2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

STATE OF NEW MEXICO ENERGY AND MINERALS DEPARTMENT OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION State Land Office Building Santa Fe, New Mexico 11 September 1978

COMMISSION HEARING

IN THE MATTER OF: Application of Maralo, Inc., for statutory unitization, Lea CASE County, New Mexico. 6328 and Application of Maralo, Inc., for a) CASE waterflood project, Lea County, 6313 New Mexico.

BEFORE: Commissioner Joe Ramey Commissioner Emery Arnold

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

APPEARANCES

For the Oil Conservation Lynn Teschendorf, Esq. Commission: Legal Counsel for the Commission State Land Office Bldg. Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

For Maralo, Inc.: Conrad Coffield, Esq.

HINKLE, COX, EATON, COFFIELD & HENSLEY

Midland, Texas

I N D E X

1	INDEX	
2	CHARLES LOVE	
3	Direct Examintion by Mr. Coffield	3
4	Cross Examination by Mr. Ramey	23
5		
6		
7	BILL SELTZER	
8	Direct Examination by Mr. Coffield	29
9	Cross Examination by Ms. Teschendorf	38
10		
11	EXHIBITS	
12	Applicant Exhibit One, Plat	23
13	Applicant Exhibit Two, Well log	23
14	Applicant Exhibit Three, Study (a&b)	23
15	Applicant Exhibit Four, Schematic	23
16	Applicant Exhibit Five, Plat & List (a&b)	23
17	Applicant Exhibit Six, Plat	23
18	Applicant Exhibit Seven, Schematic	23
19	Applicant Exhibit Eight, Schematics (a thru e)	23
20	Applicant Exhibit Nine, Water Analysis	23
21	Applicant Exhibit Ten, List (a thru f)	38
22	Applicant Exhibit Eleven, Agreement	38
23	Applicant Exhibit Twelve, Operating Agreement	38

SALLY WALTON BOYD CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER 3020 Plaza Blanca (606) 471-2462 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

24

25

MR. RAMEY: Okay, the hearing will come to order.

Ask for appearances.

MR. COFFIELD: Conrad Coffield with the law firm of Hinkle, Cox, Eaton, Coffield and Hensley, appearing on behalf of Maralo, Inc.

I will have two witnesses but I'd like to have three people sworn in case there are some questions.

MR. RAMEY: Will you please stand and be sworn.

(Witnesses sworn.)

CHARLES LOVE

being called as a witness and having been duly sworn upon his oath, testified as follows, to-wit:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. COFFIELD:

- Q. State your name, your residence, and occupation, and what is your position relative to Maralo, Inc.?
- A. My name is Charles Love. I live in Midland, Texas, and I am a consultant petroleum engineer, and I have been retained by Maralo, Inc. to analyze and prepare certain data for presentation before the OCD.
 - Q. Have you previously testified as a petroleum

Page ___

And are you familiar with Maralo's application

3

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Further, are you familiar with the area in-Q. volved in these applications and with the Jalmat pool?

> A. Yes, sir.

Yes, sir, I am.

in these cases?

MR. COFFIELD: Are the witness' qualifications acceptable?

The Commission is acquainted with MR. RAMEY: Mr. Love and consider him qualified.

0. (Mr. Coffield continuing.) Mr. Love, what is Maralo seeking to accomplish in these cases?

Maralo is seeking statutory unitization for an additional recovery project in a portion of the Jalmat Field by the injection of water into various wells that are located in Township 25 South, Range 36 East, and 37 East.

Do you have certain exhibits?

Yes, sir, I have prepared exhibits for pre-A. sentation.

Please refer to what has been marked as Ex-0. hibit One and I ask you to explain what this represents.

All right. Exhibit One is an area plat or

map that shows the location of the proposed unit, plus the location of the injection well, and all other wells that are located within a two-mile radius of the proposed unit.

- Q. Are all of the lands involved in these applications privately owned or fee lands?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. From what horizons have the various wells within this two-mile radius produced?
- A. Most of the wells are producing from the Yates, Seven Rivers, and Queen, and this portion is in the Jalmat Pool. There are some that are classified in the Langlie-Mattix Pool, but most are producing from the Yates, Seven Rivers, and Queen Formations.
- Q. Mr. Love, describe the location of our proposed waterflood project, give the total number of wells, and the total acreage involved.
- A. There are fourteen wells located within the proposed unit area; thirteen oil wells and one gas well. The proposed unit area includes the southeast quarter of Section 12, the northeast quarter of Section 13, all of these located in Township 25 South, Range 36 East; then the northeast quarter of Section 18 and the north half of the southwest quarter of Section 18, located in Township 25 South, Range 37 East. There are 560 acres in the pro-

posed unit.

Q. Mr. Love, are there any other water projects in this general area?

A. Yes, Reserve operates a unit immediately to the east of this area. It is their South Langlie Jal Unit. And Union of Texas operates the Langlie Jal Unit, and it is located approximately a half a mile to the north and east of our proposed unit area.

Q. Mr. Love, have there been any border or line agreements negotiated and entered into as to these other operations in the area?

A. No, sir. Initially we are asking for approval to drill seven injection wells that are shown on our Exhibit One, and they are color coded red. These wells are located within the proposed unit area.

However, there are plans to begin negotiations with offset operators around this proposed unit area and if the negotiations are successful, then we propose to ask for approval to drill ten additional wells, which are color coded in green; however, we're planning initially, and asking initially just for the seven injection wells as shown in the wells in red on our Exhibit One.

Q. Mr. Love, please refer to what has been marked as Exhibit Two and identify this exhibit and explain what it represents.

A. All right. Exhibit Two is a portion of a well log of the Humble Winters "A" No. 2, that is located within the unit area, and it is a typical log of a well in the unit area, and on this we have shown what our proposed unitized interval is.

Q. With reference to this exhibit, Two, go ahead and give some more details with respect to the reservoir to which the water will be injected.

A. All right. We propose to unitize the interval from the top of the Yates, and on this log it's at 2848 feet, to 100 feet below the base of the Queen. Now, the base of the Queen is estimated at -- to come in at 3680 feet. This well, the total depth of this well is only 3400 feet. This base of the Queen was determined from preparation of a cross section with other wells in the area.

However, we are asking initially, or our injection will be initially into the Yates Formation and production in the Yates Formation is found in four sandstone intervals separated by an anhydritic dolomite section, and from looking at logs in the area, or in this unit, the productive interval appears to be continuous across the proposed unit area.

Q. Okay, Mr. Love, go on to Exhibit 3-a and 3-b and please identify these exhibits.

A. Exhibit 3-a is a secondary recovery study, dated December the 9th of 1976, that was prepared by the firm of T. Scott Hickman.

Exhibit 3-b is a supplemental study, or a supplement to the secondary study, and it is dated June 13th, 1977. It is also prepared by T. Scott Hickman.

Both of these relate to the area covered by the application involved in these cases and show the feasibility of the proposed project.

Q. Okay, Mr. Love, there are some slight differences in the area covered by this study in Exhibits 3-a and 3-b. Would you please explain just what this difference is?

A. Yes. The study, if you'll look at the maps and figures in the report, the study area included more acreage than what we're proposing to unitize. The study area included the southeast of the northeast of Section 12, one well, 40 acres, and the study area included the south half of the southwest quarter of Section 18, and there's one well there and 80 acres.

Q. Do you feel there's any difference here of any consequence with respect to the conclusions which may be drawn from this particular study?

A. No, sir, I do not. I do not think that it will make any difference.

Q. Okay, as covered by this report shown in these exhibits, 3-a and 3-b, please explain briefly the general procedures or plan of operation which Maralo proposes and point out any differences in the procedures which Maralo proposes which may be different from those contemplated in the Hickman study.

A. Well, actually, the secondary recovery study offered two proposals, a conversion proposal or a drill proposal. Maralo has decided to go with the drilled wells and the study, the report, recommended that this well located in the southeast of the northeast of Section 12 would be converted to an injection well, but it would be totally as a back-up well, and I don't think that it would make any difference.

Q. What -- what reasons do you feel the drilled approach is better than the -- for what reasons do you feel the drilled well approach is better than the conversion well approach, Mr. Love?

A. Well, I think the study points out that the economics are favorable by the drill plan, even though the investment initially is greater, but there is a better cash flow resulting from it due to the lessening of the life of the project.

And also I think that you will have better control over the injection fluid by having cased completions,

new wells, new cement, than you would if you would convert some older wells. I think you would be able to have better control over the injection and sweep efficiency in the waterflood.

Q All right, Mr. Love, with respect to the general situation relative to production here in this area and the matters which are reflected in the unit agreement and unit operating agreement, copies of which have been submitted, the unit agreement and unit operating agreement for the proposed unit is stated in a two-page formula with Phase One to go into effect from the effective date of the unit until 7:00 a. m. on the first day of the month after the cumulative production of oil following 7:00 a. m., October 1, 1976 totals 39,000 barrels, and thereafter Phase Two is to apply.

Would you please tell us now where we are relative to the application of Phase One and Phase Two?

- A. We would be unitizing. The formula -- the Phase Two formula would be in effect from 10-1-76 to 1-1-78, the first of this year there were 39,196 barrels of oil produced, so we would be in Phase Two.
- Q. All right. What information do you have, Mr. Love, with respect to porosity, permeability, and so forth, within the unit area?
 - A. As pointed out in the study the cores were

available from two wells within the study area. They indicate an average porosity of 15-1/2 percent and an average permeability of 24 milledarses.

A gas/oil contact was picked at 300 feet above sea level. There are no oil/water contact which has been established in the area, and the initial bottom hole pressure was 1400 psi.

- Q. Mr. Love, please briefly review the primary performance for these wells within this proposed unit area.
- A. Well, as I said earlier, on our Exhibit One there are fourteen wells currently within the unit. There are twelve active oil wells, one well temporarily abandoned, and there is one gas well.

The twelve active oil wells produced 31,129 barrels of oil during the year of 1977, and 89,014 Mcf of gas. This represents an average production rate of the wells within the unit of 7 barrels a day and an average GOR of 2859 cubic feet per barrel.

The cumulated oil production to January 1, 1978 was 1,274,890 barrels, or that gives an average per well recovery of 98,000 barrels.

The Yates gas well in the unit produced 9,558 Mcf during 1977 for an average daily rate of 26 Mcf.

The cumulative production to January 1, 1978 has been 1,458,904 Mcf.

You can refer to our Exhibit 3-a, I think it's interesting to note, beginning with -- that is our secondary recovery report -- and beginning with the figure five in the unit is the decline curves for the leases within the unit, and I think that the decline curves show a typical decline for all leases except the Winters "c", which if you will turn to figure eight, there is the decline curve for the Winters "C". You will note that its normal decline was interrupted by a steep production increase in January, 1975. It reached 2,521 barrels per month in September of 1975 and in March, 1978 it produced 2,750 barrels for the month, and in July of 1978 the production was 2,461 barrels.

So it would indicate that this lease is receiving some benefit for some waterflood response, and we feel like that it is coming from the two salt water disposal wells located to the north and west of our proposed unit area, the one on the Tenneco lease, their Wells No. 2, the Arco Well No. 4, and these on our Exhibit One are noted as SWD wells.

So I think that this is -- gives pretty good evidence that this area is capable of a waterflood response. And it is estimated as of the first of this year, 1-1-78, that there are only 108,450 barrels of oil to be recovered from existing operations.

Q. Mr. Love, please outline for the Commission the

plans to recover additional oil by waterflood in this project.

A. If you'll refer back to our Exhibit One, our map, initially injection will be into the seven wells that are shown in red on the exhibit.

The wells, we're planning to drill those to sufficient depth to penetrate the Empire Queen section; however, initially injection will be confined into the Yates interval.

We plan to set 8-5/8ths inch surface casing at approximately 400 feet, with sufficient cement to circulate to the surface; then 4-1/2 inch long string casing will be set at the total depth and cemented with sufficient cement to circulate back to the surface.

We plan to drill the additional injection wells, those shown in green, upon successful negotiations with our offset operators.

The study prepared by the Hickman firm indicates that the area under consideration should yield an additional 1,086,000 barrels of oil, and this would result in a future net revenue of \$11,792,000.

- Q. Over what period of time?
- A. With this plan that we're using it would be over a fifteen year life.
 - Q. Okay, Mr. Love, refer to what's been marked

as Exhibit Four, and I ask you to identify this and explain what it represents.

- A. Exhibit Four is a schematic diagram of a typical injection well that we plan to drill.
- Q. Will these wells which will be drilled and completed in accordance with the plans represented on this schematic, confine the injected water to the producing horizon?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Will you be using plastic coating in the injection wells?
- A. Yes, sir. As I pointed out earlier, that we intend to set our surface -- and these volumes that I have on there are approximate, but I did talk with some cementing people, but there will be sufficient cement on our surface, we're estimating something around 200 sacks that will be circulated. I've shown here the approximate depth that we will want to drill these wells to penetrate the Queen and the 4-1/2 inch string will be cemented with sufficient cement to circulate, and I've shown where our initial injection interval will be approximately from 2900 feet to 3050 feet, or in the Yates Zone.

MS. TESCHENDORF: May I interrupt you, Mr.

Love?

A. Yes, ma'am.

MS. TESCHENDORF: I missed the figure before you were talking about additional barrels of oil to be recovered and just before that you said approximately how many barrels could be obtained simply by the primary recovery method.

- A. 108,450 barrels.
 - MS. TESCHENDORF: Thank you.
- Q. (Mr. Coffield continuing.) Refer to what's been marked as Exhibits 5-a and 5-b and identify these exhibits and explain what they represent.
- A. Exhibit 5-a is a plat showing the location of all wells within the Jalmat Yates Unit, both proposed injection wells and producing wells, with the wells numbered with the new unit well numbers from 1 to 31; and Exhibit 5 is a list -- 5-b is a list of the unit wells and the location of each, and we ask at this time that the Division designate the unit wells in this fashion.
- Q. Are these wells actually staked at these locations?
- A. The seventeen wells are all staked and the ones that we show to be drilled and give the footages, are staked location footages, and have been surveyed.
- Q. Okay. You may have already said this, but how many producing wells are there proposed?
 - A. There will be fourteen producing wells in the

unit.

- Q. And how many injection?
- A. Seventeen injection wells.
- Q. But initially?

A. Initially there will be seven injection wells to be drilled with the subsequent drilling of the ten additional wells. We at this time, too, would ask for authority for the drilling of the initial seven wells and with the entry of the order approving this unit, and we also request authority for the drilling of the additional ten wells administratively without a formal hearing at a later date.

- Q. Mr. Love, referring -- excuse me.
- A. If I may just add --
- Q. Certainly.

