

OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

P. O. BOX 871

SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

March 13, 1961

Shell Oil Company
P. O. Box 845
Roswell, New Mexico

Attention: Mr. R. L. Rankin

Administrative Order NSP-549

Gentlemen:

Reference is made to your application for approval of a 240-acre non-standard gas proration unit in the Jalmat Gas Pool consisting of the following acreage:

TOWNSHIP 24 SOUTH, RANGE 36 EAST, NMPM

Section 36: NW/4, NE/4 SW/4 and NW/4 NE/4

It is understood that you propose to dedicate this unit to your Shell State A Well No. 1, located in Unit D of said Section 36.

By authority granted me under provisions of Order No. R-1670, you are hereby authorized to operate the NW/4 and the NW/4 NE/4 of said Section 36 as a non-standard gas proration unit, with allowable to be assigned thereto in accordance with the pool rules, based upon the unit size of 200 acres.

Inasmuch as the NE/4 SW/4 of said Section 36 is located between the Shell State A Well No. 1 and a Jalmat

C
O
P
Y

OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

P. O. BOX 871

SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

Shell Oil Company

March 13, 1961

-2-

C
O
P
Y

dry hole, addition of this tract to the present Jalmat gas proration unit is not deemed warranted in the absence of a hearing wherein it is established that it is reasonable to presume that this acreage is productive of gas from the Jalmat Gas Pool.

Very truly yours,

A. L. PORTER, Jr.,
Secretary-Director

ALP/OEP/og

cc: Oil Conservation Commission - Hobbs
Oil & Gas Engineering Committee - Hobbs

MAIL ROOM OFFICE OCC

OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

1961 FEB 24 AM 8 35
BOX 2045

HOBBS, NEW MEXICO

DATE Feb. 24, 1961

OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION
BOX 871
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

Re: Proposed NSP 549

Proposed NSL _____

Proposed NFC _____

Proposed DC _____

Gentlemen:

I have examined the application dated _____
for the Shell Oil Co. State A #1 36-24-36
Operator Lease and Well No. S-T-R

and my recommendations are as follows:

O.K.---E.F.E.

I do not recommend the approval or addition of the NE/4 SW/4 to the present
acreage dedication due to the fact that the dry hole in Unit F was never
productive, and this well being in between the producing well and proposed
40 acre tract in the NE/4 SW/4 it is doubtful that this 40 acres could be

drained if productive.
The other 40 acre tract
in the NW/4 NE/4 should
be productive and drainable.
JWR

Yours very truly,

OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION