

STATE OF NEW MEXICO
ENERGY AND MINERALS DEPARTMENT
OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION
STATE LAND OFFICE BLDG.
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

4 March, 1987

EXAMINER HEARING

IN THE MATTER OF:

| | |
|---------------------------------------|------|
| Applications of John E. Schalk, Col- | CASE |
| umbus Energy Corporation, Union Texas | 9096 |
| Petroleum Corporation, William C. | 9097 |
| Russell, C & E Operators, Inc., and | 9098 |
| Dugan Production Corporation, for an | 9099 |
| exception to Rule 5(a)2(2) of Divi- | 9100 |
| sion Order No. R-8170, as amended, | 9101 |
| San Juan and Rio Arriba Counties, | |
| New Mexico. | |

BEFORE: Michael E. Stogner, Examiner

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

A P P E A R A N C E S

| | |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| For the Commission: | Jeff Taylor |
| | Legal Counsel for the Division |
| | Oil Conservation Division |
| | State Land Office Bldg. |
| | Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501 |
| For the Applicants: | W. Thomas Kellahin |
| | Attorney at Law |
| | KELLAHIN, KELLAHIN, & AUBREY |
| | P. O. Box 2265 |
| | Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501 |

I N D E X

A. R. KENDRICK

| | |
|--------------------------------------|----|
| Direct Examination by Mr. Kellahin | 7 |
| Cross Examination by Mr. Stogner | 26 |
| Redirect Examination by Mr. Kellahin | 35 |
| Recross Examination by Mr. Stogner | 37 |

E X H I B I T S

| | |
|--------------------------------------|----|
| Schalk Exhibit A-1, Policy | 8 |
| Schalk Exhibit A-2, Calculation | 8 |
| Schalk Exhibit A-3, Calculation | 8 |
| Schalk Exhibit A-4, Calculation | 8 |
| Schalk Exhibit One, Application | 18 |
| Schalk Exhibit Two, Well Information | 18 |
| Schalk Exhibit Three, Plat | 18 |
| Schalk Exhibit Four, Page A-1 | 19 |
| Schalk Exhibit Five, Page A-2 plus | 19 |

E X H I B I T S CONT'D

| | | |
|----|--|----|
| 1 | | |
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | Columbus Exhibit One, Certificate of Mailing | 19 |
| 6 | Columbus Exhibit Two, Plat | 19 |
| 7 | Columbus Exhibit Three, Plat | 19 |
| 8 | Columbus Exhibit Four, Page A-1 | 19 |
| 9 | Columbus Exhibit Five, Page A-2 plus | 19 |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | UTP Exhibit One, Certificate of Mailing | 19 |
| 12 | UTP Exhibit Two, Wells Information | 20 |
| 13 | UTP Exhibit Three, Wells Information | 20 |
| 14 | UTP Exhibit Four, Plat | 20 |
| 15 | UTP Exhibit Five, Plat | 20 |
| 16 | UTP Exhibit Six, Plat | 20 |
| 17 | UTP Exhibit Seven, Plat | 20 |
| 18 | UTP Exhibit Eight, A-1 | 20 |
| 19 | UTP Exhibit Nine, A-2 | 20 |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | Russell Exhibit One, Certificate of Mailing | 21 |
| 22 | Russell Exhibit Two, Well Information | 21 |
| 23 | Russell Exhibit Three, Plat | 21 |
| 24 | Russell Exhibit Four, Page A-1 | 21 |
| 25 | Russell Exhibit Five, Page A-2 | 21 |

E X H I B I T S CONT'D

| | | |
|----|---|----|
| 1 | | |
| 2 | | |
| 3 | C & E Exhibit One, Document | 21 |
| 4 | C & E Exhibit Two, Plat | 22 |
| 5 | C & E Exhibit Three, Page A-1 | 22 |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | Dugan Exhibit One, Certificate of Mailing | 23 |
| 9 | Dugan Exhibit Two, Plat | 23 |
| 10 | Dugan Exhibit Three, Plat | 23 |
| 11 | Dugan Exhibit Four, Plat | 23 |
| 12 | Dugan Exhibit Five, Page A-1 | 23 |
| 13 | Dugan Exhibit Six, Page A-2 | 23 |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |

1
2 MR. STOGNER: Call next Case
3 9096.

4 MR. TAYLOR: Application of
5 John E. Schalk for an exception to Rule 5(a)2(2) of Division
6 Order No. R-8170, as amended, Rio Arriba County, New Mexico.

7 MR. STOGNER: Call for appear-
8 ances in this case.

9 MR. KELLAHIN: Mr. Examiner,
10 I'm Tom Kellahin of Santa Fe, New Mexico, appearing on be-
11 half of John E. Schalk.

12 Mr. Examiner, with regard to
13 the Cases 9097, 9098, 9099, 9100, and 9101, each of them is
14 in the same regard as Case 9096, and we represent all appli-
15 cants in these six cases in this matter, and would request
16 that the cases be consolidated for purposes of testimony.

17 MR. STOGNER: Very well, Mr.
18 Kellahin, we will call Cases 9097, 9098, 9099, 9100, and
19 9101 at this time and they will be consolidated for purposes
20 of this hearing.

21 MR. TAYLOR: Application of
22 Columbus Energy Corporation for an exception to Rule
23 5(a)2(2) of Division Order No. R-8170, as amended, San Juan
24 County, New Mexico.

25 Application of Union Texas

1 Petroleum Corporation for an exception to Rule 5(a)2(2) of
2 Division Order No. R-8170, as amended, San Juan County, New
3 Mexico.

4 Application of William C.
5 Russell for an exception to Rule 5(a)2(2) of Division Order
6 No. R-8170, as amended, San Juan County, New Mexico.

7 Application of C & E Opera-
8 tors, Inc. for an exception to Rule 5(a)2(2) of Division
9 Order No. R-8170, as amended, San Juan County, New Mexico.

10 Application of Dugan Produc-
11 tion Corporation for an exception to Rule 5(a)2(2) of Divi-
12 sion Order No. R-8170, as amended, San Juan County, New Mex-
13 ico.

14 MR. STOGNER: Will the witness
15 please stand and be sworn?

16
17 (Witness sworn.)

18
19 MR. STOGNER: Mr. Kellahin.

20 MR. KELLAHIN: Thank you, Mr.
21 Stogner.

22
23 A. R. KENDRICK,
24 being called as a witness and being duly sworn upon his
25 oath, testified as follows, to-wit:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. KELLAHIN:

Q Mr. Kendrick, for the record would you please state your name and occupation?

A A. R. Kendrick, Petroleum Consultant.

Q With regards to the six consolidated cases, Mr. Kendrick, have you been retained by each of those applicants to prepare testimony as a petroleum engineer in those cases?

A Yes, sir.

Q Would you describe generally what is the subject matter of each of those six applications for the Examiner?

A The subject matter is the procedure for calculating allowables for these wells. They are nonstandard proration units having approximately 50 percent acreage factors because they have only one-quarter of a section dedicated to the wells instead of a half section, and the present proration formula does not treat these wells fairly compared to offset wells on standard proration units.

Q Have you made an examination of the way the allowables are calculated for each of the wells for each of the applicants?

A Yes, sir.

1 MR. KELLAHIN: We tender Mr.
2 Kendrick as an expert petroleum engineer.

3 MR. STOGNER: Mr. Kendrick is
4 so qualified.

5 Q Mr. Kendrick, I have marked as Schalk Ex-
6 hibit A-1 the allowable calculation policy and then the al-
7 lowable calculation as Exhibit A-2, and then finally, as A-3
8 and 4 are the Schalk calculations on specific wells.

9 So that the Examiner will have an
10 understanding of what we're doing for all of these cases, I
11 would like to use the Schalk case as an example and have you
12 begin, then, with the generic exhibit, if you will, A-1, and
13 have you go through the allowable calculation policy that
14 you're recommending and give us the basis upon which -- to
15 give us a basis upon which you have made the recommendation
16 that the allowable for nonstandard proration units be
17 adusted.

18 A The generic description package, Exhibit
19 A-1, shows the -- my conception of the allowable calculation
20 policy as it currently exists and is a recap of the proce-
21 dure for the determination of the allowable formula, which
22 the allowable is equal to the acreage factor times a factor
23 known as F-1, plus the acreage times deliverability factor,
24 times a factor known as F-2, which is referred to as the A x
25 D factor or the deliverability factor in the formula.

1 Where we have infill wells drilled we add
2 the deliverabilities in the deliverability portion of that
3 formula and those are shown on the bottom of Page A-1 in
4 this packet.

5 On Page A-2, the allowable calculation, I
6 cited the statute, 70-2-17, which essentially says that the
7 allowable assigned to each proration unit shall be equal to
8 that or represent that proration unit's fair share of the
9 known reserves of the pool.

10 And I stated further that based on the
11 premise that this statute was followed when the proration
12 formulas were established, the deliverability of one well in
13 the Basin Dakota or Blanco Mesaverde Pools would represent
14 the recoverable reserves under each proration unit or 320
15 acres.

16 When the infill drilling orders were is-
17 sued for these pools this must have caused a redefinition of
18 the value of the deliverability to equal the deliverability
19 of a 160-acre tract since we added the deliverabilities to
20 represent the reserves under the tracts.

21 And this is resulting in the equation
22 shown at the bottom of the page, or the second one up from
23 the bottom the bottom showed that the allowable is equal to
24 the acreage factor times F1 plus the acreage factor times
25 the sums of the deliverabilities of the two wells times the

1 factor F2.

2 The formula that I'm proposing to be used
3 on these wells would delete the acreage factor itself of the
4 deliverability portion of that formula so that the allowable
5 formula would be equal to the acreage factor times the F1
6 plus the sums of the deliverabilities times F2, and if this
7 is applied on a poolwide basis, if the second well had not
8 been drilled on a drill tract, you would add a zero for
9 deliverability and wind up with the exact same formula that
10 we have now if it were on a standard unit.

11 On a nonstandard unit you would just not
12 reduce the calculated reserves under the tract by the
13 multiplication of the acreage factor.

14 Q To see how the existing formula and the
15 proposed formula work in a specific example situation, have
16 you prepared a calculation to demonstrate the disparity in
17 allowables under the current formula versus the proposed
18 formula?

19 A Yes. I have tow pages of generic type
20 situations.

21 The first is shown as an example for the
22 Basin Dakota Pool. I've made the assumptions that we have a
23 320-acre unit on which two wells are drilled, one with the
24 deliverability of 200 MCF and one with a deliverability of
25 400 -- excuse me, of 500 MCF.

1 By taking the average allocation factors,
2 F1 and F2, from the Basin Dakota Pool for the year 1985, the
3 average factors are entered under Assumption 2.

4 By substitution into the present formula
5 the allowable for one 2-well unit is 10,150 MCF.

6 Using the present formula if we divide
7 that into two 1-well units, each well having a 50 percent
8 acreage factor, the allowable for the one with deliverabil-
9 ity of 200 would be 3,303 MCF and the allowable for the unit
10 having a deliverability of 500 MCF would be 4,366.

11 When we add those together we get 7,669
12 MCF for the 320 acres.

13 When we subtract that from the 10,150
14 where we have one 2-well unit, we find that during that
15 month those two 160-acre units would lose 2,481 MCF of al-
16 lowable just because the unit was divided into two units in-
17 stead of one unit.

18 Q There is no other factor that accounts
19 for the difference in the disparity in allowables other than
20 the fact that you've taken a 320-acre unit and divided it in
21 half --

22 A Yes, sir.

23 Q -- into two nonstandard 160-acre prora-
24 tion units.

25 A That is true.

1 Q By adjusting the formula as you have pro-
2 posed by deleting the acreage factor from the deliverability
3 portion of the calculation, can you show us what happens
4 then under the proposed formula?

5 A Under the proposed formula if we apply
6 the proposed formula to one 2-well unit, we would arrive
7 with the same answer of 10,150 MCF for the allowable for
8 that average month.

9 If we divide the unit and have two 1-well
10 units with the same deliverabilities as cited in the example
11 earlier, for the well with the deliverability of 200 MCF,
12 that allowable is moved from 3,303 to up 4,012, and for the
13 well the deliverability of 500, the allowable would change
14 from 4,366 to 6,138.

15 We add those two together we get 10,150
16 MCF.

17 We subtract that from the allowable as-
18 signed to the 320-acre unit and we get zero.

19 So that all we're asking for is that the
20 wells, because they're on nonstandard units, be given the
21 same allowable they would get if they were on the 320-acre
22 drill tract.

23 Q All right, you've demonstrated for us the
24 Basin Dakota Gas Pool situation and how you would propose to
25 adjust the allowable calculation to remove the disparity in

1 the formula, does the change also hold true if you do the
2 calculation for the Blanco Mesaverde Gas Pool?

3 A Yes, the examples shown on the next page
4 are using the average factor for the Blanco Mesaver Pool un-
5 der Assumption 2, and by substituting those values in the
6 same formulas, this page shows the identical calculations
7 and the difference in allowables under the present formula
8 would be 6,412 MCF and under the proposed formula the dif-
9 ference would be zero.

10 So that the wells would wind up with
11 identical allowables as those for two wells on one 320-acre
12 tract.

13 Q What is your recommendation to the Exam-
14 iner as to when this affected change in the calculation
15 should be made for all the applicants involved in the six
16 consolidated cases?

17 A I think the effective date should be the
18 first day of a proration month so that there would be no
19 supplemental requirements to change the history. Probably
20 on the next schedule calculated if the resulting order can
21 be out earlier enough that they can (not clearly under-
22 stood).

23 Q Are you seeking to make any type of
24 retroactive adjustment in the allowables for any of these
25 wells?

1 A No, sir.

2 Q All right, sir, let's go to Page A-3 of
3 the exhibit package and the caption says John E. Schalk.
4 Would you describe for the examiner what it is that you've
5 put on this exhibit?

6 A Do the --

7 Q Do you want to go to that exhibit?

8 A Well, let's apply these together with the
9 plat from the John Schalk --

10 Q All right.

11 A -- case.

12 MR. KELLAHIN: Mr. Examiner,
13 I'm handing you what is a package of exhibits from the
14 Schalk Case 9096. They're Exhibits One through Five, and
15 I'd like to direct your attention to Exhibit Three in that
16 package.

17 Q All right, sir, if you'll -- if we'll use
18 Schalk Exhibit A-3 and then turn to Schalk Exhibit Three,
19 which is the plat, describe for us what you have specifical-
20 ly done for the Schalk well.

21 A The Schalk Exhibit Number Three is a plat
22 showing the John E. Schalk Schalk Gulf No. 2 Well and it's
23 proration unit, and the Union Texas Petroleum Corporation's
24 McCrodden A-3 Well, both being in the east half of Section 8
25 of Township 25 North, Range 3 West.

1 And on Schalk Exhibit A-3 there's a cal-
2 culation of the allowables based on the current formula and
3 the proposed formula showing the different sets of factors,
4 one for the total of 1985, one for the average of 1985, and
5 one for September '86, which happened to be a schedule lay-
6 ing on my desk when I prepared these.

7 It shows the allowables calculated under
8 formula one, being the current use formula; formula two,
9 being the proposed formula, and the differences identified
10 in the column shown as gain in MCF.

11 Moving from the current use formula to
12 the present formula -- excuse me, from the present formula
13 to the proposed formula.

14 Q We've looked at how to make the adjust-
15 ment in the allowable formula for the Schalk Well. Also on
16 Exhibit Three below the Schalk nonstandard unit is a Union
17 Texas Petroleum Corporation nonstandard unit. Can you show
18 us the allowable calculation for that one so that we can
19 compare the Schalk to the Union Texas?

20 I think that's shown on your Exhibit A-4.

21 A On Exhibit A-4 we have the top set of
22 calculations is similar to those that we just discussed on
23 Exhibit A-3 for the same three types of calculations, using
24 the actual deliverability of the well and the acreage
25 factors.

1 And immediately below that is the same
2 information shown on Exhibit A-3 for the John E. Schalk
3 well, and then at the bottom of the page where we have both
4 wells considered as being unitized, and the composite is
5 shown there of what the allowables would be calculated for
6 Formula 1 or Formula 2, and it shows how they would be as
7 one 2-well unit as compared to being two 1-well units, and
8 the difference in each case results in zero.

9 Q If we assume the west half -- the east
10 half of Section 8 is a single spacing unit with an infill
11 well on it, then we would look at the bottom portion of A-4
12 and you can see for September of '86 there would be an al-
13 lowable of -- under your formula, yours is Formula 2 --

14 A Yes, Formula 2, the proposed formula.

15 Q -- the 2118?

16 A During the month of September, 1986.

17 Q Okay.

18 A For the average of 1985 it would be 6,957
19 MCF, to relate back to the pages in the generic package, or
20 earlier.

21 Q If we take the Union Texas well for Sep-
22 tember of '86, and under your Formula 2 the allowable for
23 September of '86 is 1194, right?

24 A Yes, sir.

25 Q And then on the Schalk well the September

1 '86 allowable under your proposed change is 924.

2 A That's correct.

3 Q And we add those two together and we're
4 going to get the 2118.

5 A That's correct.

6 Q So by using the adjusted formula you're
7 proposing you have removed the inequity in the formula so
8 that regardless of whether or not you have two wells on a
9 single communitized 320-acre unit or whether you have a well
10 on separate 160-acre units, they will each have allowables
11 that are equitable for the owners of those particular inter-
12 ests.

13 A Yes, sir.

14 Q It would --

15 A It would remove the inequities in the al-
16 lowable calculation.

17 Q And without the change the current rule
18 provides a disadvantage in allowables for nonstandard 160-
19 acre units.

20 A That's correct.

21 Q And the only reason that disparity is
22 there is simply a function of the calculation and the fact
23 that you've taken 320 acres and divided it in half.

24 A Yes, sir.

25 Q All right. In your opinion, Mr. Ken-

1 drick, is the proposed change in the formula that you've re-
2 quested for each of these wells one that is in the best in-
3 terests of conservation, the prevention of waste, and the
4 protection of correlative rights?

5 A Yes, sir.

6 Q Let's start, sir, with the exhibits for
7 each of the cases now so that the Examiner will understand
8 how we have put together the exhibit package.

9 If you'll start with the first Schalk
10 exhibit, would you identify Exhibit One?

11 A Exhibit One in the Schalk package is the
12 application for hearing for Case Number 9096.

13 Q It will be the certificate of mailing
14 portion to the offset operators, it would be that portion of
15 the application?

16 A Yes, sir.

17 Q And Exhibit Number Two is what?

18 A Shows the name of the operator, the well,
19 the location of the well, and the pool it's located in, and
20 the names of the offset operators.

21 Q Okay. Exhibit Number Three is what?

22 A It's a plat showing the proration units
23 with different patterns to show the Schalk well and the off-
24 set wells identified by operators and well names and loca-
25 tions.

1 Q Okay. And Exhibit Number Four?

2 A Exhibit Number Four is the same as Page
3 A-1 on the generic exhibit.

4 Q And Exhibit Five?

5 A Page A-5 -- excuse me, Page 5 is the same
6 as the generic Page A-2, and the supplemental calculation
7 pages attached behind that for the pool in which this opera-
8 tor's wells exist; in this case the Blanco Mesaverde Pool.

9 Q All right, sir, let's turn to the next
10 case, which is the Columbus Energy Corporation Case 9097.

11 A Exhibit One is the Certificate of Mailing
12 and shows the names and addresses of the offset operators
13 notified.

14 Exhibit Two is a plat showing Columbus
15 Energy's Aberdeen (sic) No. 1 and Landower No. 1-E Well lo-
16 cations and their -- their offset operators.

17 Exhibit Number Three shows the Owens No.
18 1, Gross No. 1-E, Arnstein No. 1, and Reed No. 1 locations
19 and proration units and their offsets.

