17 above or something like that.

18 MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. On Page 8 the next change is striking  
19 the meets and bounds reference. Also down in 6A3 we made  
20 a change, a statement of proposed location of the well in  
21 relation to wells permitted or for which a permit  
22 application is pending before the Division of Gas and Oil  
23 at the time of filing. This is applications for an  
24 exception to minimum well spacing requirements. That's  
25 just to insure the Board has before it a complete picture



1 as it's hearing these cases. Page 9, here again deleting  
2 some of the language that's believed to be unnecessary,  
3 redundant. And also down at the bottom of Page 9, A7 is  
4 another area where we could possibly (Inaudible.) On  
5 Page 10 we've attempted to combine old 13 and 14, an  
6 estimate of the production over the life of well or wells  
7 and if different an estimate of the recoverable reserves  
8 of the unit. Typically that's going to be the same and  
9 if it is then we don't need the language. On Page 11 at  
10 the top of the page where it talks about the affidavit  
11 shall state if no elections were made or if any response  
12 was untimely the affidavit shall be accompanied by a  
13 proposed supplemental order to be made and recorded to  
14 complete the record regarding elections. The affidavit  
15 and proposed supplemental order shall be filed by the  
16 unit operator within 45 days of the last day on which a  
17 timely election could have been delivered or mailed or  
18 within 45 days of the last date for payment set forth in  
19 the pooling order, which ever occurs last. This is  
20 incorporating the Board's supplemental order into  
21 regulation.

22 MS. RIGGS: I think the only concern we had with regard to the  
23 45 days was you have 30 days from recording to make  
24 elections and then I think the order provides you have 60  
25 days from recording to pay bonuses. So probably if you



1 go to 45 days for filing of the supplemental order you're  
2 going to have to change the order to probably 90 days to  
3 pay bonuses.

4 MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. We talked about that but we can handle  
5 that with the order.

6 MS. RIGGS: So that they fall in sequence.

7 MR. KAISER: Right.

8 MS. RIGGS: So you get your elections, file your supplemental  
9 order and then based on those elections then you make  
10 payments. But that can be done through the orders  
11 themselves. I don't think that's referred to anywhere  
12 else in the regs that would be impacted.

13 MR. CHAIRMAN: On Page 12 we had a proposal to add Item E,  
14 unless one or more respondents elect to participate or  
15 elect to be a nonparticipating operator on a carried  
16 basis the unit operator shall have no obligation to  
17 report costs after the expiration of the election  
18 period.

19 MS. RIGGS: That's an issue that came up earlier today.

20 MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, our discussion centered around -- and I  
21 pointed out that the Board in the past had asked for  
22 actual costs to be reported so that the Board could be  
23 aware of a comparison if it wanted to make those of DWSs.  
24 Earlier today I asked some questions about do you  
25 maintain these records, but at the meeting the other day



1       some company -- at least one company represented that  
2       they do not, in fact, maintain actual costs of wells.  
3       Unless if --

4       MR. LEWIS: I can't believe that.

5       MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm simply reporting what was said. I'm  
6       not --

7       MR. KAISER: Of course, the order now requires --

8       MR. CHAIRMAN: The order currently requires that to be done,  
9       but the regulation here then would change that so that  
10      unless you had one or more respondents electing to  
11      participate then you would not have any obligation to  
12      provide that.

13      MR. KAISER: And I guess the point being if all operators  
14      continue to assess their costs on a continuing basis,  
15      which I assume that they all did for many reasons, this  
16      does not -- this addition would not impact the Board's  
17      duty to check those on behalf of any citizens who may  
18      elect to participate.

19      MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

20      MR. KAISER: So if you could insure somehow that all the  
21      operators do keep those costs, which I assume they have  
22      to, then this is not so bad. I guess that would be my  
23      point.

24      MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, several people will recommend --

25      MR. KAISER: But if you assume they don't then I can under-



1 stand why you may not want that.

2 MR. CHAIRMAN: A lot of them represented that this is just an  
3 added burden, a lot of added expense to have to do this  
4 for every one. And it probably is. I'm just talking  
5 Benny Wampler to the Board, not Board member to repre-  
6 sent. But just based on experience it probably is. I  
7 think it does nothing to take away any authority we have  
8 to discover costs in any fashion -- reasonable fashion  
9 within the law.

10 MS. RIGGS: I think it does. I would prefer that it be silent  
11 over having a prohibition because with the prohibition in  
12 there it's basically saying that by law once these  
13 regulations are promulgated that you can't require them  
14 to do it. Unless there's a participant or a nonp-  
15 articipating operator that the Board cannot require that  
16 they updated those costs. And once that becomes a  
17 regulation I think the Board has no authority after  
18 that. I mean, it's bound by its own regulations.

19 MR. KAISER: In my over two years of representing EREX and  
20 forced pooling hearings we've never had anybody elect to  
21 participate or be carried.

22 MS. RIGGS: I only know of one well which is Ashland -- OXY --  
23 where you had two operators where there was a partici-  
24 pation in the whole program. Only one time. So basic-  
25 ally what this says is you're not going to get any



1 actual costs. If those are the only circumstances under  
2 which the Board could require the filing of actual costs  
3 that's going to be knell to never probably.

