1	STATE OF NEW MEXICO
2	ENERGY, MINERALS AND NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT
3	OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION
4	IN THE MATTER OF THE HEARING )
5	CALLED BY THE OIL CONSERVATION ) DIVISION FOR THE PURPOSE OF )
6	CONSIDERING: ) CASE NO. 10307
7	APPLICATION OF BIRD CREEK ) RESOURCES, INC., FOR SALT WATER )
8	DISPOSAL, EDDY COUNTY, NEW ) MEXICO )
9	)
10	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
11	EXAMINER HEARING
12	BEFORE: DAVID R. CATANACH, Hearing Examiner
13 14	May 16, 1991 11:00 a.m.
15	Santa Fe, New Mexico
16	This matter came on for hearing before the Oil
17	Conservation Division on May 16, 1991, at 11:00 a.m.
18	at Oil Conservation Division Conference Room, State Land
19	Office Building, 310 Old Santa Fe Trail, Santa Fe, New
20	Mexico, before Paula Wegeforth, Certified Court Reporter
21	No. 264, for the State of New Mexico.
22	
23	FOD. OIL CONCEDUATION DV. DAMA MEGEROPHU
24	FOR: OIL CONSERVATION BY: PAULA WEGEFORTH DIVISION Certified Court Reporter CSR No. 264
25	CON NO. 204

I N D E X May 16, 1991	
Examiner Hearing	
CASE NO. 10307	
APPEARANCES	PAGE
APPLICANT'S WITNESS	
BRAD D. BURKS	
Direct Examination by Mr. Carr Examination by Examiner Catanach	4 17
Examination by Mr. Stovall	18
REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE  * * *	22
EXHIBITS	
APPLICANT'S EXHIBIT	ADMTD
1 and 2	17
	1,

APPEARANCES FOR THE DIVISION: ROBERT G. STOVALL, ESQ. General Counsel Oil Conservation Commission State Land Office Building 310 Old Santa Fe Trail Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501 FOR THE APPLICANT: CAMPBELL & BLACK, P.A. Attorneys at Law BY: WILLIAM F. CARR, ESQ. 110 North Guadalupe Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501 \* \* \* 

1	EXAMINER CATANACH: At this time we'll call
2	Case 10307.
3	MR. STOVALL: Application of Bird Creek Resources,
4	Inc., for salt water disposal, Eddy County, New Mexico.
5	EXAMINER CATANACH: Are there appearances in this
6	case?
7	MR. CARR: May it please the examiner, my name is
8	William F. Carr with the law firm of Campbell & Black,
9	P.A., of Santa Fe. I represent Bird Creek Resources, and I
10	have one witness.
11	EXAMINER CATANACH: Are there any other appearances?
12	Will the witness please stand and be sworn in?
13	(Whereupon the witness was duly sworn.)
14	BRAD D. BURKS,
15	the Witness herein, having been first duly sworn, was
16	examined and testified as follows:
17	DIRECT EXAMINATION
18	BY MR. CARR:
19	Q. Will you state your full name for the record,
20	please?
21	A. My name is Brad D. Burks.
22	Q. Where do you reside?
23	A. I reside in Tulsa, Oklahoma.
24	Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?
25	A. I am operations manager for an engineering

- consulting firm called BK Energy, also of Tulsa. We provide engineering and geological services for the applicant, Bird Creek Resources, when it deals with southeastern New Mexico property.
  - Q. Have you previously testified before the New Mexico Oil Conservation Division?
  - A. Yes, I have.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q. And at that time were you qualified as an expert witness in petroleum engineering?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Are you familiar with the application filed in this case and the subject well?
- 13 A. Yes, I am.
- MR. CARR: Are the witness' qualifications acceptable?

  EXAMINER CATANACH: They are.
  - Q. (By Mr. Carr) Mr. Burks, would you briefly state what Bird Creek seeks with this application?
  - A. Bird Creek seeks approval to drill and complete a well for the sole purpose of disposing produced water into the Cherry Canyon member of the Delaware formation in the East Loving-Delaware Pool.
    - Q. Can you refer to what has been marked as Bird Creek Exhibit No. 1? Identify that for the examiner.
- A. Exhibit No. 1 is the C-108 application filed with the commission in the month of April requesting

1 administrative approval.

- Q. And then why was this matter set for hearing?
- A. This matter was set for hearing due to a couple of letters from concerned citizens in the area.
  - Q. Does the application that was filed on April the 12th contain all the attachments that are required by OCD Form C-108?
    - A. Yes, it does.
  - Q. And you've indicated this is a new well that will be drilled for disposal purposes?
    - A. That is correct.
    - Q. Into what formation do you propose to inject?
  - A. We will inject Delaware-produced water back into the Delaware, specifically the Cherry Canyon sand member.

    The Delaware is subdivided into three members, the Bell Canyon being the upper third, Cherry Canyon the middle third, Brushy Canyon the lower third.

Production from the East Loving-Delaware Pool comes from the Brushy Canyon, the lower Delaware, and we will be reinjecting the water into the middle Delaware.

- Q. Would you refer to the plat that is contained in Exhibit No. 1? Identify that and review it for Mr. Catanach.
- A. On Exhibit 1, page 4 and page 5 are plats.

  Page 4 is the general area. That is a lease ownership map

showing the leaseholders and the name of the wells. The -on page 4 the black arrow -- or it could be a red arrow on
one copy -- denotes the proposed location of our salt water
disposal well, which is roughly in the middle of the
East Loving-Delaware field.

Page 5 -- let me stay on page 4. Page 4 shows two radii depicted. One is the half-mile radius which we have called our area of review around the proposed injection well. There's also a two-mile radius. Data was also gathered from wells within that two-mile radius.

- Q. Are there any Cherry Canyon wells within the one-half-mile radius circle?
- A. There is one producing Cherry Canyon well. That would be Pogo's NEL No. 2. The location of that is Unit Letter I of Section 9. It's in the northwest quadrant of the two-mile area.
- Q. Let's go to page No. 5, and I'd ask you to review that.
- A. Page No. 5 is just a blown-up version of what -- the half-mile radius or area of review depicted on page 4.

Page 5 again shows an arrow depicting our proposed location to drill this disposal well and all known producing wells around it. There are no plugged or abandoned wells within this area of review.

Q. Does Exhibit 1 contain a tabulation of various

data on all of the wells within the area of review which penetrate the injection zone?

A. Yes, it does.

- Q. And on what pages do you find that tabulation?
- A. That would be pages 18, 19 and 20, the last three pages of Exhibit 1.

That is a tabulation of data within the area of review, the half-mile area of review. Roughly looking at the headings on page 18, the first of the three pages, I've shown the operator's name, the well name and location, what type of well it is — as in is it an oil producer or gas producer or shut in — the TD of that well to demonstrate that they have gone through the Cherry Canyon, completion data and the mechanical construction of the well.

- Q. Are there any plugged and abandoned wells within the area of review?
  - A. No, there are not.
- Q. Could you refer to the schematic drawing of the proposed injection well and review that for Mr. Catanach?
- A. If you'll refer to page 8, is the well bore schematic of our proposed well. We will drill through fresh-water sands and into salt beds at 400 feet and set our surface casing cement to surface. We will then drill a hole to a depth of 4,500 feet and set seven-inch casing with cement to surface.

Also depicted on this well bore schematic is the type of tubing utilized. It will be fiberglass tubing.

Since it is fiberglass, there will be no reason to line that.

- Q. In Exhibit 1 do you have the specifications for the particular tubing you propose to use?
- A. Yes, I do. Page 9 and 10 are data sheets on the proposed fiberglass tubing showing the maximum pressure rating of 1,500 pounds, and of course fiberglass being corrosion resistant, we would not have any problems with getting disposal water into the annular space of this well.

A pressure gauge -- the annular space will have a pressure gauge on it. We will also be loading with treated fluid so that we can monitor the annulus.

- Q. And this monitoring mechanism will comply with the federal Underground Injection Control Program regulations; is that right?
  - A. Yes, it will.

- Q. You indicate on the schematic drawing that you are going to be injecting from -- in an interval from approximately 4,000 feet to 4,450 feet; is that right?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. Do you plan to have that entire zone open, or will you be utilizing just a portion of that zone?
  - A. We will at first be utilizing a portion of that

zone, say, roughly 4,400 to 4,450. We stated 4,000 just so that if that first zone does not take water, we can add additional zones up to 4,000 feet until we were able to establish the injection rate of 200 barrels of water per day.

- Q. Mr. Burks, you indicated that the water you will be injecting in this well is from the Brushy Canyon portion of the Delaware. What is currently being done with that water?
- A. That water is currently being picked up by transportation companies and hauled to a disposal facility approximately eight miles to the east.
- Q. What volumes are you proposing to inject in this disposal well?
- A. Approximately 2,000 barrels of water per day would be our maximum.
- Q. And is this going to be an open or a closed system?
- A. It will be a closed system in the sense of the type of tanks utilized. All tanks or vessels handling the water will be closed-top tanks.

The system would be open in the sense that there would be a tap at the facility that would allow us to bring in produced water from outlying areas which -- that we have not established a line to them yet.

I would state -- for example, let's say we drill
a well, we're testing it, cannot justify laying a disposal
line to it. Then we would like to have that opportunity to
pick up that water with a transport truck and haul it to
this facility.

- Q. This tap situation at the facility is what you meant when you indicated in the form C-108 that this would be an open system?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. And you do not intend to place this water in containers that are open to the atmosphere in any way?
- A. No, we do not.
- Q. Are you going to be injecting by gravity or under pressure?
- A. We feel we will be injecting under pressure based on area experience.
  - Q. Would a pressure limitation of two-tenths pounds per foot of depth to the top of the injection interval be adequate for your purposes?
- A. It would be adequate for now. We feel that the two-tenths should take care of our purposes.
- Q. In your C-108 did you request an 800-pound pressure limitation?
- A. I requested 800 pounds based on a top perforation of 4,000 feet.

That might be inadequate, however, if you start 1 Q. your injection in a lower portion of the Cherry Canyon than 2 the 4,000 foot interval? 3 It might be. That's why I'd like to go with the 4 Α. two-tenths per pound. 5 6 Q. Per foot of depth? Per foot of depth. 7 Α. And you'd recommend that the order contain that 0. 8 9 provision? 10 Α. Yes. Now, what do you recommend happen if in fact you 11 Q. have to go above the two-tenths-pound-per-foot-of-depth 12 13 pressure limitation? If we feel that the two-tenths is constrictive, 14 15 we would run a step rate test in compliance with commission 16 rules and then request a higher injection pressure N rate. 17 Q. Do you request that the order that results from this hearing provide for such an administrative procedure? 18 19 Α. Yes. 20 Q. Could you refer to the water analyses of the injection fluid contained in Exhibit 1? 21 In Exhibit 1, pages 12 and 13. 22 Α. You did say, "injection fluid"? 23 24 Q. Yes, sir.

Pages 12 and 13 are two separate analyses of

25

Α.

produced water from the Brushy Canyon field. The East Loving-Delaware field is again Brushy Canyon production at approximately 6,000 feet of depth.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Looking at the two analyses, one can assume that the Brushy Canyon is characterized by high chloride, high co-dissolved solids as far as the production water.

- Q. Do you anticipate any compatibility problems when you place this fluid in the Cherry Canyon portion of the Delaware?
- A. I do not. The Cherry Canyon and the Brushy Canyon sands of the Delaware exhibit very similar water analyses characterized by again high salinities and high total dissolved solids. We do not believe that any compatibility problems will arise.
  - Q. Are there fresh-water zones in the area?
- A. Yes, there are. There is a fresh-water zone contained within alluvial deposits from approximately surface -- from the surface to 250 foot of depth.
  - Q. And are there fresh-water wells in the area?
- A. Yes, there are. There are approximately seven fresh-water wells within a one-mile area of this injection well.
  - Q. And from what interval are they producing?
- A. Roughly at a depth of 100 feet.
- Pages 14 and 15 of Exhibit 1 are water analyses

on seven wells. There are eight analyses but seven wells.

I might correct myself. One of those wells, Sample No. 4, is actually a sample from the Pecos River, which is roughly three-quarters to a mile away. We felt we should go ahead and get a sample of that.

