





INDEX

Page.....2

PAGE

3 9

g

HARLEY REAVIS

1.

and an and a state of the state

 ∞_{ε}

Direct Examination by Mr. Hinkle Cross Examination by Mr. Nutter

<u>EXHIBITS</u>

Applicant's Exhibits Nos. 1 through 5

REAVIS-DIRECT

MR. NUTTER: Case 5503.

MR. CARR: Case 5503. Application of Exxon Company, USA, for a dual completion, Lea County, New Mexico.

MR. HINKLE: Clarence Hinkle, Hinkle, Bondurant, Cox and Eaton, appearing on behalf of Exxon Company. We have one witness and several exhibits. I would like to have the witness sworn.

(Witness sworn.)

HARLEY REAVIS

called as a witness, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. HINKLE:

Q State your name, your residence, by whom you are employed?

A My name is Harley Reavis. I am an engineer for Exxon Corporation and I work in Midland, Texas.

(Whereupon, a discussion was held off the

record.)

BY MR. HINKLE:

Q You have previously testified before the Commission and qualified as a petroleum engineer in a number

of cases?

CASE 5503

Page...... 4

REAVIS-DIRECT

A Yes, sir, I have.

MR. HINKLE: Are his qualifications acceptable?

MR. NUTTER: Yes, sir.

BY MR. HINKLE:

ES.

Q What is the purpose of Exxon's Application in this case?

A Exxon -- this Hearing was called because we wish to complete our No. 3, N. G. Penrose as a dual completion from two zones, which the lower one is completed from 7234 to 7437 in the Wantz-Granite Wash, and the upper zone is from 6256 to 7120 in the Drinkard Pool, I believe it is.
Q Do you have a technicality involved on account of the tubing in this case?

A Yes, sir. The only reason this could not be granted administratively was the tubing I.D. was 1.61 and the Commission allows that it has to be 1.67, I believe it is.

Q So, it is just a fraction difference?

A It is .06 inches too small.

Q Have you prepared, or has there been prepared under your direction certain exhibits for introduction in this case?

A Yes, I have.

CASE 5503

REAVIS-DIRECT

Q Refer to Exhibit 1 and explain what that is and what it shows?

A Exhibit 1 is an aerial map and we have an orange arrow on it which shows the location in Lea County. There is the approximate location of this particular well that we are asking for the N. G. Penrose No. 3. Q Refer to Exhibit 2 and explain that?

A Exhibit 2 shows the location of the N. G. Penrose No. 3 Well which is in Section 13 of Township 22 South, Range 37 East. It is in the southwest corner of the northeast quarter.

Q Does this also show the ownership of the leasehold interests around this area?

A Yes, sir, it does.

Q Now, refer to Exhibit 3 and explain what this is? A Exhibit 3 is a schematic sketch of the particular well, the N. G. Penrose No. 3. It shows 8 and 5/8-inch casing set at 1241 feet and cemented to the surface. It shows the $5\frac{1}{2}$ inch set at 7500 feet and cemented up to 500 feet from the surface. It shows the perforations in the Drinkard from 6256 to 7120 feet. It shows the perforations in the Wantz-Granite Wash from 7238 to 7437 feet. It shows the packer set at 7160 feet which is the packer separating

CASE 5503

Page.....6

REAVIS-DIRECT

and a state of the second s Second second

the two particular zones, the Drinkard and the Wantz-Granite Wash.

Q In your opinion, will this effectively separate these zones and permit the measurement of production? A Yes, sir, I believe it will. They have tested the packer set at 7160 and indicated no communication between the packer. Now, additional data will be submitted on this at the time of the actual completion of the well. Now, this hardware is in the well and has been tested. They are now trying to get a production test on the well. Q What was the reason for using this size of tubing

in this particular well? A This was available, and it was much cheaper than

A This was available, and the requirement which would have -- was just slightly larger inside, in the inside diameter of the tubing. larger inside, in the inside diameter of the tubing. The inch and .61 was what we have here, and I believe 1.67 The inch and .61 was what we have here, and I believe 1.67 was what was required by the Commission in the granting of administrative requests. Q Would there have been a delay in obtaining the

other size of tubing in this case? A There would probably have been a delay in obtaining the other size casing, we are almost positive. Q Would this smaller size, fraction of a smaller

REAVIS-DIRECT

size result in any appreciable difference in production?

A No, sir, I don't think so. It is only a fraction of an inch less and this tubing was available and the other one would have probably delayed the completion of the well considerably.

Q Now, refer to Exhibit 4 and explain what this is? A Exhibit 4 is the log of the well which shows the top of the perforation and the bottom of the perforation of the upper zone, and it shows the top and bottom of the lower zone perforations, as is marked on the log. I do not have a copy.

(Whereupon, a discussion was held off the record.)

A (Continuing) The top of the upper zone, the Drinkard, is at 6256 and the lower perforations in that particular zone is 7120 which is shown on this log. And then the Wantz-Granite Wash is shown at 7238 to 7437. Q Have you had any protests from any of the offset owners to this Application?

A No, sir, we have not. We have sent this out to all of them at the time.

Q You did furnish all of them with copies of the

Application?

REAVIS-DIRECT

A Yes, sir, we did.

Q Did you request waivers?

A Yes, we did.

Q Did you obtain waivers from any of them?

A Yes, sir. We obtained waivers from four different operators: Penrose Zachary Operating Company, American Petrofino, Sohio Petroleum Company, and Texaco furnished us waivers.

Q These are shown by the Exhibit No. 5 which has been marked 5-A, B, C and D, is that right?

A That's right.

Constant Constant

Q In your opinion, would the approval of this Application be in the interest of conservation? A Yes, sir, I think it will.

MR. HINKLE: We offer in evidence, Exhibits 1 through 5.

MR. NUTTER: Applicant's Exhibits 1 through 5 will be admitted into evidence.

> (Whereupon, Applicant's Exhibits Nos. 1 through 5 were marked for identification, and were offered and admitted into evidence.)

MR. HINKLE: That's all we have on direct.

MR. NUTTER: Are there any questions of Mr. Reavis?

REAVIS-CROSS

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. NUTTER:

Q Mr. Reavis, with this size of tubing, will it be possible to artifically lift the well?

A We don't think that the well will need artifical lift for at least five years, and at that time, we feel that one of the zones will be gone and the other zone, we can then remove one of the tubing strings and finish producing the other zone.

Q It is anticipated that both zones will flow at the present time?

A Yes, sir.

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

(Witness dismissed.)

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

MR. HINKLE: That's all.

MR. NUTTER: Does anyone have anything they wish

to offer in Case 5503?

We will take the case under advisement.

CASE 5503 Page......10

STATE_OF_NEW_MEXICO_) SS. COUNTY OF SANTA FE }

Andrewski a Andrewski a I, RICHARD L. NYE, Court Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing and attached Transcript of Hearing before the New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission was reported by me, and the same is a true and correct record of the said proceedings, to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.

i do hereby certify that the foregoing in a complete record of the proceedings in the Examiner hearing of Case No. 5503 heard by me on 610, 19.25

tun, Examiner New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission

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. 5503 Order No. R-5044

APPLICATION OF EXXON COMPANY, USA FOR A DUAL COMPLETION, 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 10, 1975, at Santa Fe, New Mexico, before Examiner Daniel S. Nutter.

NOW, on this <u>17th</u> day of June, 1975, 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, Exxon Company, USA, seeks authority to complete its N. G. Penrose Well No. 3, located in Unit G of Section 13, Township 22 South, Range 37 East, NMPM, Lea County, New Mexico, as a dual completion (conventional) to produce Drinkard and Wantz-Granite Wash production through parallel strings of 1-1/2 inch tubing, with separation of the zones achieved by means of a packer set at approximately 7160 feet.

(3) That the mechanics of the proposed dual completion are feasible and in accord with good conservation practices.

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

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:

(1) That the applicant, Exxon Company, USA, is hereby authorized to complete its N. G. Penrose Well No. 3, located in Unit G of Section 13, Township 22 South, Range 37 East, NMPM, Lea County, New Mexico, as a dual completion (conventional) to produce Drinkard and Wantz-Granite Wash production through parallel strings of 1-1/2 inch tubing, with separation of the -2-Case No. 5503 Order No. R-5044

zones by means of a packer set at approximately 7160 feet.

