BEFORE THE
OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

EXAMINER HEARING

IN THE MATTER OF:

Application of Texaco Inc. for an unorthodox oil well location, Lea County, New Mexico.

CASE NO. 2399

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

October 4, 1961

BEFORE THE
OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

October 4, 1961

EXAMINER HEARING

IN THE MATTER OF:
Application of Texaco Inc. for an unorthodox oil well location, Lea County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks approval of an unorthodox oil well location in the Paduca-Delaware Pool for its Cotton Draw Unit Well No. 54, located 1980 feet from the North line and 2339 feet from the East line of Section 28, Township 25 South, Range 32 East, Lea County, New Mexico.

CASE NO. 2399

BEFORE: Elvis A. Utz, Examiner

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

EXAMINER UTZ: Case No. 2399.

MR. MORRIS: Application of Texaco Inc. for an unorthodox oil well location, Lea County, New Mexico.

MR. KELLY: Booker Kelly, Gilbert, White * Gilbert, representing the applicant. I have one witness, C. R. Black.

(Witness sworn.)

C. R. BLACK,

called as a witness, having been first duly sworn on oath, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. KELLY:

Q Will you state your name, please?

A C. R. Black.

Q And your employer?

A Texaco Inc., petroleum engineer, Midland, Texas.

Q Have you previously testified before this Commission?

A Yes, I have.

Q Can you state what Texaco seeks by their application?

A This is the application of Texaco Inc., for an unorthodox well location in its Cotton Draw Unit Well No. 54. Texaco is the operator of this unit. This well was originally located, was staked, 2339 feet from the East line and 980 feet from the North line of Section 28, Township 25 South, Range 32 East.

Q Would you further refer to Exhibit 1 and show the Commission what this indicates?

A Exhibit 1 is a plat showing the bearing and actual distance of Section 28, Township 25 South, Range 32 Ease. It can be noted that this section is unusual in that it is not a true square. The sectional lines are not actually straight lines in that the bearings change from one point to another. The iron pipes that were driven in the original survey had been laid in all but one instance and that is the southeast corner of the section.

Texaco staked this location and it was intended to be 980 feet from the North line and 2339 feet from the East line. At that time, since this section does have excess footage in it, it was thought that the well would be located 330 feet from the quarter-quarter section line as required of the statewide rules. So, the error on our survey resulted in approximately a little over four feet in from the 330-foot mark. The actual location in regard to the quarter-quarter section line was 325.4 feet. This is some 4.6 feet too close to the quarter-quarter section line. The location as shown in Exhibit No. 1 is the actual drilled location of this well. This well has been drilled and completed.

Q Would the four-foot difference have any, in your opinion, have any effect on correlative rights at all?

A No, sir. As I stated previously, Texaco is the operator of the Cotton Draw Unit. The center line of Section 28 is the southern boundary of the Cotton Draw Unit itself. There are wells located in the northwest quarter of this section and they are not shown on this plat. I don't feel that this 4.6 feet in any way denies anyone his correlative rights in this area in that this well is located in a unit and is actually crowding no one or another well in the unit.

Q Was Exhibit No. 1 prepared by you or under your direction?

A Yes.

MR. KELLY: We will offer Exhibit 1 in evidence.

EXAMINER UTZ: Without objection, Exhibit 1 will be entered into the record of this case.

MR. KELLY: That's all I have.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY EXAMINER UTZ:

Q Mr. Black, the northwest of Section 28 is a participating area?

A Yes, it is. It has four producing wells.

EXAMINER UTZ: Are there any other questions of the witness?

Are there any other statements in this case?

The witness may be excused.

(Witness excused.)

EXAMINER UTZ: The case will be taken under advisement.

* * * * *

STATE OF NEW MEXICO)
) ss.
COUNTY OF SAN JUAN)

I, THOMAS F. HORNE, Notary Public in and for the County of San Juan, State of New Mexico, do hereby certify that the foregoing and attached transcript of hearing was reported by me in Stenotype and that the same was reduced to typewritten transcript under my personal supervision and contains a true and correct record of said proceedings, to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.

DATED this 29 day of October, 1961, in the City of Farmington, County of San Juan, State of New Mexico.

Thomas F. Horne
Notary Public

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES:

12-2-65

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a complete record of the proceedings in the Examiner hearing of Case No. 2399, heard by me on Oct 4, 1961.

Examiner
New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission