Case No. 2625

Application, Transcripts, Small Exhibits, Etc. FARMINGTON, N. M. PHONE 325-1182

BEFORE THE CIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION Santa Fe, New Mexico August 29, 1962

EXAMINER HEARING

IN THE MATTER OF:

Application of Sinclair Oil & Gas Company tor an order establishing special rules and regulations for the Medicine Rock-Devonian Pool, Lea County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks an order establishing special rules and regulations for the Medicine Rock-Devonian Pool, Lea County, New Mexico, to include provisions for 80-acre oil proration units therein.

CASE 2625

BEFORE: Daniel S. Nutter, Examiner

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

MR. NUTTER: Call next Case 2625.

MR. DURRETT: Application of Sinclair Oil & Gas Company for an order establishing special rules and regulations for the Medicine Rock-Devonian Pool, Lea County, New Mexico.

MR. WHITE: If the Examiner please, Charles White of Gilbert, White and Gilbert, appearing on behalf of the Applicant. We have one witness to be sworn.

(Witness sworn.)

(Whereupon, Applicant's Exhibits Nos. 1 through 8 marked for identification.)

LBUQUERQUE, N. PHONE 243.669



DOUGLAS W. CUNNIEGHAM

called as a witness, having been first duly sworn on oath, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. WHITE:

- Q Mr. Cunningham, will you state your full name for the record, please?
 - A // My name is Douglas W. Cunningham.
 - Q By whom are you employed and in what capacity?
- A I am employed by Sinclair Oil and Gas Company as a petroleum engineer.
- Q Have you previously testified before the Commission or the Examiner as a petroleum engineer?
 - A Yes, I have.
 - Q Have your qualifications been accepted?
 - A Yes, they have.
 - Q Are you familiar with the subject application?
 - A Yes, sir.
 - Q Will you briefly state what Sinclair is seeking?
- Reck-Devonian Pool with 80-acre allowables. The 80-acre proration units would consist of any two contiguous quarter quarter sections in any single governmental section, and we would seek the permission to drill the well on either quarter quarter section within 150 feet of the center of that quarter quarter section.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. PHONE 243.669



A Yes, sir. Exhibit No. 1 shows the general area of the present limits of the Medicine Rock-Devonian Pool. It shows that there are seven producing wells and there are two dry holes which have penetrated the Devonian formation. The two dry holes, one being Argo No. 1 W. R. Tomlinson in Section 14 of Township 15 South, Range 38 East. The other Devonian dry hole is Gult's Clara M. Roberts located in Section 26, Township 15 South, Range 38 East.

I might point out that the Reed Estate No. 2 Well shown in the Southeast Quarter of Section 22 is currently being completed. I would point out that Section 22 is shown to be fully Sinclair operated. Sinclair does operate this, but it was a drilling unit. There are other working interest owners in this thing, and in the past we have had a hearing for L.A.C.T. installation on this unit and the Commission at that time was turnished ownership.

Q Are there other operators in the Pool?

A Yes, sir. Atlantic has one well, the F. B. Graham in the Southeast Quarter of Section 15. Tri-Service Drilling Company has one well, the W. R. Tomlinson No. 1 in Section 14; and Jack L. Hamon has the No. 1 Clara M. Roberts in Section 23.

Q Now will you refer to Exhibit 2 and explain the structural map?

A Exhibit No. 2 is a structure map of the Devonian reservdir.



LBUQUERQUE, N. M. PHONE, 243 6691 What is this information based upon?

A It is based upon the completion data that we got off the logs here on the seven producing wells and the two dry holes, which all penetrated the Devonian formation. The contour interval is 50 feet. We show the oil-water contact at minus 9060.

Q How did you arrive at the oil-water contact from that data?

A The oil-water contact is based on the production data that we have obtained from the seven producing wells. All the wells which have been completed above a subsea depth of 9060 on initial completion made no water. The wells which were completed with perforations below 9060 did make some water.

Q What is the significance of the well location marking in the Southeast Quarter of Section 15?

A That open circle, the uncolored circle there to which Mr. White is referring is an old location. It could well have been rubbed out. I understand it will not be drilled. The old location was made sometime during 1961 by Texaco.

Q Will you explain the dashed line on the west side of the plat, or the left side?

A The dashed line represents what is possibly a tault.

It could well be a steep dip. Some configuration is required in there, based on the regional geology of this area. We don't have any definite proof of either the steep dip or possible fault. None of the wells that have penetrated the Devonian so far have reflected



any such possibilities.

Where is the closest pool and what is its name and location?

A I believe that the closest pool is the South Denton Pool, which is approximately four miles southwest of this field. The Denton-Devonian Pool is approximately five miles northwest of this pool.

Q Will you refer to Exhibit 3 and describe your structural exhibit?

A This exhibit is quite bulky. It was necessitated by the fact that we had to use the small scale logs here, and if we shot them down any further we probably couldn't have read them. The cross section line is shown on the little small map territory here from A to A^1 , it reads from left to right on the cross section itself. It starts with Argo's dry hole, the Tomlinson No. 1, and comes across the field down the center of the structure and down to A^1 , which is the Gulf dry hole, Clara M. Roberts C No. 1. There are a few minor errors that I should like to point out to the Commission.

The completion data on the Argo Tomlinson No. 1 shows the drillstem test recovering 91/2 BA and it should be "BF" and stands for barrels of fluid.

The completion data on Atlantic's No. 1 was actually completed 7-12-60 instead of 7-11-62, and on Sinclair's C. S. Stone No. 1, which is the fifth well from the left side, the initial



potential should have been 453 and not 456. And the completion data on the Reed Estate No. 1, the sixth well from the left side, the small foot sign after the 414 has no significance. That's supposed to be I.P.F. 414 barrels of oil.

There's one other small error that was possibly caused by drafting. If you look close at the oil-water contact, which was supposed to be at minus 9060, it bends slightly upward on the C. S. Stone No. 2. That should be a perfectly straight line and perfectly level.

This cross section was supposed to have been all wells referred to a datum of 7778, and I kind of think possibly that the log slipped down before we got them shot there, and these lines were put on there a little bit crooked. I don't think it detracts from the depicting of the structure.

We will notice that the Mississippian thickness and the Woodford thickness directly overlying the Devonian are uniform in each direction, as shown on this cross section. The amount of Devonian penetrated by each well is shown on this section, shown on our C. S. Stone No. 1 -- Sinclair C. S. Stone No. 1 penetrated the most section of the Devonian and this perforated the lowest in the Devonian section.

Q Now will you give the well completion data and in so doing, refer to Exhibit No. 4?

A Yes, sir. Exhibit No. 4 is a tabulation of the well completion data on all the wells that are in the field, including



Argo's dry hole and Gulf's dry hole. Starting at the left of the page, we have Operator, Lease Name and Well Number, and then the Elevation and the Total Depth, the Oil String Size and Setting, and then the Completion Interval both subsurface and subsea, and then the Treatment or the stimulation that the well was given, and the Initial Potential data and the Completion Date.

You will note that the Reed Estate No. 2 shown for Sinclair, we had set the oil string on it and we are currently completing the well. It has not been potentialed at this time, or at least it hadn't when I left Midland.

MR. NUTTER: Is that well going to be a producer, however?

A We have indications that the well will be a producer, but it will be marginal. It will not make top allowable. The latest test that I saw on it I think was 27 barrels of oil and 90 percent water, or something like that, or possibly more water. That's my best recall. I don't actually remember, but it does make a considerable amount of water.