4 MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I guess I was thinking more or less on  
5 the DWE, that the Board has a right to do any kind of  
6 discover it wants before it accepts the DWE.

7 MS. RIGGS: Well, that's what you'd have to do. You would  
8 have to really --

9 MR. LEWIS: That's not the actual costs, though.

10 MR. KAISER: I guess in practicality if you were to call one  
11 of the operators and say, "Look, we want to compare your  
12 AFE on well X that you forced pooled in January of 1995.  
13 Our information is the well's been drilled and complet-  
14 ed." What are they going to say, no?

15 MS. RIGGS: I think that's what happened before when we --

16 MR. KAISER: Oh, really?

17 MS. RIGGS: When we were asked to make the comparison and had  
18 no data to do it with. There's no obligation to file  
19 that data which is why it got put in the order in the  
20 first place, to enable the Board to get the data.

21 MR. CHAIRMAN: Several were not keeping information before.  
22 But anyway you're not --

23 MR. LEWIS: Well, I think that maybe ought to be changed.

24 MR. CHAIRMAN: You're not being asked to do that here today.  
25 Okay? I'm just presenting to you today for your con-



1 sideration for next month's meeting. Then that's when  
2 we'll take this up as far what you want to go forward  
3 with.

4 MR. GARVIS: Once somebody makes an election that they will  
5 not participate basically then is that a -- I mean, it's  
6 a done deal. I mean, can they reverse that after they've  
7 made the election? At that point it's almost not  
8 relevant what the costs are, is it? Is it relevant?

9 MS. RIGGS: The only way it becomes relevant from the Board's  
10 duty is to make sure that the up front estimate is  
11 accurate as it can be. You don't want the estimate to be  
12 a deterrent to participation. So what you're looking at  
13 is when these applications come before you and they  
14 present the costs -- the estimate -- that you have some  
15 basis on which you can look and say this is a reasonable  
16 cost and it's not inflated and it wouldn't deter partici-  
17 pation because it's inflated in any way. But you're  
18 right. Once they make their election or choose not to  
19 elect to participate or be carried they're deemed to have  
20 leased or they actually leased and the supplemental order  
21 gets filed. The interests become locked in at that point  
22 and the Board has no ongoing duty to monitor those costs  
23 after that.

24 MR. GARVIS: How do we know that the AFEs are accurate?

25 MR. LEWIS: You don't.



1 MS. RIGGS: Well, that's what this subject up to begin with.

2 The Board member said, "How do we know these AFEs are  
3 accurate?" Well, the only way you know is to compare  
4 them to actual costs and see if they were accurate. So  
5 the Board member, I think, requested of the Board  
6 requested Tom to do a comparison of estimates to actuals  
7 and come back with a report to the Board so that they  
8 could analyze that at which point it was discovered that  
9 Tom couldn't make that comparison because the actuals  
10 weren't on file. So at that point the Board said all  
11 right, in our orders we're going to require you to update  
12 these numbers once the well is drilled so that we'll have  
13 data to do that comparison.

14 MR. KAISER: Well, having them on file and actually having  
15 them internal are two different things. Right?

16 MR. LEWIS: Right.

17 MR. GARVIS: Tom, what's your feeling. Based on your  
18 experience have they proven to be fairly accurate?

19 MR. FULMER: In a lot of cases they can below what the AFE is  
20 and in a lot of cases they can be above. Of course, a  
21 lot of it depends on what happens at the time of drill-  
22 ing, whether you have problems or not.

23 MR. CHAIRMAN: I guess the bottom line though -- if I can  
24 interject a question or two. Have you found that the  
25 amount per foot of casing, you know, the costs per



1 tubing, those kinds of things -- obviously field condi-  
2 tions are going to dictate some of those, but have you  
3 found those costs to be very much off base?

4 MR. FULMER: No. They usually follow -- from year to year to  
5 year they'll follow the inflation rate and they don't  
6 deviate all that much. The one thing that I've wondered  
7 about and when you talk about AFEs and what people do  
8 here is when you present an AFE in a Board order is that  
9 the cost in which somebody comes in and participates at  
10 or do they have to actually participate the actual costs?

11 MS. RIGGS: At actual.

12 MR. FULMER: So that drives the other to be more accurate.

13 And there may be cases where you have a bloated AFE and  
14 come in a little bit under that AFE which would be a  
15 benefit on those who elect to participate. And then you  
16 can have under estimated AFEs and come in at a higher  
17 rate. I've always wondered how that works. Do you work  
18 on actual or do you work it on what the Board order would  
19 require them to do?

20 MS. RIGGS: Once they elect to be a partner in the deal they  
21 assume the risk and they -- if there's a short fall  
22 they've got to make it up.