- Q. Does your proposed method of completing the subject well assure that these fresh-water zones will not be contaminated by any injection fluids?
- A. Yes, it will. Our surface casing will have its cement brought to surface, and likewise the seven-inch string will also have cement to surface. That should adequately protect the fresh-water sands around 100 feet.
- Q. And will Bird Creek file a log on the proposed injection well once that is obtained?
- A. Yes. A log will be run after drilling the well and will be filed with the commission.
- Q. Would you identify what has been marked as Bird Creek Exhibit No. 2?
- A. Bird Creek Exhibit No. 2 is a copy of the return receipts demonstrating that BK Energy or Bird Creek Resources notified all offset producers within -- or all offset leaseholders within the area of review, notified them of this application, and furnished them a copy of the application.
  - Q. You have as a last page of this exhibit a

returned envelope from R.C. Bennett.

A. Yes, sir.

- Q. This mailing was refused?
- A. Page 4 of Exhibit No. 2 was -- is a copy of the envelope that was refused by R.C. Bennett. He may have refused it because there was postage due of eight cents.

I don't think he has a problem. He has already laid a water line from his well to our nearest battery so that he can utilize our disposal system.

- Q. Is a list of the offset operators set forth on page 17 of Exhibit No. 1?
- A. Yes, a list of operators is on page 17. We received all cards back or all return receipts back from these operators.

Bird Creek Resources is the surface owner, so there was no need to have a mailing to an individual.

- Q. Are you aware of any similar applications that have been granted for injection in the same general area?
- A. Two applications have been granted in the past two years. The most recent would be BTA Producers received approval for an injection well into the Cherry Canyon. That well is located in approximately a half mile to a mile

northeast of this proposed location.

An earlier well drilled to the Cherry Canyon for

the purpose of injecting produced waters is Parker and

- 1 Parsley. Their well is approximately two miles south.
- 2 They also inject Brushy Canyon water into the Cherry
- 3 | Canyon.

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

- Q. Have you examined the available geologic and engineering data on this area?
- A. Yes, I have.
  - Q. As a result of that examination, have you discovered any evidence of open faults or any other hydrologic connection between the disposal zone and any underground source of drinking water?
- A. No.
  - Q. In your opinion, will granting this application prevent waste, protect correlative rights and otherwise be in the best interests of conservation?
  - A. It will provide for better economics in the production of the East Loving-Delaware field for Bird Creek and other operators willing to participate in the disposal of water into this system.
    - Q. Were Exhibits 1 and 2 prepared by you?
    - A. Yes, they were.
- MR. CARR: At this time, Mr. Catanach, I would move
  the admission of Bird Creek's Exhibits 1 and 2.
- EXAMINER CATANACH: Exhibits 1 and 2 will be admitted into evidence.
- 25 (Whereupon Applicant's Exhibits 1 and 2 were admitted

1 into evidence.)

MR. CARR: That concludes my examination of Mr. Burks.

## EXAMINATION

## BY EXAMINER CATANACH:

- Q. Mr. Burks, are you satisfied that the Cherry Canyon and Bell Canyon -- I'm sorry -- Cherry Canyon and Brushy Canyon are separated by some permeability barrier so that you're not affecting any kind of oil production in the Brushy Canyon?
- A. Yes, I am. We're talking roughly 2,000 feet of difference here. We have a number of shale markers near the top of the Brushy Canyon, which allows you to pick the top of the Brushy Canyon. We feel that those shales would be adequate seals for any water working its way towards the Brushy Canyon.

We do not feel a threat, though, since we will be staying under the .2-p.s.i.-per-foot pressure limitation. I feel that all water would stay in the Cherry Canyon.

- Q. Are you familiar with the potential for oil or gas production from the Cherry Canyon in this area?
- A. The nearest Cherry Canyon well, as I stated earlier, was a Pogo well. It was a one-well field. Pogo attempted to drill offsets to it and could not find the same sands, apparently very limited in its extent. It's

depth is approximately at 3,200 feet, so we are basically near the base of the Cherry Canyon, and they are in the top of the Cherry Canyon.

Open-hole logs from the wells that I have studied through the Cherry Canyon indicate water resistivity or formation resistivity of approximately one ohm meter, which indicates water saturations of 95 to 100 percent. We feel, based on logs and based on lack of shows, that these zones are not capable of producing any oil from the Cherry Canyon.

EXAMINER CATANACH: That's all I have.

