

1 STATE OF NEW MEXICO
2 ENERGY AND MINERALS DEPARTMENT
3 OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION
4 STATE LAND OFFICE BLDG.
5 SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

6 1 August 1984

7 COMMISSION HEARING

8 IN THE MATTER OF:

9 Application of Northwest Exploration CASE
10 Company for an exception to the special 8042
11 pool rules for the Gavilan-Mancos Oil
12 Pool, Rio Arriba County, New Mexico.

13 BEFORE: Commissioner Joe Ramey, Chairman
14 Commissioner Ed Kelley

15 TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

16 A P P E A R A N C E S

17
18
19 For the Oil Conservation
20 Division:

W. Perry Pearce
Attorney at Law
Oil Conservation Commission
State Land Office Bldg.
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

21
22 For the Applicant:

William F. Carr
Attorney at Law
CAMPBELL & BLACK P. A.
P. O. Box 2208
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

23
24
25

A P P E A R A N C E S

For Mesa Grande Resources: Owen M. Lopez
HINKLE LAW FIRM
P. O. Box 2068
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

I N D E X

DAN NUTTER

Direct Examination by Mr. Lopez 5

Cross Examination by Mr. Ramey 23

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

3

E X H I B I T S

Mesa Grande Exhibit One, Order	6
Mesa Grande Exhibit Two, Plat	7
Mesa Grande Exhibit Three, Form 9330	7
Mesa Grande Exhibit Four,	8
Mesa Grande Exhibit Five, Log	9
Mesa Grande Exhibit Six, Log	10
Mesa Grande Exhibit Seven, Form C-104	12
Mesa Grande Exhibit Eight, Production Data	13
Mesa Grande Exhibit Nine, Production Data	13
Mesa Grande Exhibit Ten, Allocation	14
Mesa Grande Exhibit Eleven, Agreement	18
Mesa Grande Exhibit Twelve, Agreement	18

1
2
3 MR. RAMEY: We'll call next
4 Case 8042.

5 MR. PEARCE: That case is on
6 the application of Northwest Exploration Company for an ex-
7 ception to the special pool rules for the Gavilan-Mancos Oil
8 Pool, Rio Arriba County, New Mexico.

9 MR. CARR: May it please the
10 Commission, my name is William F. Carr with the law firm
11 Campbell and Black, P. A., of Santa Fe, appearing on behalf
12 of Northwest Exploration Company.

13 I'm appearing in association
14 with Mr. Owen Lopez with the Hinkle Law Firm, who will pre-
15 sent the case for Mesa Grande Resources, Inc.

16 MR. RAMEY: Thank you, Mr.
17 Carr.

18 MR. LOPEZ: Mr. Chairman, my
19 name is Owen Lopez with the Hinkle Law Firm, Santa Fe, New
20 Mexico, appearing on behalf of Mesa Grande Resources, a suc-
21 cessor in interest to Northwest's interest in this acreage.

22 And I have one witness to be
23 sworn.

24 MR. PEARCE: Are there other
25 appearances in this matter?

Would you rise, please, sir?

(Witness sworn.)

DANIEL S. NUTTER,

being called as a witness and being duly sworn upon his oath, testified as follows, to-wit:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. LOPEZ:

Q Would you please state your name and where you reside?

A Dan Nutter. I live in Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Q On whose behalf are you appearing here today?

A I'm appearing here on behalf of Mesa Grande Resources, Inc.

Q Are you familiar with the application in this case?

A Yes, I am.

Q What is it that Mesa Grande seeks?

A Mesa Grande, as successor of interest to Northwest Exploration Company in the north half of Section 26, Township 25 North, Range 2 West, Rio Arriba County, New Mexico, seeks the simultaneous dedication of the north half of Section 26 to two wells, being the Gavilan Well No. 1, located in Unit A of Section 26, and the Gavilan Well No. 1E, located in Unit E of Section 26.

