

BEFORE THE  
**Oil Conservation Commission**  
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO  
April 20, 1955

IN THE MATTER OF:

CASE NO. 882 - Regular Hearing

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

**ADA DEARNLEY AND ASSOCIATES**  
COURT REPORTERS  
605 SIMMS BUILDING  
TELEPHONE 3-6691  
ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO

BEFORE THE  
OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION  
Santa Fe, New Mexico  
April 20, 1955

-----  
IN THE MATTER OF:

Application of the Oil Conservation Commission upon its own motion for revision of Order R-333-A to clarify and standardize the gas well testing procedure in the San Juan Basin, as outlined in the provisions of said Order R-333-A.

Case No. 882

-----  
BEFORE:

Mr. E. S. (Johnny) Walker  
Mr. William B. Macey

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

MR. MACEY: The next case on the docket is Case 882.

E L V I S A. U T Z ,

called as a witness, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

By MR. KITTS:

Q Will you state your name and position, please?

A Elvis A. Utz, Engineer with the Oil Conservation Commission.

Q Mr. Utz, are you familiar with Case 882?

A Yes, I am.

Q Do you have a recommendation to make based on your consideration of this case?

A Yes, I have.

Q Have you prepared that in Exhibit form or something that could be marked as an Exhibit?

A Yes, I have.

(Marked Commission's Exhibit No. 1,  
for identification.)

Q Would you explain what that shows?

A Briefly this is some proposed revisions to Order R-333-A, which is the deliverability testing order for the San Juan Basin . I have listed these as to the paragraphs, in the original order, and I wonder if it is necessary that I go ahead and read the whole thing through?

Q I would suggest that you need not. Everyone has been furnished copies?

A They were available this morning, I presume they do have.

Q We are going to introduce this into the record. I would suggest that you just outline in a very general manner how this proposed order changes the previous order.

A I can do that quite briefly

Q Then you can be questioned on it.

A Under Section B, Subsection 1, Part (2) and so forth, has to do with the testing procedure. I am suggesting, or recommending, rather, that the Commission adopt a method which they actually used last year in calculating the wellhead working pressure. The wellhead working pressure to be calculated by using the average seven day wellhead flowing pressure, and calculating a pressure loss by using the methods which was adopted by the Commission, namely, release 4-G-9FLT-NW. It is merely a method of using the wellhead flowing pressure and calculating the wellhead working pressure.

Another brief change is to measure the seven-day shut-in pressure through the string through which the well flowed during the conditioning and on the seven day flow period.

Another very slight change has to do with the marking, the deadweight readings on the flowchart and the point readings were taken so as to have a ready record on the flowchart.

The most important change has to do with determining the volume during the flow period, which has to be done, or recommended to be done by the purchasing companies. Briefly this simply means that the purchasing companies shall furnish to the testers the seven day average flowing meter pressure calculated by averaging the two hour chart readings. The flow volume, incidentally, this pressure is the pressure that will be used in calculating the wellhead working pressure, also in determining supercompressibility and for purposes of checking the integrated flow, if anyone cares to do so.

The actual flow volume will be furnished by the purchasing companies to the testers from the integrated volume corrected for supercompressibility, gravity and temperature. Instead of pinning it down to the exact seven day flow, I am recommending that they use the number of flowing days on the chart, which in some cases will be seven days, some cases eight days.

I am recommending that the Commission adopt, for the purpose of calculating flow, a release known as 4G-12-Back Pressure Test for the State, which is merely flange and pipe flowing factors, orifice meter flow factors, flowing temperature correction factors and gravity correction factors. These factors do give the precise volumes that Southern Union and El Paso is using.

It also stipulates that any other method of calculating flow volumes may be specifically approved provided it is appropriate and necessary.

It also pins down the supercompressibility table to be used,

which is available and will be furnished by the Commission which was copied from ~~squires~~ tables and, incidentally, do check with the tables that Southern Union and El Paso measurement depths are using.

The last change is a stipulation that the testing companies shall keep an accurate log of the time and pressures that the dead-weight meter pressures are taken, as well as the seven day shut-in pressures. Briefly, the reason for this is that we will undoubtedly spot-check some wells and we will want to know whether our pressures agree with the testing companies pressures.

Q Mr. Utz, in your opinion, will the adoption of this proposed amendment constitute a more satisfactory and accurate method of well testing?

A I think it will take a lot of the guess-work out of the test, be a more accurate test.

MR. KITTS: That is all.

MR. MACEY: Any questions?

CROSS EXAMINATION

By MR. WOODRUFF:

Q You mentioned that the resultant volumes, by using the Commission release No. 4G-12-BPT-State, would give the same results at those measures by El Paso and Southern Union, and also that the supercompressability correction table which you recommend, would give the same results as those that El Paso and Southern Union use. The reason for that is that the basis for what you recommended and what is being used is the AGA Bulletin, Number 2, specifying the basis upon which gas shall be measured, so that the reason that they agree is the fact that they are all based on the same thing. Is that not correct?

A That is correct.

Q Then, as far as the supercompressability correction tables are concerned, they are all based on the same basic fundamentals, too, is that correct?

A They are all based on California Natural Gas Association 402 and 461.

MR. WOODRUFF: Thank you.

MR. MACEY: Anyone else?

MR. KITTS: We will offer in evidence Commission's Staff Exhibit No. 1.

MR. MACEY: Without objection it will be received. The witness may be excused.

(Witness excused.)

MR. MACEY: Anyone have anything further in this case? If not we will take the case under advisement and we will adjourn until nine o'clock in the morning.

STATE OF NEW MEXICO )  
                                  : SS.  
COUNTY OF BERNALILLO )

I, ADA DEARNLEY, Court Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing and attached transcript of proceedings before the New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission at Santa Fe, New Mexico is a true and correct record to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have affixed my hand and notarial seal this 30th day of April, 1955.

*Ada Dearnley*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Notary Public, Court Reporter

My Commission Expires:  
June 19, 1955