NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION

EXAMINER HEARING

SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

	•	
Hearing Date	MARCH 19, 1998 T	ime 8:15 A.M.
		•
NAME	REPRESENTING	LOCATION
She di	Kallachia Hillachia	
	FENRON	MIDLAND
PATRICK J. TOWER	ENRON	11
Todaw. Mortherborns	Source	Midland
Chad R. Shaw	Sonat	11 11
James Bruce		Surfate
1 CARL BROWN	FASKEN 314	MIDLANDITE
Diccing Lay	Complet an Form	and the
	+ Tendem	*** Marine Statement of the Statement of
	,	

STATE OF NEW MEXICO

ENERGY, MINERALS AND NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION

IN THE MATTER OF THE HEARING CALLED BY THE OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONSIDERING:

APPLICATION OF EXXON CORPORATION FOR A WATERFLOOD PROJECT AND TO QUALIFY SAID PROJECT FOR THE RECOVERED OIL TAX RATE PURSUANT TO THE ENHANCED OIL RECOVERY ACT, LEA COUNTY, NEW MEXICO

CASE NO. 11,947

) Of Conservation I was

ORIGINAL

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

EXAMINER HEARING

BEFORE: MICHAEL E. STOGNER, Hearing Examiner

March 19th, 1998

Santa Fe, New Mexico

This matter came on for hearing before the New Mexico Oil Conservation Division, MICHAEL E. STOGNER, Hearing Examiner, on Thursday, March 19th, 1998, at the New Mexico Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources Department, Porter Hall, 2040 South Pacheco, Santa Fe, New Mexico, Steven T. Brenner, Certified Court Reporter No. 7 for the State of New Mexico.

* * *

INDEX

March 19th, 1998 Examiner Hearing CASE NO. 11,947

PAGE

APPEARANCES

3

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

9

* * *

EXHIBITS

Applicant's		Identifie	ed	Admitted
Exhibit	1	5,	6	6
Exhibit	2		6	6
Exhibit	3		6	6
Exhibit	4		6	6
Exhibit	5		6	6
Exhibit	6		6	6
Exhibit	7		6	6
Exhibit	8		6	6
Exhibit	9		6	6
Exhibit	10		6	6
Exhibit	A		6	8
Exhibit	В		6	8
Exhibit	С		6	8

* * *

APPEARANCES

FOR THE DIVISION:

RAND L. CARROLL Attorney at Law Legal Counsel to the Division 2040 South Pacheco Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505

FOR THE APPLICANT:

JAMES G. BRUCE, Attorney at Law 612 Old Santa Fe Trail, Suite B Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501 P.O. Box 1056 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504

* * *

WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were had at 8:25 a.m.:

EXAMINER STOGNER: At this time I'm going to call the hearing to order on Docket Number 7-98. Please note today's date, March 19th, 1998. I'm Michael Stogner, appointed Hearing Examiner for today's cases.

At this time I'll call Case Number 11,947.

MR. CARROLL: Application of Exxon Corporation for a waterflood project and to qualify said project for the recovered oil tax rate pursuant to the Enhanced Oil Recovery Act, Lea County, New Mexico.

EXAMINER STOGNER: At this time I'll call for appearances.

MR. BRUCE: Mr. Examiner, Jim Bruce of Santa Fe, representing the Applicant. I have no witnesses. I do have a short presentation.

EXAMINER STOGNER: Okay.

MR. BRUCE: Mr. Examiner, in Case 11,665 Exxon applied for approval of a waterflood project in the Oil Center-Blinebry Pool and to qualify the project for the recovered oil tax rate. That Application was approved by Division Order R-10,736. That Order required injection to commence by January 15, 1998.

Exxon did everything required by the Order, including the drilling of the two injection wells for this

project, but failed to commence injection by that date or request an extension of time from the Division.

As a result, Exxon has re-applied for approval of the project. I see you have Exhibit 1 in front of you. This project covers two leases: the Knox lease, which covers the entire east half of Section 10, 21 South, 36 East, and the Adkins lease, which covers the entire west half of Section 10.

