25

BEFORE THE NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION 2 CONFERENCE ROOM, STATE LAND OFFICE BUILDING SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO 3 August 9, 1972 4 EXAMINER HEARING 5 б IN THE MATTER OF: 7 Application of Anadarko Production) Case No. 4760 Company for a waterflood project, 8 Lea County, New Mexico. 9 10 Elvis A. Utz, **BEFORE:** 11 Examiner. 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING 19 20 21 22 23

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 MR. HATCH: Case 4760: Application of Anadarko 2 Production Company for a waterflood project, Lea County, 3 If the Examiner please, this case was heard New Mexico. on July 26th, I believe -- rather, July 12th, and due to some 5 of the evidence that appeared, it was felt that it needed б to be readvertised. In the absence of objections, I would 7 suggest that an order be issued on the testimony in evidence 8 9 that was presented on that date. MR. UTZ: Is there any objection to counsel's 10 11 statement on Case 4760? 12 (No response)

Case 4760.

MR. UTZ:

MR. UTZ: Does anyone have any additional evidence? (No response)

MR. UTZ: Case 4760 will be taken under advisement and an order will be issued based on the July 12th testimony.

```
STATE OF NEW MEXICO
 1
   COUNTY OF BERNALILLO )
                             SS
 2
 3
              I, RICHARD E. McCORMICK, a Certified Shorthand
 4
    Reporter, in and for the County of Bernalillo, State of
5
   New Mexico, do hereby certify that the foregoing and attached
6
    Transcript of Hearing before the New Mexico Oil Conservation
7
    Commission was reported by me; and that the same is a true
8
    and correct record of the said proceedings to the best of
9
    knowledge, skill and ability.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

BEFORE THE NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

CONFERENCE ROOM, STATE LAND OFFICE BUILDING SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

EXAMINER HEARING

July 12, 1972

4760.

1

2

3

4

5

25

MR. HATCH: Case 4760: Application of Anadarko 2 Production Company for a waterflood project, Lea County, 3 New Mexico. MR. KELLAHIN: Jason Kellahin, of Kellahin and 5 Fox, Santa Fe, appearing for the Applicant. We have one б witness I would like to have sworn. 7 C. W. STUMHOFFER, 8 was called as a witness, and after being duly sworn, 9 testified as follows: 10 DIRECT EXAMINATION 11 BY MR. KELLAHIN: 12 Would you state your name, please? Q 13 C. W. Stumhoffer, S-t-u-m-h-o-f-f-e-r. Α 14 By whom are you employed and in what position? Q 15 Anadarko Production Company, as a petroleum engineer Α 16 for secondary recovery in Houston, Texas. 17 Have you testified before the Oil Conservation Commission 18 and made your qualifications as an engineer a matter 19 of record? 20 Yes, I have. 21 MR. KELLAHIN: Are the witness' qualifications 22 acceptable? 23 MR. STAMETS: They are. 24

MR. STAMETS: Case 4760.

(By Mr. Kellahin) Are you familiar with the application

23

24

25

1 of Anadarko in Case 4760? 2 Α Yes, I am. 3 Briefly tell us what is proposed by the Applicant in this case. In Case 4760, Anadarko Production Company seeks to 5 institute a waterflood project by the injection of б water into the Penrose-Skelley Pool by the injection 7 of water through the R.E. Cole Well Number Three 8 located in the Southwest quarter of the Southwest 9 quarter of Section 16 and the E. W. Walden Well Number 10 Six located in the Southeast quarter of the Southwest 11 quarter of Section 16, Township 22 South, Range 37 12 East, Lea County, New Mexico. 13 Now, referring you to what has been marked Applicant's Q 14 Exhibit One, would you identify that exhibit, please? 15 Exhibit One shows the reference leases that have just A 16 previously been described and the offset water 17 development under the Penrose-Skelley Unit. 18 Now, the Penrose Unit has been approved as a waterflood 19 project by the Commission, has it not? 20 Yes. 21

Now, the wells circled in red in the northern portion are those injections wells which have been approved as injection wells, are they not?

The wells that are circled in red in the North end of

the unit are proposed water injection wells.

- Q And they have been approved by the Commission?
- A Yes.

2

3

5

б

7

8

0

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Now, the application before the Commission today is just an extension of the Langlie Mattix-Penrose Sand Unit, is it not?
- waterflood development on the Langlie Mattix-Penrose
 Unit, is proposed for waterflooding the Penrose Sand
 Reservoir. In this application, we propose to convert

The application we are proposing, which is initial

- the water injection in the R. E. Cole Well Number
 Three located in the Southwest quarter of Section 16
 and the E. W. Walden Well Number Six located in the
 Southeast quarter of the Southwest quarter of Section 15
 for water injection into the Penrose Sand Reservoir,
 and it will be in cooperation with the Langlie Mattix-
- Your exhibit also shows a Continental Oil Well located in the Southeast of the Southeast of Section 15, will that be an injection well too?
- A Yes, it is proposed to be an injection well, and it will be converted as part of the lease agreement between Langlie Mattix.
- Q Would you explain Exhibit Two, please?

Penrose water flood project.

A Exhibit Two is a gamma ray neutron log of the R. E. Cole

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Well Number Three showing the zone that is open for production with a perforation from 3,480 to 3,642. The exhibit indicates the surface casing setting, the production casing setting, the cementing, and the top of the cement at initial completion of the well, and what we propose to do with the well as a water injection well. We propose to inject produced water from a salt water disposal system into these perforations through plastic coated tubing set in a five and a half inch casing at an approximate depth of thirty-four hundred feet. The water will be injected at a rate of approximately 500 barrels per day at a maximum surface pressure of 2,250 pounds. We propose that it be open to the surface and filled with injection water so we can detect any leakage of the Packer. Will the water be treated? Yes. Is this the same water that is being used in the other