12 EXAMINATION

13 BY MR. STOVALL:

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

23

- Q. You referred earlier to this matter of coming for hearing because of letters which the division received; is that correct?
- A. That's correct.
  - Q. The division file shows a letter from a Billy and Pauline McDaniel --
- 20 A. Uh-huh.
- Q. -- Loving, New Mexico, and a Charles Brown. Are these the letters you referred to?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. Did you or Bird Creek receive copies of these?
- A. No, we did not. Our -- Mr. Carr received a copy

from the commission and notified us of their content.

- Q. Do you have any idea where their -- they refer to being concerned land owners or ranchers and neighboring citizens. Do you have any idea where they are?
- A. Yes, they are. I contacted Mr. Brown shortly after Mr. Carr notified me of the letter. Mr. Brown notified me that by the time I had contacted him he had realized that he misread the location wrong in the newspaper article.

The newspaper article stated the correction correctly -- the location correctly. He misread that. He lives in 26 south, 24 east. This application is for a well in 23 south, 28 east. Yet he said he was still concerned because he knew of people in the area -- he works in the potash mines, and there are potash mines in the immediate area or within ten miles.

And I assumed then that that's the -- where the second individual, Billy McDaniel -- I feel that that's how he became aware of our application, was through Mr. Brown.

It's apparent from those two letters that
Mr. Brown's wife, Joanne Brown, typed the one that Charles
Brown signed and also apparently typed the one that
Mr. McDaniel signed. There were basically word for word,
even with the same typos in the letters.

Q. I would concur that they appear to be identical

1 letters. Α. Yes. 2 Q. 3 Grammatical usage and typing appears to be the 4 same. That is correct. 5 Α. I visited with a neighbor of Mr. Brown to verify 6 7 his location of residence, and it was verified that he does live out near a place called Washington Ranch out near 8 McKittrick Canyon, which is 30 miles from this proposed 9 10 site. 11 Am I correct in learning that you did not give Q. 12 notice to either of these parties? Is that correct? 13 MR. CARR: I think, Mr. Stovall, I did send a 14 certified letter to Mr. Brown, telling him that the hearing 15 was being held today; and we expected him, if he had an 16 argument, to show up and present it. 17 And I did not know about Billy or Pauline 18 McDaniel until yesterday afternoon, and we did not contact them. 19 MR. STOVALL: Do you know where they are? 20 THE WITNESS: 21 They live in the area. 22 MR. CARR: Of the proposed well somewhere. They have 23 a trailer in that area somewhere.

gather they are not within the notice requirement area

(By Mr. Stovall) You don't know exactly?

24

25

Q.

1	under the rules; is that correct?
2	A. No, they are not.
3	Q. And just one last question. What facility are
4	you currently using to dispose of your water?
5	A. Most of our produced water goes to or goes
6	through B&E Trucking, which is one of the facilities out in
7	the middle of the salt lakes. I can't recall the name of
8	that facility right now. It is approximately ten
9	miles that facility is approximately ten miles north and
10	east of Loving, again out in the middle of one of the
11	larger salt lakes that the potash mines surround.
12	MR. STOVALL: I have no further questions.
13	EXAMINER CATANACH: Witness may be excused.
14	Anything further in this case?
15	MR. CARR: Nothing further.
16	EXAMINER CATANACH: There being nothing further,
17	Case 10307 will be taken under advisement.
18	
19	(The foregoing hearing was concluded at the
20	approximate hour of 11:25 a.m.)
21	* * *
22	I do hereby certify that the foregoing is
23	a complete record of the proceedings in the Examiner hearing of Case No. 10307
24	heard by me on / ky 16 1997,
25	Oil Conservation Division Examiner
	* ** * **** *** **** *****************

1 2 STATE OF NEW MEXICO 3 ss. COUNTY OF SANTA FE 5 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE 6 7 I, PAULA WEGEFORTH, a Certified Court Reporter and 8 9 Notary Public, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that I stenographically 10 reported these proceedings before the Oil Conservation 11 Division; and that the foregoing is a true, complete and 12 accurate transcript of the proceedings of said hearing as 13 appears from my stenographic notes so taken and transcribed 14 under my personal supervision. 15 I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not related to nor 16 employed by any of the parties hereto, and have no interest 17 in the outcome hereof. 18 DATED at Santa Fe, New Mexico, this 3rd day of June, 19 1991. 20 21 22 PAULA WEGEFORTH My Commission Expires: Certified Court Reporter September 27, 1993 23 CSR No. 264, Notary Public 24 25