PROVIDED HOWEVER, that the applicant shall complete, operate, and produce said well in accordance with the provisions of Rule 112-A of the Commission Rules and Regulations insofar as said rule is not inconsistent with this order;

PROVIDED FURTHER, that the applicant shall take packerleakage tests upon completion and annually thereafter during the Annual Gas-Oil Ratio Test Period for the Wantz-Granite Wash Pool.

(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

I.LR. TRUJILLO, Chairman Juce

DHIL JCERO Member JOE D. RAMEY, Member & Secretary

SEAL

dr/

OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

I. R. TRUJILLO CHAIRMAN

STATE OF NEW MEXICO

Re:

LAND COMMISSIONER PHIL R. LUCERO MEMBER

P. O. BOX 2088 - SANTA FE 87501 June 17, 1975

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

Mr. Clarence Hinkle Hinkle, Bondurant, Cox & Eaton Attorneys at Law Post Office Box 10 Roswell, New Mexico 88201

Applicant:

ORDER NO. R-5044

CASE NO.

Exxon Company, USA

5503

Dear Sir:

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

Yours very truly JOE D. RAMEY Secretary-Director

JDR/fd

Keel as so it

Copy of order also sent to:

Hobbs OCC	X
Artesia OCC	****
Aztec OCC	
Other	









l l

tap of cant 500'

#3

2 m

EXHIBIT N

Öz

CASE

As an offset operator to Exxon's N. G. Penrose lease, we have no objection to their dual completion of Well No. 3 as a dual using two strings of 1.5 inch tubing with inside diameter of 1.61 inches. Well No. 3 is located 1980 feet from the north and east lines of Section 13, T22S, R37E, Lea County, New Mexico and will be completed in the Drinkard and Wantz Granite Wash Pools.

BY Malarhun ACHARY OPERATING CO. FOR PENROSE

May 19, 1975 DATE

BEFORE EXAMINER NUTTER OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION EXHIBIT NO. 5A-B-CTD 5503 CASE NO.

WAIVER

1

TASA SECONDERS

WAIVER

As an offset operator to Exxon's N. G. Penrose lease, we have no objection to their dual completion of Well No. 3 as a dual using two strings of 1.5 inch tubing with inside diameter of 1.61 inches. Well No. 3 is located 1980 feet from the north and east lines of Section 13, T22S, R37E, Lea County, New Mexico and will be completed in the Drinkard and Wantz Granite Wash Pools.

Valters BŸ Petrolum Co. FOR

 G_{11}

DATE

BEFORE EXAMINER NUTTER OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION ERON EXHIBIT NOS-13 CASE NO. 5503

WAIVER

As an offset operator to Exxon's N. G. Penrose lease, we have no objection to their dual completion of Well No. 3 as a dual using two strings of 1.5 inch tubing with inside diameter of 1.61 inches. Well No. 3 is located 1980 feet from the north and east lines of Section 13, T22S, R37E, Lea County, New Mexico and will be completed in the Drinkard and Wantz Granite Wash Pools.

S

R. C. Bott R. C. Bott BY

FOR AMERICAN PETROFÍNA COMPANY OF TEXAS

DATE May 21, 1975

BEFORE EXAMINER NUTTER OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION EANN EXHIBIT NO.5 C 5507 CASE NO.

WAIVER

and the state of the

As an offset operator to Exxon's N. G. Penrose lease, we have no objection to their dual completion of Well No. 3 as a dual using two strings of 1.5 inch tubing with inside diameter of 1.61 inches. Well No. 3 is located 1980 feet from the north and east lines of Section 13, T22S, R37E, Lea County, New Mexico and will be completed in the Drinkard and Wantz Granite Wash Pools.

BY LOVBrown

FOR TEXACO INC.

DATE May 20, 1975

BEFORE EXAMINER NUTTER
OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION
CASE NO. 5503

Case 5503

OH COMPLETEVATION COMM. Santa Fe

EXON COMPANY, U.S.A.

POST OFFICE BOX 1600 . MIDLAND, TEXAS 79701

PRODUCTION DEPARTMENT - MIDCONTINENT DIVISION

L. H. BYRD MANAGER

May 15, 1975

Hearing for Exception to Rule 112-A, Multiple Completion

New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission P. O. Box 2088 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

Attention: Mr. A. L. Porter, Jr.

