ASE 6667: ENHOW COMPORATION FOR A NON-STANUARD PRORATION UNIT, AN UNORTHODOX MEL LOCATION, AND SIMULTANEOUS DEDICA-"ION, LEA COUNTY. NEW MEXICO

್ಯ

CASE NO.

6667

APPliCation, Transcripts, Small Exhibits,

ETC.



STATE OF NEW MEXICO ENERGY AND MINERALS DEPARTMENT OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION

BRUCE KING GOVERNOR LARRY KEHOE SECRETARY POST OFFICE BOX 2088 STATE LAND OFFICE BUILDING SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO 87501 (505) 827-2434

October 11, 1979

Mr. Conrad Coffield Hinkle, Cox, Eaton, Coffield & Hensley Attorneys at Law P. O. Box 3580 Midland, Texas 79702

| CASE NO | • | 6667 |
|----------|---|------|
| ORDER NO | D | 5136 |

Applicant:

Exxon Corporation

Dear Sir:

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

Re:

Pours very truly, ú JOE D. RAMEY Director

JDR/fd

Copy of order also sent to:

| Hobbs OCD | x |
|-------------|---|
| Artesia OCD | X |
| Aztec OCD | |

Other_

ĺ

STATE OF NEW MEXICO ENERGY AND MINERALS DEPARTMENT OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION

IN THE MATTER OF THE HEARING CALLED BY THE OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONSIDERING:

> CASE NO. 6667 Order No. R-6136

APPLICATION OF EXXON CORPORATION FOR AN UNORTHODOX WELL LOCATION AND SIMULTANEOUS DEDICATION, LEA COUNTY, NEW MEXICO.

ORDER OF THE DIVISION

BY THE DIVISION:

This cause came on for hearing at 9 a.m. on September 19, 1979, at Santa Fe, New Mexico, before Examiner Daniel S. Nutter.

NOW, on this 10th day of October, 1979, the Division Director, 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 Division has jurisdiction of this cause and the subject matter thereof.

(2) That the applicant, Exxon Corporation, seeks authority to simultaneously dedicate a 320-acre non-standard gas proration unit comprising the W/2 of Section 10, Township 21 South, Range 36 East, NMPM, to its A. J. Adkins Com Well No. 1, located in Unit L and to its Well No. 2, recently drilled at an unorthodox location 1650 feet from the North line and 1650 feet from the West line of said Section 10.

(3) That the entire non-standard proration unit may reasonably be presumed productive of gas from the Eumont Gas Pool and that the entire non-standard gas proration unit can be efficiently and economically drained and developed by the aforesaid two wells.

(4) That approval of the subject application will afford the applicant the opportunity to produce his just and equitable share of the gas in the Eumont Gas Pool, will prevent the economic loss caused by the drilling of unnecessary wells, -2-Case No. 6667 Order No. R-6136

avoid the augmentation of risk arising from the drilling of an excessive number of wells, and will otherwise prevent waste and protect correlative rights.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:

(1) That Exxon Corporation is hereby authorized to simultaneously dedicate a 320-acre non-standard gas protation unit in the Eumont Gas Pool comprising the W/2 of Section 10, Township 21 South, Range 36 East, NMPM, Lea County, New Mexico, to its A. J. Adkins Com Well No. 1, located in Unit L and its Well No. 2, at an unorthodox location 1650 feet from the North line and 1650 feet from the West line of said Section 10.

(2) That jurisdiction of this cause is retained for the entry of such further orders as the Division may deem necessary.

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

STATE OF NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION emo. JOE D. RAMEY Director

fd/

SEAL



INDEX J. K. LYTLE Direct Examination by Mr. Coffield Cross Examination by Mr. Nutter JOHN W. IRVING Direct Examination by Mr. Coffield Cross Examination by Mr. Nutter .11 ALTON EXHIBITS Applicant Exhibit One, Map Applicant Exhibit Two, Tabulation Applicant Exhibit Three, Log

MR. NUTTER: Call next Case Number 6667.
MR. PADILLA: Application of Exxon Corporation for a non-standard proration unit and an unorthodox
well location and simultaneous dedication, Lea County, New
Mexico.

MR. COFFIELD: Conrad Coffield with the Hinkle Law Firm, appearing on behalf of the applicant. I have two witnesses, one of whom has already been sworn and you have his qualifications, and the one witness has not been sworn.

(Witness sworn.)

J. K. LYTLE

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

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. COFFIELD:

Q.

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

My name is J. K. Lytle. I reside in Mid land, Texas. I work as an engineer for Exxon Company,
 U.S.A.

And haveyou previously testified before

SALLY WALTON BOYD CERTINGD SHORTKAND REPORTER 2020 Plaza Blance (201) 171-24(2 Blatta Pa, New Marilen 37701 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

ž

1 the Division as a petroleum engineer? 2 Yes, I have. A. 3 Were your qualifications made a matter 0. of record --4 5 Yes, they were. À. 8 -- and accepted by the Division? Q. 7 A. They were, 8 Q. Are you familiar with Exxon's application 9 in this case? 10 A. I am. 11 As well, are you familiar with the pro-Q. 12 perty and the well location? 13 A. Yes, sir. 14 MR. COFFIELD: Is the witness considered 15 qualified? 16 MR. NUTTER: Yes, he is. 17 Mr. Lytle, would you please state briefly Q. 18 what Exxon seeks by this application? 19 A. Exxon seeks approval of a 320-acre non-20 standard gas proration unit, comprising the west half of 21 Section 10, Township 21 South, Range 36 East, in the Eumont 22 Gas Pool, and the unit to be simultaneously dedicated to 23 its A. J. Adkins Community Well No. 1, located in Unit L, and to its Well No. 2 at an unorthodox location, which is 1650 feet from the north and west lines of Section 10.

Okay, Mr. Lytle, would you refer to what's Q. 2 been marked as Exhibit One and state what this represents? 3 A. Exhibit One is a map of an area that covers a portion of the Eumont Gas Field. It covers por-5 tions of Township 20 South and 21 South, and Range 36 East. The map was prepared to show the outline 7 of the 320-acre non-standard proration unit which is known 8 as the A. J. Adkins Community, which is the west half of 9 Section 10 of 21 South, 36 East. This unit is outlined in 10 yellow on the exhibit. 11 The well that has a red dot pasted over 12 it is the Adkins Community No. 2 Well, which has been re-13 cently drilled and completed by Exxon. There is one other 14 existing Eumont gas well on the proration unit. This is 15 the Adkins Community No. 1, which is colored in red. 16 There are a number of wells on this map 17 which are colored in red. This identifies the Eumont gas 18 completions on the area that's covered by the map. 19 Also there are some structural contours 20 but those will be referred to our geological witness. 21 One point or observation I would like to 22 make to the Commission about the number of red colored wells

make to the Commission about the number of red colored wells is that this shows that in a field where the standard gas proration unit is 640 acres, the Commission has previously recognized and permitted completions at a much greater

Y WALTON BOYD D SHORTHAND REPORTER B Banda (605) 411-3462

23

density than one well per 640 acres in the Eumont Gas Field. Q Let's go now to Exhibit Two, Mr. Lytle, and please discuss that exhibit.

A. Exhibit Two is a tabulation of both well and proration unit data for the A. J. Adkins Community Lease. The information shown on the top part of the exhibit is the well data for both of the wells that are now on the proration unit.

The A, J. Adkins Community No. 1 Well, which is located in Unit L, was spudded many years ago on April 22nd, 1936. It was initially completed in the Grayburg and subsequently plugged back for completion in the Eumont Gas Field, which occurred on October 30th, 1952. The initial rate at that time from the --

for the well was 1910 Mcf per day with a 3/4 inch choke, with a tubing pressure of230 psig.

Currently the well produces at the average rate which was recorded in June, 1979, of 586 Mcf per day. It is a marginal well on the 320-acre proration unit. The cumulative production from the well to date is 5.9 billion cubic feet and the estimated ultimate recovery from the well is 6.94 billion cubic feet.

Going over to the data for the A. J. Adkins Community No. 2, this well is in an unorthodox location on the proration unit. It's located in Unit F, 1650 feet from

LY WALTON BOYD FED SHORTHIAND REPORTER Parts Blanca (506) 471-3443 Mar Pe, New Marico 57701 1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the north and west lines of Section 10.

1

2

3

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

WALTON BOY

It was spudded on July 3rd of this year and completed on July 24th in the Eumont Gas pay. The initial completion test was 931 Mcf per day through a 1/2 inch choke with a flowing tubing pressure of 140 psig. The well is not on production pending the approval of the Commission.

The estimated ultimate recovery for this well is 3.03 billion cubic feet.

Now going down to the proration unit data this shows that the proration unit consists of the west half of Section 10. There are 320 acres. It is a nonstandard proration unit and was authorized by Commission's Order NSP 974, which was dated October 31st, 1974.

The estimated recoverable gas in place for the 320-acre proration unit -- this is based on a volumetric calculation -- is 9.97 Bcf.

Q Mr. Lytle, were these two exhibits prepared by you or under your supervision?

Yes, sir.

A.

A.

Q Do you have anything else to offer in connection with either of these?

No, I believe not.

Q. In your opinion will the approval of this application by Exxon prevent waste, protect correlative

Page _____8

reservoir?

A.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

26

Yes, in my opinion it will.

rights as well as result in increased production from the

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

MR. NUTTER: Exxon Exhibits One and Two will be admitted in evidence.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. NUTTER:

Q. Mr. Lytle, you mentioned that the estimated recoverable gas in place under the 320 was 9.97 billion cubic feet of gas based on a volumetric calculation. Now what factors went into that volumetric calculation?

A. This is based on log data. It is based on the calculation of an average recovery per acre foot for the Eumont gas pay, and then applying an 80 percent recovery factor to that as being recoverable gas. And then applying the estimated acre feet of pay under the subject proration unit.

Q. How did you obtain the estimated acts feet of pay under the proration unit?

A. This is based on the log estimation of net pay on the 320 acres. It was the Adkins Community No.
2 Well.

LLY WALTON BOYD Fred shorthand rehorter Plaza Blance (1913) 471-3462 246 75, New Meridon 17741

