2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

STATE OF NEW MEXICO
ENERGY AND MINERALS DEPARTMENT
OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION
STATE LAND OFFICE BLDG.
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO
12 March 1980

EXAMINER HEARING

IN THE MATTER OF:

Application of American Trading and Production Corporation for a unit agreement, Lea County, New Mexico.

CASE 6824

BEFORE: Daniel S. Nutter

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

APPEARANCES

For the Oil Conservation Division:

Ernest L. Padilla, Esq. Legal Counsel to the Division State Land Office Bldg. Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

For the Applicant:

Conrad E. Coffield, Esq.
HINKLE, COX, EATON, COFFIELD &
HENSLEY
P. O. BOX 3580
Midland, Texas 79701

23

24

25

SALLY W. BOYD, C.S.R.

I N D E X

K. H. GRIFFIN

Direct Examination by Mr. Coffield

Cross Examination by Mr. Nutter

FRANK D. CHRISTIANSON

Direct Examination by Mr. Coffield

Cross Examination by Mr. Nutter

EXHIBITS

Applicant Exhibit One, Unit Applicant Exhibit Two, Structure Map Applicant Exhibit Three, Letter

MR. NUTTER: We'll call next Case Number 6824.

MR. PADILLA: Application of American

Trading and Production Corporation for a unit agreement, Lea

County, New Mexico.

MR. COFFIELD: Conrad Coffield with the Hinkle Law Firm of Midland, Texas, appearing on behalf of Applicant, American Trading and Production Corporation. I have two witnesses.

(Witnesses sworn.)

K. H. GRIFFIN

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

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. COFFIELD:

Mr. Griffin, would you please state your name, address, occupation, and employer?

A. I am K. H. Griffin. My address is 501

Petroleum Building, Midland, Texas. I'm an independent

petroleum landman, operating as a partner in Griffin and

Burnett, Inc., for the purposes of this hearing representing

American Trading and Production Corporation.

1	Q.	Have you previously testified before the
2	Division as a landr	nan?
3	А.	Yes.
4	Q.	And were your qualifications made a matter
5	of record and accepted by the Division?	
6	А.	Yes.
7	Q.	Mr. Griffin, are you familiar with Amer-
8	ican Trading's application in this particular case?	
9	A.	Yes.
10	Q.	And are you likewise familiar with the
11	property involved in the proposed unit area?	
12	А.	I am.
13		MR. COFFIELD: Mr. Examiner, do you have
14	any further questions?	
15		MR. NUTTER: No. Mr. Griffin is quali-
16	fied.	
17	Q.	Mr. Griffin, what is it that American
18	Trading and Production Corporation seeks by this application?	
19	А.	We propose to form a federal type ex-
20	ploratory unit cove	ering 4800 acres in Lea County, New Mexico,
21	comprised of 4160 a	acres of Federal land, 640 acres of State
22	Land.	
23		The proposal will follow the standard
24	form of unit operating agreement.	
25	Q.	Mr. Griffin, please refer to what we've
- 11		l control of the cont

anta Fe, New Mexico 87501 Phone (505) 455-7409 marked as Exhibit Number One and explain this to the Examiner

A. Exhibit One is the proposed unit agreement for the operation of the Talco Unit Area. The agreement follows the standard Federal 1968 reprint with the necessary revisions to comply with the requirements of the Commissioner of Public Lands.

To this exhibit we have attached a land plat as Exhibit A, which will outline the area that is proposed for unitization.

Q. By reference to that land plat, Mr. Griffin, can you point out any features relative to the ownership and commitments that you have?

M. The unit area is owned by five different working interest owners, all but one of which have agreed to commit their acreage to this unit. We will have an 88.5 percent sign-up in the unit area, which will constitute effective control of the unit area.

Q. Do you have anything further to add in connection with Exhibit One or the attachment?

A. Not at this time.

Q. Okay, Mr. Griffin, do you have prepared and ready to submit a copy of the unit operating agreement to study?

A. The unit operating agreement for the Talco Unit Area is in the process of being formed --- being

prepared right now. It will be filed with the Commission if the order is properly issued in due course.

Q. What contact have you made with the Commissioner of Public Lands in connection with this particular unit?

A. We have reviewed the unit area with the Commissioner of Public Lands Office, and have received a preliminary approval of the unit outline and the proposed well and depth.

Q. Likewise, what sort of contact have you had with the U. S. Geological Survey?

A. Along the same parallel, we have met with the USGS in Roswell. We have had a preliminary evaluation. We established the unit outline in conference with them and have agreed that the proposed well is the proper depth to drill an initial test. We do have a preliminary approval from both those agencies for the formation of this unit.

O. Does American Trading have a well commencement obligation in connection with either the operating agreement or farmout agreements in connection therewith?

A. Yes, we do. We have a rig availability situation where our rig will be available on April the 15th, approximately April the 15th. We would propose to try to wrap up our paperwork and get this done and be commencing the well at approximately that time.