20 Exhibits Four and Five are copies of the
21 generic exhibit pages similar to those in Case 9096.

22 Q Let's turn now to the Union Texas Petro-
23 leum Corporation Case 9098 and let me have you identify the
24 exhibits that are submitted for that case.

25 A Exhibit Number One is the Certificate of

1 Mailing showing the names and addresses of the offset opera-
2 tors notified for the lease.

3 Exhibit Number Two shows the names of the
4 wells, the locations of the wells and the pools they're lo-
5 cated in and the offset operators for three of the wells.

6 Exhibit Number Three identifies two other
7 wells and their locations and pool and the offset operators
8 that were notified.

9 Exhibit Four is the plat of the Jicarilla
10 L No. 5 and its offset operators.

11 Exhibit Number Five shows the plat of the
12 Schalk Gulf 2 and the McCrodden A-3 and the offset operators.

13 A Exhibit Number Six shows a plat of the
14 Rothson (sic) No. 2 Well and the offset operators.

15 Exhibit Number Seven shows the plat of
16 the Jicarilla L No. 12 and Jicarilla L No. 11 Wells and the
17 offset operators.

18 And the remainder of this package is
19 identical to the generic package that we discussed earlier,
20 the A-1, A-2 package.

21 The calculation pages were not identified
22 by exhibit numbers. They were just attachments to -- One
23 through Nine and then we also have a calculation for the
24 well which would be similar to Exhibit A-3 of the Schalk
25 Well but this exhibit or page is for the Union Texas McCrod-

1 den A-3 Well, which is the companion well to the Schalk
2 well, and that is the well in the same quarter section --
3 same half section.

4 Q Let me direct your attention now, Mr.
5 Kendrick, to the package of exhibits for the Russell Case
6 9099 and have you identify those exhibits.

7 A Exhibit Number One is the Certificate of
8 Mailing and the names and addresses of the operators noti-
9 fied.

10 Exhibit Number Two shows the names and
11 locations and the pool name and the offset operators for the
12 two wells covered by the William C. Russell case.

13 Exhibit Number Three shows the plats of
14 proration units and their offsets.

15 Exhibit Number Four is equivalent to
16 generic Exhibit A-1 and Exhibit Number Five would be the Ex-
17 hibit Number A-2.

18 Q I direct your attention to the C & E
19 Operators, Inc. Case 9100, and ask you to identify the exhi-
20 bits for that case.

21 A Since there were no offset operators to
22 this, there was no certificate of mailing.

23 Exhibit One shows the list of offset
24 operators as "none" for the Aztec Wells Nos. 8 and 9, the
25

1 location of the wells and the pool they're in.

2 Exhibit Two is a plat showing the prora-
3 tions units of these two wells and their offsets, and C & E
4 Operators is the only offsetting operator to these wells.

5 Exhibit Number Three is the -- a copy of
6 generic Exhibit A-1 and Exhibit Number Four is a copy of
7 generic Exhibit A-2.

8 Q When we talk about the generic exhibit
9 for the calculation of the allowable, that is simply a sam-
10 ple for the Mesaverde Pool and does not represent the actual
11 numbers for the two C & E Operator wells.

12 A That's correct.

13 Q And that's true of the other exhibits.

14 A Yes, all exhibits.

15 Q All right. So except for the original
16 package of exhibits where we made a specific calculation on
17 the Schalk wells and the UTP wells to show a comparison and
18 to show the absence of a disparity in allowables, you have
19 not run an actual calculation for each of the wells.

20 A I have not included it in these packages.

21 Q There's no reason to believe that the
22 calculation would be other than as you've represented in the
23 generic example in terms of balancing the equity.

24 A It's calculated according to the present
25 formula and the proposed formula. They will be equivalent

1 to the generic.

2 Q And turning now to the Dugan Production
3 Corporation Case 9101, I hand you what is marked as a pack-
4 age of exhibits for the Dugan case and ask you to identify
5 those exhibits.

6 A Exhibit Number One is the Certificate of
7 Mailing, showing the names and addresses of those persons
8 notified.

9 Behind that without an exhibit number is
10 a list of the wells, the locations, and the pool they're in,
11 and the offsets to each of those.

12 Exhibit Number Two is the plat of Dugan
13 Production Corporation's No. 1-A New Dawn Well, and the off-
14 set operators.

15 Exhibit Number Three is the plat of the
16 Fullerton No. 1 Well and the offsets.

17 And Exhibit Number Four is the plat of
18 the McAdams No. 3 and McAdams No. 2 Wells, and their off-
19 sets.

20 Exhibit Five is a copy of generic Exhibit
21 A-1 and Exhibit Six is a copy of generic Exhibit A-2 and the
22 calculation page behind that.

23 MR. KELLAHIN: At this time,
24 Mr. Examiner, we'd move the introduction of the respective
25 exhibits in the relative cases, as well as the Schalk Exhi-

1 bit A-1 through A-5, was it?

2 THE REPORTER: Four.

3 MR. KELLAHIN: Through A-4.

4 MR. STOGNER: Schalk, or gen-
5 eric, Cases 1-A through 1-4 and all the exhibits in the
6 cases will be admitted into evidence at this time.

