Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102

Suite 105

25

				Page 2			
1	APPEA	R A N C E	S				
2	For the Applicant						
3	Jordan Lee Kessler, Esq. Holland & Hart						
4	110 North Guadalupe Suite 1						
5	Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501 (505)983-6043						
6	jlkessler@hollandhart.com						
7							
8	I N D	E X					
9	CASES NUMBER 15385 AND 1538	86 CALLED					
10							
11	WPX ENERGY PRODUCTION, LLC CASE-IN-CHIEF:			:			
12	WITNESS BRENNAN WEST						
13							
14	By Ms. Kessler	Direct 4	Redirect	Further			
15	EXAMINATION Examiner Jones 15						
16							
17	WITNESS AMY M. RICHARDSON						
18		5	D 1				
19	By Ms. Kessler	Direct 20	Redirect	Further			
20	Examiner Jones	ION					
21		24					
22							
23				:			
24				PAGE			
25	Reporter's Certificate			29			

							Page
1			ЕХН	ІВІ	T I N	DEX	
2			Exhibits	Offer	ed and Ad	dmitted	PAGE
3							
4	WPX	ENERGY	PRODUCTION,	LLC,	EXHIBIT	1	15
5	WPX	ENERGY	PRODUCTION,	LLC,	EXHIBIT	2	15
	WPX	ENERGY	PRODUCTION,	LLC,	EXHIBIT	3	15
6	WPX	ENERGY	PRODUCTION,	LLC,	EXHIBIT	4	15
7	WPX	ENERGY	PRODUCTION,	LLC.	EXHIBIT	5	15
8			PRODUCTION,	•			15
9			·	·			
)	WPX	ENERGY	PRODUCTION,	LLC,	EXHIBIT	7	15
1	WPX	ENERGY	PRODUCTION,	LLC,	EXHIBIT	8	15
	WPX	ENERGY	PRODUCTION,	LLC,	EXHIBIT	9	15
2	WPX	ENERGY	PRODUCTION,	LLC,	EXHIBIT	10	15
3	WPX	ENERGY	PRODUCTION,	LLC,	EXHIBIT	11	15
4			PRODUCTION,				23
5			·	·			
6	WPX	ENERGY	PRODUCTION,	TTC,	EXHIBIT	13	23
7							
8							
9							
0							
1 2							
3							
4							
5							

PAUL BACA PROFESSIONAL COURT REPORTERS 500 FOURTH STREET NW - SUITE 105, ALBUQUERQUE, NM 87102

Q. Have you previously testified before the

24

25

Division?

- 1 A. Yes, I have.
- 2 Q. Were your credentials as a petroleum landman
- 3 accepted and made a matter of record?
- 4 A. They were.
- 5 Q. Are you familiar with the applications filed in
- 6 these consolidated cases?
- 7 A. I am.
- 8 Q. And are you familiar with the status of the lands
- 9 in the subject area?
- 10 A. Yes.
- MS. KESSLER: Mr. Examiner, I would tender
- 12 Mr. West as an expert in petroleum land matters.
- 13 EXAMINER JONES: He is so qualified.
- Q. Could you please turn to Exhibit 1 and identify
- 15 this exhibit and explain what WPX seeks under case
- 16 15385.
- 17 A. Exhibit 1 is our C-102 that we file with the OCD.
- 18 In this application, we are seeking for 120-acre
- 19 nonstandard spacing unit for the Basin Mancos, which
- 20 will be the north half of the northwest quarter of
- 21 section 12; the northwest quarter of the southeast
- 22 quarter of section 12.
- 23 And then we are also seeking for a 240-acre
- 24 spacing unit to pool.
- Q. And that would be comprised of the north half,

- 1 south half of section 12 and the north half, southwest
- 2 quarter of section 7?
- 3 A. That is correct.
- Q. Do you also seek to pool all the mineral
- 5 interests in the Mancos formation for both the Basin
- 6 Mancos Gas Pool and the Lybrook-Gallup Pool?
- 7 A. That is correct.
- Q. Do you also seek to downhole commingle production
- 9 from the Basin Mancos Gas Pool and the Lybrook-Gallup
- 10 Pool?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Do you also seek an unorthodox location for this
- 13 well?
- 14 A. We do.
- Q. And do you seek to dedicate the proposed 240-acre
- 16 nonstandard spacing unit for compulsory pooling to the
- 17 Chaco 2307-07N 409H Well?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Has an APD been approved for this well?
- 20 A. Yes, they have. For the 409 the API number is
- 21 30-039-31337.
- Q. And can you please identify the two pools
- 23 involved with this application?
- A. Yes. We have the Basin Mancos Pool, which is
- 25 subject to 320-acre spacing and 660 foot setbacks; and