23 MR. KAISER: That's where your duty comes in, to try to keep  
24 them accurate.

25 MS. RIGGS: It's just like a partner in a partnership. You've



1 got to divvy up your share.  
2 MR. GARVIS: For better or worse.  
3 MS. RIGGS: That's right.  
4 MR. HARRIS: I think most of the time your AFES will be a  
5 little higher than the actual drilling.  
6 MR. KELLY: I think that's right.  
7 MR. LEWIS: I think they will because -- you hate to go out  
8 there and estimate what something will cost and then you  
9 run over the cost because that don't look good, not too  
10 good at all.  
11 MR. FULMER: One of the other problems we have with the AFES  
12 is that a lot of times you try to project -- for instance  
13 in the case of the Board, the Board produced an order but  
14 that does not necessarily say that that well's going to  
15 be drilled at the time of the order. And a year or so  
16 later there's going to be an inflationary cost in there  
17 that at the time the order was issued to the next year in  
18 casing, stimulation, some of the time coordinates which  
19 would go up. So you may have a cost that's sometimes  
20 above quite a bit the AFE at the time. It depends on  
21 when the well is drilled. That's kind of like the bottom  
22 line.  
23 MS. RIGGS: Then you're going to see another change when we  
24 get back here, that they want the life of these pooling  
25 orders to be much longer than they are now. So if that



1 were approved and say you had a four year life on a  
2 pooling order I guess you would then anticipate building  
3 four years worth of inflation up front to cover the fact  
4 that you may not drill till the end of that period. So  
5 you might see that even get -- those two changes combined  
6 with each other may impact.

7 MR. KAISER: But I think also we need to keep the overall  
8 effect of this in prospective. And that being that -- at  
9 least certainly on behalf of EREX and I think the other  
10 operators, too, based on the fact that nobody essentially  
11 ever elects to be a participant or be carried. I mean,  
12 there's certainly no motivation or intent on the part of  
13 the operator to try to AFE people out of it, so to speak.  
14 There's no reason to.

15 MR. HARRIS: I have a question kind of like that. I'm not  
16 real -- I don't know how to put it. I'm rather naevi  
17 when it comes to business sense. Would a company want  
18 somebody to participate or is it better financially  
19 speaking not to have someone to participate? I don't  
20 know.

21 MR. LEWIS: Most of the time they don't want to.

22 MR. KAISER: No.

23 MS. ? : It depends on that person's interest, what size of  
24 participation would be.

25 MR. HARRIS: No, I'm not talking about from the standpoint of



1 a person but from the standpoint of the company.

2 MS. RIGGS: It would be like taking in a partner into a  
3 partnership. If they're going to have a .0002 percent  
4 interest and they -- but they're in your business in.

5 MR. CHAIRMAN: As a business you're better off not to have  
6 that in general because it's another headache.

7 MS. RIGGS: That's another business partner they have to  
8 contend with.

9 MR. CHAIRMAN: That's another business partner to have to deal  
10 with.

11 MR. HARRIS: I guess I was thinking of it in terms of the  
12 initial cost or cost to produce, since you're being aided  
13 with that, if that's --

14 MS. RIGGS: I would say the way that ownership interests in  
15 these particular wells are fractured unless you got a  
16 situation where you had two operators within the same  
17 unit and one would elect to participate and had a  
18 substantial interest within the unit. Now, that you see  
19 and the one we have is that situation where you had  
20 Ashland owning interest in an OXY unit and they elected  
21 to participate.

22 MR. GARVIS: I think as far as Paragraph E this is really  
23 going to require a balancing act because on the one hand  
24 we don't want to incumber the businesses from doing  
25 things that are excess and regulatory. But on the other



1 hand I think we have an obligation to the citizens really  
2 to have -- to keep everybody honest. As an example, if  
3 the AFEs are even over by 10 or 15 percent, that margin  
4 over a whole lot of wells, that can be quite a bit of  
5 money that would be -- I mean, that could be very  
6 significant in long term. So I think it's going to  
7 require some degree of balancing. I'm not exactly sure  
8 how to do that, but I think you see what I'm saying.

9 MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure. And if you all have any suggested  
10 language or anything like that obviously that would be  
11 something we'll take up next time as well. On Page 13,  
12 on the applications to change unit operator for a unit  
13 established by order of the Board, striking the whole  
14 Paragraph A, saying what the Board's not required to do.  
15 And then really combining what use to be two sections,  
16 one referring to a voluntary transfer and the other an  
17 involuntary transfer into one, cutting out a lot of the  
18 redundant language for transferring.

19 MR. GARVIS: I don't understand that, the approval of the  
20 Board is not required. That was eliminated?

21 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. It just gets into -- it's something that  
22 the Board isn't required to do when you're going to sell  
23 or sign or otherwise convey. It's private business  
24 transactions. It's something in regulation that --

25 MR. GARVIS: So Board approval is not required if you want to



1           sell --

2       MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

3       MR. GARVIS: I understand.

4       MR. CHAIRMAN: So we'll just take that out and talk about when  
5                   the Board does mix in with your business. That's on  
6                   voluntary and involuntary transfers. It more clearly  
7                   defines the Board's role when you have those transactions  
8                   occurring in the private section.

9       MS. RIGGS: I have a questions and it just now occurred to me  
10               Where it says a transfer of the right to operate a unit,  
11               a unit established by the Board?

12      MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

13      MS. RIGGS: I guess when I read that previously I was thinking  
14               by a forced pooling order. But the Board could create a  
15               unit by a field rule that was a voluntary unit.