7 MR. KENDRICK: Mr. Examiner, on
8 each of the plats, I would refer you to any of the plats
9 showing the proration unit, in the center of that proration
10 unit I've attempted to identify the order that set out the
11 nonstandard proration unit.

12 On Union Texas Petroleum Cor-
13 poration's exhibits, for the Jicarilla L-11 and 12 Wells I
14 did not show you the order for those two wells and I learned
15 that those two wells were drilled on 160-acre drill tracts
16 because the West Lindrith Gallup-Dakota Pool was expanded to
17 include the 160-acre tract in the section and merely left
18 this acreage to be all that's still available to dedicate to
19 these wells because there's an offset 320-acre drill tract
20 in each section, and I would submit to you a miscellaneous
21 notice filed through the BLM with an attached C-103 that ex-
22 plains why they dedicated the 160-acre tract to the Jicaril-
23 la L Well and I think the situation is, or will be, similar
24 to the Jicarilla L-11, because there was only 160 acres a-
25 vailable in that section to dedicate to a well, and I don't

1 think that a nonstandard proration unit has been approved
2 for either of those as such, but the Jicarilla L-12 Well has
3 produced for several years as the Jicarilla L No. 6-E and
4 due to this other manipulation of the expansion of the West
5 Lindrith-Gallup-Dakota Pool it only left 160 acres in the
6 Dakota formation for this well.

7 MR. STOGNER: Let me make sure
8 I got that right.

9 You're talking about Jicarilla
10 L No. 12 and the Jicarilla L No. 11 only.

11 MR. KENDRICK: Yes.

12 MR. STOGNER: Those were 160-
13 acre units because of a quirk in the pooling (not under-
14 stood).

15 MR. KENDRICK: Yes, sir.

16 MR. STOGNER: Okay, how about
17 the Jicarilla L No. 5?

18 MR. KENDRICK: If it's not in-
19 cluded in the packet, I'll determine the order number and
20 get you notice of the nonstandard proration unit order num-
21 ber.

22 Tom, why don't you read him
23 that. I failed to read that order number that sets up
24 those. It's --

25 MR. STOGNER: Also do you have

1 a copy of that order?

2 MR. KELLAHIN: Sure.

3 MR. KENDRICK: The order number
4 for Jicarilla L-11 and Jicarilla L-6 is Order No. R-8106 and
5 8106A.

6 MR. STOGNER: So that the
7 record may be straight on those wells, Mr. Kendrick, would
8 Union Texas Petroleum Corporation please submit an applica-
9 tion for nonstandard proration units -- better late than
10 never -- so we'll have it on record?

11 MR. KENDRICK: I'll tell them
12 that you requested that.

13

14 CROSS EXAMINATION

15 BY MR. STOGNER:

16 Q I don't know where to get started on this.
17 Let's turn to the generic exhibits and
18 the third page, this is your example for the Basin Dakota
19 Gas Pool?

20 A Yes, sir.

21 Q So that I'm understanding this, let's go
22 through the present formula, AF concept 1, and F1 you show
23 to be 5188.54 and that changes each proration period?

24 A That's -- that's the average F1 for the
25 year of 1985 for the Basin Dakota Pool, and the 7.087965 is

1 the average F2 for the year of 1985.

2 Q For the record, how is that F1 accom-
3 plished? How is that determined?

4 A Each month the purchasers nominate the
5 amount of gas they plan to take from each pool and those
6 nominations are totaled and an adjustment factor may or may
7 not be applied in each pool. The amount of gas to be
8 allocated to marginal wells is taken from that volume and
9 the reamining amount of gas is to be allocated to the
10 nonmarginal wells within that pool.

11 And based on the pool proration orderss,
12 that is split into a portion to be allocated on
13 deliverability and a portion to be allocated on acreage.

14 The portion to be allocated to straight
15 acreage is divided by the sums of the participating acreage
16 factors of the nonmarginal wells and determines factor F1.

17 The volume of gas to be allocated to the
18 nonmarginal wells based on deliverability is divided by the
19 sums of the acreage factors times the deliverability factors
20 of the individual wells and that resultant answer is F2.

21 Then the calculation of the allowable for
22 the well is as shown on the bottom of page one or page -- or
23 Exhibit A-1 or Exhibit A-2 or the example for one 2-well
24 unit where we have wells -- the deliverabilities added
25 together, and we take the acreage factor of the individual

1 well or the proration unit and the deliverabilities and ap-
2 ply those through these formulas, using the F1 and F2 fac-
3 tors determined each month for that pool, and by computer
4 all the allowables are calculated based on these two factors
5 and the individual well factors throughout the pool.

6 Factors F1 and F2 change each month in
7 each pool based on the anticipated market.

8 Q So in using the present formula, to keep
9 this to an example, let's say that we had a prorated pool
10 that had five sections, that would be the 320-acre proration
11 units, correct?

12 A Right.

13 Q There would a finite number assigned to
14 that pool during a proration period, is that correct?

15 A The anticipated market would be assigned
16 to the pool.

17 Q Okay.

18 A And if those ten proration units were
19 nonmarginal, then we would add the acreage factors of those
20 and divide that into the volume to be allocated to acreage
21 and wind up with an F1.