Q Will you give the past production data as shown on your Exhibit No. 5?

A Yes, Exhibit No. 5 is just a tabulation of the production data. I did put this production data to the end of July, and when I made this table, the C-115's for July were not in, so I called our District Office and got our production data which they had already got off their gauge sheets, so that our monthly production for July will be reflected by the C-115's. I calculated the



Atlantic production here of 4600 barrels. I just took the number of producing days it should have produced and multiplied by top allowable, which was 230. I calculated their gas, also. I called a representative of Jack Hamon and he gave me the total production for June and July from his well of 6424. He also told me what the average production rate during July was. I therefore multiplied the average production rate by the number of days in July to get the 3860 for the barrels of oil we show there, and I multiplied that number of barrels of oil by the gas-oil ratio they had reported to get their gas, and then subtracted those two figures from the total figures to go back to June's production.

Tri-Service, I called them and got their well data, which their well was completed in the middle of July sometime, and they produced 1633 barrels up to August the lst. So that the last month there, some of the data shown there is calculated by myself.

- Q The exhibit is otherwise self-explanatory?
- A Yes, sir.
- Q Will you explain your graph as shown on Exhibit 6?
- A Yes, sir, Exhibit 6 is a graph of the production data which we just saw on Exhibit 4 here. However, the graph does have two additions. I put on the number of producing wells; it shows that in July we had seven, and the curve, it reflects in which month the producing wells were added. And I put on a curve of bottomhole pressure. The first pressure is at or about what I consider



DEAKINELY-WEIEK KEFUK

Pool of approximately 4950, that is a bomb pressure. That comes from one well, the discovery well, Sinclair's C. S. Stone No. 1. The pressure was taken on 8-6-61 after a 120-3/4 hour shutin. In other words, a little over five days. The well had been produced only four days at the time that pressure was taken, and the actual pressure recorded was 4888, and we have corrected it to a datum of minus 9,000 feet for pressure recording of that datum of 4941.

MR. NUTTER: What was your datum?

A Minus 9,000.

MR. NUTTER: 9,000 even?

A Yes. That is approximately the middle of the penetrated Devonian, approximately the middle of the Devonian penetrated by our Stone No. 1.

We next read a pressure nine days later on 8-15-61 when we took a bottomhole fluid sample from our Stone No. 1, the well had been shut in 48 hours, and recorded a pressure of 4895, which was corrected to the subsea datum of 9,000 for 4947. That's the reason that I have called the original bottomhole pressure somewhere around 4950. Both those pressures were read within nine days of each other. That's the first pressure that is recorded in July on the bottomhole pressure graph on this Exhibit No. 6.

Then the next point was recorded on February 4, 1962 in the C. S. Stone No. 2. The C. S. Stone No. 2 was completed the



29th of January, so that was shortly after the Stone Mo. 2 was completed that the pressure was recorded there. After a 53-1/2 hour shutin at 9,000 feet we read 4757, or a reduction of almost 200 pounds since the pressure was originally recorded in the C. Stone No. 1.

The next pressure point is actually the arithmetic average of static pressures read when we started an interference test which I'll come to in a minute in the exhibits. I think the arithmetic average, as I've shown here, may possibly be a little bit below what the actual pressure at that time was. However, I went ahead and graphed it on the Exhibit 6 as just the arithmetic average, which is 4746 and would only represent a drop of 9 pounds since the pressure in the C. S. Stone was recorded, the Stone No. 2, on 2-4-62.

Then the last pressure on the pressure curve there was recorded by one well August the 21st, 1962, Atlantic on their F. B. Graham No. 1 after a 96-hour shutin recorded 4635 referred to the datum of 9,000 feet, minus 9,000 feet, a drop of almost 300 pounds since the initial well was drilled in the tield. Mr. Tomlinson did tell me this morning that the well was not fully built up and that it was still building. However, I think that is the approximate range of the bottomhole pressure during August. I think the pressure curve reflects that the entire reservoir is in excellent pressure communication.

Q Will you refer to Exhibit 7; explain your interference



test?

test that we can starting on April 17th. Up in the right-hand corner the red line is the recorded by bomb static buttomhole pressure in the C. S. Stone No. 1. We see the red shaded area is the drawdown that was recorded in the well or approximately 30 pounds per square inch gauge. It you would refer back to the Exhibit No. 1, which is the land map or the area, at the time this interference test was run in the middle or April of 1962 there were only four wells in the field. They were Sinclair C. S. Stone Nos. 1, 2, and 3, and our Reed Estate No. 1. In order to prepare for the interference test, we shut all the wells in at 8:00 A.M. on April 14, 1962. Then we can static bottomhole pressures on all four wells and we can those with the same bomb, so that if there were any error in the bomb itself that all the pressures recorded would be relative to each other.

Q What is the spacing or these wells?

A These wells are all 1320 feet apart. When we read the static bottomhole pressures in those wells, in the Reed Estate No. 1 we read 4762, that's corrected to 9,000 foot pressure; and on the C. S. Stone No. 1 we read 4741; on the C. S. Stone No. 2, 4724; and on the C. S. Stone No. 3, 4764.

Q What does this signify, that there's communication?

A I would say that there is communication. They all read approximately the same pressure. They don't read exactly the same



)EAKINLEY-! % 6601 DEAKINLEY-MEIEK KEI

pressures. Those four static pressures I just read on the first points recorded approximately the middle of the date of the 17th there. The green point is the static on the Reed Estate No. 1, the first blue point the static on the Stone No. 3, the first red is the static on the Stone No. 1, and the first yellow point the static on the Stone No. 2. We only opened the Stone No. 3 right at first. We planned later to open the other two wells; however, we were trying to make some reservoir calculations with relation to the distance to a possible fault that we showed on our structure map a while ago. We were going to record the pressure drawdown. We did that with the same bomb that we took the statics on the first four wells there, and we recorded these pressures shown in blue there.

The calculations were made, and we didn't have any indication of a fault being there, so we still say that it's completely possible that it could be but not probable, based on our calculations. After that well was flowed for about three days we took the bomb out of it and ran over and ran the bomb in the Stone No. 1 and recorded the build-up shown from about the middle of the 20th to the last part of the 21st there. Then we left the bomb in Stone No. 1 and opened up the Reed Estate No. 1 and the Stone No. 2 at a rate of 300 barrels per day each. This made three wells now flowing, the three wells surrounding the Stone No. 1; and then we recorded the 30 pounds drawdown in the well.

If we assume radial drainage in this reservoir, then



those wells are all draining a circle of radius 1320 feet. area inside a circle with a radius of 1320 feet is 120 acres. We therefore feel that the wells are draining at least 126 acros. We think that, based on the way the pressure in the field has tallen, they are probably draining in excess of that.

. Now will you refer to Exhibit 8? Explain the oil reserves and the oconomic data.

Well, Exhibit 8 is the oil reserve and economic data for the Medicine Rock-Devonian Pool. Roman Numeral I, I have set down the data that I used in calculating the oil reserves for the entire field. I used an average effective porosity of 3.05 percent. This is read ouf the core analysis of our Sinclair Reed Estate Well No. 1. The gross porosity is slightly higher than that, but this is supposedly the porosity that is connected by permeability. The average connate water saturation of 30 percent I estimated from the core analysis on our Reed Estate No. 1. The formation volume factor of 1.4, that's a rounded-off figure from the reservoir fluid sample that we took on the Stone No. 1. Total reservoir gross volume is 64,510 acre-feet, which I obtained by planimetering gross pay isopach.

I estimated a recovery efficiency of 65 percent, which is a little bit high. I think this field will probably be, or will probably have a strong water drive as a producing mechanism. Some bt the surrounding tields, the Denton, and I don't know exactly how fak the Gladiola Field is away from this, but it's in the area, they



both have strong water drives, and I feel fairly sure that this field later in its life will exhibit a strong water drive.

Therefore I estimated the original oil in place of 7,640,000 stock tank barrels; the estimated recoverable reserves of 65 percent, which is 4,960,000 stock tank barrels.

Then I went to Roman Numeral II and calculated the recoveries for the average field wells if the field was developed on 40 and 80-acre spacing. The productive acreage is 1183 acres, I obtained that from planimetering the gross pay isopach above the oil-water contact. Then if you develop that 1183 acres with one well to 80 acres, and drilled every one of them, you would have a possible 15 productive wells to be drilled. If you drilled it on 40, you would have approximately 30 productive wells to be drilled. So that the recovery on the average well on the 80-acre would be 330,000 stock tank barrels, and the recovery on the average well on 40 would be 165,000 stock tank barrels.

In Roman Numeral III, we come to the economics of 40 and 80-acre spacing. We see that over the life of this thing, the total cost for 80-acre is \$534,890, and for 40-acre is \$401.690.

That would give a net profit to the operator on 40 acres of \$95,310; on 80-acre spacing of \$459,110. That means we would only obtain \$95,310, we would risk \$268,490 drilling a well.

That's on 40 acres.

Q What were these well costs based upon?



A The costs of drilling equipment that I have used are based on our cost experience of our first four wells. It does include a pumping unit, which so far we haven't had to put a pumping unit on any of our wells, but I included one for a total cost of \$19,400, based on a pumping unit that we ran on our T. D. Pope in the Denton Field, Devonian.

Based on your studies and the information reflected on the exhibits, is it your opinion that this pool can be economically drilled and drained on 80-acre proration unit?

A Yes, in my opinion 80-acre development will recover the exact amount of oil that 40-acre development would recover. 40-acre development would deplete the field quicker. We notice on Roman Numeral IV of Exhibit 8 that if we have to develop on 40 acres, it will require 15 additional wells that we would not need on 80-acre spacing, making a total cost of the additional wells of approximately \$4,000,000. which would have to be spent if we drilled on 80 acres. I did some additional calculation which I did not show on the exhibit. I calculated the number of feet of pay that would be required to pay out a 40-acre well. With the permission of the Commission, I'll just read that data to them.

Over the entire life of the field, as shown on Exhibit 8, the cost of a 40-acre well would be \$401,690. The oil required to pay out that cost would be 133,000 stock tank barrels. In order to get 133,000 stock tank barrels, the average gross thickness of the well would need to be 43 feet; therefore, if you went to the



structure map and drew the contour which would be 9,017, or 43 feet above the oil-water contact at minus 9,060, you would see if you located a well on each 40 acres there and on that map there probably would be 12 wells on 40-acre spacing drilled which would either lose money or break even.

- Q What special rules and regulations are you requesting?
- A We're requesting 80-acre allowables, 80-acre proration units. The proration unit would consist of any two contiguous quarter quarter sections in the same governmental section, and we're requesting permission to drill a well on either 40 of the quarter quarter section within 150 feet of the center of that quarter quarter section.
- Q Will any correlative rights be impaired by the proposed rules?
 - A No, sir, I don't think so.
- Q Were these exhibits prepared by you or under your direction and supervision?
 - A Yes, sir, they certainly were.
 - Q Does that complete your testimony?
 - A It does.

MR. WHITE: At this time we offer Exhibits 1 through 8.

MR. NUTTER: Sinclair's Exhibits 1 through 8 will be admitted in evidence.

(Whereupon, Applicant's Exhibits Nos. 1 through 8 entered in evidence.)



MR. MUTTER: Do you have anything further, Mr. White?

MR. WHITE: That's all we have.

MR. NUTTER: We will recess the hearing until 1:30, at which time we will ask Mr. Cunningham a couple of questions.

(Whereupon, the hearing was recessed at 12:00 o'clock.)

* * * * *

AFTERMOON SESSION

(Whereupon, the hearing was resumed at 1:30 o'clock P.M.)

MR. NUTTER: The hearing will come to order, please.

Does anyone have any questions of Mr. Cunningham?

MR. MONTGOMERY: I do, Mr. Nutter.

MR. NUTTER: Mr. Montgomery.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. MONTGOMERY:

Q Mr. Cunningham, are there any wells in this field that are located 330 from the property line?

A Yes, Tri-Service W. R. Tomlinson in Section 14, and J. L. Hamon in Section 23 are all 330 from the property lines.

- Q It's my understanding that the proposed pool orders call for the well to be 150 foot from the center, is that correct?
 - A Yes.
 - Q Would you state what the royalty is in Section 21?
 - A Section 21?
 - Q Yes, sir.
 - A You mean who owns the royalty?



- Q Yes, sir.
- A I suppose the State does, that's what my map shows.
- Q Most all the other acreage in the pool would be patented land?
- A Well, I see the State owns partly in Section 15 and also in Section 27.
- Q If Sinclair should drill another well in this field, where do you think the location would be?
- A They have proposed a location directly north of our C. S. Stone No. 3. However, I do not know whether the well will be drilled or not. We have not definitely decided to drill or not drill the well. It's in the state of flux. We also have several locations open in the Southwest Quarter there that show the B. D. Buckley royalty. A well might possibly be drilled there. I can't say for sure at this time.
- Q Would you have any strong objection to the order tollowing the State-wide rule, as far as spacing is concerned?
- A I don't know whether our company would have any strong objection at this time or not. We would have to discuss it with our top management. The rules that we have proposed are what we have thought would be fair in this field, and right now we would stick to the same proposal that we made.

MR. MONTGOMERY: That's all the questions I have.

MR. NUTTER: Any other questions?

BY MR. NUTTER:



Mr. Cunningham, referring to your Exhibit No. 2, which is the structure map of this field, what primarily is that structure map based on?

It's based on the control that we have from the wells that have benetrated the Devonian, seven producing wells and two dry holes there. Also that Reed No. 2 is through the Devonian already.

- Now prior to drilling the first well in here, does 0 Sinclair have a seismic picture of the structure?
 - Yes, sir, it was snot by seismic.
- Does that seismic picture, is it confirmed by what you've found in drilling these wells?
- The seismic high wasn't just exactly where our No. 1 has found it, but in general it is almost the same.
 - What is the fault based on?

The fault was put in there and by the way, we put it in as a dashed line because we aren't at all certain that it is a tault. It could be steep dip. It is from regional interpretation there. The seismic map did show the elevational changes there, or the subsurface changes. In other words, over in Section 16 there and to the west, there, is lower than over around Section 22 and 15.

- By the seismic?
- By seismic.
- Actually the westerly-most well, which is the No. 3 Stone, is a high well as tar as the structure is concerned, isn't it?



- A Yes, sir. It topped the Devonian at 8955.
- Q I presume in making your economic evaluation as on Exhibit 8 where you planimetered the gross pay isopach, you were using the same structure you had here?

A Yes, sir, I did, and I stopped at that fault, that dashed line.