| 1 0 Just based on that one well. 2 A Yes, sir. 3 0 You did say that that well has extended 4 over the 320. A Yes, sir. 5 A Yes, sir. 0 Now, you've also got an estimated ultimate 7 0 Now, you've also got an estimated ultimate recovery of 6.94 Bcf for the Adkins Com 1 and 3.03 Bcf for 8 the Adkins Com 2. Those obviously add up to the estimated total recoverable gas under the proration unit. How did 9 you separate that 9.97 into two figures, then? A Well, the ultimate recovery for the existing well, the Adkins Com No. 1, is based on the cumulative production of 5.9 Bcf plus estimated remaining reserves based on a decline curve analysis, of the declinify trend of that well. 18 Q So you took its actual production curve and took it down to some economic limit and determined it's going to produce 6.94 billion? 19 A Yes, sir, and then the difference is the amount of gas that is attributable to the new well. 11 MR. NUTTER: Are there any other questions of Mr. Lytle? He may be excused. | | | Page7 |
|--|----------------------------------|-----|--|
| Vou did say that that well has extended over the 320. A Yes, sir. Q Now, you've also got an estimated ultimate recovery of 6.94 Bcf for the Adkins Com 1 and 3.03 Bcf for the Adkins Com 2. Those obviously add up to the estimated total recoverable gas under the proration unit. How did you separate that 9.97 into two figures, then? A Well, the ultimate recovery for the existing well, the Adkins Com No. 1, is based on the cumula- tive production of 5.9 Bcf plus estimated remaining reserves based on a decline curve analysis, of the declining trend of that well. Q So you took its actual production curve and took it down to some economic limit and determined it's going to produce 6.94 billion? A Yes, sir, and then the difference is the amount of gas that is attributable to the new well. MR. NUTTER: Are there any other questions of Mr. Lytle? He may be excused. | | 1 | Q. Just based on that one well. |
| Not did sky that that well has extended over the 320. A Yes, sir. Q Now, you've also got an estimated ultimate recovery of 6.94 Bcf for the Adkins Com 1 and 3.03 Bcf for the Adkins Com 2. Those obviously add up to the estimated total recoverable gas under the proration unit. How did you separate that 9.97 into two figures, then? N Well, the ultimate recovery for the existing well, the Adkins Com No. 1, is based on the cumulative production of 5.9 Bcf plus estimated remaining reserves based on a decline curve analysis, of the declining trend of that well. Q So you took its actual production curve and took it down to some economic limit and determined it's going to produce 6.94 billion? A Yes, sir, and then the difference is the amount of gas that is attributable to the new well. MR. NUTTER: Are there any other questions of Mr. Lytle? He may be excused. | | 2 | A. Yes, sir. |
| 5 A. Yes, sir. 6 Now, you've also got an estimated ultimate recovery of 6.94 Bcf for the Adkins Com 1 and 3.03 Bcf for the Adkins Com 2. Those obviously add up to the estimated total recoverable gas under the proration unit. How did you separate that 9.97 into two figures, then? 10 Nell, the ultimate recovery for the existing well, the Adkins Com No. 1, is based on the cumulative production of 5.9 Bcf plus estimated remaining reserves based on a decline curve analysis, of the declining trend of that well. 16 Q. So you took its actual production curve and took it down to some economic limit and determined it's going to produce 6.94 billion? 17 Nes, sir, and then the difference is the amount of gas that is attributable to the new well. 17 MR. NUTTER: Are there any other questions of Mr. Lytle? He may be excused. | | 3 | Q. You did say that that well has extended |
| Now, you've also got an estimated ultimate 0 Now, you've also got an estimated ultimate recovery of 6.94 Bcf for the Adkins Com 1 and 3.03 Bcf for the Adkins Com 2. Those obviously add up to the estimated total recoverable gas under the proration unit. How did you separate that 9.97 into two figures, then? 10 you separate that 9.97 into two figures, then? 11 A Well, the ultimate recovery for the existing well, the Adkins Com No. 1, is based on the cumulative production of 5.9 Bcf plus estimated remaining reserves based on a decline curve analysis, of the declining trend of that well. 0 So you took its actual production curve and took it down to some economic limit and determined it's going to produce 6.94 billion? A Yes, sir, and then the difference is the amount of gas that is attributable to the new well. MR. NUTER: Are there any other questions of Mr. Lytle? He may be excused. | | 4 | over the 320. |
| Now, you we also got an estimated ultimate recovery of 6.94 Bcf for the Adkins Com 1 and 3.03 Bcf for the Adkins Com 2. Those obviously add up to the estimated total recoverable gas under the proration unit. How did you separate that 9.97 into two figures, then? Nell, the ultimate recovery for the existing well, the Adkins Com No. 1, is based on the cumulative production of 5.9 Bcf plus estimated remaining reserves based on a decline curve analysis, of the declining trend of that well. So you took its actual production curve and took it down to some economic limit and determined it's going to produce 6.94 billion? A Yes, sir, and then the difference is the amount of gas that is attributable to the new well. MR. NUTTER: Are there any other questions of Mr. Lytle? He may be excused. | | 5 | A. Yes, sir. |
| The overly of or off ber her her her and a determined it's going to produce 6.94 billion? A Yes, sir, and then the difference is the amount of gas that is attributable to the new well. A Yes, Sir, and then the difference is the amount of gas that is attributable to the new well. | .* | . 6 | Q. Now, you've also got an estimated ultimate |
| and that is out it into control of the provision unit. How did you separate that 9.97 into two figures, then? A Well, the ultimate recovery for the existing well, the Adkins Com No. 1, is based on the cumulative production of 5.9 Bcf plus estimated remaining reserves based on a decline curve analysis, of the declining trend of that well. Q So you took its actual production curve and took it down to some economic limit and determined it's going to produce 6.94 billion? A Yes, sir, and then the difference is the amount of gas that is attributable to the new well. MR. NUTTER: Are there any other questions of Mr. Lytle? He may be excused. | | 7 | recovery of 6.94 Bcf for the Adkins Com 1 and 3.03 Bcf for |
| you separate that 9.97 into two figures, then? A Well, the ultimate recovery for the existing well, the Adkins Com No. 1, is based on the cumula- tive production of 5.9 Bcf plus estimated remaining reserves based on a decline curve analysis, of the declining trend of that well. 6 Q So you took its actual production curve and took it down to some economic limit and determined it's going to produce 6.94 billion? 10 A Yes, sir, and then the difference is the amount of gas that is attributable to the new well. 11 MR. NUTTER: Are there any other questions 12 of Mr. Lytle? He may be excused. | | 8 | the Adkins Com 2. Those obviously add up to the estimated |
| A Well, the ultimate recovery for the existing well, the Adkins Com No. 1, is based on the cumulative production of 5.9 Bcf plus estimated remaining reserves based on a decline curve analysis, of the declining trend of that well. Q So you took its actual production curve and took it down to some economic limit and determined it's going to produce 6.94 billion? A Yes, sir, and then the difference is the amount of gas that is attributable to the new well. MR. NUTTER: Are there any other questions of Mr. Lytle? He may be excused. | | 9 | total recoverable gas under the proration unit. How did |
| weil, the ultimate recovery for the existing well, the Adkins Com No. 1, is based on the cumulative production of 5.9 Bcf plus estimated remaining reserves based on a decline curve analysis, of the declining trend of that well. Q So you took its actual production curve and took it down to some economic limit and determined it's going to produce 6.94 billion? A Yes, sir, and then the difference is the amount of gas that is attributable to the new well. MR. NUTTER: Are there any other questions of Mr. Lytle? He may be excused. | OYD ONTER ONTER Distant | 10 | you separate that 9.97 into two figures, then? |
| 13 13 14 15 14 15 16 16 16 17 18 18 19 10 10 10 11 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 18 19 10 10 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 18 19 10 10 11 12 14 15 16 17 18 18 19 10 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 18 19 10 10 11 12 14 15 16 17 18 18 19 10 10 11 12 14 15 16 17 18 18 19 10 11 12 14 15 16 17 18 19 10 11 12 14 15 16 17 18 19 10 11 12 14 15 16 17 18 19 10 10 11 12 14 14 15 16 17 18 19 10 11 11 12 14 14 15 16 17 18 18 19 19 10 10 11 12 14 14 15 16 17 18 18 19 19 10 10 11 12 14 14 15 16 16 17 18 19 10 10 11 12 14 14 14 15 16 < | | 11 | A. Well, the ultimate recovery for the |
| based on a decline curve analysis, of the declining trend of that well. Q So you took its actual production curve and took it down to some economic limit and determined it's going to produce 6.94 billion? A Yes, sir, and then the difference is the amount of gas that is attributable to the new well. MR. NUTTER: Are there any other questions of Mr. Lytle? He may be excused. | | 12 | existing well, the Adkins Com No. 1, is based on the cumula- |
| based on a decirine curve analysis, of the decirining field of that well. 16 Q So you took its actual production curve 17 and took it down to some economic limit and determined it's going to produce 6.94 billion? 19 A Yes, sir, and then the difference is the 20 amount of gas that is attributable to the new well. 21 MR. NUTTER: Are there any other questions 22 of Mr. Lytle? He may be excused. | | 13 | tive production of 5.9 Bcf plus estimated remaining reserves |
| 16 Q So you took its actual production curve 17 and took it down to some economic limit and determined it's 18 going to produce 6.94 billion? 19 A Yes, sir, and then the difference is the 20 amount of gas that is attributable to the new well. 21 MR. NUTTER: Are there any other questions 22 of Mr. Lytle? He may be excused. 23 24 | 0 3 1 1 | 14 | based on a decline curve analysis, of the declining trend of |
| and took it down to some economic limit and determined it's going to produce 6.94 billion? A. Yes, sir, and then the difference is the amount of gas that is attributable to the new well. MR. NUTTER: Are there any other questions of Mr. Lytle? He may be excused. | | 15 | that well. |
| and took it down to some economic limit and determined it's going to produce 6.94 billion? 19 A. Yes, sir, and then the difference is the amount of gas that is attributable to the new well. 21 MR. NUTTER: Are there any other questions of Mr. Lytle? He may be excused. 23 | | 16 | Q So you took its actual production curve |
| going to produce 6.94 billion? 19 A. Yes, sir, and then the difference is the 20 amount of gas that is attributable to the new well. 21 MR. NUTTER: Are there any other questions 22 of Mr. Lytle? He may be excused. 23 | | 17 | and took it down to some economic limit and determined it's |
| A. Yes, sir, and then the difference is the amount of gas that is attributable to the new well. MR. NUTTER: Are there any other questions of Mr. Lytle? He may be excused. 23 24 | | 18 | going to produce 6.94 billion? |
| amount of gas that is attributable to the new well. MR. NUTTER: Are there any other questions of Mr. Lytle? He may be excused. 23 24 | | 19 | A. Yes, sir, and then the difference is the |
| MR. NUTTER: Are there any other questions of Mr. Lytle? He may be excused. 23 24 | | | amount of gas that is attributable to the new well. |
| of Mr. Lytle? He may be excused. 23 24 | | | MR. NUTTER: Are there any other questions |
| 24 | | | of Mr. Lytle? He may be excused. |
| | | | |
| 209 | | | |
| | | 25 | |