22 And we would take the acreage factor of
23 the individual well times the deliverability of that well on
24 that proration unit or the two wells on the proration unit,
25 and determine an AD factor for the proration unit and divide

1 that into the volume of gas to be allocated based on
2 deliverability and get F2.

3 Then we would apply the -- excuse me, we
4 would take the acreage factors times the deliverabilities of
5 each of the units and total all those and get a pool total,
6 A times D factor and divide that into the volume of gas to
7 be allocated to the nonmarginal well based on deliverability
8 and get the F2.

9 The we would go back and take the indivi-
10 dual acreage factor of the well times the F1 that had been
11 calculated and the acreage factor of the proration unit
12 times the deliverability of that proration unit, and multi-
13 ply that by F2.

14 F1 and F2 applies to all wells within the
15 pool each month.

16 Q Okay.

17 A But the acreage factors of the individual
18 wells and the deliverabilities of individual wells is what
19 causes the difference in allowables between the wells in the
20 pool.

21 Q So we throw this scenario in there that
22 we have two 160-acre units and we've been prorating along
23 using the old formula, if we come in and change it now, how
24 would that affect the other wells in this scenario?

25 Would they have to give up a certain por-

1 tion of their allowable or would the allowable be broken
2 down evenly throughout the pool?

3 A The effect of changing the allowables of
4 these few wells in the pool, I don't remember the count of
5 these wells for these six operators, but it would be some-
6 where in the range of about 15 wells, but the total effect
7 here would not affect the allowable assigned to any other
8 well in the pool by any more than one MCF.

9 Q So in essence there wouldn't be some al-
10 lowable taken from a standard 320 to make up for this 160,
11 with the formula you have.

12 A No, what would happen was that the allow-
13 ables that have been assigned historically are in error and
14 it would correct that error so that this 320-acre drill
15 tract would get its rightful allowable equal to what would
16 be on an offset 320-acre tract with two wells of equal de-
17 liverabilities.

18 Q How come this hasn't come up before a
19 hearing to change the proration rules, do you know?

20 A I do not know.

21 MR. KELLAHIN: These type cases
22 have come up in the past, have they not, Mr. Kendrick, be-
23 fore the Division on an individual well basis?

24 A Yeah, the first one of these was about a
25 year ago, sometime last summer, for Cinco, Limited, in Case

1 Number --

2 MR. KELLAHIN: That's a differ-
3 ent case.

4 A -- Case Number 8820 -- no, excuse me, in
5 a case or two cases last summer, Cinco, Limited, asked for
6 one 160-acre proration unit and Gerber, I think it's the
7 Gerber Estate, asked for the companion 160-acre proration
8 unit, and then this is a matter of four cases here by P-R-O
9 Management, Incorporated, asking for some similar things.

10 Q Would it be better to correct an allow-
11 able formula than to come in and get exception to each of
12 these that exist out here?

13 A I think in the long haul it would be.

14 Q Let's stay with this particular exhibit
15 right here for the time being.

16 All of these proration units that you're
17 seeking exceptions on the existing proration units that
18 you're seeking today, do they have 160 acres dedicated to
19 them or do some of them have less acres or more acres?

20 A Each of these proration units has a quar-
21 ter section dedicated to it and I think that in each in-
22 stance they have a .5 acreage factor; that is, a 160-acre
23 proration unit.

24 I did encounter one or two in my study of
25 these type of units that had acreage factors of .49 or .51,

1 but I think each of these has .50 acreage factor.

2 Q All right, now let's take that scenario
3 for a second.

4 Let's assume that, and I'm going with the
5 formulas here on this particular page, let's say that we had
6 an acreage factor of 320 (not clearly understood) that would
7 be essentially one of the quarter sections having about 224
8 acres and the other one having 160 acres, that's usually
9 the way it works, or in this particular case how would we
10 make up for that in this formula? Would that change this
11 formula to where it would be equal if we had this scenario
12 pop up?

13 A If you apply the acreage factor correc-
14 tion in the first portion of this formula --

15 Q Okay, when you say "first portion of the
16 fomula" are you talking about the --

17 A The factor in the formula that's acreage
18 factor times F1.

19 Q Uh-huh.

20 A If the acreage factor is left in that
21 proportion, then you have corrected for the difference in
22 acreages among the proration units.

23 If you leave the acreage factor out of
24 the deliverability portion and allow the deliverability to
25 represent the reserves under that drill tract on the basis

1 that since infill drilling has caused the definition of the
2 deliverability to represent the reserves under one 160-acre
3 tract, then if you don't drill the second tract your
4 deliverability is zero, or 320-acre one-well units as com-
5 pared to 320-acre two-well units.