Dear Sir:

We respectfully request a hearing be scheduled on June 11, 1975 to consider Exxon Corporation's application for an exception to Rule 112-A for our N. G. Penrose Well No. 3 to allow the use of two strings of 1.5 inch tubing for dual completion in the Drinkard and Wantz Granite Wash Pools. These two tubing strings have an inside diameter of 1.61 inches which is less than the minimum 1.67 inches allowed for administrative approval. This well is located 1980 feet from the north and east lines of Section 13, T22S, R37E, Lea County, New Mexico. This well was spudded on May 6, 1975 and was drilling at 3750' on May 15, 1975.

A list of the offset operators is attached. By copy of this letter, we are requesting each offset operator to furnish us a waiver if they have no objection to our drilling of this well and using 1.5 inch tubing with inside diameter of 1.61 inches. A copy of a waiver is attached for their convenience.

Your scheduling of this hearing on June 11, 1975 will be appreciated.

Yours very truly,

L. H. BYRD

HNR/ss

Attachments

A DIVISION OF EXXON CORPORATION

cc: New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission P. O. Box 1980 Hobbs, New Mexico 88240

All offset operators

DOCKET MAILED

Date



 ϵ

OFFSET OPERATORS TO EXXON'S N. G. PENROSE LEASE LEA COUNTY, NEW MEXICO

Marathon Oil Company Box 2409 Hobbs, New Mexico 88240

A THE PARTY AND A CONTRACT OF A CONTRACT

J. H. Hendrix 403 Wall Towers West Midland, Texas 79701

Texas Pacific Oil Company Box 4067 Midland, Texas 79701

Penrose Production Company 1605 Commerce Building Fort Worth, Texas 76102

American Petrofina Company of Texas Box 1311 Big Spring, Texas 79720

Texaco, Inc. Box 3109 Midland, Texas 79701

Sohio Petroleum Company Box 3167 Midland, Texas 79701

Case 5503

WAIVER

As an offset operator to Exxon's N. G. Penrose lease, we have no objection to their dual completion of Well No. 3 as a dual using two strings of 1.5 inch tubing with inside diameter of 1.61 inches. Well No. 3 is located 1980 feet from the north and east lines of Section 13, T22S, R37E, Lea County, New Mexico and will be completed in the Drinkard and Wantz Granite Wash Pools.

BY

FOR

DATE

₹{}.

Et a.

DRAFT

dr,

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.	5503
		The second s

Order No. R- 5044

APPLICATION OF EXXON COMPANY, USA FOR A DUAL COMPLETION, 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 10 , 1975, at Santa Fe, New Mexico, before Examiner Daniel S. Nutter

NOW, on this <u>day of June</u>, 1975, 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, Exxon Company, USA
seeks authority to complete its N.G. Penrose
Well No. 3, located in Unit G of Section 13, Township
South East 22 xxxxxxxxx Range 37 xxxxxxxx NMPM, Lea County, New
Mexico, as a <u>dual</u> completion (conventional) XXXX (XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
FYXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
parallel strings of 1-1/2 inch tubing, with Mperation of
The gones achieved by many of a packer
set at approximately 7160 feet.

(3) That the mechanics of the proposed <u>dual</u> completion are feasible and in accord with good conservation practices.

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

TTTISTHEREPORE-ORDERED+____

(1) That the applicant, Exxon Company, USA is hereby authorized to complete its N. G. Penrose Well No. 3 , located in Unit G of Section 13 , Township South East 22 37 Lea WESEX NMPM, County, New North' Range 8XXX (conventional) Mexico, as a dual completion % 88 MB * HA * Som to produce 8 MB * Drinkard and Wantz-Granite Wash production through xxxxxxxxxx parallel strings of 1-1/2 inch tubing, with separation The zoner by man of a packer

raymate 1140

PROVIDED HOWEVER, that the applicant shall complete, operate, and produce said well in accordance with the provisions of Rule 112-A of the Commission Rules and Regulations insofar as said rule is not inconsistent with this order;

PROVIDED FURTHER, that the applicant shall take packer-leakage tests upon completion and annually thereafter during the Annual Gas-Oil Ratio Test Period for the Wanty Aramic With Pool.

(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.

-2-