- 1 then the Lybrook-Gallup Pool, which is 40-acre spacing
- 2 and 330 feet setbacks.
- 3 O. What is the character of this land?
- 4 A. It's all BLM.
- 5 Q. Could you please turn to Exhibit 2 and explain
- 6 what WPX seeks under case No. 15386?
- 7 A. Exhibit 2 is our C-102 for the 410-H. We are
- 8 seeking another 120 nonstandard Basin Mancos spacing
- 9 unit and a 240-acre nonstandard spacing unit for the
- 10 purposes of pooling. This 240 acres will be the south
- 11 half of the south half of section 12 and then the south
- 12 half of the southwest quarter of section 7.
- 13 Q. And the Basin Mancos spacing unit would be
- 14 comprised of --
- 15 A. It will be the south half of the southwest
- 16 quarter of section 12 and then the southwest quarter of
- 17 the southeast of section 12.
- 18 Q. And, once again, you seek to pool all the mineral
- 19 interests in the Mancos formation for both the Basin
- 20 Mancos Gas Pool and the Lybrook-Gallup Pool?
- 21 A. That is correct.
- Q. Do you also seek to downhole commingle production
- 23 from those two pools?
- 24 A. We do.
- Q. And do you seek unorthodox location for the 410H

- 1 Well also?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. And do you seek to dedicate the proposed
- 4 nonstandard spacing unit for compulsory pooling to the
- 5 Chaco 2307-07N and 410H Well?
- 6 A. We do.
- Q. And has an APD been approved for this well?
- 8 A. It has. And the API number is 30-039-31340.
- 9 Q. And we have the same two pools in this acreage
- 10 also; is that correct?
- 11 A. Correct.
- 12 Q. Is this also federal land?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. You mentioned that there's special pool rules for
- 15 the Basin Mancos Gas Pool; is that correct?
- 16 A. That is correct. We are subject to 320-acre
- 17 spacing and 660-foot setbacks. And then for the
- 18 Lybrook-Gallup, 40-acre spacing and 330 setbacks.
- 19 Q. Would you please turn to Exhibit 3. What is this
- 20 exhibit?
- 21 A. Exhibit 3 is a notice map that shows the
- 22 240 acres, the 409H wellbore, and then the surrounding
- 23 spacing units and ownership of the affected parties.
- Q. And this exhibit shows that the Basin Mancos and
- 25 Lybrook-Gallup Pool each have essentially three 40-acre

- 1 tracts; is that correct?
- 2 A. That is correct.
- 3 Q. And is it due to the configuration of this
- 4 acreage that you are seeking the 120-acre nonstandard
- 5 spacing unit in the Basin Mancos Pool?
- 6 A. Yes, it is.
- 7 Q. Does Exhibit 3 reflect the acreage that was
- 8 provided notice for this hearing?
- 9 A. It does. And it is outlined in the dark blue
- 10 outlines on all the spacing units where notice was
- 11 provided.
- 12 Q. So for the nonstandard 120-acre spacing unit in
- 13 the Basin Mancos Gas Pool, did you provide notice to the
- 14 affected parties in the north half of section 12, in the
- 15 south half, south half of section 12?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. And for compulsory pooling and formation of the
- 18 240-acre nonstandard spacing unit for pooling, did you
- 19 provide notice to the working interest owners in the
- 20 proposed 240-acre nonstandard spacing unit?
- 21 A. We did.
- Q. And then also the surrounding 320 Basin Mancos
- 23 offsets and the 40-acre spacing offsets in the
- 24 Lybrook-Gallup Pool?
- 25 A. Correct.

- 1 Q. And that's surrounding the proposed nonstandard
- 2 unit?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. For the nonstandard location, did you provide
- 5 notice for the parties in the east half and north half
- 6 of section 11 and the north half of section 12?
- 7 A. We did.
- 8 Q. Did you also provide notice to the working
- 9 interest owners, royalty owners, and overriding royalty
- interest owners for the request to downhole commingle?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Are the letters and green cards on the list of
- 13 parties to whom notice was sent provided in a later
- 14 exhibit?
- 15 A. It is.
- 16 Q. Turning to Exhibit 4, please identify this
- 17 exhibit.
- 18 A. Exhibit 4 is a notice map again, but this one is
- 19 specific for the 410H. It shows like 240 acres. The
- 20 pool outlined for the Basin Mancos and Lybrook-Gallup
- 21 and then the noticed parties for all of the affected
- 22 interest owners.
- Q. And, once again, you're required to seek a
- 24 120-acre nonstandard spacing unit in the Basin Mancos
- 25 due to the pool configuration, correct?

- 1 A. Correct.
- 2 O. And Exhibit 4 reflects the acreage provided
- 3 notice for this hearing?
- 4 A. It does.
- 5 Q. So we'll go through this again. For the 120-acre
- 6 spacing unit in the Basin Mancos Gas Pool, did you
- 7 provide notice to the affected parties in the north half
- 8 of 12 and the north half, south half of 12?
- 9 A. We did.
- 10 Q. And then for compulsory pooling and formation of
- 11 a 240-acre nonstandard spacing unit for pooling, did you
- 12 provide notice to the working interest owners within the
- 13 spacing unit as well as the 320-acre and 40-acre offsets
- 14 surrounding the proposed spacing unit?
- 15 A. We did.
- 16 Q. For the nonstandard location, did you provide
- 17 notice to the north half and north half, south half of
- 18 section 12 as well as all of section 11?
- 19 A. That is correct.
- 20 Q. Okay. And did you provide notice to the working
- 21 interest owners, royalty owners, and overriding royalty
- 22 interest owners for the request to downhole commingle?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. And those letters and green cards are provided in
- 25 a later exhibit, correct?

- 1 A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. Turning to Exhibit 5, does this exhibit
- 3 show ownership of south half of section 12 in the
- 4 southwest guarter of section 7 by tract?
- 5 A. It does. And it also outlines who the parties
- 6 are that own a working interest on our royalty, own the
- 7 acreage in section 7. And that's the party that we are
- 8 compulsory pooling today -- both applications.
- 9 Q. And they are highlighted in yellow, correct?
- 10 A. That is correct.
- Q. Is Exhibit 6 a well proposal letter for the 409H
- 12 Well that was sent to R&R?
- 13 A. It is.
- Q. On what date was that letter sent?
- 15 A. August 12, 2015.
- Q. And is Exhibit 7 a well proposal letter for the
- 17 410H Well sent to R&R?
- 18 A. It is. And it is dated August 12, 2015.
- 19 Q. What additional efforts did WPX undertake to
- 20 reach voluntary agreement with R&R?
- 21 A. Once we proposed the well, we engaged in some
- 22 discussion with R&R. And we are currently still in
- 23 discussions and pretty close to working out a farmout
- 24 agreement to where we would farm in their acreage in
- 25 section 7.

- 1 Q. So you have been engaged in active negotiations
- 2 with R&R for quite some time now; is that correct?
- 3 A. Correct.
- Q. Do you have a rig scheduled for these wells?
- 5 A. We do. We are looking to drill these wells at
- 6 the beginning of January.
- 7 Q. Is that ultimately why you moved forward with the
- 8 pooling here?
- 9 A. We did. While I think we are going to come to an
- 10 agreement, we just needed to get the clock started.
- 11 Q. In the event that you reach a voluntary agreement
- 12 with R&R, would the terms of that agreement supersede
- any pooling order resulting from this hearing?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. Turning to Exhibit 8, did each well proposal
- 16 letter that you sent to R&R contain an AFE?
- 17 A. It did.
- O. So does Exhibit 8 include the AFE for both the
- 19 409H and the 410H wells?
- 20 A. Yes, it does.
- 21 Q. Are the costs reflected on these AFEs consistent
- 22 with what WPX has incurred for drilling similar
- 23 horizontal wells in the area?
- 24 A. They are.
- Q. Have you estimated or have administrative costs