| | | | - |
|---------------------------------|----|-------------------|---|
| | 1 | | JOHN W. IRVING |
| | 2 | being called as a | a witness and having been previously sworn |
| | 3 | upon his oath, te | estified as follows, to-wit: |
| | 4 | | |
| | 5 | | DIRECT EXAMINATION |
| | 6 | BY MR. COFFIELD: | |
| | 7 | Q. | Mr. Irving, for the record in this case |
| | 8 | would you once ac | gain state your name, address, occupation, |
| | 9 | and employer? | |
| | 10 | А. | My name is John W. Irving, Midland, Texas. |
| | 11 | I'm a geologist w | with Exxon Company, U.S.A. |
| NALT NALT | 12 | Q. | You have already stated your qualifications |
| LLY V Triffed 8 Urlana 19 | 13 | and they have bee | en made a matter of record in a prior case, |
| | 14 | and that they wer | e acceptable. |
| | 15 | | Are you also familiar with the application |
| | 16 | of Exxon in this | case? |
| | 17 | A. | Yes. |
| | 18 | <u>Q</u> . | And as well, the property and the proposed |
| | 19 | well location? | |
| | 20 | А. | Yes, I am. |
| | 21 | | MR. COFFIELD: Is the witness considered |
| | 22 | qualified? | |
| \sim | 23 | | MR. NUTTER: Yes, he is. |
| | 24 | Q. | (Mr. Coffield continuing.) Please refer |
| | 25 | to what we've alr | eady been discussing here, Mr. Irving, Ex- |

