

Lase Number 4759 Application Trascripts Small Exhibits ETC



	PAGE 3
1	MR. STAMETS: Case 4759.
2 2	MR. HATCH: Application of Atlantic-Richfield
3	Company for a special cas-oil ratio limitation, Lea County-
4. (A)	New Mexico.
5	MR. HINKLE. Clarence Hinkle, appearing on behalf
6. • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	of Atlantic-Richfield in Case 4759. We have one witness
	we would like to have sworn and two exhibits.
	JERALD TWEED,
e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e	was called as a witness, and after being duly sworn,
10	testified as follows:
<b>11</b>	DIRECT EXAMINATION
	BY MR. HINKLE:
	Q Would you state your name and address and by whom you
	are employed?
z ⊻ 	A Jerry Tweed, and I am employed by Atlantic-Richfield
	in Midland, Texas.
	Q What is your position with the company?
	A Senior operating engineer and petroleum engineer.
	Q Have you testified before the Oil Conservation Commission
	before?
	A Yes, I have.
	Q And made your qualifications a matter of record with
	the Commission?
οι 24	A Yes, sir.
25	Q Have you made a study of the Justice Tubb-Drinkard Pool

٠.

	2	·		PAGE 4
	an a	1	and the wells in the pool and the lo	gs of the wells
	**************************************	2	and all the information concerning t	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<u>\$2</u>	3 A	Yes. I have	
		4 Q	Are you familiar with the applicatio	n filed by
	41 a. 12	5	Atlantic-Richfield in this case?	
		6 A	Yes.	· · · ·
	mc cormick	7 Q	What are they seeking to accomplish?	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	COL	8 A		in a state of the second s
	mc		We are asking for an exception to Ru	e 506 of the
	8	9	Commission Rules and Regulations.	
	meier	10 Q	Have you prepared, or has there been	prepared under
	۲, n	11	your direction, certain exhibits for	introduction in
	dearnley,	12	this case?	
	deal deal	13 A	Yes.	
	と し の で し の で の で の で の で の で の で の で の で の で の で の の の の の の の の の の の の の	14 Q	Referring you to Exhibit Number One,	would you please
	2 X . ຈ ພັນ ວ z	15	explain what it is and what it shows?	
	QUERQ RQUE,	16 A	Exhibit One is a structure map on the	top of the Tubb
		17	sand. The wells that have produced fi	
	43 <sup>4</sup> 0001. 57 e A L'	18	rinkard formation are colored on the	
	10NE 2 06. EA	19	can be seen that this is a north-south	
	NK BL	20	structure, and there originally were ]	
	NAL 3A	21	completions. There are presently fift	
	0.9 0.1 4 2 2	22	producing from the Tubb-Drinkard, and	
	S BLD	23	in red on the map. The limits of prod	
	6 5 16	24	pool were determined by both porosity	
		25	There is some downdip water in some ar	

-

1

÷.,

		PAGE 5
	1	a rather low permeability, low porosity reservoir
	2	which is in the late stage of production. The fifty-
	<u></u>	One_wells_made_428_barrels_of_oil_is_April, which is
	4	approximately nine barrels of oil per day per well
	5	April. The SOL for the pool for April was
	6	9,631.
	7 Q	Does this map also show the ownership of the acreage
	8	in the pool?
& mc	<b>9</b> A	Yes, it shows various ownership and there would be
eie.	10	four wells now that would be affected by this gas-oil
dearnley, meier	11	ratio. They are the Wimberley Number Six in Section
<b>unie</b>	12	D of Section 24, Township 25 South, Range 37 East.
	13	The other wells are the Shell State JM Number 1B in
	14	Unit B of Section 22, 5, 37; the Colt C Number 25 in
ζ Z Z 3 4 2 2 2 2 2 2	15	Unit A of Section 24, 25, 37; and the Texas-Pacific
	16	Eton Number Eleven in Unit K of 12, 25, 37.
	17 <sup>Q</sup>	Are those the only wells that would be affected?
	18 A	That's right. The other thing, on these wells, it is
	19	our estimate from recent tests that an increase in the
	20	GOR from 2,000 to 1 to 6,000 to 1 would result in
	21	approximately 800 MCF per day being produced and
	22	120 barrels of oil per day.
	23	MR. STAMETS: Eight hundred MCF and 120 barrels
2.7 2.7 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0	24 of	oil?
	25	THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
	n a shirthean a shirth	

 $\mathbf{\hat{s}}_{i}$ 

t las more

15

,		PAGE 6
1	1	Q (By Mr. Hinkle) Referring you to Exhibit Two, would
	2	
<u> </u>		A Exhibit Two is a decline curve of the Justice Tub-
	4	Drinkard Pool. The daily average of oil production
	Ę	
ें 	6	
dearniey, meier & mc cormic	7	December of 1957 with first production being essentially
CO	8	
E	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	in January, 1958. I would like to point out on the
3		oil production curve that oil production has declined
neit	10 	rather rapidly since 1965, and the gas-oil ratio curve
ey, I	11	has increased since that time.
arni	<b>12</b>	This is, in my opinion, a typical performance of
de	001 <b>13</b>	a low permeability reservoir producing from solution
	ы <sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup>	gas drive mechanism.
	22 เมษ <b>15</b> วุ <i>z</i>	Q Referring you to Exhibit Three, would you explain that?
	ะมี มีการ 16 ชาย	A Exhibit Three is a letter from the gas purchaser, El
		Paso Natural Gas Company, in which they state that
	43-669	they are willing and able to take the additional 800
	w w z o 19 0 T 0	MCF of gas per day which would be produced with an
		increase in the GOR. El Paso would take all of the
		gas from the wells that would be capable of producing
	00 0.⊩ • <b>₹</b> 22	additional gas.
	4 K 1 M	
	S M M S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S	a setting to take the excess gas if the
	° 24	gas-oil ratio is increased? A Yes, sir.
	25	

میں دیکھ ہے۔ ماہ کر کی ایک ہے۔ میں میں کی کی ایک ہے ہے۔ ماہ ماہ ہے کہ ایک ہے کہ کہ ہے۔

 $\mathbf{F}$ 

· - · · · ·

 $\epsilon$ 

 $\mathcal{M}$ 

· · ·

42

ι.

1

8 E.A

			PAGE 7
		1	Q In your opinion, would this increase prevent waste
		2	and protect correlative rights?
		3	A Yes, it would.
	•	4	Q Do you have anything else you would like to present
		5	in connection with this matter?
		6	
	ji ji		
	corn	7	MR. HINKLE: At this time, we will offer Exhibits
	UC C	. 8	One through Three.
	Š		MR. STAMETS: Any objection?
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	eier	10	(No response)
	L	11	MR. STAMETS: They will be admitted.
	nley	g 12	(Whereupon Applicant's Exhibits One through Three
	dearnley,	01 13	were admitted in evidence.)
		Сте ще ще ще ще ще ще ще ще ще щ	
			MR. HINKLE: That's all we have on direct.
	2 <b>4</b>	ษ£ 15 ⊃z ชษ	
		ษา วัง <b>16</b> วัษ	CROSS EXAMINATION
			BY MR. STAMETS:
		80-L 18	Q What benefit does Atlantic-Richfield hope to receive
		а в с о о о о	from a 6000 to one GOR?
		• 7 20	A Essentially, the benefit that will be derived will be
		×0 1 21	the ability to produce forty barrels of oil and
		0 0 4 F	approximately 250 MCF more production.
	•	• V 22	그는 것 같아요. 그는 것 같아요. 이렇게 잘 하는 것 같아요. 이렇게 가장 가장에 가지 않는 것 같아요. 이렇게 많이 가지 않는 것 같아요. 이렇게 하는 것 같아요. 이렇게 하는 것 같아요. 이렇게
		a si 23	2 Do you feel that a higher GOR limit will adversely affect the ultimet
양왕국은 소전가 여기고 전 2		<sub>୧୪</sub> 24	affect the ultimate recovery in the field?
		25 [	No, sir, I don't. This is a solution gas drive

3.22 

٠ŧ.

÷4...

. Sterry

		p	PAGE 8
	*	1	reservoir in a tight field and an additional GOR
		2	limit increase will not have any adverse affect on
	<u></u>	3	the recovery. We are not getting any bonofit from the
		<b>4</b>	gas other than pushing the oil in the well bore. We
		5	are not getting any secondary gas cap expansion or
		б	anything of this type.
·	mc cormick	7	I would also like to point out that in April that
		8	the actual producing GOR for the pool was over 9,000
	E 8	9	to one, and I calculate that well will roughly be
	eie	10	producing additional oil and gas at a GOR of about
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	dearnley, meier	11	6,500 to one, so the additional fluid that would be
1975 - Santa Santa Santa Santa Santa Santa Santa Santa Santa Santa Santa		12	taken out of the reservoir would be produced at a lower
	<b>dea</b>	13	GOR than is now currently in the reservoir.
동물은 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 있다. 이 같은 것이 있는 것이 있 같은 것이 같은 것이 같은 것이 있는 것이 없는 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 없는 것이 없는 것이 없다. 것이 있는 것이 있는	X X V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V	14 Q	The four wells you mentioned which would benefit from
	2 Σ 	15	the higher GOR, would they benefit by receiving a
	0 K 2 C 2 C 2 C 2 C 2 C 2 C 2 C 2 C 2 C 2 C	16	higher oil allowable?
	שוכ בנג ער בי גוי	17 A	Yes, sir.
	87 0 0 1	18 Q	They are basically near the top of the structure, isn't
	× ₩ U U U U U U	19	that right?
	L 6 6 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	20 A	I think all of them are except the Texas-Pacific Well,
	b b b b b c c c c c c c c c c c c c	21	which is on the east side.
	0 0 0 1 4 4 7	22 Q	But there are wells higher structurally, according to
	001 101 101 101 101 101 101 101 101 101	23	your exhibit, which will not be affected by the higher
n de la composition d Anticipat de la composition de la compos	00 SIMM	24	GOR, is that right?
	5 <b>6</b> 57	25 A	That's true. Their allowable is not restricted to the
		<b>L</b>	

2

i san jari

1

<ul> <li>high GOR , and I believe that affects approxima forty of the current fifty-one producing wells the are produced at a higher rate than 2,000 to one.</li> <li>Q The oil production rate is low enough that they a not restricted?</li> <li>A Yes, sir. The pool is near-depletion except for a few wells.</li> <li>MR. STAMETS: Are there any other questions of this witness?</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>2 forty of the current fifty-one producing wells th</li> <li>3 are produced at a higher rate than 2,000 to one.</li> <li>4 Q The oil production rate is low enough that they a</li> <li>5 not restricted?</li> </ul>	tely
<ul> <li>3 are produced at a higher rate than 2,000 to one.</li> <li>4 Q The oil production rate is low enough that they a not restricted?</li> <li>6 D Yog give When h is</li> </ul>	
4 Q The oil production rate is low enough that they a 5 not restricted?	
5 not restricted?	ro
	16
No.No	
B MR. STAMETS: Are there any other questions of this witness?	just
NR. STAMETS: Are there any other questions ofNR. STAMETS: A	
9 this witness?	of
	-
. 10 (No response)	
IndextIndext(No response)IndextIndext(No response)Indext <td>used.</td>	used.
General (Witness excused.)	
MR. STAMETS: Any additional testimony in thi	s case?
MR. HINKLE: No, sir.	
MR. STAMETS: Any statements?	
$\begin{bmatrix} 3 & z \\ x & y \\ y & z \\ z $	
s ar decey supp	orting
18 the application.	
MR. STAMETS: Case 4759 will be taken under	
advisement.	
0 0 n F • 5 22	an Again a sa
	2
25	
	1.

÷

1.

يحقر والمرتجة

ı

PAGE 10 STATE OF NEW MEXICO 1 ) SS COUNTY OF BERNALILLO ) 2 I, RICHARD E. MCCORMICK, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, 4 in and for the County of Bernalillo, State of New Mexico 1 do hereby certify that the foregoing and attached Transcript б dearnley, meier & mc cormick of Hearing before the New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission 7 was reported by me; and that the same is a true and correct 8 record of the said proceedings to the best of my knowledge, 9 skill and ability. 10 11 12 CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER NEW MEXICO 87103 MEXICO 87108 13 天下的 14 SIMMS BLDG.0-P.O. BOX 10020-PHONE 245-66910-ALBUQUERQUE. 1210 FIRST NATIONAL BANK BLDG. EASTOALBUQUERQUE, NEW 15 **1**6 17 18 19 20 21 , do hereby certify that the forecoing be There recent of the mathematic 22 3° C. ti g Sine: 4759 23 *0*0 1972 have 200 24 New Verice Oil Conservation Consission Cumy X - Exection 25