- 1 for drilling and producing this well?
- 2 A. We have.
- 3 O. What are those costs?
- A. We've had some other JOAs we've entered where
- 5 we've had 10,000 and 1,000 monthly drilling and
- 6 producing costs. For this particular hearing, we are
- 7 just asking for 7,000 and 700 drilling and producing
- 8 rates.
- 9 Q. Do you ask that those costs be incorporated into
- 10 any order resulting from this hearing?
- 11 A. We do.
- 12 Q. And do you ask that it be adjusted in accordance
- 13 with Copas accounting procedures?
- 14 A. Yes.
- Q. With respect to R&R royalty, the uncommitted
- 16 interest owner, would you ask that the Division impose a
- 17 200 percent risk penalty?
- 18 A. We would.
- 19 Q. Is Exhibit 9 a copy of the C-107A request to
- 20 downhole commingle for the 409H Well?
- 21 A. Yes, it is.
- 22 Q. Was that signed by you?
- 23 A. It is.
- Q. And is Exhibit 10 a copy of the C-107A request to
- 25 downhole commingle for the 410H Well?

- 1 A. It is and it is also signed by me.
- Q. Is Exhibit 11 an affidavit prepared by my office
- 3 with attached letters providing notice of this hearing
- 4 to all of the parties entitled to notice?
- 5 A. Yes, it is.
- 6 Q. So it's for the affected and offsetting grid
- 7 shown in Exhibits 3 and 4 as well as the parties for
- 8 compulsory pooling and downhole commingling?
- 9 A. That's correct.
- 10 Q. Were Exhibits 1 through 10 prepared by you or
- 11 compiled under your direction and supervision?
- 12 A. Yes, they were.
- MS. KESSLER: Mr. Examiner, I move into
- 14 evidence Exhibits 1 through 11.
- 15 EXAMINER JONES: Exhibits 1 through 11 are
- 16 admitted.
- 17 (WPX Energy Production, LLC, Exhibits 1
- 18 through 11 were offered and admitted.)
- 19 EXAMINATION BY EXAMINER JONES
- 20 EXAMINER JONES: This R&R royalty, are they
- 21 a working interest?
- 22 THE WITNESS: Yes, they are a working
- 23 interest.
- 24 EXAMINER JONES: A lessee working interest?
- THE WITNESS: Right, they are a lessee.

- 1 EXAMINER JONES: Now, where do they have
- 2 interest? Only in section 7?
- 3 THE WITNESS: Yes. They also have -- that
- 4 lease is a 640-acre lease that spans up into the
- 5 northwest quarter of section 7, the south half of
- 6 section 7 and then the southwest quarter of section 8.
- 7 EXAMINER JONES: So, basically, it's only
- 8 section 7 that you have lands that you're compulsory
- 9 pooling?
- 10 THE WITNESS: That is correct.
- 11 EXAMINER JONES: So are you seeking to form
- 12 the 120 in the Lybrook-Gallup as a nonstandard spacing
- 13 unit and compulsory pooling at 120 and then forming a
- 14 240 project area to drill a well; is that basically what
- 15 you're doing here?
- 16 MS. KESSLER: That is basically it, yes.
- 17 Just because of the configuration of the pools, we had
- 18 to downsize from the 320 in the Basin Mancos down to the
- 19 120.
- 20 EXAMINER JONES: Okay. So as far as the way
- 21 it's worded, the interest that you are pooling is only
- 22 in section 7?
- MS. KESSLER: Correct.
- 24 EXAMINER JONES: So the reason I am asking
- 25 is, let's say this was a -- in other words, we

- 1 conventionally put together a nonstandard project area
- 2 or nonstandard spacing unit that's for the horizontal
- 3 drilling, and then we compulsory pool all uncommitted
- 4 interests in that spacing unit. But in this case, your
- 5 spacing unit covers two different pools, so wouldn't it
- 6 be cleaner to just say, we are forming the nonstandard
- 7 spacing unit consisting of the three tracts in the
- 8 Lybrook-Gallup Pool and then pooling those uncommitted
- 9 interests and then forming the project area to drill the
- 10 well.
- MS. KESSLER: Well, either way -- I think
- 12 that we would have had to form a nonstandard project
- 13 area in that event since it would have been three 40s
- 14 strung together. So I think, essentially, we would have
- 15 ended up the same place.
- 16 EXAMINER JONES: I just didn't know if you
- 17 had a preference as to how it's worded or some legal
- 18 reason why it would have to be worded that way.
- MS. KESSLER: Only for the nonstandard
- 20 project area for pooling, we did have to form that just
- 21 for pooling purposes.
- 22 EXAMINER JONES: Okay. This is almost a
- 23 record for number of exceptions in one case. I thought
- 24 maybe you just might want to make it saltwater disposal
- 25 well or something.