mental sections

.

10___

hibit One, and would you please explain the geological data shown on that exhibit?

A. Yes, sir. The contours on this Exhibit Number One are structure contours on top of the Yates formation, which is the -- defined as the top of the Eumont pay. The contour interval is 50 feet. The rate of dip shown -well, first, the contours show a northwest/southeast trending anticline with dip to the northeast of about 200 feet per mile. And over on the west side it gets up to about 250 feet per mile.

Exxon's Adkins Com proration unit is located at a position near the structural axis of this anticline and the Adkins Com No. 2 Well has been drilled at a position at the -- at an optimum place on the proration unit coinciding with the structural position, also taking into consideration the possible drainage area of other wells.

Q All right. Let's go on to what we've marked as Exhibit Three, Mr. Irving, and please explain that exhibit.

A. Exhibit Three is what we refer to as a type log. It's a portion of the wire line log run on Humble Oil and Refining Company Knox No. 6 Well, located in Section 10, Township 21 South, Range 36 East, and that is -- that well is marked on Exhibit One over in the southeast quarter of Section 10, showing this tight log. This is a radio-

LY WALTON BOYD ED SHORTIAND REPORTER AND BALL (0.05) 411-4415 2 Now Mexico 411-4415 1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

activity log run by Lane Wells in 1954. 1 2 On the log we show the Yates, Seven Rivers, Upper Queen, Lower Queen, and Grayburg formations, and then 3 on the left side the Eumont Pool interval is indicated to 4 5 be from the top of the Yates to the top of the Grayburg. Q. Then in summary, Mr. Irving, would you say 7 that it is your professional opinion, then, that from a geological standpoint that the location which has been 8 selected here by Exxon is the best place to locate the well? 8 10 Α. Yes, sir, I ---11 Q. On this acreage? 12 I would. Ă. 13 Was geological data on Exhibit One and 0 14 what we've marked as Exhibit Three prepared by you or under 15 your supervision? 16 A. Yes. 17 a And in your opinion will the approval of 18 the application of Exxon in this case prevent waste and 19 protect correlative rights and result in increased production 20 I believe it will. Α. 21 Q. From the proration spacing area? 22 MR. COFFIELD: Mr. Examiner, I move the 23 admission of Exhibit Three. 24 MR. NUTTER: Exxon Exhibit Three will be 25 admitted in evidence.

BY MR. NUTTER:

A.

2

3

5

G

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Q Mr. Irving, in preparing Exhibit Number Two, the structure map, I presume you looked at the logs on a number of wells in the area?

CROSS EXAMINATION

Yes, sir.

Q You heard Mr. Lytle testify that he had obtained his volumetric calculation of reserves on the west half of Section 10 by taking the net pay shown on the log of the Adkins No. 1 Well and applying that to the entire 320 acres. Did you observe, when you were looking at those logs in the vicinity of this area that the net pay under one well would extend uniformly throughout the 320-acre tract?

A. Let me explain a little bit about the
 vintage of the basic data that we had to work with. On
 these older wells we only had the gamma ray neutron curves.
 Q. Uh-huh.