We would also seek the downhole comming-

1
2 ling of Dakota and Mancos production in the Well No. 1 and
3 the Dakota, Greenhorn, and Mancos production in the wellbore
4 of Well No. 1E.

5 This was previously heard in another
6 hearing and this is a de novo hearing of the same matter.

7 MR. LOPEZ: Would you consider
8 the witness qualified?

9 MR. RAMEY: Yes, sir, Mr. Lopez.

10 Q Would you briefly review, then, the sta-
11 tus of where we're at and where we're going?

12 A Yes. Case Number 8042 was originally
13 heard by an Examiner on January 18th, 1984, and on May 7th,
14 1984, Order No. R-7407A was entered, which approved the
15 simultaneous dedication of the two wells to the 320-acre
16 unit but denied the downhole commingling of the two wells.

17 Subsequent to that, Northwest Production
18 Company and Mesa Grande filed an application for the de novo
19 hearing of Case Number 8042.

20 That's where we are today.

21 Q I'd now refer you to what's been marked
22 Exhibit Number One and ask you to identify it.

23 A Exhibit Number One is the Order No. R-
24 7407A, which came out of hearing number -- Case Number 8042.
25 The order is entered on May 7th of '84.

Q Now I'd refer to you what is marked Exhi-
bit Number Two and ask you to discuss it.

1
2 A Exhibit Number Two in this case is a
3 plat. In the center of the plat is Section 26, cross
4 hatched the north half of Section 26, being the 320-acre
5 unit, and the two subject wells of this hearing are indi-
6 cated by triangles and boxes, the Gavilan 1 and the Gavilan
7 1E.

8 Q All right, now I refer to you what's been
9 marked Exhibit Number Three and ask you to identify it.

10 A Exhibit Number Three is the Federal Form
11 9330 for Gavilan No. 1 for the Dakota and for the "wildcat
12 completions". It's four pages, being the front and back of
13 the 9330 for the Dakota completion and for the so-called
14 wildcat completion.

15 The wildcat completion is the Gallup.

16 Order No. R-7407, which established the
17 Gavilan-Mancos Pool, established vertical limits for the pool
18 for which for this -- which for this well run from 6590 to
19 7574, so that we see that all the perforations on the wild-
20 cat 9330 are in the Gavilan-Mancos Pool.

21 For the Dakota zone the 9330 form says
22 perforations from 7880 to 8026. In addition, another group
23 of perforations was tried in the lower Dakota from 8192 to
24 8202, but those perforations made water and were squeezed.

25 So those perforations are definitely in
the Dakota producing interval.

Q I'd ask you to refer to what's been mark-
ed Exhibit Four and ask you to discuss it.

1
2 A Exhibit Four is the State Form C-105, the
3 completion report, for the Gavilan 1E. Again, there are
4 four sheets, the first being -- or I'm sorry, there are
5 three sheets, the first being for the one -- the Dakota and
6 the second sheet being for what was pencilled in as the Gav-
7 ilan Gallup by the District office in Aztec.

8 For the Dakota zone the perforations are
9 shown to be from 7822 to 7918. Now the base of the Green-
10 horn occurs at 7714 in this well, so all of the Dakota per-
11 forations are in the Dakota producing interval as defined by
12 the Commission.

13 Potential for the Dakota is shown here
14 and was taken on July the 1st of 1983. The well made 5.1
15 barrels of oil; 17.3 Mcf of gas; and 50 barrels of load
16 water in 12 hours, so extrapolated to a 24-hour rate it's
17 shown to be 10.2 barrels of oil, 34.6 Mcf of gas, and 100
18 barrels of load water.

19 The oil is shown to be 36.8 degree grav-
20 ity.

21 For the upper zone in the well, what was
22 called the Gavilan Gallup, there were perforations from 6804
23 to 7366 and a set of overlapping perforations from 7100 to
24 7105.