A. -- one thing? Initially what we're asking to drill will be Unit Well No. 4 -- what I'm referring to now is my Exhibit 5-b, what we call as Unit Well No. 4, the well to be drilled at 1575 from the south and 1050 feet from the east line of Section 12; Unit Well No. 9, Unit Well No. 15, Unit Well No. 19, Unit Well No. 20, Unit Well No. 25, and Unit Well No. 31.

- Q. Mr. Love, refer to what has been marked as Exhibit Six and explain what this exhibit represents.
- A. Exhibit Six is a reduced, and it's reduced to one-half scale of our Exhibit One, what we're showing,

this is an old area and I'm showing the radius of one-half mile around each of the proposed injection wells. The red line outside of the unit encompasses an area of a radius of one-half mile from our injection wells in red and the green line encompasses the radius of one-half mile from the wells that are color coded in green.

- Q Mr. Love, refer to what has been marked as Exhibit Seven, with pages lettered a through q. Please identify this exhibit.
- A. These are schematics of all plugged and abandoned wells within a half mile radius of the unit, and it shows the size and location of the plug to such extent as the information was available to me.
- Q. Do you actually have more schematics as far as wells are concerned than is strictly necessary under the rules here?
- A. I -- when I prepared these -- these, there are seventeen of these schematics, I took an area a half a mile from the boundary of the unit. As I said, the red line is the wells that are included in the half mile radius of our initial injection well, would include our Exhibit 7-c, 7-d, 7-e, 7-f, 7-g, 7-i, 7-j, and 7-k.
- Q. Mr. Love, why are you submitting these for the Division's consideration?
 - A. Well --

- Q. Excuse me, are you through with this subject?
- A. Well, within the green outline, the half mile of our wells that will be proposed to drill later, you have to refer to schematics 7-h, 7-l, 7-n, and 7-o.
- O. So the ones that you have just now given are strictly the only ones that fall within the one-half mile radius; anything in excess of that, is this correct --
 - A. Right.
 - Q -- are simply extra?
 - A. Right.
- Q. All right, Mr. Love, for what purpose are these schematics being submitted?
- A. To show the Division the status of various wells within the area so that possible problems can be considered.
- Q. Okay, will you refer to what's been marked Exhibits 8-a through 8-e, and of course I'm going to ask you to identify these and explain what they represent.
- A. These are tabular summaries of all wells within a half mile, again, radius of our proposed unit, showing the casing strings, the setting depths, the sacks of cement, cement tops, total depth, producing intervals, and well identification and location.
- These are given to you by sections. The first would be in Section 12 and I've started in Section 12 and

again I'm going -- I went one-half mile from the unit boundary. I started with the well that would be located in production unit A and tabulated those wells through the section and ending with the well that would be located in production unit B.

- Q. And the wells that are marked with asterisks in the --
- A. The wells that are marked with asterisks are wells that are within the proposed unit area.
- Q. Again, the purpose for the submission of these is --
- A. Again to advise the Division of the status of all wells in the general area for your consideration of any possible problems.
- Q. Mr. Love, what quantities of water do you anticipate to be injected for the purpose of this proposed waterflood?
- A. The -- it is anticipated that the water volume will be between 300 and 500 barrels per day per injection well.
 - Q. 300 to 500?
 - A. 300 to 500.
 - Q. Per day?
 - A. Per day per injection well.
 - Q. What do you anticipate will be the source of

4

5

6

7

9

10 11

13

12

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

the supply of the water to be injected?

We have not determined one source of supply. There are three possible sources. There are produced water taken from some Maralo leases that are in the area. There is a possibility that we'll purchase water from the Getty water system, or there's produced water from various leases in the area that are operated by other companies.

- And you say there is one fourth possible, which is --
- There is a fourth possibility that they could--A. we could develop the Santa Rosa as a water source.
- Mr. Love, please refer to what has been marked as Exhibit Nine and I ask you to identify this exhibit and state what it represents.
- Well, Exhibit Nine is the water analysis showing the analysis of the three sources of water. That from the Maralo leases, these leases -- this Humble State lease is about two miles south of this proposed unit area. Then there's an analysis from the Getty Water System, and also from produced water that was obtained from the Sid Lanier lease, which is a lease in the unit area -- I mean near the unit area under consideration.
- These three sources are actually available, is that correct?
 - A. Yes.

CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER 3020 Plaza Blanca (505) 471-2462 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87601

	Q.	Now	wha	at	has	been		what	s	the	conclu	ısion
with	respect	to	the	Wá	ater	analy	zsis	s here	≘?			

A. I think the water -- we were unable to get a water analysis from the produced wells within the area because they're not making any water, but I think that from other operations in the area that these three sources of water will be compatible and that we won't have any problems.

- Q. Mr. Love, what injection pressure do you propose in this project?
- A. Initially -- the injection facilities will be designed for 1500 pounds, psi.
- Q. Okay, Mr. Love, is Maralo aware of the pressure limitations imposed by Rule 377, I believe it is?
 - A. Yes, sir, that's the 2/10ths of a psi.
- Q. And would Maralo be willing to comply with that requirement, at least initially?
- A. Initially we would like to ask that if we need to exceed the -- that would be approximately -- for reservoirs of 3000 beet that would be approximately 600 psi.

 We would like to be able to take step rate tests at a later date to see if we could get a pressure above that 600 psi.
- Q. Mr. Love, what equipment does Maralo have or propose to obtain for this project?
 - A. Well, I haven't made any equipment design, but

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

they will install all new equipment. Like I say, I don't have any specific size or anything like that, other than, probably a triplex pump, but it will be new equipment.

- Q. Are all of the producing wells within the proposed Jalmat Yates Unit within the stripper category?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Have you made an estimate of the additional oil which is to be expected to be recovered by virtue of this proposed waterflood?
 - A. 1,086,000 barrels of oil.
- Q Are you requesting a project allowable for this waterflood?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Have all of the offset owners been contacted in connection with this proposed project?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Insofar as you know has there been any objection by any of the offset owners to this proposed project?
 - A. No, not to my knowledge.
- Q. Mr. Love, were the Exhibits to which you have referred and which we've discussed here either prepared by you or under your supervision?
- A. Yes, all were prepared by me or under my supervision with the exception, now, of Exhibits 3-a and 3-b.

These were prepared by the firm of -- the Hickman firm, but now I have reviewed these exhibits and I agree with them fully in their matters and their conclusions and their matters set out in their -- both their studies.

Q. Mr. Love, in your opinion do you believe that the approval of the applications in these cases will result in prevention of waste, protection of correlative rights, and the promotion of conservation?

A. Yes, sir, I do.

MR. COFFIELD: I move the admission of the exhibits tendered to the Commission.

MR. RAMEY: Exhibits One through Nine will be admitted.

MR. COFFIELD: I have no further questions at this time of this witness.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. RAMEY:

Q. Okay, Mr. Love, I have two questions.

You're asking for seven injection wells at this time?

A. Yes, sir.

Q And these are at nonstandard locations, I assume, or --

A. Well --

-- some of them are and some of them aren't?

Some of them are and some of them aren't.

These are all within the unit boundary?

1

2

3

4	A. They are	all within the unit, though, right.
5	Q And not -	- not close to the edge of the unit
6	6 boundary. They're all	relatively inside the unit.
7	7 And then	you would like, I assume, some ad-
8	8 ministrative procedure	for approving additional injection
9	9 wells	
10	A. Yes, upon	
11	0 that w	ould be on the outer edges?
12	A. Yes, sir.	
13	Q. The remain	nder of the wells would be on the
14	outer edges.	
15	A. After suc	cessful negotiations with these
16	Q. Now, your	average you show your average
17	production per well is	around 7 barrels?
18	A. Yes, sir.	
19	0. That incl	ides the wells that have response
20	from injection up in t	ne
21	A. Yes, sir.	
22	Q. I guess t	nat's the northwest portion of the
23	unit?	
24	A. Right, it	's on the Winters "C", is where we're
25	experiencing the respo	nse. The production from the unit

area, well, it actually averages 7.5 barrels of oil per day.

Now you take out the Winters "C" lease production and the

remaining four leases in there, the average production is

1.6 barrels of oil per day.

- Q. Okay, so the production from the Winters "C" actually raises your per well average to almost --- or almost six barrels a day?
 - A. That's right.
- Q. So the remainder of the wells, then, are in extremely --
 - A. Extreme.
 - Q -- marginal condition.
 - A. Marginal, yes, sir.
- Q. Mr. Love, do you have any figure for cost of development of this waterflood?
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - 0. How much you're going to have to spend to --
 - A. \$1,830,000.
 - Q. That's your development cost for --
- A. That includes funds for the drilling of the seventeen injection wells, the development of a water supply installation of the injection plant, and injection lines, centralization of the tank battery, and installation of well test facilities, and also there's some money included in this \$1,830,000 to clean out and possibly deepen some

2

3

Δ

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

existing producing wells as we drill these wells with new logs and things like that, and pick up additional information, we may want to do some work on our existing wells within the unit.

- Q Did you allocate any money for perhaps reentering and plugging or replugging some of these wells that are on the unit and offset the unit?
- A. This \$1,830,000 does not include any funds for that.
- Q I need a figure for -- for the total cost of I guess operating and developing a waterflood over the life of the project.
- A. All right. Our capital investment is \$1,830,000. You need an operating expense.
- MR. COFFIELD: Is it a summary, really, of the economics that you're looking for?
 - MR. RAMEY: I want, yes, I want a summary --
 - MR. COFFIELD: Page two of the -- of 3-a.
- MS. TESCHENDORF: We have to be sure that the costs are going to be less than the extra revenues derived from the oil recovery.
- MR. COFFIELD: If I may, I think page two of Exhibit 3-a, the December study.
- A. All right. The operating cost, including ad valorem and taxes over the life of the project is \$2,630,000.

Actually, this is the computer printout of Table Five, which is the drill plan in the 3-b.

It's not included in that Table Seven, the operating costs, as such. They give you a future net after expenses and taxes of \$13,622,000, taking away this \$1,830,000 capital investment, then that would give you a future undiscounted profit of \$11,792,000. The operating expenses over the life of the project are \$2,630,000.

MS. TESCHENDORF: Does that include your capital investment?

A. No, no, the capital investment -- that's just operating expenses.

Q. (Mr. Ramey continuing.) But I notice on page one of Exhibit 3-a they estimated an investment of \$910,000. They missed that a little bit.

A. Well, sir, what you have to look at their -this Exhibit Three more as a feasibility study of that area
there. And that particular investment was they had not
considered drilling the seventeen wells, so at that time
they were looking more at conversion rather than the
drilling, and in our 3-b exhibit, Table Four, will include if you'll look in that computer printout you will see a
column capital cost, and that is their \$910,000, but that
is a conversion, looking at conversion -- converting some
of the old oil wells in the area. The economics are favor-

able, too, even though the investment is greater by having to drill the wells, the discounted cash flow is greater using this drill plan which we're proposing to use.

- 0. Okay, so your total cost of equipping and operating this flood would be the \$1,830,000 plus the \$2,630,000.
 - A. Right.
- Q. And then your total revenue will be the \$11,792,000.
- A. \$11,792,000: I rounded it off. The computer shows \$373, but --
- Q. So your net -- your net gain will be somewhere in the area of \$7,300,000.
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - O. All right.
- MR. ARNOLD: Did you mention what the cumulative prior production was on that area?
- A. I believe I did. I don't -- \$1, -- now the cumulative primary, \$1,380,000.
- MR. ARNOLD: It's going to be a little better than one to one, then.
- A. No, sir, \$1,383,000. They figured 82 percent of their primary recovery. See, we're only estimating 1,086,000 barrels. See, we happen to have almost 1.4 million cumulative production. And it may approach 100 percent

of primary, I don't know.

Q. And then you would like to have written in the order permission to increase your injection pressure if after step rate tests that you could --

- A. Yes.
- Q. -- show that you can --
- A. Well, if it's necessary. In visiting with Reserve, they're putting 500 barrels a day on the average in their unit over here at less than 600 pounds. This we may not need to, but if we do need to, we would like to be able to run the step rate tests, then.
- Q. And then we could -- you would request the Commission -- or the Division to increase the pressure --
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - 0. -- at some rate less than fracture pressure.
 - A. Yes, sir.

MR. RAMEY: Any other questions of the witness?

The witness may be excused.

BILL SELTZER

being called as a witness and having been duly sworn upon his oath, testified as follows. to-wit:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. COFFIELD:

	Q.	P.	leas	se sta	ate	your	name	, res	ider	nce,	and	occupa.
tion,	and	what	is	your	po:	sitio	n rel	ative	to	Mara	alo?	

A. Bill Seltzer. I'm a resident of Midland.

Texas. I'm an independent land man and I have been employed by Maralo to prepare the unit agreement, unit operating agreement, ratification, take care of the negotiations and consummation of all the instruments for the proposed Maralo Jalmat Yates Pool.

Q. And are you familiar with the application of Maralo for the approval of this unit?

A. Yes.

Q. Have you previously testified before the Oil Conservation Division as a land man and were your qualifications made a matter of record and acceptable to the Division?

A. Yes.

MR. COFFIELD: Is the witness considered qualified in this case?

MR. RAMEY: Yes, he is.

- Q. (Mr. Coffield continuing.) Are all the lands involved in this unit either privately owned or fee lands?
 - A. Yes, they're privately owned lands.
- Q. Is Maralo, Inc. designated as the operator under the terms of this unit agreement?

A. Yes.

Q. All right, Mr. Seltzer, on Exhibit B to the unit agreement there is a correction which needs to be made on a well location. Would you please explain that to the Commission?

A. Under the unit agreement under Exhibit B right below Tract Number Five, right there in the corner it shows

No. 4, it looks like a dry hole when in fact that is an abandoned well; it was never drilled. An abandoned location it's just an error on preparing this tract.

MR. RAMEY: Now which tract?

A. Tract Five, which is that Maggie Rose tract.

Right below that you'll see Number 4 there, which is an abandoned location.

Q. All right, Mr. Seltzer, what formation is unitized under this?

A. On page one of the unit agreement it is provided that the unitized formation shall be all formations or zones extending from the top of the Yates formation down to 100 feet below the base of the Queen formation underlying the unitized land; said interval having heretofore been found to occur in the Maralo, Inc. Humble Winters "A" Lease Well No. 2, originally drilled by Humble Oil and Refining Company as their E. C. Winters "C" Well No. 2, located 660 from the north line and 1980 from the west line of Section 18, Township 25 South, Range 37 East, Lea

County, New Mexico, at an indicated depth of 2,848 feet to 100 feet below the base of the Queen formation, as indicated on the hereinafter described log. The base of the Queen formation is estimated to occur 280 feet below the total drilled depth of 3,400 feet as recorded in the Perforating Guns Atlas Corporation Simultaneous Radiation Log, dated January 19, 1954, said log being measured from one foot above a rotary table elevation of 3,137 feet above sea level.