16      MR. CHAIRMAN: But you're still going to pick it up under the  
17               voluntary and involuntary transfer.

18      MS. RIGGS: But I thought that we only had -- I guess I  
19               thought that the only time they needed to come to the  
20               Board for approval to transfer or to substitute a new  
21               operator was if the pooling order named the original  
22               operator, that if it was strictly a voluntary unit where  
23               they had 100 percent leased and they've never come to the  
24               Board that we wouldn't interfere there -- I mean, that  
25               that wouldn't be within our --



1 MR. KAISER: That was never under your jurisdiction.

2 MS. RIGGS: Right. If they never came to us for a pooling  
3 order in the first place we never had jurisdiction over  
4 that unit. All we did was create field rules that  
5 establish, say, an 80 acre unit.

6 MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that's right.

7 MS. ? : Or a location exception also.

8 MS. RIGGS: Well, location exceptions don't create units.

9 MS. ? : That's true. Right.

10 MS. RIGGS: The only two things that can create a unit are  
11 either field rules or individual forced pooling applica-  
12 tions where you create the unit and then pool it whether  
13 it's under statewide spacing or whether it's some other  
14 configuration, I guess. But where you have statewide  
15 spacing and we create the unit at time of pooling because  
16 it's outside of the field, there I think it works. But  
17 where you create the unit by field rule but there's never  
18 a forced pooling application it doesn't.

19 MR. CHAIRMAN: Even where we say unless ordered by the Board  
20 on it's own motion to transfer the right to operate?

21 MS. RIGGS: Well, that just addresses the way it comes on  
22 before the Board, I think.

23 MR. KAISER: Uh-huh.

24 MS. RIGGS: I think it's to operate a unit established by the  
25 Board and pursuant -- and pooled pursuant to Section



1 45.1-361.21 or 22. You need two elements there, I think.

2 MR. KAISER: Yeah. We should add that. I agree with that.

3 If it's a voluntary pool there's no reason we should have  
4 to come before the Board.

5 MS. RIGGS: I don't think we ever have in the past is the  
6 reason I'm saying that.

7 MR. FULMER: Well, in a way we have. Do you remember this  
8 question about two conflicting leases? They're not  
9 conflicting leases, but they've taken leases out from two  
10 different parties and they've come before the Board and  
11 asked us to pool those interests.

12 MS. RIGGS: But there we would have a pooling order.

13 MR. FULMER: But, see, that's a voluntary situation.

14 MS. RIGGS: I don't want to carve out voluntary. If there's a  
15 pooling order -- if we've accepted jurisdiction by  
16 entering a pooling order that names an operator then  
17 those are the situations where if you're going to change  
18 that operator it, in essence, is a modification of that  
19 pooling order.

20 MR. KAISER: And you have to continuing jurisdiction.

21 MR. CHAIRMAN: I think you're right on that. We'll work on  
22 that language for next time.

23 MS. RIGGS: Because when OXY transferred to Consol what the  
24 Board was considered was a transfer of operator and the  
25 order actually attached a list of all the force pooling



1 and we didn't address voluntary units there. I think  
2 historically we never have.

3 MR. CHAIRMAN: On Page 15 under appeals of the Director's  
4 decision, a proposal to strike B8 which was asking them  
5 to provide anything else they felt relevant. They can  
6 still do that. On Page 16, here again the same thing,  
7 striking the language that said other information that  
8 the petitioner wishes to provide. Also at the bottom of  
9 16 under effective dates for Board orders, this is where  
10 we had the change that Sandra's talking about. Currently  
11 the Board orders expire a year from the date of entry and  
12 this proposal is to say that unless otherwise provided in  
13 the Board order all orders issued by the Board shall  
14 remain into effect for a period of two years from the  
15 date of issuance of the Board order unless prior to said  
16 expiration date the operator applies for a permit in  
17 which event the order shall expire two years from the  
18 issuance of the permit. That will cut -- as discussed,  
19 cut out a lot of going back and forth, having an order  
20 expire and having a permit and then having to come back  
21 and get an order continued.

22 MS. RIGGS: The permits are good for two years.

23 MR. CHAIRMAN: Does that make sense? All right.

24 MR. FULMER: I've just got a question about that language in  
25 there. Unless prior to said expiration date the operator



1           apply for a permit.

2   MS. RIGGS: Applies for and is issued a permit?

3   MR. FULMER: Yeah. I think it has to go from the issue date.

4           That just says apply.

5   MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that was the intent of the discussion.

6           That's a good point. Two years from the issuance is

7           what --

8   MS. RIGGS: Well, we tied the expiration to the issuance, but

9           the continuancy doesn't require an issuance.

10   MR. CHAIRMAN: Tell me what you're looking at.

11   MR. FULMER: What it says is, "Unless prior to said expiration

12           date the operator applies for a permit."

13   MS. RIGGS: Applies for and is issued a permit.

14   MR. FULMER: And then the next thing it says, "In which then

15           order shall expire two years from the issuance of the

16           permit." So you'll have a Board order expiring but you

17           don't have a permit.

18   MR. CHAIRMAN: I've got you.

19   MS. RIGGS: Max. If you came in and got your permit on the

20           last day of your initial two year period it would be a

21           four year max.