25 There were also perforations from 7654 to
26 7708 and an overlapping set from 7653 to 7657. Now I don't
27 know why -- I don't have the top of the Gavilan Mancos as
28 defined by the Commission for this well, but I've estimated

1
2 that it would be at approximately 6470, way up there, so the
3 lower limit of the pool is at 7452. We'll come to that on a
4 log in a minute.

5 So we see that all of the upper perfora-
6 tions is definitely in the Mancos Pool. Now that would be
7 the ones from 6804 to 7366.

8 The lower group of perforations, from
9 7653 to 7708, is in the Greenhorn.

10 So what we're seeking for the Gavilan 1
11 is authority for downhole commingling of Gavilan Mancos and
12 Dakota production, and for the Gavilan 1E commingling of
13 Gavilan Mancos, Greenhorn, and Dakota production.

14 Q Okay. I ask you now to refer to what's
15 been marked Exhibits Five and Six and ask you to identify
16 them.

17 A Okay. Exhibit Five is the log of the
18 lower portion of the Gavilan No. 1 Well. You'll notice on
19 the first page it points to the top of the Gavilan Mancos
20 Pool way up there at 6590; the top of the Gallup is at 6780.
21 Perforations are shown by the ticks on the righthand side of
22 the depth column on the log.

23 All these other perforations for the
24 first three or four pages there are in the Gavilan Mancos.
25 The bottom of the Gavilan Mancos is shown at 7574. Then you
come on down and you see the top of the Dakota producing in-
terval at 7865. That's the base of the Greenhorn, and those
perforations that are -- there are no perforations on this

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

well in the Greenhorn formation, but then the other perforations in the Dakota are shown.

That lower set of perforations that I mentioned, way down there at 8200 feet, which were squeezed, are also shown on the last page of that exhibit.

Q And Exhibit Six?

A Exhibit Six is a similar log for the lower portion of Gavilan 1E Well. Now we pointed up to the top, the top of the Gavilan Mancos I estimated at 76 -- 6470, which is way up above the top of this log. Again the ticks for the perforations are shown.

The bottom of the Gavilan Mancos is shown on page three at 7452.

The top of the Greenhorn is shown on the next page at 7653, and those Greenhorn perforations are then shown until you get to the base of the Greenhorn on the next page at 7820, where the Dakota pool starts, and the lower set of perforations, of course, are in the Dakota reservoir.

Q How are these wells currently being produced?

A Gavilan No. 1 is producing from the Mancos and has been for many, many months, and has the Dakota shut in.

Gavilan 1E is producing from the commingled Mancos and Greenhorn and has the Dakota shut in.

Q Do these wells have packers in them?

A Yes, they do. Gavilan No. 1 has 9-5/8ths

1
2 inch surface pipe set at 540, cemented with 400 sacks; 4-1/2
3 inch production casing is set at 8540 and cemented with 1100
4 sacks. I don't have a top for the cement.

5 It has 2-3/8ths inch tubing set in a
6 packer at approximately 7600 feet. There's a sliding sleeve
7 above the packer and a seeding nipple below, so that either
8 zone can be produced through the tubing.

9 Gavilan 1E is similarly equipped. 9-
10 5/8ths is at 278 with 160 sacks; 7 inch casing at 6070 with
11 450 sacks. They had intended to run a liner in there but
12 they did run a full length string of 4-1/2 inch pipe, which
13 is set at 8148 with 240 sacks.

14 The packer is set at 7230, below the
15 Greenhorn perforations and above the Dakota. There's a
16 sliding sleeve at 7727 and a removable blanking plug below
17 that so that the commingled Mancos-Greenhorn or the Dakota
18 can be produced through the tubing.

19 Q Now you said that the Gallup or the Man-
20 cos is producing from 60 wells and the Dakota is shut-in.
21 How can the Mancos and Greenhorn be producing from the No.
22 1E inasmuch as the Greenhorn is not included in the vertical
23 limits of the Gavilan-Mancos Pool?