Now, the Adkins lease, even though there is one base lease covering the entire west half, the 20 acres outlined in green, the north half of the northeast of the northwest, does have a slightly different -- Exxon is the working interest owner in all of this section, except in that 20 acres Exxon and Texaco are the working interest owners, and there is a slightly different composition of the royalty owners, although all the royalty owners are the same, but their percentages are a little bit different.

The two injection wells, the Adkins Number 11 and the Knox Number 14, indicated by the triangles, have been drilled, as I said.

The wells circled in red are the initial producers for this cooperative waterflood project.

The two wells I've highlighted in pink are completed in different zones. In the future they may be recompleted in the Blinebry.

Because all the evidence in this matter has been presented, Exxon requests that the record from Case 11,665 be incorporated in the record of this case and a decision issued on that record.

What I've handed you are Exhibits 1 through 10 from the original case. Nothing has changed from that original hearing except, as I said, the two injection wells have been drilled, and I believe that the production from the six Oil Center-Blinebry wells has decreased slightly, which would be evidenced by the Division's records.

Also submitted to you are Exhibits A, B and C. Exhibits A and B are sketches of the two injection wells, and Exhibit C is my affidavit of notice in which I gave notice to all of the interest owners in Section 10, plus the offset leasehold owners, as required for injection purposes.

Also, I would ask at this time if I could submit a proposed order which is -- would be much the same as the original Order, R-10,736.

And with that, if you have any questions I'd be glad to answer them. I would ask that this matter be taken under advisement.

EXAMINER STOGNER: At this time I'll take administrative notice of the record in Case Number 11,665.

Mr. Bruce, I don't have a copy of original Order

Number R-10,736 in front of me. Was there any special provisions included in that order with regards to the injection wells, or did everything check out within the area of review?

MR. BRUCE: The testimony of Mr. Duncan was that -- Yeah, there was nothing in the order regarding any problem wells in the area of review. The engineer at the last hearing, Mr. Duncan, testified that there were no plugged and abandoned wells and no wells that he saw that had any problem with casing or cementing.

EXAMINER STOGNER: And all the royalty interests and working interests -- The royalty interests are still the same within that west half?

MR. BRUCE: Yes, they're all the same. There has been no change.

EXAMINER STOGNER: What happened? Did time just get away from --

MR. BRUCE: Yes. Apparently what happened was -Well, as you may know, Exxon closed its Midland office last
summer. That delayed the commencement of operations
because the project engineer for this project quit Exxon,
and they didn't get the wells to being drilled until
December of 1997, and with the move and everything time
just got away.

EXAMINER STOGNER: Okay. Does anybody else have

1	anything further in this matter?
2	Your additional exhibits what, A through D
3	MR. BRUCE: C.
4	EXAMINER STOGNER: A through C will be admitted
5	into evidence at this time. Thank you for the rough draft
6	order and the floppy, or the cassette.
7	If there's nothing further in Case Number 11,947,
8	then this matter will be taken under advisement.
9	(Thereupon, these proceedings were concluded at
10	8:32 a.m.)
11	* * *
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	d do heraby a stiff that the toregoing is a confidence of the companies of the confidence of the confi
19	11947. March 98
20	Marie & Samo
21	OH Consensation Lindsler
22	
23	
24	
25	

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

STATE OF NEW MEXICO)
) ss.
COUNTY OF SANTA FE)

I, Steven T. Brenner, Certified Court Reporter and Notary Public, HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing transcript of proceedings before the Oil Conservation Division was reported by me; that I transcribed my notes; and that the foregoing is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative or employee of any of the parties or attorneys involved in this matter and that I have no personal interest in the final disposition of this matter.

WITNESS MY HAND AND SEAL March 19th, 1998.

STEVEN T. BRENNER

CCR No. 7

My commission expires: October 14, 1998