PAGE <u>I N D E X</u> WITNESS PAGE Q. JERALD THEED Direct Examination by Mr. Hinkle æ LLOSS EXAMINATION by Mr. Stamets dearnley, meier & mc cormick 🔬 б EXHIBITS APPLICANT'S I AL BUQUERQUE. NEW MEXICO 57103 - BUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO 57103 ADMITTED OFFERED Exhibit 1 Exhibit 2 Exhibit 3 209 SIMMS BLCG.0 P.O. BOX 10920 PHONE 243-6691 1216 First. National Bank Blog. East-al 



### **OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION**

STATE OF NEW MEXICO P. O. BOX 2008 - SANTA FE \$7501 GOVERNOR BRUCE KING CHAIRMAN

LAND CONMISSIONER ALEX J. ARMIJO MEMBER

STATE GEOLOGIST A. L. PORTER, JR. SECRETARY - DIRECTOR

July 19, 1972

Mr. Clarence Hinkle Re: Case No. 4759 Hinkle, Bondurant, Cox & Eaton Order No. R-4346 Attorneys at Law Post Office Box 10 Applicant:

Atlantic Richfield

#### Dear Sir:

Enclosed herewith are two copies of the above-referenced Commission order recently entered in the subject case.

Very truly yours, a torter.

A. L. PORTER, Jr. Secretary-Director

ALP/ir

Copy of order also sent to:

Roswell, New Mexico 88201

Hobbs OCC	X
Artesia OCC	
Aztec OCC	

Other\_

٠t.,

#### 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. 4759 Order No. R-4346

APPLICATION OF ATLANTIC RICHFIELD COMPANY FOR A SPECIAL GAS-OIL RATIO LIMITATION, JUSTIS TUBB-DRINKARD POOL, LEA COUNTY, NEW MEXICO.

#### ORDER OF THE COMMISSION

#### BY THE COMMISSION:

This cause came on for hearing at 9 a.m. on July 12, 1972, at Santa Fe, New Mexico, before Examiner, Richard L. Stamets.

NOW, on this 19th day of July, 1972, the Commission, a quorum being present, having considered the testimony, the record, and the recommendations of the Examiner, 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, Atlantic Richfield Company, seeks, as an exception to Rule 506 of the Commission Rules and Regulations, a limiting gas-oil ratio of 6,000 cubic feet of gas per barrel of oil in the Justis Tubb-Drinkard Pool, Lea County, New Mexico.

(3) That the reservoir characteristics of the subject pool presently available justify the establishment of a gas-oil ratio limitation of 6,000 cubic feet of gas per barrel of liquid hydrocarbons.

(4) That an additional volume of 800 MCF per day of casinghead gas production is anticipated to be produced from the Justis Tubb-Drinkard Pool at a gas-oil ratio of 6,000 cubic feet of gas per barrel of oil.

(5) That the anticipated volume of additional casinghead gas may be produced from the Justis Tubb-Drinkard Pool without waste. -2-CASE NO. 4759 Order No. R-4346

(6) That in order to afford to the owner of each property in the Justis Tubb-Drinkard Pool the opportunity to produce his just and equitable share of the oil and gas in the subject pool and for this purpose to use his just and equitable share of the reservoir energy, a limiting gas-oil ratio of 6,000 cubic feet of gas per barrel of liquid hydrocarbons should be established for the subject pool.

(7) That approval of the subject application will prevent waste and protect correlative rights.

IT-IS-THEREFORE ORDERED:-

(1) That, effective September 1, 1972, the limiting gas-oil ratio in the Justis Tubb-Drinkard Pool, Lea County, New Mexico, shall be 6,000 cubic feet of gas for each barrel of oil produced.

(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 hereinabove designated.

SEAL

STATE OF NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION BRUCE KING rman

ARMIZO. Member ALEX J

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

dr/

Getty Oil Company and, Texas 79701 Mid-Continent Division J. E. Pierce, Midland District Production Manage OIL CONSERVATION COMM. Santa Fo July 7, 1972 \$MA Mr. A. L. Porter, Jr. Secretary-Director New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission 4759 P. O. Box 2088 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501 Dear Mr. Porter: Getty Oil Company respectfully wishes to support the Atlantic. Richfield Company in their efforts to increase the GOR limit of the Justis Tubb-Drinkard Pool from 2000/1 to 6000/1, Case No. 4759, which is to be heard before the New Moxico Oil Conservation Commission on July 12, 1972. Yours truly, JE Presie TCW:rt

Examiner Hearing - Wednesday July 12, 1972 -2-

Docket No. 15-72

CASE 4759: Application of Atlantic Richfield Company for a special gas-oil ratio limitation, Lea County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks as an exception to Rule 500 of the Commission Rules and Regulations, a limiting gas-oil ratio limitation of 6,000 cubic feet of gas per barrel of oil in the Justis Tubb-Drinkard Pool, Lea County, New Mexico.