24 A I didn't say it was produced from 60
25 wells. I said it was producing from both wells.

26 Q Well, both wells, I'm sorry.

27 A Does my "both" look like a 60? Right.

28 Well, when the well was drilled there was

1
2 no pool here. Everything was wildcat or undesignated, if
3 you prefer.

4 So Northwest perforated what they thought
5 was one reservoir; that is, everything from the -- every-
6 thing in the Mancos from the base of the Mesaverde to the
7 top of the Dakota; anything that was productive.

8 It so happens that when the Commission
9 defined the Gavilan-Mancos Pool the lowermost perforations,
10 that is the ones in the Greenhorn in this well, were left
11 out in a no man's land in between the base of the Gavilan
12 and the top of the Dakota.

13 The Greenhorn is uneconomic on its own,
14 so it must be included in either the upper pool or the lower
15 pool. I might add that there are two applications pending
16 before the Commission to designate an oil pool for the Dako-
17 ta and the Greenhorn and the Graneros Shale would both be
18 included in that pool under either application.

19 Q Do you have anything that would indicate
20 that this arrangement for the Gavilan 1E has at least had
21 the tacit approval of the Commission?

22 A Yes. Exhibit Number Seven is a combina-
23 tion exhibit of three parts. They include a Form C-104, a
24 Form C-103, and a schematic diagram that was filed by North-
25 west Exploration on August the 22nd, 1983.

26 They -- they show the manner in which the
27 Gavilan 1E is equipped and producing and were approved by
28 the OCD District office on August the 23rd, 1983.

1
2 Now the schematic over there on page
3 three shows that the Greenhorn perforations and the Gallup
4 perforations are both available to the tubing through the
5 sliding sleeve above the packer, which is set at 7230.

6 The Dakota perforations are below that
7 and there is a blanking plug in that tubing to seal off the
8 Dakota at this time.

9 So that has been approved by the District
10 Office of the Commission.

11 Q Do you have any production history for
12 these two wells?

13 A Yes. We have a good history on the Gavi-
14 lan No. 1 from both zones to be commingled and production
15 history from the Gavilan 1E from the Mancos-Greenhorn only,
16 although we do have a Dakota test in that well.

17 We do not have any separate information
18 on the Mancos and Greenhorn in the 1E.

19 Q What does the production history on the
20 Gavilan No. 1 show?

21 A Exhibit Eight is a tabulation of produc-
22 tion from June, 1982, through December of 1983, on a daily
23 basis.

24 Periodically the sliding sleeve and the
25 blanking plug would be manipulated so one or the other of
the two zones could be flowed by itself.

Q And I'd ask you to refer to Exhibit Nine,
and what is it?

1
2 A Exhibit Nine is a similar tabulation of
3 production for the Gavilan 1E; however, this is for the Gal-
4 lup only, because the Dakota has never produced in this
5 well.

6 Q Okay. Now I'd ask you to turn to what's
7 been marked Exhibit Ten and ask you to identify it.

8 A Okay. Exhibit Ten is a two-page exhibit.
9 It's an allocation of production to the zones in the two
10 wells.

11 The Gavilan No. 1 is the first page and
12 what I've done, I've taken a 30-day continuous flow which
13 had no interruptions and looked like a good, typical month
14 of production for the Mancos zone, from Exhibit Number
15 Eight.

16 This 30-day total was in June of 1983.
17 During that month it produced 1779 barrels of oil from the
18 Mancos and 18,855 Mcf of gas, so the daily average for the
19 month was 59.3 barrels of oil and 628.5 Mcf of gas.

20 Now the Dakota production is over in No-
21 vember of 1983, several pages back in there, where I found a
22 good, typical month, and for the 30-day total for the Dakota
23 in November of 1983, it made 179 barrels of oil and 2651 Mcf
24 of gas. This came out to a daily average of 6 barrels of
25 oil and 88.4 Mcf of gas.

If we take both of them together, the two
averages, we find that the well produces 65.3 barrels of oil
on a daily basis and 716.9 Mcf of gas.

1
2 Percentagewise this would be 90.8 percent
3 oil to the Mancos and 9.2 percent oil to the Dakota.

4 87.7 percent oil to the -- gas to the
5 Mancos and 12.3 percent gas to the Dakota.

6 The second page is allocation for the 1E.
7 Now, as I mentioned before, this well has always produced
8 from the Mancos so I don't have any Dakota production; how-
9 ever the 31-day production test, it says 30, that's in er-
10 ror. That should be a 31-day production test in December of
11 1983 for the Mancos in Well No. 1E was 1046 barrels of oil
12 and 4969 Mcf of gas. This was a 31-day average of 33.7 bar-
13 rels of oil and 160.3 Mcf of gas.

14 Now we've had some information on some
15 other wells that were tested in the Mancos and they ran
16 about 10 percent of the Greenhorn, so I've taken that same
17 10 percent and applied it to this Mancos production because
18 Mancos and the Greenhorn are commingled in this well and
19 have never been tested separately.

20 So I applied that 10 percent and came up
21 with 3.4 barrels of oil from the Greenhorn, 16 Mcf of gas.
22 I deduct that from the Mancos and come up with a net remain-
23 ing share to the Mancos of 30.3 barrels of oil and 144.3 Mcf
24 of gas.

25 The Dakota zone is taken from the initial
potential test, which was 10.2 barrels of oil and 34.6 Mcf
of gas.

So we have total productive rate from all

three zones of 43.9 barrels of oil and 194.9 Mcf of gas.

Percentage-wise this figures out to the Mancos producing 69 percent of the oil, 74 percent of the gas; Greenhorn producing 7.7 percent of the oil, 8.2 percent of the gas; and the Dakota producing 23.3 percent of the oil and 17.8 percent of the gas.

Q What is the allowance for the Gavilan-Mancos Pool?

A The current allowable based on 320-acre spacing in effect and the depth bracket which is applicable, is 702 barrels of oil per day with the current GOR limit of 2000-to-1, this allows up to 1404 Mcf of gas to be produced.

The allowable for the Dakota, I presume, would be based on the current 40-acre spacing and a depth bracket allowable of 7-to-8000 feet, or 187 barrels per day oil and a maximum casinghead allowable of 700 -- 374 Mcf per day.

Q Are either of these wells capable of exceeding their allowables?

A The two wells are simultaneously dedicated to a single 320-acre unit in the Gavilan-Mancos Pool, so they would have to share a single 320-acre allowable.

However, based on the numbers we presented a few minutes ago, the No. 1 makes 59.3 barrels of oil from the Mancos and the 1E makes 30.3, for a total of 89.6 from both wells.

So they are well within the oil allow-

1
2 able.

3 As to gas, the No. 1 made 628.5 Mcf and
4 the No. 1E makes 160.3 for a total of 788.8 Mcf against an
5 allowable of 1404.

6 In the Dakota the No. 1 makes 6 barrels
7 and 88.4 Mcf of gas while the 1E makes 10.2 barrels of oil
8 and 34.6 Mcf of gas.

9 This gives a total of -- for oil of 16.2
10 barrels of oil against an oil allowable of 187, and a gas
11 total of 123 against an allowable of 374.

12 So there's no problem of overproducing
13 either allowable.

14 Q What about the pressure differentials
15 between the zones?

16 A We don't have exact pressure -- we don't
17 have any pressures for the Gavilan 1. We do have some pres-
18 sures for the 1E, however.

19 The pressure was measured in the Dakota
20 at a depth of 7772 feet and it was 3320 psia.

21 The pressure was measured in the Mancos
22 at a depth of 6768 feet and it was 2177 psia.

23 If the Dakota pressure is corrected to
24 the same datum as the Mancos pressure, using a water grad-
25 ient, it would be 2885 psi. So you'd have a differential
between the upper and the lower zones from 2177 to 2885.
This is well within the limits allowed by Rule 303 of the
Division rules and regulations.