- 1 MS. KESSLER: Just going through these
- 2 regulations.
- 3 EXAMINER JONES: Maybe a dual uphole or
- 4 something? Okay. So just one noncommitted owner and
- 5 they are locatable?
- THE WITNESS: Yes.
- 7 EXAMINER JONES: And nobody has protested
- 8 any of these?
- 9 THE WITNESS: I am pretty confident we are
- 10 going to reach an agreement in just a matter of time and
- 11 have a backup plan. I was hoping we would already have
- 12 one before today, but it just didn't work out.
- 13 EXAMINER JONES: So if you do reach
- 14 agreement, you are still going to need a nonstandard
- 15 project area?
- 16 THE WITNESS: We still need all of the --
- 17 EXAMINER JONES: Pretty much everything
- 18 except for the wording that it be a spacing unit.
- 19 MS. KESSLER: That's correct.
- MR. WADE: I might be mistaken, but it seems
- 21 like in some of these cases if you do get an agreement
- 22 after the compulsory pooling or while it is pending, an
- order is pending, it seems to me some of the times the
- 24 operator comes back out when it comes back and dismisses
- 25 a portion -- that portion of the order versus I think

- 1 the testimony was that an agreement would supersede the
- 2 compulsory pooling order.
- And I'm just thinking for the -- to make it
- 4 clean in the future, that the applicant would come back
- 5 and amend the order, if there is an order, or ask that
- 6 that portion be dismissed, because everything else will
- 7 stand.
- MS. KESSLER: We'll let the Division know --
- 9 MR. WADE: Okay.
- 10 MS. KESSLER: -- if an agreement is reached.
- MR. WADE: And I'm not sure that is
- 12 something the Division has been consistent with.
- 13 EXAMINER JONES: We have a paragraph at the
- 14 bottom that says, if a party joins, that the applicant
- 15 notice the Division that they are no longer subject to
- 16 compulsory pooling.
- 17 But we don't go back and --
- MR. WADE: And change the order --
- 19 EXAMINER JONES: Yes.
- MR. WADE: So the notice would be
- 21 sufficient.
- MS. KESSLER: I have one more witness.
- 23 EXAMINER JONES: Okay. Go ahead.
- 24 AMY M. RICHARDSON
- 25 having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified

- 1 as follows:
- 2 DIRECT EXAMINATION
- 3 BY MS. KESSLER:
- 4 Q. Please state your name for the record and tell
- 5 the examiners by whom you're employed and in what
- 6 capacity.
- 7 A. I am Amy Richardson. I am employed by WPX Energy
- 8 as geology manager for the San Juan Basin asset.
- 9 Q. Have you previously testified before the
- 10 Division?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 O. Were your credentials as a petroleum geoscientist
- 13 accepted and made a matter of record?
- 14 A. They were.
- 15 Q. Are you familiar with the application filed in
- 16 these consolidated cases?
- 17 A. I am.
- 18 Q. And have you conducted a geologic study of the
- 19 lands that are the subject of these applications?
- 20 A. I have.
- 21 MS. KESSLER: I would tender Ms. Richardson
- 22 as an expert in petroleum geoscience.
- 23 EXAMINER JONES: She is qualified as an
- 24 expert in petroleum geoscience.
- THE WITNESS: You can just say geology.

- 1 Q. Can you please turn to WPX Exhibit 12.
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. And identify this exhibit.
- A. This is a structure map on the top of the Mancos
- 5 formation. And the contours are at a 20-foot contour
- 6 interval. And then you can also see on here that
- 7 proposed wells, the 409H and the 410H extending from the
- 8 southwest quarter of section 7 into the south half of
- 9 section 12.
- And we also have a cross section line on there
- 11 from A to A Prime that goes through some vertical wells
- 12 in the area. And that's the next exhibit.
- And the structure map just shows that we are
- 14 following regional depth going down to the northeast and
- 15 up to the southwest. And there doesn't appear to be any
- 16 faults or geologic impediments to drilling these
- 17 horizontal wells.
- 18 Q. Do you consider the wells on the A to A Prime
- 19 line to be representative of wells in the area?
- 20 A. I do.
- 21 O. Please turn to Exhibit 13.
- MS. KESSLER: And, once again, Mr. Examiner,
- 23 there's a larger copy of this tucked in the sleeve.
- Q. Ms. Richardson, could you please identify
- 25 Exhibit 13.