- Q So you figured the volume of the reserves, based on the contours and over to the fault and down to an assumed water-oil contact of 9060?
 - A Yes, sir, I sure did.
- Q Are any of these wells dually completed in any other zone, Mr. Cunningham?
 - A No, sir.
- Q Is there any Pennsylvanian production indicated on any of the logs of the wells?
 - A Not that I'm familiar with, Mr. Nutter.
- Q I notice on Exhibit No. 6 that in May, June, and July of 1962 there has been a rather marked increase in production of water in this pool. Is this due to water coming into any of the high wells, or is this due to completion of wells on the fringe of the pool which are completed lower?
- A The predominant amount of that water is from our Stone
 No. 3. Sometime in June it started cutting a lot of water.
 - Q Its original completion was for water-free production?
 - A Yes, sir.



- Q What's the percentage of water that it's making at the present time?
 - A Approximately 41 percent.
 - Q Of the total fluid is water?
 - A Yes, sir.
 - O That was No. 3, you say?
 - A Yes, sir.
- Q Is this on Exhibit No. 4 the completion interval, that by 9017 to 9037, is that the perforated interval in that well?
 - A In Stone No. 3 it is.
 - Q So it's actually above the 9060?
 - A Yes.
- Q To what do you attribute the fact that the No. 3 is making considerable water at the present time; is it an indication of conning, in your opinion?

A I don't think it's probably caused by conning. I think if it were conning, that both the Reed Estate No. 1 and the C. S. Stone No. 1 and the C. S. Stone No. 2 should all be making like amounts of water, if it were due to conning. They are all in general completed in almost the same subseas. They aren't quite as low as that one, but that would be my reason for not attributing the water production from the Stone No. 3 to conning.

- Q What do you attribute it to?
- A I don't have an honest opinion as to the cause of that water. It might possibly be in flux; , maybe in a preferential



1000ERQUE, N. M.

that it's edge water and it's going to come from some direction.

I note that in the Denton, water production usually starts on the south end first. We may have something like that going on here.

We have not run any tests on the No. 3 to determine where the water could be coming from. I'm sure when it gets to where it will not make top allowable, we will probably run some tests on it to determine where the water is coming from and may possibly plug back the well and recomplete higher up in the Devonian.

- Q There's no indication as yet that this is an edge water drive from the west, then?
 - A Not definitely, I'd say.
- Now, Mr. Cunningham, your Exhibit No. 7, the interference test data, as I understand it, all of the wells were shut in on the 14th?
 - A Yes, sir.
- Q And they remained shut in until the 17th, at which time the blue well, being the No. 3 Stone, was opened up?
 - A Yes, sir, that's correct.
- And the pressures, the static pressures as measured in the three wells, or all four wells which are shut in, is indicated in the upper portion of the exhibit there, the 4762 pounds for Reed No. 1, 4741 for the Stone No. 1, 4724 for the Stone No. 2, and 4764 for the Stone No. 3?
 - A Yes, sir.



- Q Actually these wells are drilled on an almost per 40-acre pattern, are they not?
- A Yes. If you drilled all the wells in there on the place they are already on, it would be fully developed on 40's.
- Q These three wells that remained shut in when the Stone No. 3 was opened up continued to increase in pressure up until the time they were opened on the 20th, is that right?
- A The dashed lines there, Mr. Nutter, were not continuous ly recorded, and that is just my interpretation of probably what happened. The only two pressures that were measured on the Stone No. 2 are the initial static pressure, --
 - Q That's the yellow one, right?
 - A That's the yellow one, -- and the final fluid pressure.
 - Q Where is that final flowing pressure depicted on here?
- A Well, you see the yellow line with the arrow pointing downward, there's a little note over here at the bottom right of the graph, the final flowing bottomhole pressure measured on the Stone No. 2 was 3966, which would have been off this graph. We did not measure --
- Q So actually no static pressures were taken after the No. 3 well was opened up?
 - A Only on No. 1.
 - Q And that's the red well?
 - A Yes, sir.
 - Q So you've just dotted these in, assuming the other wells



built up in the same --

- A To the same pressure.
- O -- to the same point that the No. 1 well had built up to?
- A Yes. I don't necessarily say that that would be the path that the build-up took. It could go up right away, or it could have gone up not uniformly at all.
- Q Was the Atlantic well to the north completed and in production at the time this interference test was made?
- A No, sir. At the time this test was made there were only four wells in the field, and those are the four wells that the pressures were taken on.
- Q Now on Exhibit No. 8, you have an average effective porosity of 3.05 percent?
 - A Yes, sir.
- Q What did you include as porosity, Mr. Cunningham? What were your cut-off points for including it in the porosity computation?
- A I didn't cut off anything in this computation. I took the core and went down to 9060, and I averaged every foot of the porosity that was shown on the core. In other words, some of these may have had permeability of less than one-tenth of a millidarcy. I did not cut those out of there. The core description depicts multiple random fracturing and vuggy porosity throughout this thing, and I think that probably there's very little inter-



crystalline and porosity and permeability in this reservoir.

- How much core was taken from the well?
- I don't know. I have the footage here somewhere. I can tell you in just a minute. 158 feet.
- Does that represent the entire productive interval of \mathcal{C} the Davonian in this structure, or --
 - Þ. I think so, yes, sir.
- And you get an average of 3.05 percent porosity by averaging each foot of the 158 feet that was cored?

I only averaged down to 9060. That doesn't quite get the entire section on this Reed No. 1. The one that was cored, the gross section on there isn't the entire 158 feet. Some of the bottom of that core was left out.

- Q That's below the oil-water contact?
- Α Yes, sir.
- Is that the only well in the pool that has been cored, do you know?
- No. sir. Atlantic has cored their F. B. Graham No. 1 up there, but we did not get a copy of that core from Atlantic.
- Q 'So you don't know what porosity was indicated in that well?
- I talked to Mr. Tomlinson with Atlantic one day over the phone, and he told me it averaged 3.5 percent, which is a little bit higher than I used on my data sheet.
 - Q And the 30 percent water saturation is taken from the



- A Yes, sir.
- Q Now this \$268,000, that's your estimated cost of drilling and equipping a well?
 - A Yes, sir.
 - Q That did include the pumping unit?
 - A Yes, that includes \$19,400 for a pumping unit.
- O What does the remainder of the \$268,000 include? Is that an average of all of the wells that you've drilled?
- A That's an average of our first four, Mr. Nutter, the average cost on our Stone 1, 2, and 3, and our Reed Estate No. 1.
 - Q What were the individual well costs there?
- A I have that on a sheet of paper here somewhere. The Stone No. 1 cost \$249,917, excluding a pumping unit and tank battery. They put in a tank battery, the first one cost \$11,850. The Stone No. 2 cost \$224,792, excluding the pumping equipment and tank battery. At the time they drilled that one, they added to the existing tank battery with an L.A.C.T. Unit, which cost \$4588. The Stone No. 3 cost \$336,922, excluding pumping equipment and tank battery. The Reed No. 1 cost \$249,061, excluding pumping equipment and tank battery. At the time they drilled that Reed No. 1, they added \$7,939 for some more tankage. That made the average cost of the well \$249,090, and the tankage that had been put on the first four wells averaged \$6,000 per well, approximately. Those are the costs that I included in that average cost of a well,



DEAKIVLEY
oue, n. m.

\$6,000 for tankage and \$19,000 for pumping unit, and the rest of it was drilling and equipping.

Q And the \$6,000 per well for the tankage includes the automatic custody transfer that was installed?

A Yes, it does. I think subsequent wells on there probably wouldn't cost quite that much for additional tankage. We have two 1,000-barrel tanks and the L.A.C.T. will run approximately 300,000 barrels a day.

