1	NEW MEXICO UIL CONSERVATION DIVISION
2	STATE LAND OFFICE BUILDING
3	STATE OF NEW MEXICO
4	CASE NO. 10811
5	
6	IN THE MATTER OF:
7	
8	The Application of Giant Exploration and Production Company for an
9	Unorthodox Oil Well Location. Sants Fe County, New Mexico.
10	ochico e codincy, new hexico.
1 1	
12	
1 3	
1 4	
15	REFORE:
16	MICHAEL E. STOGNER
7 7	Hearing Examiner
18	State Land Office Building
19	Thursday, September 23, 199 3
5 0	
2 1	
22	4
23	REPORTED BY:
24	CARLA DIANE RODRIGUEZ Centified Count Reporter for the State of New Movies

ORIGINAL

1 APPEARANCES 2 FOR THE NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION: 3 4 ROBERT G. STOVALL, ESQ. General Counsel 5 State Land Office Building 6 Post Office Box 2088 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504-2088 8 FOR THE APPLICANTS 9 TANSEY, ROSEBROUGH, GERDING & STROTHER, P.C. 1.0 Post Office Sox 1020 1 1 Farmington, New Mexico 87401-1020 BY: TOMMY ROBERTS, ESQ. 12 1.3 14 15 16 17 18 1.9 20 2 1 22 23 24 25

INDEX 2 Page Number 3 2 Appearances WITNESSES FOR THE APPLICANT: 4 5 1 . ALAN P. EMMENDORFER Examination by Mr. Roberts Examination by Mr. Stogner 1.6 Examination by Mr. Stovall 7 19 8 2.2 Cestificate of Reporter 9 4.0 EXHIBITS 11 Page Marked 12 Exhibit No. 1 7 Exhibit No 2 9 1.3 Exhibit No. 3 1.0 14 Exhibit No. 4 1 L 1.5 16 17 18 1.9 20 21 22 23 24 25

1	EXAMINER STOGNER: The hearing will
2	come to order. Call next case, No. 10811.
3	MR. STOVALL: Application of Giant
4	Exploration & Production Company for an
5	unorthodox oil well location, Santa Fe County,
6	New Mexico.
7	EXAMINER STOGNER: Call for
8	appear ance s.
9	MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Examiner, my name is
10	Towny Roberts. I'm an attorney practicing with
11	the Tansey Law Firm in Farmington, New Mexico.
12	I'm appearing on behalf of the Applicant, Giant
13	Exploration and Production Company, and I have
14	one wi tnes s to be sworn.
15	EXAMINER STOGNER: Are there any other
16	appearances in this matter?
17	Will the witness please stand to be
18	sworn.
19	ALAN P. EMMENDORFER
2 0	Having been first duly sworn upon his oath, was
2 1	examin ed and testified as follows:
2 2	EXAMINATION
2 3	BY MR. ROBERTS:
2 4	O. State your name and your place of
25	reside nce .

1 A. My name is Alan P. Emmendorfer, and I live in Farmington, New Mexico. C. By whom are you employed? I work for Giant Exploration and 4 5 Production Company in Farmington. 6 In what sapacity? 7 A . As a petroleum deologist. 8 How long have you been employed by 0 ... Giant in that capacity? 10 For approximately three and a half Pr. . 11 vears. Have you testified before the Oil 12 Ο. 13 Conservation Division on any prior occasion? 14 Δ. Yes, I have. 15 C_{∞} In what dapacity? 16 As a petroleum geologist. ,3, , 17 Were your qualifications as an expert 18 in the field of petroleum geology accepted and 19 made a matter of record at that time? 2.0 Д. Yas, they were. 21 Are you familiar with the application C ... 22 in this case? 23 Yes. I am. Α. 24 Q. Have you prepared certain exhibits to

be submitted in conjunction with your testimony?

1 1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

25

Yes

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Examiner, I would tender Mr. Emmerdorfer as an expert in the field of petroleum deplody.

EXAMINER STOGNER: Mr. Emmendorfer is so qualified.

- C. Mr. Smmendorfer, would you briefly describe the purpose of this application?
- A. Yes. Mr. Examiner, Giant seeks approval with this hearing for the drilling of an unorthodox oil well located 1300 feet from the south line and 1000 feet from the west line of Section 10. Township 20 North, Range 9 East, Santa Fe County, New Mexico.

The well is to test the Pennsylvanian formation, and the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of Section 10 is to be dedicated to this well.

- O. Is the Pennsylvanian formation an oil producing formation?
- There have been oil shows in the Pennsylvanian. In Santa Fe County there is no commercial production at this time.
- C. When does Giant intend to spud this we11?

1 A. This fall.

- Q. What is the current status of your application for permit to drill?
- A. It is with the BLM, and they're currently looking over it to go ahead with the approval.
 - Q. Is it fair to describe this proposed operation as a wildcat operation?
 - A. Yes, very much so.
 - Q. Would you refer to what you've marked as Exhibit No. 1. Identify that exhibit and identify the material depicted there that's relevant to this case.
 - A. Exhibit No. 1 is a land map, Township
 20 North, Range 9 East, Santa Fe County, New
 Mexico. Each of the numbered squares are
 government sections.

The outline of Giant's leasehold is the heavy, dark, dashed line. Color-coded are three leases currently held by Giant in the township. The large lease colored in purple is a government lease, which is where the proposed well is located.

On this map it is shown by a circle with an arrow and a flag, calling it the

1 | "Espanola No. 1 Proposed Location."

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1.0

1 1

12

13

14

15

1.6

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In addition, Giant holds two other leases, one in Section 16, which is colored in orange. It's a State of New Mexico lease. And in Section 21, color-coded in green is another State of New Mexico lease.

- Q. What are the statewide rules for spacing of the Pennsylvanian formation in this area?
- A. Statewide rules are for 40-acre spacing.
- O. Your testimony has been that all of the acreage, which is colored on Exhibit No. 1, in any color. is 190-percent Giant leasehold, is that accurate?
- A. Yes, that's correct. Giant owns 100 percent working interest in all three leases.
- Q. Then I assume that you've given no notice to any offsetting operators of this hearing?
- A. No. The rules state that offsetting 40-acre operators need to be notified, and since Giant is the operator involved in the offsetting 40-acres, no additional parties were notified.
 - Q. So, in your opinion, the requirements

for notification set forth by the Oil
Conservation Division have been satisfied?

A. Yes, they have.

1.8

1.8

2.4

O. Would you refer to what's been marked as Exhibit No. 2 and identify that exhibit?

Exhibit No. 1, color-coded in the same manner. I would ask you to pay attention to the fact that these are not sections, but they're quarter sections. The southwest of 10, the southeast of 9 and the northwest of 15 are purple, and there's a portion of the state lease referred to in Exhibit No. 1.

The northeast of Section 16 is a state lease that's similarly colored orange. The proposed unorthodox location is shown by the green dot, at a distance of 1300 feet from the south line, 1000 feet from the west line of the southwest quarter of Section 10.

In addition, there are a number of squares representing the drilling windows that are set up by statewide wildcat rules for this area.

Q. And what are the setback requirements for standard locations, statewide rules?

A. Okay. The setbacks, set up by statewide nules for this area, are 330 feet from any governmental quarter/quarter boundary.

1.0

1 1

1.6

- Q. On this exhibit, why do you illustrate the windows for standard locations in the offsetting quarter/quarter sections?
- A. Well, in the event that commercial protection is found in this well, additional development drilling does take place. Statewide rules provide that the other wells should be within these drilling windows, and that no well shall be within 330 feet of any other producing well.

This would show that if the other wells are put within the drilling windows, they would still be within the state rules, offset from a producing well from that same horizon.

- Q. Now refer to what you've labeled as Exhibit No. 3, and identify that exhibit.
- A. Exhibit No. 3 is a drilling activity map in the area surrounding the Espanola No. 1 proposed location. The scale is a little different.

Each of the squares, again, are governmental sections. A square mile. There are

approximately four townships noted on this map.

Siant's leasehold in Township 20 North, Range 9

East, is outlined in the same dark, hatchered

Iine. The Espanola No. 1 well proposed location

5 is identified by the green-colored circled,

6 | flagging, and the title.

In addition, the only two wells that were drilled in this four-township area are noted by the dry holes, colored red. I would point out that Township 21 North, 9 East, the E.M. Elliot No. 1 well, was drilled in Section 26 back in the early 30s.

The only other well drilled in the area was drilled approximately one mile to the east of the proposed location, in Section 11 of Township 20 North, Range 9 East, by Castle and Wigzell, called the Kelley Federal #1.

Ir addition, I've identified on this map the seismic traces that Giant shot seismic in this area earlier, a few years ago, in 1989. The purpose of this exhibit is to show that this is a rank wildcat, and there's very little geological subsurface data to aid in the placement of the we':

O. What was the objective depth of the

1 E.M. Elliot No. 1 well, in Section 26 of 21 North, 9 East?

1.8

2.0

2.1

- A. They drilled to a total depth in the Pennsylvanian, I believe, approximately 1700 feet.
- Q. And the same question applicable to the Castle and Wigzell, Kelley Federal #1, and that's in Section 11, of Township 20 North, 9 East.
- A. That well drilled to an approximate total depth of 2700 feet, and TD'd also in the Pennsylvanian section
- O. Just a point of clarity, how are the seismic shot lines depicted on this exhibit?
- A. The shot points are, every fifth shot point is depicted by a small circle, and every twentieth shot point is identified by a small number, such that the Espanola No. 1 is staked right adjacent to Shot Point No. 160.
- Q. Why have you deemed it unsatisfactory to drill at a standard location?
- A. Well, because this is a wildcat and there's very little subsurface data, we shot seismic in the area based on that subsurface data and some gravity modeling that we did. The area has very rugged topography, and we had to design

our seismic program to follow that topography.

The seismic data that we've received from the line the Espanola No. 1 is located on, was rather surprising and revealing, and really set up the prospect, as we see it, and we feel that to properly evaluate the subsurface, when we drill this we'l, that we would need to run wire line logs, such as the sonic log, that we could then create a synthetic seismogram, tie directly back to the seismic line, to aid in the interpretation of the subsurface, both at the wellbore and at adjoining areas.

- Q. Is it your opinion that there's no standard location that is geologically sound?
- A. Well, we really don't know exactly what we have off the seismic line. There's a number of faults that are shown subsurfacely by the seismic lines. It's a rank wildcat area and we just don't know what we have away from that seismic line.

It's not unusual, in these situations, to stake your well directly on a seismic line.

If we drilled it at a standard location and later wanted to run additional seismic, because of state rules applying to the closeness of

2 1

additional seismic lines to a producing well, we wouldn't be able to tie our data directly to the line, and that's pretty important for geophysical analysis.

1.6

1.8

2 1

O. Exhibit No. 4 is a topographical map of a nine-section area, eight of those sections surrounding the section in which this proposed location is situated.

What role does topography play in your selection in this proposed site?

A. Okay. As stated, this plat is of a topo map of the area. It's very rugged. The contour intervals are 20-foot contours.

Again, the proposed location is highlighted in green, and the Kelley Federal dry hole is highlighted in red.

As in the previous exhibit, the seismic line is shown by every fifth shot point, by the small circles. As you can see, there's a major wash that is running through Section 9, into Section 10. and on into Section 11.

When Giant shot the seismic program in 1989, they were careful in reducing the amount of environmental damage to this surface in this area. And all four of our lines were shot up to

these major drainages, which also, all the roads into the area follow these drainages.

Q. Does this proposed location help to minimize surface disturbance associated with roads that access into the location?

2 1

A. Yes, it does. The seismic line, as I stated previously, was shot along the road, which sometimes was in the drainage and sometimes just adjoining it.

The proposed location is staked on the seismic line, on the road, and a portion of the location would fall on a reclaimed borrow pit.

Downstream a little ways, the Bureau of Reclamation built a diversion dam and used material from the area to build the dam. And our location is partially on this reclaimed land, so no new disturbances would need to be taken into account.

- Q. Sriefly summarize why, in your opinion, this application should be granted.
- A. Well, if we are allowed to drill at this location, then we could more effectively use all the subsurface information gained from this well to effectively get a better picture of the subsurface reservoir.

1 If commercial production is found and 2 additional wells are necessary, we would have a 3 better picture of the subsurface. We would be 4 able to better plan our development program, and 5 limit the number of wells that will need to be drilled. 6 0. In your opinion, will the granting of 7 this application be in the best interests of 8

- O. In your opinion, will the granting of this application be in the best interests of conservation and result in the prevention of waste and the protection of correlative rights?
- A, Yes, I do.

9

1.0

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

21

22

23

25

- O. Were Exhibit No. 1 through 4 either prepared by you or at your direction or under your supervision?
- 15 A. Yes, they were.
 - MR. ROBERTS: I would move the admission of Exhibit Nos. 1 through 4 on behalf of the $\mbox{\sf App}^{\mbox{\scriptsize limit}}$ cant.
- EXAMINER STOGNER: Exhibits 1 through 4

 20 will be admitted into evidence.
 - MR. ROBERTS: I have no other questions for this witness.

EXAMINATION

- 24 BY EXAMINER STOGNER:
 - Q. Going back to Exhibit No. 3, it appears

that your seismic line appears to be somewhat curved, as opposed to going either due south or north or due east or west. Did that follow that wash that you referred to in Exhibit 4?

A. Yes, it did. Well, there's county roads which pretty much parallel the wash to the western portion of the seismic line.

This area is in the Sombrillo Surface

Management area, and they're concerned about

vertebrate fossils in the area, so we tried to

minimize surface disturbance as much as possible.