water floods to the South?

Well, it is comparable water, it's not the same, but it is comparable.

Have you had any problems in using that water for Q injection purposes?

No, we have not.

Will your other well be completed in the same manner

44. 44. 26.

24

25

1		which you have discussed here?	
2	Λ	Yes. I refer you to Exhibit Three which shows it will	
3		be completed in the same manner, except that it will	
4		be injection into an open hole instead of through	
5		perforation.	
6	Q	But it will be under coated tubing?	
7	A	Yes, sir.	
8	Q	And you will leave the annulus open to the surface?	
9	A	That is correct.	
10	Q	Now, this application is for the injection of water	
11		into the Penrose-Skelley Pool, is that the same	
12		formation as the Langlie Mattix-Penrose?	
13	A	No, it is not.	
14	Q	What is the difference?	
15	Α	The Langlie Mattix also includes the bottom one hundred	
16		feet of the Seven-Rivers and Queen formations.	
17	Q	Are your wells open in the Grayburg?	
18	A	Yes, they are.	
19	Q	Do you want to inject into the Grayburg as well as	
20		into the Penrose?	
21	A	Yes, we would like to.	
22	Q	Insofar as injection into the Penrose is concerned, it	
23		will be offset to your Langlie Mattix-Penrose Sand Unit?	
24	A	Yes.	

Were Exhibits One through Three prepared by you?

April 12 Section 12 Section 12 1 A

Yes.

25

2 MR. KELLAHIN: I would like to offer Exhibits 3 One, Two, and Three. Any objections? MR. STAMETS: (No response) 5 MR. STAMETS: They will be admitted in evidence. 6 (Whereupon Applicant's Exhibits One through Three 7 were admitted in evidence.) 8 (By Mr. Kellahin) Will the approval of this application Q 9 result in your recovery of oil that would not otherwise 10 be recovered? 11 Yes. 12 Would the correlative rights of the various operators Q 13 offsetting your acreage be protected? 14 Yes, sir. 15 I would like to add that we are operating under 16 a proration unit and under Rule 701, we would like 17 to request administrative approval for additional 18 conversion on this particular acreage so we could 19 divert other wells on this acreage. 20 MR. KELLAHIN: That's all I have. 21 CROSS EXAMINATION 22 BY MR. STAMETS: 23 Q 24

Under 701, is it your understanding that basically there would be two separate floods here even though

25

Yes, sir.

they might be called the same thing? 1 Yes. A 2 And there would be no transfer of allowables? Q 3 A No, we can't physically do that. And would you have a cooperative water flood in the Q 5 Langlie Mattix-Penrose Sand Unit? б Α Yes, sir. 7 I wish you would run over the last of your testimony 8 again concerning the difference between the Langlie 9 Mattix-Penrose Sand Unit flood and the surrounding 10 flooding and what you propose here. 11 In the Langlie Mattix, the Langlie Mattix Oil Pool is 12 producing horizontally and it is defined as having 13 the lower one hundred feet of the Seven-Rivers which 14 is not productive in this area. The Queen formation 15 which includes the Penrose Sand Unit, all the wells 16 are completed in the Penrose Sand and it does not 17 penetrate the Grayburg. The well we are proposing to 18 water inject is in the Penrose-Skelley Pool, and the 19 producing formation is designed as the Queen formation 20 which includes the Penrose and the Grayburg formations. 21 We would like to have permission to inject into the 22 Penrose Sand as well as into the Grayburg. 23

Are the completed wells both Penrose and Grayburg?

1	Q	So any oil which might be driven to the producing		
2	wells by the injection wells in the Langlie Mattix-			
3		Penrose Unit would be producible through the producing		
4		wells?		
5	A	Yes.		
6	Q	And I presume they are open to the Grayburg as well?		
7	A	Yes, and under the Grayburg. If the Grayburg proves		
8	successful, we will expand the waterflood into the			
9		Grayburg on a cooperative basis.		
10		MR. STAMETS: Are there any other questions of		
11	this	witness?		
12		(No response)		
13		MR. STAMETS: If not, he may be excused.		
14	(Witness excused.)			
15		MR. STAMETS: Is there any additional testimony		
16	in this case?			
17		MR. KELLAHIN: No, sir.		
18		MR. STAMETS: Any statements?		
19		(No response)		
20		MR. STAMETS: Case 4760 will be taken under		
21	advis	sement.		
22				
23				
24				
25				

```
STATE OF NEW MEXICO )

, ss
COUNTY OF BERNALILLO )
```

I, RICHARD E. McCORMICK, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, in and for the County of Bernalillo, State of New Mexico do hereby certify that the foregoing and attached Transcript of Hearing before the New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission was reported by me; and that the same is a true and correct record of the said proceedings to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.

CHRTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER

Richard Hamit

NEW MEXICO 87103	MEXICO 87108
209 SIMMS BLDG. P.O. BOX 1092 PHONE 243-6691 ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO 87103	1216 FIR\$T NATIONAL BANK BLDG. EAST ♦ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO 87108

1	<u>INDEX</u>					
2	WITNESS		PAGE			
3	C. W. STUMHOFFER					
4	Direct Examina	3				
5	Cross Examina	8				
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
11		EXHIBITS				
12	APPLICANT'S	ADMITTED	OFFERED			
13	Exhibit 1	8	4			
14	Exhibit 2	8	5			
15	Exhibit 3	8	7			
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21			,			
22						
23						
24						
25						