1		1		
2	STATE OF NEW MEXICO ENERGY AND MINERALS DEPARTMENT			
. 3	OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION STATE LAND OFFICE BLDG.			
4	SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO			
5	25 May 1983			
	EXAMINER HEARING :			
6				
7	IN THE MATTER OF:			
8	Application of Yates Petroleum Cor- CASE poration for salt water disposal, 7873			
9	Lea County, New Me			
10				
11				
12				
13	BEFORE: Richard L. Stamets, Examiner			
14				
15	TRANSCI	RIPT OF HEARING		
16				
i				
17	APPI	EARANCES		
18				
19	For the Oil Conservation	W. Perry Pearce, Esq.		
20	Division:	Legal Counsel to the Division State Land Office Bldg.		
21		Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501		
22				
23	For the Applicant:	Chad Dickerson, Esq. LOSEE, CARSON, AND DICKERSON		
24	P. O. Drawer 239			
		Artesia, New Mexico 88210		
25				

1		2
2	INDEX	
3		
4	NELSON MUNCY	
5	Direct Examination by Mr. Dickerson	3
6	Cross Examination by Mr. Stamets	9
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12	EXHIBITS	
13		
14	Applicant Exhibit One, Documents	4
15	Applicant Exhibit Two, Map	4
16	÷	
17 -		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
35		

1	3				
2	MR. STAMETS: Let's call Case 7873.				
3	MR. PEARCE: That case is on the				
4	application of Yates Petroleum Corporation for salt water				
5	disposal, Lea County, New Mexico.				
6	MR. DICKERSON: Chad Dickerson of				
7	Artesia, New Mexico, on behalf of the Applicant, Mr. Examiner				
8	and I have one witness, who has already been sworn.				
9					
10	NELSON MUNCY,				
11	being called as a witness and being previously sworn upon his				
12	oath, testified as follows, to-wit:				
13					
14	DIRECT EXAMINATION				
15	BY MR. DICKERSON:				
16	Q. Will you state your name, your occupation,				
17	and where you reside, please?				
18	A. My name is Nelson Muncy. I'm an engineer				
19	with the Yates Petroleum Corporation. I reside in Artesia,				
20	New Mexico.				
21	Q. Mr. Muncy, have you previously testified				
22	before this Division as an engineer and had your qualification				
23	made a matter of record?				
24	A. Yes, they have been.				
25	0 And are you familiar with the applications				

.

.

2 in this Case 7873?

A. Yes, I am.

MR. DICKERSON: Is Mr. Muncy qualified,

Mr. Examiner?

MR. STAMETS: Yes.

Q. Mr. Muncy, maybe for initial purposes it would be helpful for you to, number one, briefly state what Yates seeks in this application, and refer to your exhibit which is marked Exhibit Number Two, and direct the Examiner's attention to the well in question and any other pertinent wells in the area of review.

A. We have prepared Exhibit Number One, which is a 1-inch to 2000 foot scale map. It has the half mile radius circle drawn and it has the 2-mile radius circle drawn, and I think the notable thing about the map is the fact that there are no other wells within the area of review.

Q. And the subject well is indicated where on that exhibit?

A. It's in the center of the small 1/2-mile radius circle.

Q. Okay. Mr. Muncy, please refer to your second page of your Exhibit Number One and describe for the Examiner where and in what fashion Yates proposed to inject water into that well.

Z

A. Okay. The well is presently drilled and abandoned and we have a current well diagram in Exhibit One that depicts the current status of the well and shows all the geological tops.

And what we propose to do is to re-enter this well, as Mr. Boneau noted in the previous testimony, and if we're not satisfied that it would be a productive oil well, we'd like to convert it to a disposal well.

And in Exhibit One we have the proposed set-up on the way that we'd like to dispose into this well and we would like to inject into what we call the Canyon dolomite from 10,378 to 578.

MR. STAMETS: Mr. Muncy, will the -- will that be -- will there be perforations there or would that be open hole, or what?

A. In this well that will be perforations and it will be behind cased pipe with cement behind it, as so noted in the -- in the well injection data sheet in Exhibit One.

MR. STAMETS: It shows that you're going to deepen the well to 10,650. Will you be plugging back if that proves not productive?

A. Okay, pardon me, I'm thinking about -- I've got the other well mixed up with this one. Let me regress.

-

Yes, we do want to deepen this well and we want to inject from 10,378 to 10,578. We have a new TD of 10,650, as I have noted there on the schematic, so it would be -- we would have some open zone to inject into there, yes.

MR. STAMETS: And are there some existing perforations -- well, no, obviously, if you don't have any casing in there.

Will this be a combination of perforations and open hole?