CASE 4732: (Continued from the June 7, 1972 Examiner Hearing) Application of Continental Oil Company for downhole commingling, Lea County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks authority to commingle production from the Skaggs-Glorieta, East Weir-Blinebry, and Skaggs-Drinkard Pools in the wellbore of its Skaggs "B" Well No. 5 located 990 feet from the North line and 1700 feet from the West line of Section 12, Township 20 South, Range 37 East, Lea County, New Mexico.

CASE 4760: Application of Anadarko Production Company for a waterflood project, Lea County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks to institute a waterflood project by the injection of water into the Penrose-Skelly Pool by the injection of water through its R. E. Cole Well No. 3 located in the SW/4 SW/4 of Section 16 and its E. W. Walden Well No. 6 located in the SE/4 SW/4 of Section 15, Township 22 South, Range 37 East, Lea County, New Mexico.

> Applicant further seeks establishment of a procedure whereby the conversion of additional wells to injection may be approved administratively.

CASE 4761:

Application of Shell Oil Company for an unorthodox location, Lea County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks authority to drill a well at an unorthodox location 1980 feet from the South line and 660 feet from the East line of Section 33, Township 23 South, Range 34 East, Antelope Ridge-Devonian Gas Pool, Lea County, New Mexico.

CASE 4762: Application of Shell Oil Company for an unorthodox location and simultaneous dedication, Lea County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks authority to deepen its Antelope Ridge Well No. 4 to the Antelope Ridge-Morrow Gas Pool at an unorthodox location 990 feet from the Northline and 2310 feet from the East line of Section 4, Township 24 South, Range 34 East, Lea County, New Mexico, which location is approximately 800 feet from its Antelope Ridge Well No. 2 located 660 feet from the North line and 1650 feet from the East line, same pool, township and range. Applicant proposes to simultaneously dedicate the N/2 of said Section 4 to the two wells.

CASE 4763:

3: Application of Black River Corporation for compulsory pooling and nonstandard proration unit, Eddy County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the abovestyled cause, seeks an order pooling all mineral interests in the Morrow formation underlying the E/2 of Section 3, Township 26 South, Range 24 East, adjacent to the Washington Ranch-Morrow Gas Pool, Eddy County, New Mexico, comprising, approximately, a 409.22-acre non-standard proration unit. Said acreage to be dedicated to its Cities "3" Federal Well No. 2 located 2212 feet from the North line and 1998 feet from the East line of said Section 3.

El Paso Natural Gas Company

El Paso, Jexas 1999 May 26, 1972

Atlantic-Richfield Company P. O. Box 1610 Midland, Texas

Attention: Mr. K. W. Hill

Re: G-O-R Limit Justice Tubb Drinkard Cas Pool Lea County, New Mexico

#### Gentlemen:

This letter is in response to your letter dated May 22, 1972 concerning your plans to request the New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission to increase the Gas-Oil-Ratio limit from 2000:1 to 6000:1 in the above reference field.

Please be advised that El Paso Natural Gas Company is able and willing to take the estimated 800 MCF of gas per day for processing and has no objections to your request.

Yours very truly,

F. N. Woodruff, etor Gas Proration Operation

FNW:vap

BEFORE EXAM			
OIL CONSERVATI	ON CO	MMIS	SION
EXHIS	T NO	3	
CASE NO			
Submitted by			-
Hearing Date		·.	· .

