W. CLAY H. RIDGETH
OIL
OFFICE 216 U. S. NATIONAL BANK BLDG.
PHONE KE 3417
DENVER COLORADO

RES. 728 HARRISON ST
PHONE FA 3398

00818441

46

2-26

728 Harrison St.
Denver, Colorado
June 13, 1955

Mr. H. C. Teasdel
The California Company
800 The California Bldg.
New Orleans 12, Louisiana

Dear Mr. Teasdel:

I have received your communication concerning unitization of the Rangely Oil Field situated in Colorado. Also note your request for a reply.

My reasons for opposing your unitization plan are as follows:

1. The method of operation of the Rangely Oil Field which has been employed for the ten or more years just past has been absolutely satisfactory; therefore, I am unalterably opposed to the involved and complicated plan proposed by your company in your unitization plan. Ten years of satisfaction is definite proof of the soundness and efficiency of the present method of production. I feel that whatever measures needed for economy or conservation can be adopted by the present operators of the field. Further, after ten years of established production and ownership, I question the legality of having unitization forced upon us.

2. I oppose your unitization plan because my past experience with unitization proves to me that it is highly inequitable and therefore unsatisfactory.

3. I oppose your unitization plan because I am not interested in any cutback in production that will give impetus to increased importation of oil.

4. I am opposed to your unitization plan because I object to a cutback in my own personal income from the field. And definitely not interested in the argument that it will prolong production over a greater period of years.

For the above set forth reasons I decline to join in your effort toward unitization of the Rangely Oil Field.

Very truly yours,

7

W. Clay Ridgeth