22   MR. CHAIRMAN: At the top of Page 17, B3 added in the coalbed

23           methane claimant there. Then the D language was changed

24           in the event an appeal is taken from any order of the

25           Board in the time between the filing of the appeal the



1 petition for appeal and final order of the Circuit Court  
2 shall be excluded and calculating the time period as  
3 contained in sub-section A of this section. That's what  
4 we just discussed.

5 MS. RIGGS: That is already in all of the Board orders.

6 They're just taking it out of the order and putting it in  
7 the regs.

8 MR. CHAIRMAN: The next change is fairly substantial and  
9 covers all the way over to Page 20. What we propose to  
10 do is under all the enforcement discussion, notice of  
11 violation and order of closures is to say that all orders  
12 of the Board shall be enforced by the Director pursuant  
13 to the process set out in the regulation entitled Gas and  
14 Oil Regulation VR-48005.22.1. And that just simply  
15 consolidates all the enforcement language over in the  
16 Department's regulation and doesn't repeat it here for  
17 purpose of Board orders and Board rules. The next change  
18 is a significant change. I'm not trying to discuss all  
19 of them. On Page 23 is deleting the allowable produc-  
20 tion, enhance recovery and underground storage of  
21 natural gas. Unallowable production, it's proposed to  
22 delete that entire section, A and B.

23 MR. KELLY: Why is that?

24 MS. RIGGS: It's provided in law anyway. The statute says  
25 that we will do that by Board order.



1 MR. CHAIRMAN: And Section 22 on enhanced recovery, the  
2 discussion was that there's -- no one's talking about  
3 doing enhanced recovery, no one's doing it. The Board  
4 doesn't need a regulation on it. If something comes up,  
5 you know, if someone proposes that they can always come  
6 to the Board and make a proposal and the Board can  
7 establish rules or do it by order or whatever at that  
8 time.

9 MR. KELLY: What about storage?

10 MR. CHAIRMAN: Underground storage of natural gas. Now, we  
11 had -- I kept asking them if they were sure that we  
12 didn't need this section and they all felt that we did  
13 not need this section, that people would -- if they were  
14 going to in anyway impact gas they would come to the  
15 Board for an order and --

16 MS. RIGGS: Correlative rights issue.

17 MR. CHAIRMAN: To protect correlative rights, that the Board  
18 was required to do that and that the operators are  
19 required to make sure that they're not impeding on those  
20 so that you don't really need something to say that you  
21 can't do it unless you come to the Board, that the law  
22 already covers that.

23 MS. RIGGS: Well, it covers the extraction of native gas if  
24 they're going to impact on correlative rights --

25 MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.



1 MS. RIGGS: -- as part of the underground storage operation.  
2 MR. LEWIS: How will that effect these other -- like partner-  
3 ships on the storage?  
4 MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, what it could mean is that you could  
5 conceivably have an underground storage area that wasn't  
6 under jurisdiction until such time as they got themselves  
7 established as a utility, I would imagine. I mean,  
8 that's what it could mean.  
9 MS. RIGGS: The SCC hasn't established their regulations yet,  
10 have they?  
11 MR. FULMER: No.  
12 MS. RIGGS: So we don't know how they're going to implement  
13 their jurisdiction to see how the two might mesh.  
14 MR. CHAIRMAN: Here again, taking the over view, does the  
15 Board really need to be involved if, in fact, you're not  
16 impacting anyone else's gas?  
17 MR. HARRIS: Just thinking about all of this it looks like it  
18 would. I think from -- not even someone who's claiming  
19 ownership but just from thinking about you're putting gas  
20 back into the ground you would think that surely there is  
21 some type of communication between that gas and gas  
22 that's already there. You would think it would.  
23 MS. RIGGS: Now, we're not talking about -- the safety  
24 considerations is what you're concerned about?  
25 MR. HARRIS: No. I'm saying that --



1 MR. KAISER: He's talking about correlative rights and  
2 communication between the storage field and gas outside  
3 the proposed buffer zone or whatever.

4 MR. LEWIS: I think they ought to address the safety part of  
5 it on your pressure. If you're going to inject more  
6 pressure than you've ever had in those -- most of them  
7 are old fields is what they generally use for storage  
8 wells. And if they're going to inject more pressure that  
9 needs to be looked at, I think.

10 MR. KELLY: What about the implementation of DMME approved  
11 regulations regarding that? Any move afoot for that  
12 or --

13 MR. CHAIRMAN: There's no section on underground storage of  
14 gas. I think what the Inspector's authority -- you'd  
15 have to look at it to see if, in fact, the Inspector had  
16 the authority to regulate that area. A well is a well is  
17 a well. If they have a well which they're using to do  
18 that then it's under his jurisdiction.

19 MR. KELLY: I know we had the big fuss years ago when we  
20 first changed the law, I guess, with the coal people who  
21 objected to the ability of anyone to store gas in the  
22 coal fields, I guess.

23 MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

24 MR. KELLY: And at the time we just left that out of the law  
25 or left it out of the -- it wasn't addressed, I guess,



1 and it's always just been hanging there and I just  
2 wondered if there were any new moves afoot to address the  
3 matter?