A. We will probably, as we've noted there, the injection interval would be from 10,378 -- okay, the injection interval will be from 10,378 to 10,578, and we are going to run casing and perforate it, so it's not going to be the open hole. I'm thinking about the other one and I've got you confused here. So --

MR. STAMETS: All right, so, well, are we really going to deepen this well to 10,650?

A. Okay, the -- the new TD will go to 10,650, and we'll deepen it from the old TD of 10,510. Then we're going to run casing all the way to 10,650 and then perforate it in the interval that we noted, 10,378 to 10,578.

MR. STAMETS: All right. So the casing will be set, then, at 10,650 and the perforations will be 10,378 to 10,578.

1	7
2	A. This is correct.
3	MR. STAMETS: All right, thank you.
4	Q. Mr. Muncy, what's the estimated volume of
5	water to be injected into this interval?
6	A. As we so noted on the C-108, from 2000 to
7	4000 barrels per day.
8	Q. And what pressures do you foresee as neces-
9	sary to inject at that rate?
10	A. We came up with the average injection pres-
11	sure of 2076 pounds per square inch on the gauge.
12	Q Mr. Muncy, would you very briefly summarize
13	the lithology, if you've not done it to your satisfaction,
14	of the proposed injection interval on this Midwest State No.
15	l Well, and describe why in your opinion that this water will
16	not migrate either up or down from that interval?
17	A. Okay. This injection interval is included
18	within the vertical limits of the Saunders Permo-Penn, Upper
19	Permo-Penn Pool, and it's correlative with the Abo Gray 35-1
20	in Unit N of 36, 14, 33, which is the type well to the field
21	rule, and the proposed injection zone that we talked about
22	will be stratigraphically lower than the oil production zones
23	in the field.
24	Q. What are the sources of fresh water in this
25	area, Mr. Muncy?

v

A. Okay, we have noted that the source of fresh water is the Ogallala and it's around 250 feet, and the Chinle lies immediately below that and there is some question or some possibility that there might be some fresh water just below that in the Chinle, and we'd also like to note that both of these aquifers, with respect to this particular application and well, are behind two strings of casing that are both circulated with cement.

Q. So for that reason you don't feel there's any danger of communication with this injected water with the fresh water in the area.

A. No.

Q. What water analyses have you submitted, Mr. Muncy, to reflect the compatibility relatively between the injected water and the formation water in this area?

A. Okay, we -- we have listed on our Form C-108, which is included in Exhibit One, four or five well -- or pardon me, six or seven or eight wells there where we propose to take the produced water and inject into this well, and we have those water analyses, if they are available, listed in Exhibit One, and I think it's fair to say that the chloride measurements of the wells would be compatible with the proposed injection zone.

Q. Does Yates foresee, Mr. Muncy, savings in

O

y

the economics of disposing water in these -- this proposed well rather than by trucking this water?

A. Yes, we do. It currently costs in the neighborhood of plus or minus \$1000 a barrel to have this water hauled off and disposed of commercially, and this would be a great savings, to be able to inject into a disposal well such as this.

Q Mr. Muncy, were Exhibits One and Two either prepared by you or under your direction and supervision?

. * A. Yes, they were. They were prepared by me.

MR. DICKERSON: Mr. Examiner, at this time I move admission of Yates Exhibits One and Two.

MR. STAMETS: These exhibits will be

Are there questions of the witness?

MR. DICKERSON: Nothing further.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. STAMETS:

admitted.

Q. Mr. Muncy, did you include actual copies of the water analyses for this exhibit?

A. Yes, I did, and they're listed in the back part of Exhibit One. I believe we have one, two, three, four, five, there are six of them.

1			10	
2	Q.	Apparently you have six of them an	d I don't	
3	have any of the	m.		
4	Α.	Okay, I'll trade with you.		
5	Q.	Okay.		
6		MR. DICKERSON: They were, Mr.	Examiner	
7	filed with the C-108, which should be in the file.			
8		MR. STAMETS: I'll see if we -	<u> </u>	
. 9	. A.	I think what we did is we didn't -	- in the	
10	ones we just ha	nded out we didn't copy the water ana	lyses.	
11		MR. DICKERSON: Some of the PI	reports	
12	on some of the numerous wells in the area.			
13		MR. STAMETS: Right. Okay, th	ose are	
14	included in the	original application and I see no ne	ed in	
15	duplicating the	m here.	·	
16		Are there any other questions	of the	
17	witness?			
18		MR. DICKERSON: Nothing furthe	r.	
19		MR. STAMETS: He may be excuse	d.	
20	·	Anything further in this case?		
21		The case will be taken under a	dvisement	
22			•	
23	·	(Hearing concluded.)		
24			4	
25				

gj.

CERTIFICATE

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

Snely W. Boyd CSTZ

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a complete resort. The proceedings in the Example in arise of this of the proceedings in

heard by se on

119.8

, Examiner

Oil Conservation Division