A. Very difficult to determine net pays, especially in gas zones, from the neutron curve, so for that reason I believe the log on the Adkins Com 2, the more recent log, a density log and neutron combination, was run on that well, and that's the reason it was used to pick net pay. We feel that the net pay is more accurate on the more recent

Y WALTON BOYD D SHORTILWIND REPORTER

| | | Page 14 |
|--|----|--|
| $\overline{}$ | 1 | logs. |
| | 2 | Now, about all we get off of these old |
| | 3 | logs is correlations and from the later vintage log we can |
| na Maria Maria Maria Maria Maria Maria | 4 | go back then and make comparisons and come up with a range |
| | 5 | of porosity estimates from the older logs. |
| | 6 | Q Well, now, you've got quite a bit of relief |
| | 7 | insofar as the top of the pool is concerned here. Is there |
| | 8. | a variation in the thickness of the pay also? |
| | 9 | A. Yes, sir, there is. |
| OYD OATER 1445 | 10 | Q. Well, can we take the log of one well and |
| | 11 | assume the net pay from that and transfer it to the entire |
| | 12 | 320 and make an accurate calculation of volumetric reserves |
| | 13 | under the 320? |
| | 14 | A. In a local area like this where we have |
| | 15 | the other well controls for guidance, the old neutron logs, |
| e de la | 16 | I believe that we can. I wouldn't want to take a well |
| | 17 | several miles away, even a couple of miles away, because |
| | 18 | there is some variation throughout the reservoir in net pay. |
| | 19 | Q. But you say in a local region you can. |
| | 20 | A. I think within a square mile. |
| | 21 | Q. Within a mile? |
| | 22 | A. Yes, sir. |
| \mathbf{O} | 23 | Q. And your unit here is a unit one mile long |
| | 24 | and half a mile wide? |
| | 25 | A Yes, sir. |
| ★ A set of the set | | |

•



REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

.11

I, SALLY W. BOYD, a court reporter, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing and attached Transcript of Hearing before the Oil Conservation Division was reported by me; that the said transcript is a full, true, and correct record of the hearing, prepared by me to the best of my ability from my notes taken at the time of the hearing.

Why W. Boya, C.S.R.

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a complete record of the proceedings in the Examiner hearing of Case No. 467. heard by me on 919 79. , Examiner Oil Conservation Division



| | | 4 . | | | | Page | 2 |
|---|---|-----|---------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | | r eg e | |
| | | 1 | | | INDE | X | |
| | | 2 | | | | | |
| | | 3 | J. K. LYT | LE | | | |
| | | 4 | | Direct I | Examination | by Mr. Coffiel | .đ 3 |
| | | 5 | | | | by Mr. Nutter | 8 |
| | | 6 | | | | | -** |
| · · · | | 7 | | DUTNO | | | |
| | | | JOHN W. I | | | | |
| - | | 8 | | | | by Mr. Coffiel | .d 10 |
| - - - | | ¢, | | Cross Ex | kamination | by Mr. Nutter | 13 |
| . <u>4</u> . | | 10 | | | | | |
| | | 11 | | an an Anna an Anna An Anna Anna Anna Ann | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | |
| | VAL'T New 1 | 12 | | | | | |
| | | 13 | | | EXHIB | ITS | |
| | SA See See | 14 | | | | an a | |
| a international Antonio ^{ter} national E | | 15 | Applicant | Exhibit | One, Map | | 5 |
| | | 16 | | | Two, Tabula | ation | с · |
| | 2 | 17 | | | | | ð |
| | | 18 | Applicant | EXHIDIT | Three, Log | · · · . | 11 |
| | | | | | | | |
| | • | 19 | | · · · | • | | |
| | | 20 | | | | | |
| | | 21 | | | | | |
| | • | 22 | | | | | |
| | | 23 | | | | | |
| | | 24 | | | | | • · · · · · |
| en an | | 25 | · · | | | | |
| | 1000 1000 1000 | | | | | | |
| مادر و در برد بیشند و مع | an the second | | and a state of the state of the state | | | | |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | 1 | | | an a | n e Maria (Constantino Carpa), e | ander in der son stationen aus der einen der einen einen einen einen einen son der einen einen einen der einen Ter einen e | n an an ann an an Arailtean I |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | • | | |
| | | | | | | | |

MR. NUTTER: Call next Case Number 6667. MR. PADILLA: Application of Exxon Corporation for a non-standard proration unit and an unorthodox well location and simultaneous dedication, Lea County, New Mexico.

MR. COFFIELD: Conrad Coffield with the Hinkle Law Firm, appearing on behalf of the applicant, I have two witnesses, one of whom has already been sworn and you have his qualifications, and the one witness has not been sworn.

(Witness sworn.)

J. K. LYTLE

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

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. COFFIELD:

Q.