4 MR. CHAIRMAN: No, not in that regulation per say.

5 MR. FULMER: In most cases and when we did background research  
6 and underground storage and all this stuff comes up it's  
7 usually your local city that controls storage fields for  
8 I guess, different reasons. And I think one of the  
9 primary concerns you get into is to make sure anything  
10 outside that storage field is protected. That would be  
11 the deal -- even the EPA doesn't control injection.  
12 That's brought down to the local level and the PSA,  
13 believe it or not. It kind of astonished me a little bit  
14 when we -- because it was originally under the Under-  
15 ground Injection Control Program. But apparently they  
16 don't control anything they do as a well.

17 MR. KELLY: So what would happen right now if Columbia wanted  
18 to go in through the Haysi field and make it a storage  
19 field? How would that be regulated or permitted or  
20 whatever?

21 MR. LEWIS: The same way it would be if they were drilling new  
22 wells, wouldn't it?

23 MR. FULMER: I would think that they would want to do that  
24 now. That they would first have to file with SCC the  
25 intent for a storage field -- notice of intent to have a



1 storage field.

2 MR. KELLY: I guess my question is how does that come under  
3 the jurisdiction of the SCC to begin with? If they're  
4 going back in an existing field using existing wells to  
5 store gas instead of extract gas? It's all permitted and  
6 in everything is in place now.

7 MR. FULMER: They've got it all -- it's in the statute.

8 MS. RIGGS: The new statute that was enacted last year, I  
9 don't have that but it granted jurisdiction and I don't  
10 remember how broad that was.

11 MR. FULMER: Storage. That's all it said.

12 MR. KELLY: I guess they're picking it up under the jurisdic-  
13 tion of the --

14 MR. LEWIS: Transportation.

15 MR. KELLY: The pipeline jurisdiction.

16 MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, to address Max's question. Tom, do you  
17 believe you have the authority to regulate the safety  
18 concerns of underground storage now if someone goes out  
19 -- let's say that in Bill's scenario that someone goes  
20 over and starts injecting, do you have jurisdiction?

21 MR. FULMER: I have jurisdiction up to the point that they  
22 want to do that process. In other words, what I'm saying  
23 is is that the purpose of the well that was drilled --  
24 the purpose of the well that was drilled is subject to my  
25 jurisdiction up to the point of the process. It's just



1           like a waste disposal. We could go up to the point where  
2           EPA takes over jurisdiction and as far as injection of  
3           the waste.

4   MR. CHAIRMAN: So you're saying they couldn't use that well --  
5           are you saying that they couldn't use that well for the  
6           injection of gas because that's not it's intended  
7           purpose?

8   MR. FULMER: Yes. That's where I would -- it would come in  
9           until such time that category is changed.

10   MR. KELLY: Couldn't you use it for a production well?

11   MR. FULMER: Huh?

12   MR. KELLY: You couldn't use a production well as an injection  
13           well, is that what --

14   MR. FULMER: Right, to re-inject gas.

15   MR. LEWIS: You have authority over any well until it's  
16           abandoned, don't you?

17   MR. FULMER: Yeah. Or --

18   MR. LEWIS: And that way it wouldn't be abandoned?

19   MR. FULMER: Or converted.

20   MR. LEWIS: That's right.

21   MR. CHAIRMAN: See, and then if they got the SCC approval then  
22           it would relinquish jurisdiction to them at that time.

23   MR. LEWIS: I think we still ought to have some control over  
24           it, Tom, from a safety point of view.

25   MR. CHAIRMAN: If, in fact, SCC -- I don't know exactly --



1 Sandy, I'm not trying to put you on the spot. I think  
2 probably until we see what they do we don't really know  
3 how to answer that.

4 MS. RIGGS: That's right. All we've got now is a statute  
5 that's about one paragraph that gives them jurisdiction.  
6 We don't know how they're going to implement that  
7 jurisdiction or what kind of regulations they're going to  
8 adopt and how those will interface with the safety and/or  
9 Board jurisdictions that might be in place for protection  
10 of correlative rights and/or safety issues.

11 MR. KELLY: What if you wanted to use a sealed gob area as a  
12 storage area? Who would have jurisdiction over that?

13 MR. FULMER: It wouldn't be indifferent besides the well, but  
14 if you're talking about the area that's a different  
15 situation.

16 MR. LEWIS: Yeah.

17 MR. KELLY: Obviously there would be coal concerns and other  
18 things coming in there, surface owners --

19 MR. CHAIRMAN: Correlative rights issues the Board would have  
20 to deal with.

21 MR. LEWIS: Virginia Gas is getting ready to store -- storage

22 MR. KELLY: Or a salt solution cavity.

23 MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

24 MR. FULMER: Regardless of that situation I would presume  
25 that under an SCC notice of intent it becomes a public



1 utility which is quite different than what we're talking  
2 about. We're not talking about an operator going and  
3 putting a storage place in. They become actually a  
4 public -- subject to public regulation whether it's from  
5 the SCC or the local PSC, Public Service Commission.  
6 That's the way they've been doing it in other states.  
7 The storage fields are actually run by local PSEs or  
8 public utility commissions or something of that nature.  
9 That would be a legal hassle to do it in a mine, but if  
10 somebody wanted to do --

11 MR. KELLY: I thought I'd pose the questions. I'm sure it's  
12 been thought of.

13 MR. FULMER: That would be a nightmare, I knew that.

14 MR. CHAIRMAN: In making sure that we understand any desire  
15 the Board has for next meeting when you'll be considering  
16 these for their moving forward in the system, we're going  
17 to get back with you. We're going to work on some  
18 language. On Page 6 -- let me just be specific. On Page  
19 6 we agreed that G should be F and we changed that.  
20 We'll look at the reference from the various sections to  
21 eliminate the redundant language on the state plane  
22 coordinate for longitude and latitude.