- j. Is this near that county road, did you say?
- A. Well, the western portion of the seismic line follows the county line. The county road ends in Section 9, just west of where it says Township 20 North, and there are grazing roads that follow that wash into the BLM surface, which is in the east half of Section 9, all of Section 10 and 11, 15 and 14.
- Q. Has the surface location been inspected by the U.S. BLM, or been staked?
- A. Yes, we staked the well in the latter part of July. At that time, the BLM was there to do their surface on site, and they also brought

2 1

their vertebrate paleontologist. As I mentioned earlier, this is in what's known as the Sombrillo Sunface Management area, and the area has significant vertebrate fossils that have been collected over the last 60 years, and it's a fairly unique collection for those types of fossils, and they've given the okay to place a well at this location.

1.0

- Q. What BLM area office or district office, if you will, of the BLM, handles this area?
 - A. It's the Taos Resource area.
 - O. That's who the APD will be oping to?
- A. I believe that's correct. We sent them both to the Albuquerque and to the Taos District.
 - Q. The total depth of this well will be?
 - A. We're projecting it to 5400 feet.
- O. What's your proposed casing program, surface and intermediate?
- A. We have, if production casing is set, we have four strings that will be set. We have--let me--
- Q. Right now I'm mostly concerned about surface.
- 25 A. Okay. Well, we've got a conductor

pipe, and I was going to check the APD. It's either 60 or 90 feet. And then we're wanting to set a 2000-foot string to protect any fresh water resources into groundwater.

I believe that the deepest water well of any of the residents downdip from us is 600 feet

EXAMINER STOGNER: Any other questions?

MR. STOVALL: I have just a couple.

EXAMINATION

BY MR. STOVALL:

1 1

- Q. These leases that are identified on Exhibit 1 are all, 100 percent, Giant leases, is that correct?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- O. Has Giant, assuming you have success with this wildcat, has Giant got a development plan out here? Do you kind of know where you're going to go if you find a well here? because it's not easy country to drill in.
- A. No, it's not. During the on site, one of the local residents asked the BLM if they were going to perform an environmental assessment, and they said for the initial well, no, it wasn't

necessary, because of the placement of the well.

If a discovery is made and the development of the field would take place, then an environmental assessment would be required.

2.0

Giant, when we originally shot the seismic, we tried to minimize the surface damages and keep exploration costs down, so we didn't shoot a lot of seismic.

However, if commercial production is found at the well, we're prepared to shoot additional seismic, you know, being aware of the environmental damage that could be done by any additional seismic. We'll take that into account in planning our seismic program.

- Q. Has Giant considered the possibility of coming to the Division and getting some sort of special rules for this lease that would give you some freedom to put wells where they would make sense, geologically and topographically, rather than adhere to what are the current statewide rules in the area?
- A. Well, as I testified earlier, in plat No. 2, the statewide rules for any offsetting wells, barring any special pool rules, are the 330-acre offsets.

1	Q. I understand that. What I'm suggesting
2	to you is that you might, in your development, go
3	back and say, and forget about those little boxes
4	you've drawn on your map, where does it make
5	sense to put wells to get development with the
6	kind of spacing you need but not necessarily
7	within those boxes, as kind of a lease unitized
8	development?
9	A. Yes, I think that that's probably going
10	too far into the future. We need to make the
1	initial wildcat well first.
12	But we're very aware that, perhaps,
3	special pool rules may need to be taken into
1 4	account and asked for from the state at any
5	future development time.
16	MR. STOVALL: I have nothing further.
7	EXAMINER STOGNER: Any other questions
18	of this witness?
9	MR. ROBERTS: No, sir.
2 0	EXAMINER STOGNER: If not, he may be
2 1	excused, and Case 10811 will be taken under
2 2	advise men t.
3	Let's take a 15-mi <mark>nute recess</mark> .
2 4	(And the proceedings concluded.)
₹5	I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a complete record of the proceedings in the Examiner hearing of Case Co. 1081/1993.

RODR-168-Forker Voligo Policinos (505) 988-1772

1	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	
3	STATE OF NEW MEXICO)) ss.
4	COUNTY OF SANTA FE)
5	
6	I, Carla Diane Rodriguez, Certified
7	Court Reporter and Notary Public, HEREBY CERTIFY
8	that the foregoing transcript of proceedings
9	before the Oil Conservation Division was reported
10	by me; that I caused my notes to be transcribed
1 1	under my personal supervision; and that the
12	foregoing is a true and accurate record of the
13	proce eding s.
14	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a
15	relative or employee of any of the parties or
16	attorneys involved in this matter and that I have
17	no personal interest in the final disposition of
18	this matter.
19	WITNESS MY HAND AND SEAL October 4,
20	1993.
2 1	
2 2	
23	(alla Dinne Ladinios)
2 4	CARLA DIANE RODRIGUEZ, APR.) CCR No. 4