- Q The actual well costs for the first four wells have been fairly representative of the average?
 - A I think so.
- Q You haven't had any particularly high costs on any of them?
 - A No, they were right around the 249,000.
- Q What was the average permeability, according to the core analysis?

A I didn't average it, Mr. Nutter. It ranged from less than one-hundredth of millidarcy to 777 millidarcys.

Q Without averaging, what did it look like most of it would be in the neighborhood of?

A I'd say between 80 and 100, somewhere in there.

MR. NUTTER: Thank you, Mr. Cunningham. Any further questions? The witness may be excused.

(Witness excused.)

MR. NUTTER: Do you have anything further, Mr. White?



MR. WHILE: That concludes it.

MR. MUFTER: Does anyone have anything they wish to ofter in Case 2625? We will take the case under advisement.

MR. MONTGOMERY: I would like to make a short statement, Mr. Examiner.

MR. NUITER: Go ahead, Mr. Montgomery.

MR. MONTGOMERY: I am sorry I didn't get here sooner and I didn't have an opportunity to visit with Sinclair on the matter at all.

I am representing a very small working interest and also a leaseholder of acreage that is indicated to be productive on Exhibit No. 2. I certainly have no quarrel with 80-acre spacing. I want to point out to the Examiner that Section 21 is State land, I am the leaseholder. According to Sinclair's geologic information, whether it is correct or not, Mr. Cunningham left some question as to whether it was a fault or a steep dip, but I do suggest to the Examiner that he consider State-wide spacing in the event an order is written in lieu of the 150 feet from the center of a 40-acre tract. I point this out, that there are three wells that have been staked in this field on 330-acre spacing, and point out further that the State could conceivably suffer from loss of royalty in the event this tract was not permitted to be developed.

MR. NUTTER: Which three wells have been staked on the 330-footlocations?



UDUEROUE, N. M. ONE 243-6691 MR. MONTGOMERY: The Tri-Service Johnson, the Jack
L. Hamon Roberts, and the Texaco No. 1 Graham, located in Sections
14, 23, and 15 respectively.

MR. NUTTER: I believe the earlier testimony indicated that the Texaco well had never been spudded, however.

MR. MONTGOMERY: Yes.

MR. NUTTER: That it was an old location.

MR. MONTGOMERY: I don't believe the location has been withdrawn. It has been approved and hasn't been withdrawn to date.

MR. NUTTER: Anyone else?

MR. TOMLINSON: I am Phil Tomlinson. I represent Atlantic. We would like to concur with Sinclair's proposal for 80-acre spacing here. We have examined their data and conclude that each well can drain at least 80 acres.

MR. NUTTER: Does anyone else have anything they wish to offer in Case 2625? We'll take the case under advisement.

* * * *



STATE OF NEW MEXICO) ss
COUNTY OF BERNALILLO)

I, ADA DEARNLEY, Notary Public in and for the County of Bernalillo, State of New Mexico, do hereby certify that the foregoing and attached transcript of proceedings was reported by me in stenotype and that the same was reduced to typewritten transcript under my personal supervision and contains a true and correct record of said proceedings, to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.

WITNESS my hand and seal this 8th day of October, 1962, in the City of Albuquerque, County of Bernalillo, State of New Mexico.

NOTARY PUBLIC

My Commission Expires:

June 19, 1963.

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a complete record of the proceedings in the Examiner hearing if Case No. 19

New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission

LBUQUERQUE, N.



GOVERNOR EDWIN L. MECHEM CHAIRMAN

State of New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission

LAND COMMISSIONER
E. S. JOHNNY WALKER
MEMBER



SYATE GEOLOGIST
A. L. PORTER, JR.
SECRETARY ~ DIRECTOR

P. O. BOX 871

September 18, 1962

Mr. Charl	ia Whita			Re			ю мо		2625 2315	
	White & Gilbert					APPLICANT: Sinclaix		: Oil & Gas Compan		
Santa Fe,	, New Nex	Leo					-			
Dear Sir:										
	Enclosed	herewith	are	two	copie	s of	the	abo	ve-re	ferenced

Commission order recently entered in the subject case.

Very truly yours,

A. L. PORTER, Jr. Secretary-Director

ir/

Carbon copy of order also sent to:

Hobbs OCC X
Artesia OCC
Aztec OCC

OTHER Mr. R. F. Montgomery

Dan will call Phil Tomlinson when order is signed.

BEFORE THE OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE MATTER OF THE HEARING CALLED BY THE OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION OF NEW MEXICO FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONSIDERING:

> CASE No. 2625 Order No. R-2315

APPLICATION OF SINCLAIR OIL & GAS COMPANY FOR AN ORDER ESTABLISHING SPECIAL RULES AND REGULATIONS FOR THE MEDICINE ROCK-DEVONIAN POOL, LEA COUNTY, NEW MEXICO.

ORDER OF THE COMMISSION

BY THE COMMISSION:

This cause came on for hearing at 9 o'clock a.m. on August 29, 1962, at Santa Fe, New Mexico, before Daniel S. Nutter, Examiner duly appointed by the Oil Conservation Commission of New Mexico, hereinafter referred to as the "Commission," in accordance with Rule 1214 of the Commission Rules and Regulations.

NOW, on this 18th day of September, 1962, the Commission, a quorum being present, having considered the application, the evidence adduced, and the recommendations of the Examiner, Daniel S. Nutter, and being fully advised in the premises,

FINDS:

- (1) That due public notice having been given as required by law, the Commission has jurisdiction of this cause and the subject matter thereof.
- (2) That the applicant, Sinclair Oil & Gas Company, seeks the promulgation of special rules and regulations for the Madicine Rock-Devonian Pool, Lea County, New Mexico, including a provision for 80-acre oil provation units.
- (3) That the evidence presented at the hearing of this case establishes that the Medicine Rock-Devonian Pool can be efficiently and economically drained and developed on 80-acre proration units, and that such development will prevent waste and protect correlative rights.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:

That Special Rules and Regulations for the Medicine Rock-Devonian Pool are hereby promulgated as follows: -2-CASE No. 2625 Order No. R-2315

SPECIAL RULES AND REGULATIONS FOR THE MEDICINE ROCK-DEVONIAN POOL

- RULE 1. Each well completed or recompleted in the Medicine Rock-Devonian Pool or in the Devonian formation within one mile of the Medicine Rock-Devonian Pool, and not nearer to or within the limits of another designated Devonian oil pool, shall be spaced, drilled, operated, and prorated in accordance with the Special Rules and Regulations hereinafter set forth.
- RULE 2. Each well completed or recompleted in the Medicine Rock-Devonian Pool shall be located on a unit containing approximately 80 acres, which consists of any two contiguous quarter-quarter sections of a single governmental quarter section. For purposes of these Rules, a unit consisting of between 79 and 31 surface contiguous acres shall be considered a standard unit.
- RULE 3. Each well projected to or completed in the Medicine Rock-Devonian Pool shall be located within 150 feet of the center of either quarter-quarter section in the 80-acre unit; provided, however, that nothing contained herein shall be construed as prohibiting the drilling of a well on each of the quarter-quarter sections in the 80-acre unit.
- RULE 4. For good cause shown, the Secretary-Director may grant an exception to Rule 2 without notice and hearing where an application has been filed in due form, and where the unorthodox size or shape of the tract is due to a variation in the legal subdivision of the United States Public Lands Survey, or where the following facts exist and the following provisions are complied with:
- (1) The non-standard unit consists of a single quarter-quarter section or lot.
- (2) The non-standard unit consists of not more than 81 acres.
- (3) The entire non-standard unit may reasonably be presumed to be productive of oil from said pool.
- (4) The applicant presents written consent in the form of waivers from all offset operators.
- (5) In lieu of Paragraph 4 of this Rule, the applicant may furnish proof of the fact that all of the offset operators were notified of his intent to form such non-standard unit. The Secretary-Director may approve the application if, after a period of 30 days, no such operator has entered an objection to the formation of the non-standard unit.

-3-CASE No. 2625 Order No. R-2315

RULE 5. An 80-acre proration unit (79 through 81 acres) in the Medicine Rock-Devonian Pool shall be assigned an 80-acre proportional factor of 7.75 for allowable purposes, and in the event there is more than one well on an 80-acre proration unit, the operator may produce the allowable assigned to the unit from said wells in any proportion.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED:

That the allowable provisions of this order shall become effective October 1, 1962. Further, that all operators who propose to dedicate 80 acres to a well in the Medicine Rock-Devonian Pool must file an amended Commission Form C-128 with the Bobks District Office of the Commission by September 27, 1962.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED:

That any well drilled or drilling in accordance with Statewide Rule 104 on the date of entry of this order which is located in exception to the above-described well location requirements is hereby granted an exception to said requirements.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED:

That jurisdiction of this cause is retained for the entry of such further orders as the Commission may deem necessary.

DONE at Santa Fe, New Mexico, on the day and year hereinabove designated.

> STATE OF NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

EDWIN L. MECHEM, Chairman

Eswalker

R. S. WALKER, Namber

A. L. PORTER, Jr., Member & Secretary

est/

DOCKET: EXAMINER HEARING - WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 29, 1962

9 A.M. - OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM, STATE LAND OFFICE BUILDING - SANTA FE. NEW MEXICO

The following cases will be heard before Daniel S. Nutter, Examiner or A. L. Porter, Jr., as Alternate Examiner:

CASE 2355:

(Continued)

In the matter of the application of H. L. Brown, Jr. and Clem E. George for establishment of special rules and regulations for the Bluitt-Wolfcamp Gas Pool, Roosevelt County, New Mexico. Case 2355 will be reopened pursuant to Order No. R-2051 to permit the applicant and other interested parties to appear and show cause why the Bluitt-Wolfcamp Gas Pool should not be developed on 160-acre proration units.

CASE 2345:

(Continued)

In the matter of the application of Continental Oil Company for the establishment of special rules and regulations for the Rattlesnake-Pennsylvanian Pool, San Juan County, New Mexico. Case 2345 will be reopened pursuant to Order No. R-2049 to permit the applicant and other interested parties to appear and show cause why the subject pool should not be developed on 40-acre proration units.

CASE 2617:

(Continued)

Application of Continental Oil Company for a dual completion, San Juan County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks permission to complete its Rattlesnake Well No. 140, located in Unit H of Section 11, Township 29 North, Range 19 West, San Juan County, New Mexico, as a dual completion (conventional) in the Organ Rock and Pennsylvanian-Paradox formations in the Rattlesnake-Pennsylvanian Field, with the production of oil and gas from the Pennsylvanian-Paradox formation to be through 2 7/8 inch tubing at a depth of 6658 to 6710 feet; applicant proposes to dispose of salt water into the Organ Rock formation at a depth of 4175 to 4320 feet through a parallel string of 2 7/8 inch tubing.

CASE 2620:

Application of Shell Oil Company for a dual completion, Eddy County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks permission to complete its Henshaw Deep Unit Well No. 5, located 660 feet from the North and East lines of Section 23; Township 16 South, Range 30 East, Eddy County, New Mexico, as a dual completion (conventional) in the Wolfcamp and Devonian formations.

CASE 2621:

Application of Shell Oil Company for approval of a dual completion, Lea County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks permission to complete its Middleton Federal "A" Well No. 1 located in Unit H of Section 18, Township 19 South, Range 32 East, Lea County, New Mexico, as a dual completion (tubingless) in such a manner as to produce oil from the Lusk-Strawn Pool and gas from the Morrow formation through parallel strings of 2 7/8-inch casing, cemented in a common well bore. Applicant proposes to run a third string of 2 7/8-inch casing to total depth as a spare casing string.

CASE 2622:

Application of Cactus Drilling Company for a non-standard gas unit, Lea County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks the establishment of a 120-acre non-standard gas unit comprising the E/2 NE/4 and NW/4 NE/4 of Section 11, Township 18 South, Range 36 East, Arkansas Junction-Queen Gas Pool, Lea County, New Mexico.

CASE 2623:

Application of W. K. Byrom for compulsory pooling, Lea County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks an order force pooling all mineral interests in a 160-acre unit comprising the NE/4 of Section 23, Township 18 South, Range 36 East, Arkansas Junction-Queen Gas Pool, Lea County, New Mexico or, in the alternative, to establish an 80-acre non-standard gas unit comprising the N/2 NE/4 of said Section 23.

CASE 2624:

Application of El Paso Natural Gas Products Company for a non-standard proration unit and unorthodox location, San Juan County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks the establishment of an 82.07-acre non-standard proration unit comprising the following portions of Section 17, Township 29 North, Range 14 West, Cha Cha-Gallup Oil Pool, San Juan County, New Mexico: that part of the NE/4 SW/4 lying North of the centerline of the San Juan River; the SE/4 NW/4; and that part of the NE/4 NW/4 lying South of the centerline of U. S. Highway 550. Said unit is to be dedicated to a well to be drilled at an unorthodox location 2180 feet from the South line and 1980 feet from the West line of said Section 17.

CASE 2625:

Application of Sinclair Oil & Gas Company for an order establishing special rules and regulations for the Medicine Rock-Devonian Pool, Lea County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks an order establishing special rules and regulations for the Medicine Rock-Devonian Pool Lea County, New Mexico, to include provisions for 80-acre oil proration units therein.

Ìaa,

GILBERT, WHITE AND GILBERT
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW
BISHOP BRIDDING
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

L.C. WHITE
WALLIAM B. MELLY

NEW MEXICO Off Conservation Commission
P. O. Box 871
Santa Fe, New Mexico

Attention: Mrs. Ida Rodriguez

Re: Application of Sinclair Off & Gas Company
for special rules and regulations for the
Medicine Rock-Devonian Pool in Lea County,
New Mexico.

Dear Ida:

Enclosed are original and two copies of Sinclair Oil & Gas Company's application for the establishment of special rules and regulations for the Medicine Rock-Devonian Pool.

We presume it will be set for hearing August 29, 1962.

Thanking you for your usual courtesies, I am,

Sincerely,

Lowhiel L. C. WHITE

LCW/ab Encls.

Bar Milo

BEFORE THE OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF SINCLAIR OIL & GAS COMPANY FOR AN ORDER ESTABLISHING SPECIAL RULES AND REGULATIONS FOR THE MEDICINE ROCK-DEVONIAN POOL IN LEA COUNTY, NEW MEXICO, TO PROVIDE FOR 80-ACRE PRORATION UNITS

CASE NO.	26.25
ORDER NO.	and the state of t

APPLICATION

SINCLAIR OIL & GAS COMPANY, a Maine corporation with an operating office in Midland, Texas, hereby makes application for an order establishing special rules and regulations for the Medicine Rock-Devonian Pool, Lea County, New Mexico, and in support thereof represents to the Commission:

1.