23 MS. RIGGS: Benny, you might be able to make a defined term up  
24 front of --

25 MR. CHAIRMAN: We might be and just refer to it.



1 MS. RIGGS: And then refer to it as that defined term, where  
2 ever it appears.

3 MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. And then on Page 13, the language that  
4 Sandra discussed on the units established by the Board  
5 and pooled pursuant to 361.21 and 22. The change we  
6 talked about on Page 16 under Section 15-B, applies for  
7 an is issued a permit. Do you want us to do anything on  
8 the storage field, anything different, provide any  
9 additional information on underground storage of natural  
10 gas?

11 MS. RIGGS: We can bring a copy of the SECC statute so they  
12 can see what the extent of their --

13 MR. CHAIRMAN: Anything else. Have I missed anything?

14 MR. GARVIS: What about on Page 12, E, where we discussed the  
15 AFES?

16 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thanks.

17 MR. GARVIS: Another thing, Benny, on the front here this says  
18 summary of public comment. What was the composition of  
19 the so called public, if you will? In other words, how  
20 many people were there? Who was there?

21 MR. CHAIRMAN: Two things. One, the first draft was the  
22 public comment. That was when we had advertised it in  
23 newspapers and published in the State Register Regulation  
24 announcement that the Board's regulations are open for  
25 anyone out there who wants to comment. So we received



1           those. That's reflected in the first draft.

2       MR. GARVIS: How much participation was there from the public?

3       MR. CHAIRMAN: There was none from the public per say citi-  
4           zens, at large. We had company proposed changes from  
5           the Virginia Oil and Gas Association proposed changes  
6           during that public comment period. Then we established a  
7           work committee as we talked about and in that work  
8           committee we have representatives from the various gas  
9           and oil interests, coal owners and public interest group  
10          representatives -- a citizens representative.

11       MR. GARVIS: What my concern is, I'm not worried about the  
12          interest by guys like Jim Kaiser and the companies. They  
13          will be taken care of obviously. They're going to have  
14          their representative. But I'm concerned about the little  
15          guy out there in Buchanan County or where ever. He's got  
16          to do these sorts of things and he has to work to get  
17          whatever -- his correlative rights. So I'm more concern-  
18          ed about somebody way out there, a little guy, just like  
19          the rest of us. I mean, I don't read the newspapers  
20          looking for comments on the Gas and Oil Board Regulations  
21          and those sort of things. Are we going to the extent --  
22          I'm just concerned have we taken into account that there  
23          might be some little man out there who never has the  
24          opportunity nor the desire or ability, I guess, until  
25          something actually comes up when he then has to make a



1           petition before the Board or whatever.

2       MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we've attempted to do that. And we'll  
3           also attempt prior to the Board making any regulations  
4           have our notice of hearing next time. And here again,  
5           the unfortunate thing about some of this is is a lot of  
6           people do not get involved until something does directly  
7           impact them. We've seen this room filled and running  
8           over when we have something that's impacting them.  
9           Unfortunately, a lot of times when you're making changes  
10          or considering changes like this it's difficult for  
11          people to perceive that yes, they could have an impact on  
12          that process. A lot of people just presume that's a  
13          process that they'll -- somebody somewhere will go  
14          through.

15       MR. LEWIS: They're going to do what they want to do anyway.

16       MR. CHAIRMAN: And some of those kinds of thoughts rather than  
17          believe that they can come here and make a difference.  
18          But the whole purpose of me saying today you're not being  
19          asked to decide this but just simply making you aware is  
20          so that we can put this on the agenda for next time and  
21          allow the Board to hear any further suggestions or  
22          discussions on that. If you have any ideas on how we  
23          might do that particular process while we have time in  
24          that announcement to do that we sure can.

25       MR. LEWIS: It would be nice if you could put it the local



1 papers in block form.

2 MR. GARVIS: Is there any way we could go back maybe -- like  
3 some of the individual parties. I know that the short  
4 time I've been on the Board some people have written  
5 letters that maybe had some concerns. And maybe there's  
6 a way we can go back to them and at least invite them to  
7 see if they have any ideas. I don't want to belabor the  
8 issue, but I just want to make sure that we have a  
9 balance between the companies rights because obviously we  
10 want to -- we don't want to unduly regulate those guys  
11 from doing what they have to do, but at the same time I'm  
12 equally concerned about the citizens, that they have  
13 their ability -- we have an obligation to protect their  
14 interests also.