Q Accordingly, Mr. Griffin, are you respectfully requesting of the Division that they grant expeditious handling to this particular case?

A. It would be sincerely appreciated if the Division could handle this as expeditiously as possible.

Q. Was this exhibit prepared by you or under your supervision?

A. Yes, I did prepare this particular exhibit.

Q. And in your opinion will approval of this application by American Trading prevent the drilling of unnecessary wells and otherwise prevent waste and protect correlative rights?

A. We do think it will.

MR. COFFIELD: Mr. Examiner, I move the admission of Exhibit One.

MR. NUTTER: Exhibit One will be admitted in evidence.

MR. COFFIELD: And I have no other questions of Mr. Griffin at this time.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. NUTTER:

Q. Mr. Griffin, you mentioned you had 88something percent sign-up. Did you mean of working interests?

A. Yes, of the working interests, correct.

Q. You are aware that although the unit agreement itself does not specify that, that the order emanating from this Division would require that this Division be notified and made -- and any changes of operator or plans of development and participating areas would be subject to Division approval?

A. That's right. The unit agreement does provide for furnishing this information to the Division.

Any time we revise exhibits, and so forth, we will furnish the Division with a proper copy.

Q. Okay.

MR. NUTTER: Are there any further questions of the witness? He may be excused.

FRANK D. CHRISTIANSON

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

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. COFFIELD:

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

A. My name is Frank Dion Christianson. I live at 3400 West Michigan, in Midland, Texas, and I'm a

District Geologist for American Trading and Production Corporation.

Q. Mr. Christianson, have you previously testified before the Division as a geologist?

A. No, sir.

Q And for the record, would you briefly summarize your educational background and work experience as a geologist?

A. I received a Bachelor of Arts degree from Phillips University in Enid, Oklahoma, as a geologist in 1968.

In 1974 I received a Masters of Science degree in geophysics from the University of Texas at Dallas.

I'm a professional member of the AAPG, West Texas Geological Society, and the Permain Basin Geophysical Society.

My work experience started in 1974 with Exxon and I worked as a geophysicist in their West Texas Division, primarily in the Delaware Basin and ValVerde Basin. In June of 1977 I started work with Texas Oil and Gas Corporation as a geologist, primarily working development prospects, again in the Delaware Basin and the southern part of the Central Basin Platform.

My employment with American Trading and Production Corporation as District Geologist started on

Santa Fe, New Mexico 8750 Phone (505) 455-7409 1

2

3

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

January 3rd of 1979 and has continued to the present.

Q. Mr. Christianson, are you familiar with the application of American Trading and Production Corporation in this case?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are you familiar with the property in the proposed unit area involved?

A. Yes, sir.

MR. COFFIELD: Mr. Examiner, do you have any other questions of Mr. Christianson?

MR. NUTTER: No, the witness is qualified

Q. Mr. Christianson, please refer to what we have marked as Exhibit Two and explain this in detail to the Examiner, if you would, please.

A. Exhibit Number Two is a subsurface Atoka structure map of the proposed Talco Unit.

I would like to point out that the Talco
Unit, as outlined in red, is the same outline as shown on
the Exhibit A, I believe it is, of Ken Griffin's portion of
his talk.

miles southwest of Jal in Lea County, New Mexico. It's located on the eastern limit of the Delaware Basin and the western extent of the Central Basin Platform. The area is a complexly faulted zone of down to the basin faults and we

feel that we have deciphered a prospect at this location of a rollover into the fault and then a north dip, which I'll explain later.

at, or we're trying to establish comparable production, would be the Cheyenne Field, which is located about 4 miles to the south of our proposed Talco Unit, in Winkler County, Texas. The Cheyenne Field has produced a total of 12.6 Bcf since 1975.

Another analagous field located just a little bit west of the Cheyenne Field would be the Crittendon Field. It has produced a total of 146 billion cubic feet of gas since its discovery.

The Atoka formation in the Crittendon

Field has an estimated ultimate recovery of approximately

25-billion cubic feet of gas per well. The Fusselman has

an estimated productive capacity of approximately 40-billion

cubic feet of gas per well, so the reserves that we're

looking at are substantial.

we're concerned with, BTA drilled the No. 1 Haygood Well, which is located in the section immediately south of the proposed unit. It was completed with a calculated absolute open flow of 1.8-million cubic feet of gas from the Strawn and Atoka formations and produced 171-million cubic feet

of gas prior to being plugged.

In addition, the Skelly No. 1 Mexico P
Federal Well in Section 21 produced -- or was potentialed
with a calculated absolute open flow of 2.8-million and has
produced up to this date 1.8-billion cubic feet of gas.

So the gas figures that we're looking at in the area can be somewhat substantial.

Basically, the prospect as we see it is a seismic prospect. From the well control on this exhibit there are very few well controls. American Trading has acquired approximately sixty miles of seismic data to define the limits of this prospect. That data is current CDP data. It has either been shot by American Trading, purchased, or traded for.