6 Q I did some quick calculations here, Mr.
7 Kendrick, so what I think I'm going to do is take a short
8 recess on these cases and what I'd like for you to do is
9 let's assume that we had a 320-acre unit that had 384 acres.
10 That would give us an acreage factor of 1.2, and assuming
11 that one of the quarter sections had 224 acres and the other
12 one had 160 acres, how that would change this, and while
13 you're doing that, I'm going to hear the BTA case, because
14 don't get that -- if I use your proposed formula of allow-
15 able 1 plus allowable 2, assuming that my -- one of my ac-
16 reage factors would be .7 and the other would be .5. I come
17 out with it just to be a little bit less, and this could
18 probably be assumed if we had an acreage factor for a 320-
19 acre unit to be .94.

20 A Would you please give me that proration
21 unit size again, please?

22 Q Let's go with 384 acres, the top half
23 having 224 acres, having for extended section, and the bot-
24 tom part being 160 acres.

25 A All right, sir, I'll calculate --

1 Q Maybe I'm missing something here. Let me
2 add this piece of paper that I did some rough calculations
3 on, that may help.

4 MR. STOGNER: So let's take a
5 short recess on these cases at this time and I'll come back
6 to them later.

7
8 (Thereupon Cases 9096, 9097, 9098, 9099,
9 9100, and 9101 were in recess until later
10 in the docket.)

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1
2 (Thereafter, following completion of other
3 cases on Docket No. 7-87, Cases 9096, 9097,
4 9098, 9099, 9100, and 9101 were again
5 called to be concluded.)
6

7 MR. STOGNER: The hearing will
8 come to order.

9 We will call the grouping of
10 cases starting with 9096 and ending with 9101. We took a
11 recess several hours ago.

12 Mr. Kellahin.

13 MR. KELLAHIN: Thank you, Mr.
14 Examiner.
15

16 A. R. KENDRICK,
17 resuming the witness stand and remaining under oath, testi-
18 fied as follows, to-wit:
19

20 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

21 BY MR. KELLAHIN:

22 Q Mr. Kendrick, before the continuation of
23 this case Mr. Stogner asked you whether or not there were
24 any of the nonstandard proration units which were utilizing
25 a acreage factor of other than 50 percent full acreage?

1 A To my knowledge, no. I think they all
2 have an acreage factor of .50.

3 Q If all the subject wells for the various
4 applicants have a .5 acreage factor, then will your proposed
5 formula change work in the way that you have demonstrated
6 earlier to the Examiner it would work in the generic exam-
7 ple?

8 A Yes, sir.

9 Q If the acreage factor is plus or minus
10 one for a 320-acre spacing unit, then will your proposed
11 formula be a solution for resolving the inequities of the
12 allowables?

13 A It will not resolve the problem to a zero
14 balance. It will just be a lot closer than the current for-
15 mulas.

16 Q Okay. Have you reviewed the proration
17 schedule to determine whether all of the wells that are the
18 subject of the consolidated hearings have allowables as-
19 signed to them that will allow your calculation to work pro-
20 perly?

21 A In reviewing the schedule I just found
22 two wells operated by the Columbus Energy Corporation to be
23 of acreage .49 instead of .50, being the Arnstein No. 1-E
24 and the Reed No. 1-M, in the Blanco-Mesaverde Pool.

25 Q Subsequent to the hearing, Mr. Kendrick,

1 will you make a review of all of the wells that are the sub-
2 ject of this consolidated hearing and for those wells that
3 do not fit your proposed formula, will you submit to the
4 Examiner a written calculation showing how for those excep-
5 tions you should make the adjustment in the allowable?

6 A Yes, sir.

7 MR. KELLAHIN: That concludes my
8 questions of Mr. Kendrick.

9
10 (Thereupon a discussion was had
11 off the record.)

12
13 MR. STOGNER: Well, let's get
14 back on the record here.

15 Are there any questions of Mr.
16 Kendrick?

17 Mr. Chavez? Mr. Kendrick? Do
18 you have any questions?

19 MR. H. L. KENDRICK: No, sir.

20

21 RECROSS EXAMINATION

22 BY MR. STOGNER:

23 Q The two wells that you found with the .49
24 acreage factor, those were just the two Columbus wells?

25 A Two of the Columbus wells, the Arnstein

1 No. 1-E and the Reed No. 1.

2 Q Have you had time to go through and check
3 all of them that you're proposing today?

4 A I think so. I'm not sure but I'll verify
5 that.

6 Q All right. I'll hold the record open on
7 the Columbus application, that's Case Number 9097, until
8 you're able to submit to me a calculation that would fit.

9 And assuming that all the others have a .5
10 acreage factor, I will take those under advisement at this
11 time.

12 MR. STOGNER: If there is no-
13 thing else for Mr Kendrick, he may be excused.

14 Anything else further in any of
15 these cases?

16 If not, this hearing is adjour-
17 ned.

18
19 (Hearing concluded.)

20

21

22

23

24

25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, SALLY W. BOYD, C.S.R., DO HEREBY CERTIFY the foregoing Transcript of Hearing before the Oil Conservation Division (Commission) was reported by me; that the said transcript is a full, true, and correct record of this portion of the hearing, prepared by me to the best of my ability.

Sally W. Boyd CSR

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a complete record of the proceedings in the Examiner hearing of Case Nos. 9516 through 9526 heard by me on 4 March 19 52.

[Signature], Examiner
Oil Conservation Division