That the characteristics of the reservoir are such that the Medicine Rock-Devonian Pool can be efficiently and economically drained and developed on 80-acre proration units.

2.

That to require development of the Medicine Rock-Devonian Pool on 40-acre proration units will cause the drilling of unnecessary wells and result in substantial economic waste.

3.

That 80-acre proration units should be established in the Medicine Rock-Devonian Pool under special rules and regulations that, among other things, provide for the drilling of a well on a unit containing 80 acres, more or less, which consists of any two contiguous quarter-quarter sections of a single governmental section, permit unit wells to be located within 150 feet of the center of either quarter-quarter section in the 80-acre unit, and assign each such proration unit the 80-acre proportional factor applicable under the Commission's rules for allowable purposes.

That the granting of this application will be in the interest of prevention of waste and will not impair correlative rights.

WHEREFORE, applicant prays that the Commission set this application for public hearing before an Examiner in Santa Fe, New Mexico, that notice be issued according to law, and that upon hearing this application be granted.

HORACE N. BURTON
P. O. Box 1470
Midland, Texas

GILBERT, WHITE AND GILBERT

Βv

Bishop Building Santa Fe, New Mexico

ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT

Date 9/11/62 Hearing Date 9auc 8/29/62

2625

PSI MAR PORT STORY

My recommendations for an order in the above numbered cases are as follows:

Enter an order approving 80 acres drolling and provation wints for the melicine Kock - DE vouian Pool in LEa Co Whey ar requested by the applicant, Sinclair Oil & gar Co. There is good Evidence that the Doul cam be efficiently and Decumently drained by one well to go acres. I don't if the widence Dould be much were Douchusing Ot the land of the year to recommend Weaking the order permanent. Vools prepartionate foctor will be 1.75.

KEquire weeks to be located within 150 the Redication of surf two contiguous marker quarter sections lying within a quarter quarter Dingle foornmental quarter Section to the will

(over)

Use R-2284 on a juide order.
Make the order effective October.,
1962; also require that any
estrator proposing to dedicate 80-acres
operator proposing to dedicate 80-acres
the well shall, by SEPT 20,
the new form C-128 indicating thereon
the acreage being dedicated.

BEFORE THE OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE MATTER OF THE HEARING CALIED BY THE OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION OF NEW MEXICO FOR THE PURFOSE OF CONSIDERING:

CASE No. 2594 Order No. R-2284

APPLICATION OF HILL & MEEKER FOR SPECIAL RULES AND REGULATIONS FOR THE SOUTH CROSSROADS-DEVONIAN POOL, LEA COUNTY, NEW MEXICO.

ORDER OF THE COMMISSION

BY THE COMMISSION:

This cause came on for hearing at 9 o'clock a.m. on June 28, 1962, at Santa Fe, New Mexico, before Elvis A. Utz, Examiner duly appointed by the Oil Conservation Commission of New Mexico, hereinafter referred to as the "Commission," in accordance with Rule 1214 of the Commission Rules and Regulations.

NOW, on this 17th day of July, 1962, the Commission, a quorum being present, having considered the application, the evidence adduced, and the recommendations of the Examiner, Elvis A. Utz, and being fully advised in the premises,

FINDS:

- (1) That due public notice having been given as required by law, the Commission has jurisdiction of this cause and the subject matter thereof.
- (2) That the applicant, Hill & Meeker, seeks the promulgation of special rules and regulations for the South Crossroads-Devonian Pool, Lea County, New Mexico, including a provision for 80-acre oil promation units.
- (3) That the evidence presented at the hearing of this case establishes that the South Crossroads-Devonian Pool can be efficiently and economically drained and developed on 80-acre proration units.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:

(1) That Special Rules and Regulations for the South Crossroads-Devonian Pool are hereby promulgated as follows, effective August 1, 1962.

SPECIAL RULES AND REGULATIONS FOR THE SOUTH CROSSROADS-DEVONIAN POOL

- RULE 1. Each well completed or recompleted in the South Crossroads-Devonian Pool or in the Devonian formation within one mile of the South Crossroads-Devonian Pool, and not nearer to nor within the limits of another designated Devonian oil pool, shall be spaced, drilled, operated, and propated in accordance with the Special Rules and Regulations hereinafter set forth.
- RULE 2. Each well completed or recompleted in the South Crossroads-Devonian Pool shall be located on a unit containing approximately 80 acres, which consists of any two contiguous quarter-quarter sections of a single governmental quarter section. For purposes of these Rules, a unit consisting of between 79 and 81 surface contiguous acres shall be considered a standard unit.
- RULE 3. Each well projected to or completed in the South Crossroads-Devonian Pool shall be located within 150 feet of the center of either quarter-quarter section in the 80-acre unit; provided, however, that nothing contained herein shall be construed as prohibiting the drilling of a well on each of the quarter-quarter sections in the 80-acre unit.
- RULE 4. For good cause shown, the Secretary-Director may grant an exception to Rule 2 without notice and hearing where an application has been filed in due form, and where the unorthodox size or shape of the tract is due to a variation in the legal subdivision of the United States Public Lands Survey, or where the following facts exist and the following provisions are complied with:
- (1) The non-standard unit is to consist of a single quarter-quarter section or lot.
- (2) The non-standard unit consists of not more than 81 acres.
- (3) The entire non-standard unit may reasonably be presumed to be productive of oil from said pool.
- (4) The applicant presents written consent in the form of waivers from all offset operators.
- (5) In lieu of Paragraph 4 of this Rule, the applicant may furnish proof of the fact that all of the offset operators were notified of his intent to form such non-standard unit. The Secretary-Director may approve the application if, after a period of 30 days, no such operator has entered an objection to the formation of the non-standard unit.

-3-CASE No. 2594 Order No. R-2284

- RULE 5. An 80-acre provation unit (79 through 81 acres) in the South Crossroads-Devonian Pool shall be assigned an 80-acre proportional factor of 7.75 for allowable purposes, and in the event there is more than one well on an 80-acre procation unit, the operator may produce the allowable assigned to the unit from said wells in any proportion.
- (2) That jurisdiction of this cause is retained for the entry of such further orders as the Commission may deem necessary.

DONE at Santa Fe, New Mexico, on the day and year herein-above designated.

STATE OF NEW MEXICO OLL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

EDWIN L. MECHEM, Chairman

E. S. WALKER, Member

A. L. PORTER, Jr., Member & Secretary

SEAL

esr/

DOCKET: EXAMINER HEARING - WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 29, 1962

9 A.M. - OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM, STATE LAND OFFICE BUILDING - SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

The following cases will be heard before Daniel S. Nutter, Examiner or A. L. Porter, Jr., as Alternate Examiner:

CASE 2355:

(Continued)

In the matter of the application of H. L. Brown, Jr. and Clem E. George for establishment of special rules and regulations for the Bluitt-Wolfcamp Gas Pool, Roosevelt County, New Mexico. Case 2355 will be reopened pursuant to Order No. R-2051 to permit the applicant and other interested parties to appear and show cause why the Bluitt-Wolfcamp Gas Pool should not be developed on 160-acre proration units.

CASE 2345:

(Continued)

In the matter of the application of Continental Oil Company for the establishment of special rules and regulations for the Rattlesnake-Pennsylvanian Pool, San Juan County, New Mexico. Case 2345 will be reopened pursuant to Order No. R-2049 to permit the applicant and other interested parties to appear and show cause why the subject pool should not be developed on 40-acre proration units.