15 MR. CHAIRMAN: I would think that, Tom, you would have record  
16 of the names and phone numbers and folks you could call.  
17 The only problem you've got is trying to be selective in  
18 doing that. But certainly at random, 15 to 20 people,  
19 call them up and tell them that the Board is going to  
20 consider this, that they've had concerns before.

21 MR. LEWIS: And if they have any other interested parties or  
22 party to contact them.

23 MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that something like what you have in mind?

24 MR. GARVIS: I'm just offering some suggestions. I mean,  
25 Max, you live out there and there's a lot of people out



1 there. And, Bill, you have the same thing. Maybe you  
2 know some people or whatever

3 MR. CHAIRMAN: Barney Riley and his wife with the Dickenson  
4 County Citizens Group who have been, I guess, the most  
5 consistently active parties as far as organized groups  
6 was on the committee and was invited.

7 MR. FULMER: We had several bodies from Buchanan County,  
8 public citizens and stuff that's worked on the regula-  
9 tions before. One of the other problems is process.  
10 It's all a voluntary basis. Either you come or you don't  
11 come. Unfortunately it's unfortunate that you have that  
12 situation. We may look back through the records and find  
13 out some of those people who had interests. Most  
14 questions we get is just on the whole process of pooling  
15 Constitutionally those questions come up quite a bit and  
16 we've tried to address that through brochures and other  
17 things on that question of what is pooling. And that's  
18 where we have our most questions in that area as far as  
19 different people coming in.

20 MR. LEWIS: I think in the past that most of these gas  
21 companies didn't do as good as they do right now.  
22 They're doing a lot better on their pooling than they did  
23 in the past. I think they're getting more participants  
24 and as many leases as they possibly can. But in years  
25 gone by it's not been like that.



1 MR. CHAIRMAN: Dennis, I think the suggestion is a good one.

2 I think we can certainly make an effort to call people  
3 and I think it would have to be at random. You have to  
4 understand that, but to go through and make an efforts to  
5 call a number people that have appeared before the Board  
6 before and express their concerns say for the last couple  
7 of years and let them know that the Board is going to be  
8 considering these and a copy is available. And also  
9 we'll certainly try to -- when we do our announcement,  
10 Tom, this next time by the Board is to try to set it out  
11 in the public notice section, block it off, and make sure  
12 that it's more distinguishable maybe than some of the  
13 others have been. Just the fact -- not necessarily  
14 saying the entire notice but the notice dealing with the  
15 Board considering rule changes.

16 MS. RIGGS: I had three little things. On Page 20 on the  
17 civil charges, the Board had adopted a civil charge  
18 procedural rule which I think we're going to incorporate  
19 into the regulation now instead of having two separate  
20 documents. So next time around we'll see that in.

21 MR. LEWIS: Which page?

22 MS. RIGGS: That's on Page 20 under civil charges. There's a  
23 separate process for settling -- for negotiating settle-  
24 ment on those under a separate rule. We're going to pool  
25 it in here. And the other thing was the Board's process



1 for supplemental orders. That's pretty well captured  
2 now, but we might -- that might be expanded a little bit  
3 to promulgate the form of the affidavit and so forth.

4 MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. We might have some further refinement.

5 MS. RIGGS: And the other thing was just a follow-up to what  
6 Benny just -- or I guess what Tom just said with regard  
7 to public inquiries that come in regarding challenges to  
8 the pooling statute. We got notice this past week that  
9 the 20 outstanding law suits between Ashland and OXY have  
10 been settled and they're taking dismissals of all those  
11 cases. Those were the court cases pending in Buchanan  
12 County that challenged the constitutionality of the Gas  
13 and Oil Act. So to my knowledge once those are settled  
14 I don't think we have any outstanding challenges to the  
15 Act -- we won't have pending in the courts at that point.  
16 Well, with one or two exceptions. I guess there's the  
17 Ratliff well situation that was appealed or they sought  
18 an injunction that sort of peripherally challenges the  
19 Act. That's the only one, I think, that's left.

20 MR. KAISER: Emit's case is still out there.

21 MS. RIGGS: Well, I said there's a couple that just sort of  
22 raise it but they don't really.

23 MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you have anything else? Anything further  
24 that you'd like for us to do for next time on these regs?  
25 All right. Thank you. This meeting is closed.



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

(End of Proceedings for  
February 21, 1995.)



1  
2 CERTIFICATE  
3

4 COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

5 COUNTY OF WASHINGTON  
6

7 I, Deborah J. Bise, Notary Public in and for the  
8 Commonwealth of Virginia, at Large, do hereby certify that the  
9 foregoing proceedings of the Virginia Gas and Oil Board  
10 meeting held on February 21, 1995 at the Southwest Virginia  
11 4-H Center, Abingdon, Virginia, were taken by me and that the  
12 foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the proceedings  
13 had as aforesaid to the best of my ability.

14 I further certify that I am not a relative, counsel, or  
15 attorney for either party, or otherwise interested in the  
16 outcome of this action.  
17

18 GIVEN under my hand this 9th day of March, 1995.  
19

20 Deborah J. Bise  
21 DEBORAH J. BISE  
22 NOTARY PUBLIC  
23

24 My commission expires September 30, 1996.  
25