Exhibit No. 3

AtianticRichfieldCompany Legal Division Post Office Box 1320 1610 Midland, Texas 79701 June 16, 1972 JUN 1-9 111 241 OIL CONSERVATION COMM Oil Conservation Commission P. C. Box 2088Santa Fe Case 4159 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501 Gentlemen: Enclosed in triplicate is application of Atlantic Richfield Company for special order providing for special gas-oil ratio limitation for the Justis Tubb-Drinkard Pool, Lea County, New Mexico, which we request be docketed and set for hearing at the earliest convenient date, Very truly yours, Horace N. Burton Attorney HNB:11 Enc. cc: Mr. Clarence E. Hinkle DOCKET MALLED Dal

BEFORE THE OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

JUN 1 9 19

Santa Fo

ለጠ

CASE NO

STATE OF NEW MEXICO

APPLICATION OF ATLANTIC RICHFIELD COMPANY FOR A SPECIAL GAS-OIL RATIO LIMITATION FOR THE JUSTIS TUBB-DRINKARD POOL, LEA COUNTY, NEW MEXICO.

Atlantic Richfield Company hereby makes application to the Commission for a special gas-oil ratio limitation and an exception to Statewide Rule 506 for the Justis Tubb-Drinkard Pool, Lea County, New Mexico, and in support thereof, represents:

1.

2.

The common reservoir to be affected by the order sought by Applicant is the Justis Tubb-Drinkard Pool, Lea County, New Mexico.

Applicant seeks an exception to Statewide Rule 506 to provide that the oil-gas ratio limitation for the subject pool shall be changed from 2,000 cubic feet of gas for each barrel of oil produced to 6,000 cubic feet of gas for each barrel of oil.

The approval of the application will afford to the owner of each property in the pool the opportunity to produce his just and equitable share of the oil and gas and for this purpose, to use his just and equitable share of the reservoir energy, and will prevent waste and protect correlative rights.

WHEREFORE, Applicant prays that notice be issued on this application as required by law; that the application be set for hearing before an examiner at Santa Fe, New Mexico at the earliest convenient date and after hearing, a special order be entered approving this application for said special oil-gas ratio limitation.

1 x au 0 1. 0. Lon Horace N. Burton

P. O. Box 1610, Midland, Texas 79701

Clarence E. Hinkle Hinkle, Bondurant, Cox & Eaton P. O. Box 10, Roswell, New Mexico 88201

ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT ATLANTIC RICHFIELD COMPANY

# 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:

VULL C CASE No. 400 Order No. 🔭

APPLICATION OF DTA OUL PRODUCEDO

Drinkard WARAN PERMANENAN POOL, LEA COUNTY, NEW MEXICO.

#### ORDER OF THE COMMISSION

#### BY THE COMMISSION:

This cause came on for hearing at 9 a.m. on Harth 1, 1972, at Santa Fe, New Mexico, before Examiner Richard L. Stamets.

NOW, on this day of **Turk**, 1972, the Commission, a quorum being present, having considered the testimony, the record, and the recommendations of the Examiner, 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, DTA-Oil-Preducers, seeks, as an exception to Rule 506 of the Commission Rules and Regulations, a limiting gas-oil ratio of  $\frac{10,366}{10,366}$  cubic feet of gas per barrel the Vada PonneyLyapian Pool, Lea County, New Mexico. Justis Tubb-Dim Mosd of oil in the Vada

(3) That the reservoir characteristics of the subject pool presently available justify the establishment of a gas-oil ratio limitation of  $\frac{10,000}{10,000}$  cubic feet of gas per barrel of liquid hydrocarbons.

(4) That an additional volume of **40**800 MCF per day of casinghead gas production is anticipated to be produced from

-2-

CASE No. 4670 Order No. R-4278

Justis Tubb - Drinkard

mian Pool at a gas-oil ratio of 10,000 000 cubic feet of gas per barrel of oil.

(5) That the anticipated volume of additional casinghead gas may be produced from the Vada Permsylvanian Pool without waste.  $T_{tristik}$  Tubbe compared to  $T_{tristik}$ 

(6) That in order to afford to the owner of each property in the Pool-the opportunity to produce his just and equitable share of the oil and gas in the subject pool and for this purpose to use his just and equitable share of the reservoir energy, a limiting gas-oil ratio of 10,000 cubic feet of gas per barrel of liquid hydrocarbons should be established for the subject pool.

(7) That approval of the subject application will prevent waste and protect correlative rights.

## IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED: S. pt. ber 1, 1992,

(1) That, effective March 1, 1972, the limiting gas-oil ratio in the vada Pennoy Ivanian Pool, Lea County, New Mexico, shall be 10,000 cubic feet of gas for each barrel of oil produced.

(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 hereinabove designated.

> STATE OF NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

BRUCE KING, Chairman

ALEX J. ARMIJO, Member

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

SEAL

esr/