- 1 A. This is a cross section through the cross section
- 2 line on the previous exhibit, labeled A to A Prime,
- 3 extending north to south. There are some vertical wells
- 4 in that area.
- 5 Showing the Mancos interval, there is an arrow on
- 6 the right side of the cross section, extending from the
- 7 Mancos top to the top of the Graneros, which is defined
- 8 as the Mancos interval overall.
- 9 The cross section just shows that in this area
- 10 the Mancos interval is consistent. Thickness is
- 11 approximately the same. And you would expect the same
- 12 section through the area.
- 13 Q. Can you identify the landing zone?
- 14 A. Right now we plan to land -- land the wells at
- 15 approximately a depth that would be correlatable to
- 16 about 55, 75 in that center well, the Federal 713.
- 17 Q. What conclusions have you drawn based on your
- 18 geologic study of this area?
- 19 A. That --
- Q. Have you identified any geological impediments to
- 21 developing this acreage using horizontal wells?
- 22 A. No, we have not.
- Q. And do you believe that the area can be
- 24 efficiently and economically developed by horizontal
- 25 wells?

- 1 A. I do.
- Q. Do you believe that the proposed nonstandard
- 3 240-acre unit will on average contribute more or less
- 4 equally to the production from each well?
- 5 A. I do.
- 6 Q. And you have requested -- WPX has requested a
- 7 nonstandard location for each well, correct?
- 8 A. That's correct.
- 9 Q. Why is that?
- 10 A. Because a portion of laterals will be in the
- 11 Basin Mancos Pool, which has a 660-foot setback. We are
- 12 expecting the primary production to be oil in these
- 13 wells. We've requested a 330-foot setback as is in
- 14 concordance with statewide oil rules.
- 15 Q. In your opinion will granting WPX's applications
- 16 be in the best interests of conservation for the
- 17 prevention of waste and the protection of correlative
- 18 rights?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. Did you prepare Exhibits 12 and 13?
- 21 A. Yes, I did.
- MS. KESSLER: Mr. Examiner, I would move
- 23 admission of Exhibits 12 and 13.
- 24 EXAMINER JONES: 12 and 13 are admitted.
- 25 (WPX Energy Production, LLC, Exhibits 1

- 1 through 11 were offered and admitted.)
- 2 EXAMINATION BY EXAMINER JONES
- 3 EXAMINER JONES: The Lybrook-Gallup, does it
- 4 have specific vertical limits on it?
- 5 THE WITNESS: No, not that has been defined.
- 6 Very few of the old Gallup pools in the area actually
- 7 had defined vertical limits. And then the Basin Mancos
- 8 does have a definition.
- 9 EXAMINER JONES: So where are the normal
- 10 drilling or completion points? If this was a vertical
- 11 well drilled to the Lybrook-Gallup, where in this well
- 12 would you have perforated?
- 13 THE WITNESS: You can see in the two wells,
- 14 the center well and the well on the right, kind of very
- 15 faintly, there are some little pink lines or rectangles
- 16 in the second tract, in the resistivity tract. Those
- 17 represent where those wells were completed.
- 18 EXAMINER JONES: Okay.
- 19 THE WITNESS: But, basically, it's the
- 20 interval that was most commonly completed in the
- 21 vertical wells, is where we have that SP development and
- 22 some porosity develops.
- 23 EXAMINER JONES: Okay. So you are just
- 24 below that.
- THE WITNESS: Yes. Basically, we land just

- 1 kind of at the base of that. So there's a little bit of
- 2 porosity. The well I cited, we would basically land at
- 3 the base porosity there and probably drill up through
- 4 some amount of the section or stay in that basal
- 5 porosity.
- 6 EXAMINER JONES: Okay. So you are saying
- 7 that these wells are only -- the east side of these
- 8 horizontal wells will be in the Lybrook-Gallup Pool,
- 9 vertical limits of that pool?
- 10 THE WITNESS: Yes.
- 11 EXAMINER JONES: Because it's not defined,
- 12 and it's real close.
- 13 THE WITNESS: It hasn't been defined. And
- 14 then -- and these are only, you know -- I think only
- 15 actually one of them is in the Lybrook-Gallup Pool. So
- 16 there are several wells that have been completed in the
- 17 Lybrook-Gallup Pool, again within that similar area.
- 18 Yeah, where we're drilling is within the
- 19 intervals that were completed and produced in vertical
- 20 wells.
- 21 EXAMINER JONES: Does the Lybrook-Gallup
- 22 have any special pool rules?
- MS. KESSLER: It is subject to statewide
- 24 40-acre well --
- 25 EXAMINER JONES: Okay. Some of those Gallup