What I would like to point out is the east -- well, first of all, we have also conducted extensive paleofacies analysis of the Atoka formation, and the Atoka formation is our primary objective in this well. We feel like this trend, the Atoka trend, the Atoka bank facies trend, which extends from the Chapman Deep Field in Loving County, New Mexico, eastward across Winkler County, extends on up into this portion of the basin and was present on a pre-existing paleozoic structural high. This pre-existing paleozoic structural high is defineable by seismic data that we currently have inhouse.

Our seismic data shows a down to the basin fault extending from the northeast edge of the Talco prospect in Section 1, and extending from that point down through the El Paso Natural Gas No. 1 Sinclair Well in Section 13, which did not drill deep enough to penetrate the Atoka section, and then on down to a point east of the BTA Well.

That fault block forms the eastern limit of our proposed unit.

In addition, we have substantial -- a substantial number of north/south seismic lines that indicate we can obtain about 800 to 1200 feet of structural closure over the BTA well, which produced 171-million cubic feet of gas.

pect is shown by the gas/water contact located about the north edge of Section 1 and coming down through Section 2, along the south -- I mean the northwest corner of Section 2. Gur seismic evidence indicates that we have dip to the south south of that point, and at that point in Section 1 and Section 2, the seismic indicates rollover to the north providing structural closure that's needed to provide the trap.

East/west lines through the prospect indicate that the west bounding fault is probably not present along the vicinity of Section 11 and Section 10; therefor,

SALLY W. BOYD, C.S.R. Rt. 1 Box 193-B Santa Fe, New Mexico 87301 Phone (303) 455-7409

we feel that the Atoka formation that has been built up in this area probably extends out into Section 10 and then to a smaller degree, down to the south in Section 14. Of course what we are proposing is a test primarily to the Atoka. Substantial log calculations in the area of, for instance, the -- there's an HNG well in Section 17, which is slightly off the map to the east side, had pretty good log calculations in the Morrow section, and so we are going to test the Morrow with this -- with this particular well.

The USGS has been advised as to this proposed unit outline and they are in agreement with our interpretation and the fact that the total estimated productive area is included within the proposed unit outline.

In addition to that, we have obtained surface clearance to drill a well in Section 11, 1980 from the north line and 660 from the east line, and as Mr. Griffin mentioned, a rig is available about -- approximately April the 15th to test a 16,400 foot Morrow test, with the option to drill deeper at a later date.

Q. Mr. Christianson, is it American Trading's intention then to test all prospectively producing zones all the way down to the Fusselman?

A. At this point in time our intention is to drill a test to test the Morrow formation to a depth of approximately 16,400 feet. In the event that our Atoka

2

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

marker is -- comes in about as we've interpreted it, we would probably elect at that point to go ahead and test the Fusselman formation, or test all units down to the Fusselman.

Mr. Christianson, do you believe that Q. from the data available to you, that the unit area covers all or substantially all of the anomaly or the structure involved here?

> A. Yes, sir.

Let's go now to what we've marked as Q. Exhibit Three. Would you please explain that briefly to the Examiner?

Exhibit Number Three is simply a letter that I submitted to the Regional Oil and Gas Supervisor of the USGS at Roswell. This letter is substantially the same thing that I have testified here today, indicating the geological conditions, the prospective pay zones, and it is submitted for your reference for future considerations.

Q. Were these exhibits Two and Three prepared by you or under your supervision, Mr. Christianson?

> Yes, sir. A.

And in your opinion will the approval of this application prevent the drilling of unnecessary wells and otherwise be in the interest of conservation and the prevention of waste?

> Yes, sir. A.

Santa Fe, il

MR. COFFIELD: Mr. Examiner, I move the admission of Exhibits Two and Three.

MR. NUTTER: Applicant's Exhibits Two and Three will be admitted in evidence.

MR. COFFIELD: And I have no other questions of Mr. Christianson on direct examination.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. NUTTER:

1

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Morrow?

Q. Mr. Christianson, as I understood your proposed location, it would be on that shot line at about Shot Point 1400 there, is that correct?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, while you mentioned that the Atoka is your primary objective, the unit agreement does require the drilling of the well to the Morrow formation or 16,400, unless production is encountered at a shallower depth.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the well will definitely go to the

A. Yes, sir.

MR. NUTTER: Are there any further questions of Mr. Christianson? He may be excused.

Do you have anything further, Mr. Coffield?

MR. COFFIELD: No, Mr Examiner, I do

not.

)

SALLY W. BOYD, C.S.R. Rt. 1 Box 193-B
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501
Phone (505) 455-7409

MR. NUTTER: Does anyone have anything they wish to offer in Case Number 6824?

We'll take the case under advisement.

(Hearing concluded.)

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

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

Saugh, Boyd C.S.R.

100 3/12 6824 10au

SALLY W. BOYD, C.S.R.