CASE 2617:

(Continued)

Application of Continental Oil Company for a dual completion, San Juan County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks permission to complete its Rattlesnake Well No. 140, located in Unit H of Section 11, Township 29 North, Range 19 West, San Juan County. New Mexico, as a dual completion (conventional) in the Organ Rock and Pennsylvanian-Paradox formations in the Rattlesnake-Pennsylvanian Field, with the production of oil and gas from the Pennsylvanian-Paradox formation to be through 2 7/8 inch tubing at a depth of 6658 to 6710 feet; applicant proposes to dispose of salt water into the Organ Rock formation at a depth of 4175 to 4320 feet through a parallel string of 2 7/8 inch tubing.

CASE 2620:

Application of Shell Oil Company for a dual completion, Eddy County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks permission to complete its Henshaw Deep Unit Well No. 5, located 660 feet from the North and East lines of Section 23; Township 16 South, Range 30 East, Eddy County, New Mexico, as a dual completion (conventional) in the Wolfcamp and Devonian formations.

CASE 2621:

Application of Shell Oil Company for approval of a dual completion, Lea County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks permission to complete its Middleton Federal "A" Well No. 1, located in Unit H of Section 18, Township 19 South, Range 32 East, Lea County, New Mexico, as a dual completion (tubingless) in such a manner as to produce oil from the Lusk-Strawn Pool and gas from the Morrow formation through parallel strings of 2 7/8-inch casing, cemented in a common well bore. Applicant proposes to run a third string of 2 7/8-inch casing to total depth as a spare casing string.

CASE 2622:

Application of Cactus Drilling Company for a non-standard gas unit, Lea County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks the establishment of a 120-acre non-standard gas unit comprising the E/2 NE/4 and NW/4 NE/4 of Section 11, Township 18 South. Range 36 East, Arkansas Junction-Queen Gas Pool Lea County, New Mexico.

CASE 2623:

Application of W. K. Byrom for compulsory pooling, Lea County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks an order force pooling all mineral interests in a 160-acre unit comprising the NE/4 of Section 23, Township 18 South, Range 36 East, Arkansas Junction-Queen Gas Pool, Lea County, New Mexico, or, in the alternative, to establish an 80-acre non-standard gas unit comprising the N/2 NE/4 of said Section 23.

CASE 2624:

Application of El Paso Natural Gas Products Company for a non-standard proration unit and unorthodox location, San Juan County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks the establishment of an 82.07-acre non-standard proration unit comprising the following portions of Section 17, Township 29 North, Range 14 West, Cha Cha-Gallup Oil Pool, San Juan County, New Mexico: that part of the NE/4 SW/4 lying North of the centerline of the San Juan River; the SE/4 NW/4; and that part of the NE/4 NW/4 lying South of the centerline of U. S. Highway 550. Said unit is to be dedicated to a well to be drilled at an unorthodox location 2180 feet from the South line and 1980 feet from the West line of said Section 17.

CASE 2625:

Application of Sinclair Oil & Gas Company for an order establishing special rules and regulations for the Medicine Rock-Devonian Pool, Lea County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks an order establishing special rules and regulations for the Medicine Rock-Devonian Pool Lea County, New Mexico, to include provisions for 80-acre oil proration units therein.

iqg/

SINGLAIR OIL & GAS COMPANY
MEDICINE ROCK DEVONIAN FOOL, LEA COUNTY, NEW MEXICO
WELL COMPLETION DATA

7-17-62	22	Not Run	P 21/2	26,500 1	5,043-9,064 26,500 A	12,783-12,804	5 1/2 @ 12,840	وريٰ تر وم 15'ورو 18'ورو	1 3,740 DF	Tri-Service Drilling Company S. P. Johnson, et.ai. Well No.1 3,740
4-13-62	0	650	F 320	500 MA	9,017-9,037	12,738-12,758	5 1/2 @ 12,815	208°2T 83 578°3T	3,721 Œ	C. S. Store Well No. 3
1-29-62	0	830	¥ 265	250 MA 8,000 A	9,02 3-9,03 3	12,756-12,765	5 1/2 @ 12,835	809°77 84 569°21	3,733 Œ	C. S. Stone Woll No. 2
7-29-61	٠,	189	£ 123	Norsa	9,0189,030	12,740-12,752	27/2 @ 12,848	618°21 as 818°21	3,722 Œ	డి కి. కోంటు సింమి సిం. 1
	W. T.			ô.	Ourrently being completed.	Ourrently i	5 1/2 @ 12,810	12,610 12,797	3,725 30	Foed Educte Soll No. 2
10-20-61	, •	529	म् ।	250 ил	9,016-9,026	12,736-12,746	5 1/2 @ 12,8µ8	72,795 72,795	3,720 Œ	Sincleir Oil & Gas Company Iwel Bababa Woll No. 1
6-13-62	,VI,	TTS	F 1.60	19,000 A	9,044-9,082	12,784-12,822	5 1/2 @ 12,825	12,825	3,710 KS	Clara II. Soborda Well No. I
10-20-61	ped	Plugged & Abandoned	2].ಬಕ್ಟ್ರೀ	Mone	None	None	None	3,2,90%	3,733 DF	There M. Nobersell Content to. 1
2-19-54	ed.	Plugged & Abandoned	Plugge	2,000 A	801,6-38056	12,826-12,848	5 1/2 @ 12,890	698°37 84 069°37	ತ್ತಿಯಿಂದಿಕ	
7-12-62	•	777	¥ 280	500 MA 1,000 A	9,034-9,046	12,788-12,800	5 1/2 @ 12,850	12,850 958,21, 84	3,754 DF	The Addentic Berkming Company R. D. Graham Well Mo. I
DATE	THE PART	POTENTIAL	TAL LIVE	TREATMENT	YANGARA VARGARA	COMPLETION	ONITE & SETTE ON THE STATE OF T	WTAL DEPTH	HOLLVASTE	OPERATOR, LEAST NAME AND WELL NO.

Case 2625

SINCLAIR OIL & GAS COMPANY MEDICINE HOCK DEVONIAN POOL LEA COUNTY, NEW MEXICO

PRODUCTION DATA

8	565	
356,50% 82,578 9,98 7		23. 23. 23. 33. 35. 35. 35. 35. 35. 35. 35. 35. 3
82,578		20% Second of the second of th
	MP	il a exer bl.
67,480	7,230	THE THE MADE STORY
67,480 37,760	2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 200	A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A
183	380000000	Water But
\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	\$ 1000 1000 1000	Bb1.
à,600 3,580	3,580	TIC RANG. B. Granam Oas Wa
0	10	ANTIC RENG. CO. B. Granam Oas Water MCF Bbl.
6,424 3,	3,860	CLATA M. OIL GA
4 3,280	1,310	1'49'09
361	11.80 11.80	HAMON Roberts Water Bbl.
1,633	1,633	TRI SERVICE DRIG. S. P. Johnson Oil Gas Water Bbl. MCF Bbl.
81. ₃	81.7	HVI CE
130	130	DELG. Water Bbl.
236,1411	1,980 6,978 10,942 14,362 14,362 14,362 14,362 19,425 22,521 26,244 27,720 28,535	Bûl.
128,015	1,354 1,354 1,648 1,072 1,840	FIELD TOTAL
10,496	25.50 25.50	Water Bbl.

EN SERVICE

\$-14-52 \$0\$\$1.8

The all world

Exhibit No. 5

for an order establishing special rules for MEDICINE ROCK-DEV. POOL.