- 1 pools were associated pools, so they had limited GOR
- 2 issue. But this one doesn't have an issue like that.
- 3 THE WITNESS: No, I don't believe so. The
- 4 Lybrook was pretty straightforward.
- 5 EXAMINER JONES: Okay. What about the Basin
- 6 Mancos, top and bottom. The top now, does that start
- 7 200 feet below the top of the Point Lookout? Is that
- 8 the definition of the Mancos?
- 9 THE WITNESS: The top of the Mancos here is
- 10 basically just defined as the base of the Point
- 11 Lookout Sands, which is probably most easily described
- 12 as the base of that SP development and the Point
- 13 Lookout.
- 14 And as far as -- I don't know if I can tell
- 15 you anything more than that.
- 16 EXAMINER JONES: That's fine.
- 17 THE WITNESS: Okay.
- 18 EXAMINER JONES: The reason I am asking is
- 19 actually because you're an expert geologist and you're
- 20 on the stand, and I got another issue where I need to
- 21 know the top of the Mancos, and I am being questioned on
- 22 it.
- So the base of the Mancos and the top of the
- 24 Mancos -- in other words, the top and bottom you drew
- 25 here, that is defined in the base of the Mancos Pool,

- 1 the type log; is that correct?
- THE WITNESS: To be honest, I don't know if
- 3 there's a type log for the Basin Mancos Pool. I would
- 4 imagine there would be.
- 5 EXAMINER JONES: Well, maybe not a type log,
- 6 but --
- 7 THE WITNESS: But there's a definition of
- 8 the Mancos as being from the top of the Mancos to the
- 9 base of the Greenhorn limestone.
- 10 EXAMINER JONES: Base of the Greenhorn,
- 11 so --
- 12 THE WITNESS: Right. So you can see that
- 13 kind of green correlation line in there. And that's the
- 14 top of the Greenhorn limestone. And then I've got a
- 15 Graneros top under there, top of the Graneros shale
- 16 right under the Greenhorn.
- 17 EXAMINER JONES: So the base of the
- 18 Greenhorn is the top of the Graneros; that's what you
- 19 got?
- THE WITNESS: Right.
- 21 EXAMINER JONES: So all of these -- I guess
- 22 the Basin Mancos unit will be basically a 120; you'll
- 23 have a 120 and a lot and then two 40s all put together
- 24 for one well, so each of these will contribute to the
- 25 well?

	Page 28
1	THE WITNESS: Right, right.
2	MR. WADE: I have no questions.
3	EXAMINER JONES: Thank you very much.
4	MS. KESSLER: Mr. Examiner, I ask that this
5	case be taken under advisement.
6	EXAMINER JONES: Both cases?
7	MS. KESSLER: Both cases, please.
8	EXAMINER JONES: So case 15385 and case
9	15386 are taken under advisement.
10	
11	(Time noted 2:43 p.m.)
12	
13	
14	
15	t do have of certify that the foregoing is a somple enecond of the proceedings in
16	the Examiner hydring of Case No
17	, Examiner
18	Oil Conservation Division
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	Page 29
1	STATE OF NEW MEXICO)
2) ss.
3	COUNTY OF BERNALILLO)
4	
5	
6	
7	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
8	I, ELLEN H. ALLANIC, New Mexico Reporter CCR
9	No. 100, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that on Thursday, November 12, 2015, the proceedings in the above-captioned matter
10	were taken before me, that I did report in stenographic shorthand the proceedings set forth herein, and the
11	foregoing pages are a true and correct transcription to the best of my ability and control.
12	
13	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither employed by
14	nor related to nor contracted with (unless excepted by
15	the rules) any of the parties or attorneys in this case, and that I have no interest whatsoever in the final disposition of this case in any court.
16	
17	
18	•
19	Ellen allanic
20	ELLEN H. ALLANIC, CSR
21	NM Certified Court Reporter No. 100 License Expires: 12/31/15
22	Dicense Dapiles. 12,51,15
23	
24	
25	