1
2 Q I'd now refer you to what's been marked
3 Exhibits Number Eleven and Twelve and ask you to describe
4 these.

5 A Exhibits Number Eleven and Twelve are big
6 old thick things. They are copies of the communitization
7 agreement and the operating agreement for the north half of
8 Section 26, 25 North, 2 West.

9 These are offered to show that all parties
10 owning an interest in the north half of the section,
11 the lands dedicated to the wells, have communitized their
12 interest.

13 Also, that all working interests throughout
14 the entire 320, have shared in the cost of both wells.

15 For this reason we're not seeking two
16 nonstandard 160-acre units, but a single 320 dedicated to
17 both wells.

18 Also, since the 320-acre rules in the
19 Mancos became effective on March the 1st, 1984, we would request
20 that the order entered in this case be retroactive to
21 March 1.

22 The original order entered in the case
23 approved the 320-acre unit with both wells simultaneously
24 dedicated to it, and that order was retroactive effective
25 March 1.

We'd hope the new order would continue
with these provisions.

Q What were the findings in denying the

1
2 downhole commingling in the original order?

3 A Well, the downhole commingling was denied
4 basically because of the following findings:

5 Finding Number Seven said that the appli-
6 cant did not present any reservoir, production, and/or geo-
7 logical data on the Greenhorn in Well No. 1E.

8 Finding Number Ten stated that the pro-
9 posed downhole commingling would render the Gavilan No. 1
10 and the No. 1E useless for the purpose of gathering reser-
11 voir data which would be relating to gathering reservoir in-
12 formation to establish whether the temporary rules in the
13 Mancos reservoir should be made permanent.

14 Also Findings Numbers Eleven, Twelve, and
15 Thirteen related to that last finding, amplifying the neces-
16 sity for gathering of this reservoir information.

17 Q What are your feelings about those find-
18 ings?

19 A Well, they are probably correct but only
20 to a degree.

21 In saying that no reservoir production or
22 geological data was presented concerning the Greenhorn in
23 the No. 1E, that was completely correct. There was none.

24 Now today I think we've done a little
25 better. We've presented estimates of production from the
Greenhorn based on estimates that were made comparing Green-
horn with Dakota and Gallup in other wells.

As to reservoir data, there really just

1 isn't any.

2
3 As to geology, all I can say is that the
4 Greenhorn is generally composed of layers of siltstone,
5 limestone and shaley limestones. It's sometimes marly and
6 it's often gray.

7 The Greenhorn is usually of such insigni-
8 ficance that no real geological or reservoir studies are
9 ever made on it. It's simply an ancillary source that if it
10 looks like it might produce you perforate.

11 Q So you don't feel that the commingling
12 should be denied on the grounds of lack of information on
13 the Greenhorn?

14 A No, I don't. In depth studies could be
15 made. Actual tests could be conducted and reservoir data
16 could be obtained, but it just isn't worth it on a stringer
17 like this, especially in this well.

18 Q What about the findings relating to the
19 necessity for obtaining reservoir data in the Mancos in or-
20 der to determine the permanent spacing rules?

21 A Well, I believe that these findings in
22 the order appealed here today were patterned closely after
23 the findings that had a short time before been used in an
24 order denying downhole commingling in a well that's to the
25 west of these two wells; however, in that order there was
also another finding and that was that the other well was
economic in both zones.

All of those findings taken together prob-

ably justify denial in that case. The other well was a much, much better well. It had good pressures and the reservoir data which could be obtained by keeping the zones isolated would have had some meaning in making a reservoir study.

Q Isn't that the case in the wells we're talking about today?

A No, no, these wells are marginal. Teh Dakota produces only 6 barrels a day in No. 1, originally tested only 10 barrels in the 1E.