Q. Mr. Seltzer, right here in reference to Exhibit
One, if you need to look at it, you will find reference
on Exhibit One to the Exxon Winters and the Exxon Winters
"A". Is this what we're talking about when we're saying
the Humble?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Does the unit agreement specifically provide that the primary purpose of the unit is to conduct secondary recovery project?

A. Yes. Under Article 4.2, beginning at page six of the unit agreement, indicates that secondary recovery operations shall be engaged in to the end that the quantity of unitized substances ultimately recoverable may be increased and waste prevented.

0. Do the unit agreement and unit operating agreement provide for a participation formula?

A. Yes. Article 5, beginning at page seven of the unit agreement provides that the respective tracts shown on Exhibit A, attached to the unit agreement, are to participate in accordance with the percentage set forth in Exhibit A during Phase One and Phase Two of the project.

Ownership and allocation of interest as among the various working interest owners in the various tracts is reflected on Exhibit C to the unit operating agreement.

- Q. Mr. Seltzer, have you contacted all of the working interest owners within this unit area relative to commitment of their interests to the unit agreement and the unit operating agreement?
- A. Yes, I have contacted all the working interest owners and all have agreed to join in.
- Q. Have you contacted all the royalty interest owners with respect to commitment of their interests to this unit agreement?
- A. Yes, I have contacted all the royalty interest owners and all have agreed to join in the unit except Buttram Texhoma Company in Tract Number Five and the First National Bank of Denver for the account of J. M. Richardson Lyeth, Junior, and Munro Longyear Lyeth, jointly, in the other four tracts. That's Tracts One through Four.
 - Q. Okav.
 - A. Those are the only two royalty owners who have

not joined the unit.

Q. Mr. Seltzer, what conditions have the working interest owners specified in the unit agreement and unit operating agreement relative to the royalty to be committed to the unit?

A. Under Article 9, commencing at page 12 of the unit agreement, specified matters for the qualification of tracts. It is specified in Article 9.1.1 that the unit area is to be composed of tracts listed in Exhibit A of the unit agreement which qualify by virtue of the working interest owners owning 100 percent of the working interest having become parties to the agreement and as to the royalty owners owning 85 percent or more of the royalty interest have become parties to this agreement.

MS. TESCHENDORF: Excuse me, Mr. Seltzer, in connection with that, those two roval+y interes+s you said have not agreed --

A. Yes.

MS. TESCHENDORF: -- then their interest is fifteen percent of the royalty.

A. Only one. Under Tract One, Two, Three, and Four that particular party -- I'll come to it in an exhibit in a minute.

MS. TESCHENDORF: Okay.

MR. COFFIELD: Do you have any more?

MS. TESCHENDORF: Not now, thank you.

Q. (Mr. Coffield continuing.) Have all tracts listed on Exhibit A voluntarily qualified in this fashion?

A. No, all have not so qualified, except Tract Five, and that tract, Tract Five, only 83.29 percent of the royalty interest owners have become parties to the agreement.

Q. Have you obtained what is in effect a modification from the working interest owners to the unit agreement relative to this eighty-five percent requirement for Tract Five?

A. Yes, I have obtained consent from all the working interest owners under Tract Five to be included in the -- let's see, all the working interest owners that Tract Five be included in the unit, notwithstanding the fact that they only have eighty-three point twenty-nine percent of the royalty in this tract is committed. As to the remainder of the royalty in Tract Five, and the remainder of the royalty interests in Tract One through Four, inclusive, we seek statutory unitization for these interests.

Mr. Seltzer, T hand you what's been marked -will you make reference here to what's been marked as
Exhibit 10-a through 10-f, and ask you to identify these
exhibits.

A. 10-a is a list of royalty owners who have interests in Tract One. All the royalty interest owners listed thereon have committed their interests to the unit, except the First National Bank of Denver for the account of J. M. Richardson Lyeth, Junior, and Munro Longyear Lyeth, jointly.

Exhibit b is -- 10-b, is a list of the royalty interest owners in Tract Two, which with the same 40 as Tract One not committed. All other interest owners are committed in Tract Two.

in Tract Three. Again, all interest owners have committed their royalty interests to the unit. except for the same parties as listed in Tract One.

terest owners, for Tract Four, with again all the interest owners having committed their interests to the unit, except for the same party as listed in Tract One.

in Tract Five. All the royalty interest owners have committed their interests to the unit, except Buttram Texhoma Company.

- Q. Okay, we have one more exhibit, Mr. Seltzer, that's 10-f. Would you explain that one?
 - A. 10-f is a list of the royalty interest owners

for a tract committed to the unit, showing that one Tract

Five, which you asked me about at an 83.29 percent. There
is only one royalty owner uncommitted as to each of the
above tracts.

A total of 92.93 percent of the royalty has been committed to the entire unit by ratification agreement.

- Q. Do you believe there's any possibility that you will obtain a voluntary committment --
 - A. No-
- Q. -- of the remaining outstanding royalty interest owners?
- A. No, the response which I have had indicate there's no possibility of obtaining such ratification.
- Q. Were Exhibits 10-a to 10-f. inclusive, prepared by you or under your supervision?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Is it your opinion that the statutory unitization sought by Maralo will be in the interests of conservation, prevention of waste, and protection of correlative rights?
 - A. Yes.
- MR. COFFIELD: I move the admission of Exhibits 10-a through 10-f. inclusive.

MR. RAMEY: Exhibits 10-a through 10-f will

25

i	
1	be admitted.
2	MR. COFFIELD: And I have no further questions
3	of Mr. Seltzer at this time.
4	MR. RAMEY: Did you desire to submit the unit
5	agreement and the unit operating agreement?
6	MR. COFFIELD: Yes, yes, sir.
7	A. We didn't put an exhibit on it.
8	MR. COFFIELD: We didn't mark them as exhibits.
9	MR. RAMEY: Do you want to call those Eleven
10	and Twelve?
11	MR. COFFIELD: I move the admission of Exhibits
12	Eleven and Twelve.
13	MR. RAMEY: The unit agreement is Eleven and
14	the operating agreement is Twelve.
15	MR. COFFIELD: Do vou desire the ratifications
16	as well, a copy of all ratifications?
17	A. They're attached to the operating agreement.
18	MS. TESCHENDORF: If they're part of it, then
19	that's all right.
20	MR. RAMEY: Do you have some questions, Ms.
21	Teschendorf?
22	MS. TESCHENDORF: Yes.
23	

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MS. TESCHENDORF:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q.									secure			
commitment	of	thes	se unle	eased	d ro	oyali	ties,	unc	committe	ed .	royal	ties:

I sent each rovalty owner, by certified mail, A. a copy of the unit agreement and requested -- with a resume showing them what our proposed unit will be and what we expect it to do under this secondary recovery. and requested each one of them to voluntarily execute the ratifications and joint agreement.

All did, except these two right here. I expect, possibly, that that one from the Denver hank might come in, but it has been over a year.

- Have you had responses?
- Yeah, and can't get any answer.
- They have not responded to your communications?
- I have talked with their lawyer but I just don't get any answer.

Just a minute, may I ask. Mr. MR. COFFIELD: Seltzer, I think there was one of the royalty interest owners, though, that indicated they wouldn't sign anything at all ---

> A. Yeah.

> > MR. COFFIELD: -- is that correct?

That one, under Tract Five, the Buttram Tex-A. homa, they indicated they wouldn't sign regardless.

> MR. COFFIELD: So it's the other one that

you're saying is a possibility?

A. There's a nossibility, but -MR. COFFIELD: Of response.

A. There's a possibility, but we have those tracts qualified, One through Four. And the Tract Five is qualified by the inclusion of the -- all the working interest owners in the unit and in that tract requesting that they be included.

MR. COFFIELD: Mr. Seltzer, we've two kinds of qualification here. We've got the qualification which is necessary with respect to the terms of the unit agreement and unit operating agreement, and otherwise we want to force the interests in by virtue of this proceeding, so --

A. That's correct.

MR. COFFIELD: -- they're not qualified in that sense.

Q. (Ms. Teschendorf continuing.) My only other question is kind of a large question. It has to do with statute number 65-14-7, that I'm sure Mr. Coffield's familiar with.

It has a number of provisions that should be included in the unit agreement that the Commission has to include in their order.

If you can point out to me where these provi-

1	sions are in the unit agreement, you know,
2	MR. COFFIELD: That is a large question.
3	Q the Commission can adopt the agreement, if
4	it so chooses. We need to know that some provision has
5	been made. Do you have a copy of the statute?
6	MR. COFFIELD: We have it here, 65-14
7	MS. TESCHENDORF: 7.
8	(There followed a discussion off
9	the record.)
10	MR. COFFIELD: You say we're all right on A,
11	B, and C?
12	MS. TESCHENDORF: I believe so, yes.
13	MR. COFFIELD: Okay. D would be under the
14	unit operating agreement Ten, Article Ten.
15	MS. TESCHENDORF: Okay.
16	MR. SELTZER: E, the unit agreement, Article
17	Eleven.
18	F, the unit operating agreement, Article
19	Eleven.
20	G, unit operating agreement, Six.
21	H, the unit operating agreement. Article Four
22	I, under unit agreement. Article Seventeen.
23	J, under unit agreement, Article Four.
24	MS. TESCHENDORF: Thank you very much.
25	MR RAMEV: Any other questions of the wit-

MR. RAMEY:

Any other questions of the wit-

ness? He may be excused.

MR. RAMEY: Do you have anything further, Mr.

Coffield?

MR. COFFIELD: Nothing further.

case under advisement.

SALLY WALTON BOYD
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER
3020 Plaza Blanca (605) 471-2462
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

MR. RAMEY: Then the Commission will take the

(Hearing concluded.)

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, SALLY WALTON BOYD, a Court Reporter, DO HEREBY

CERTIFY that the foregoing and attached Transcript of

Hearing before the Oil Conservation Commission was reported

by me; that the said transcript is a full, true, and cor
rect record of the hearing prepared by me to the best of

my ability, knowledge, and skill, from my notes taken at

the time of the hearing.

Sally W. Boyd, C.S.R.