

**OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION**  
1000 RIO BRAZOS ROAD  
AZTEC, NEW MEXICO

*April 25, 1961*

**Mr. Ed Oberly**  
**El Paso Natural Gas Company**  
**Farmington, New Mexico**

**Dear Sir:**

*This office recently received complaints of gas escaping in the river adjacent to your #1 Heiser Pool Unit, located in the NE 1/4 Section 15-32N-10W.*

*On April 13, 1961 El Paso personnel accompanied by Mr. A. R. Kendrick of the Commission office conducted a bradenhead survey to determine if a casing leak existed. The test did not indicate a casing leak, although the bradenhead did register 266 PSIG shut-in pressure and when opened flowed water and gas for 40 minutes, with water diminishing toward the end of the test. The well was then shut in for one week and the bradenhead pressure was measured again and found to be 245 PSIA. A gas sample was also taken at this time and analysis of the gas indicated that it was not gas from the Mesaverde formation. The analysis indicated that the gas compared very closely with gas from the Fruitland formation in the area.*

*The above facts seem to indicate that Fruitland gas is present in appreciable quantities in the annulus behind the production casing in the well. Well records on file indicate that 7" casing was cemented at 4240 feet with 500 sacks of cement with the cement top shown by temperature survey at 2548'. The top of the Fruitland formation is shown at 2350 feet. Records indicate that surface casing was set at 300 feet with cement circulated. If gas is escaping at the surface it would appear that Fruitland gas must have channeled past the surface casing and entered a near surface sand.*

*The Commission is, therefore, directing that remedial work be instituted on this well in such a manner that Fruitland formation gas is confined to the Fruitland formation and not allowed to move up the well bore.*

*Form C-102 indicating workover plans must be filed for approval before remedial work is started.*

*Yours very truly*

**ECA:ks**  
**cc: Mr. L.D. Galloway**  
**EPNG, Farmington, N.M.**

**Emery C. Arnold**  
**Supervisor, District #3**

1000 RIO BRAZOS ROAD  
AZTEC, NEW MEXICO

1. The first step is to identify the problem or question that needs to be answered. This involves understanding the context and the specific requirements of the task.

1. The first step in the process of identifying a potential threat is to determine the source of the information. This can be done by reviewing the source's history, including any previous reports of threats or other suspicious activities. It is also important to consider the source's motives and the context in which the information was obtained.

2. Once the source has been identified, the next step is to assess the credibility of the information. This can be done by comparing the information to other sources, checking for consistency, and evaluating the source's reliability. It is also important to consider the source's level of access to the information and the potential for bias or manipulation.

3. The third step is to determine the nature and scope of the threat. This can be done by asking questions such as: What is the threat? Who is the target? What are the potential consequences? It is also important to consider the timing and location of the threat, as well as any other relevant information.

4. The final step is to develop a response plan. This can be done by identifying the potential risks, determining the appropriate level of response, and developing a plan to address the threat. It is also important to consider the potential for escalation and the need for ongoing monitoring and reporting.

[illegible]

10. The Committee is of the opinion that the evidence presented in the report is not sufficient to establish that the Government of the United States has violated the provisions of the Convention. The Committee is of the opinion that the Government of the United States has not violated the provisions of the Convention.

Initial on one, ... ..  
 ... ..  
 ... ..

1. *Chlorophyll a* and *Chlorophyll b* were determined by the method of Arar and Collins (1971).

[illegible][illegible]