The Gallup, or Mancos, produces 59 and 33 barrels from the two wells. The data that might be obtained by isolating the wells will not contribute materially to the reservoir study for the spacing case.

Q Are there other wells which are isolated in the subject zones?

A There used to not be; however, all of the wells originally -- almost all of the wells originally drilled in the area were commingled in the wellbore; however, the well we mentioned awhile ago as being denied on downhole commingling, is now available for reservoir studies.

Mesa Grande also has two wells which are dual completions in the Mancos and Greenhorn Dakota and Mesa Grande's plan, which includes a vigorous drilling program, foresees the completion of numerous wells as dual completions, not downhole commingles.

Most operators in this area have always

1
2 used 4-1/2 casing, just as Northwest Production did in these
3 two wells, which precludes dual completion.

4 Mesa Grande runs 5-1/2 inch casing in its
5 wells and we will dually complete the wells whenever it's
6 economic or possible to do so.

7 So there are plenty of wells or will be
8 for the gathering of this data besides these two wells here.

9 Q Is it your opinion that the granting of
10 this application is in the prevention of waste and protec-
11 tion of correlative rights?

12 A Yes, I definitely think so. The Mancos
13 is a slow producing formation. It's going to produce for-
14 ever. If we have to wait until the Mancos has been de-
15 pleted, chances are the casing will be into such poor condi-
16 tion we won't be able to produce the Dakota, so if we aren't
17 afforded the opportunity to produce the Dakota in here, we
18 may never be able to produce it; certainly wouldn't be --
19 the reserves in the Dakota in these wells would not be worth
20 extensive rework operations, running new casing, and so
21 forth.

22 So I think that in the prevention -- in
23 the interest of the prevention of waste, it definitely is
24 adviseable to approve the downhole commingling.

25 As to the prevention of -- protection of
correlative rights, there's no way the correlative rights of
anyone could be impaired by approval of the application.

Q Were Exhibits One through Twelve prepared

1 by you or under your supervision?

2 A Some of them were and some of them
3 weren't. Some of them are excerpts from the exhibits that
4 were presented by Northwest in the original hearing. Others
5 I've prepared here today. Of course, some of them are docu-
6 ments, being the communitization agreement, and so forth.

7 I have examined them all and the ones I
8 didn't prepare I'm in concurrence with as to the evidence
9 offered.

10 MR. LOPEZ: I'd offer Appli-
11 cant's Exhibits One through Twelve.

12 MR. RAMEY: Without objection
13 Applicant's Exhibits One through Twelve will be admitted.

14 Q Is there anything further you want to of-
15 fer?

16 A No, I have nothing further.

17 MR. LOPEZ: That concludes our
18 testimony.

19 CROSS EXAMINATION

20 BY MR. RAMEY:

21 Q Mr. Nutter, now the Gavilan Well No. 1 is
22 just Dakota and Mancos.

23 A That's correct.

24 Q And you do have sliding sleeves --

25 A Yes, sir.

Q Would the applicant be willing to at some

1
2 future time to -- if this application is granted, to go in
3 and say close the sleeve on the Dakota so that they could
4 gather some reservir information on the Mancos.

5 Q Some individual reservoir information?

6 Q Right, yes, sir.

7 A Yes, sir, I believe so.

8 MR. RAMEY: Any other questions
9 of Mr. Nutter?

10 If not, he may be excused.

11 Do you have anything further,
12 Mr. Lopez?

13 MR. LOPEZ: No, I don't, Mr.
14 Ramey.

15 MR. RAMEY: Does anyone have
16 anything further in Case 8042?

17 If not, the Commission will
18 take the case under advisement.

19
20
21
22
23
24
25 (Hearing concluded.)

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, SALLY W. BOYD, C.S.R., DO HEREBY CERTIFY
that the foregoing Transcript of Hearing before the Oil Con-
servation Division was reported by me; that the said tran-
script is a full, true, and correct record of the hearing,
prepared by me to the best of my ability.

Sally W. Boyd CSR