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

 A. My name is J. K. Lytle. I reside in Midland, Texas. I work as an engineer for Exxon Company,
 U.S.A.

And haveyou previously testified before

SALLY WALTON BO CENTIPED SHONTIAND REPOR 011 Fland Blanca (1915) 471-Bania Pe, New Maxdoo 871 2

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

| | | Page4 | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|----------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | 1 | the Division as a petroleum engineer? | | | | | | |
| | 2 | λ. Yes, I have. | | | | | | |
| | 3 | Q Were your qualifications made a matter | | | | | | |
| | 4 | of record | | | | | | |
| | 5 | A. Yes, they were. | | | | | | |
| | 6 | Q and accepted by the Division? | | | | | | |
| | 7 | Λ. They were. | | | | | | |
| | 8 | Q. Are you familiar with Exxon's application | | | | | | |
| | 9 | in this case? | | | | | | |
| BOYD PONTEN 71-1461 | 10 | A. Iam. | | | | | | |
| L'TON I Thiand ne maileo | 11 | Q. As well, are you familiar with the pro- | | | | | | |
| WAL Bhuan "New | 12 | perty and the well location? | | | | | | |
| ALLY Service Service | 13 | A. Yes sir. | | | | | | |
| 47 B | 14 | MR. COFFIELD: Is the witness considered | | | | | | |
| | 15 | qualified? | | | | | | |
| | 16 | MR. NUTTER: Yes, he is. | | | | | | |
| | 17 | Q. Mr. Lytle, would you please state briefly | | | | | | |
| | 18 19 | what Exxon seeks by this application? | | | | | | |
| | 20 | A. Exxon seeks approval of a 320-acre non- | | | | | | |
| | 21 | standard gas proration unit, comprising the west half of | | | | | | |
| | 22 | Section 10, Township 21 South, Range 36 East, in the Eumont | | | | | | |
| | 23 | Gas Pool, and the unit to be simultaneously dedicated to | | | | | | |
| | 24 | its A. J. Adkins Community Well No. 1, located in Unit L, | | | | | | |
| | 25 | and to its Well No. 2 at an unorthodox location, which is | | | | | | |
| | | 1650 feet from the north and west lines of Section 10. | | | | | | |
| | 51 | | | | | | | |

A Okay, Mr. Lytle, would you refer to what's been marked as Exhibit One and state what this represents? A Exhibit One is a map of an area that covers a portion of the Eumont Gas Field. It covers portions of Township 20 South and 21 South, and Range 36 East. The map was prepared to show the outline of the 320-acre non-standard proration unit which is known as the A. J. Adkins Community, which is the west half of Section 10 of 21 South, 36 East. This unit is outlined in yellow on the exhibit.

The well that has a red dot pasted over it is the Adkins Community No. 2 Well, which has been recently drilled and completed by Exxon. There is one other existing Eumont gas well on the proration unit. This is the Adkins Community No. 1, which is colored in red.

There are a number of wells on this map which are colored in red. This identifies the Eumont gas completions on the area that's covered by the map.

Also there are some structural contours but those will be referred to our geological witness.

One point or observation I would like to make to the Commission about the number of red colored wells is that this shows that in a field where the standard gas proration unit is 640 acres, the Commission has previously recognized and permitted completions at a much greater

SALLY WALTON BOYD CENTFED SHORTIAND REPORTER 2020 Place Blader (205) 711-3462 Santa Po, New Maxico 67301 1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

A. Exhibit Two is a tabulation of both well and proration unit data for the A. J. Adkins Community Lease. The information shown on the top part of the exhibit is the well data for both of the wells that are now on the proration unit.

The A. J. Adkins Community No. 1 Well, which is located in Unit L, was spudded many years ago on April 22nd, 1936. It was initially completed in the Grayburg and subsequently plugged back for completion in the Eumont Gas Field, which occurred on October 30th, 1952.

The initial rate at that time from the --for the well was 1910 Mcf per day with a 3/4 inch choke, with a tubing pressure of230 psig.

Currently the well produces at the average rate which was recorded in June, 1979, of 586 Mcf per day. It is a marginal well on the 320-acre proration unit. The cumulative production from the well to date is 5.9 billion cubic feet and the estimated ultimate recovery from the well is 6.94 billion cubic feet.

Going over to the data for the A. J. Adkins Community No. 2, this well is in an unorthodox location on the promation unit. It's located in Unit F, 1650 feet from

Y V/AL'TON BOYD 0 \$1:00T1-XND REPORTER 2 Blance (195) 111-14151 Pe, New Marioo 1791 1

2

3

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

18

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the north and west lines of Section 10.

2

5

7

R

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

It was spudded on July 3rd of this year and completed on July 24th in the Eumont Gas pay. The initial completion test was 931 Mcf per day through a 1/2 inch choke with a flowing tubing pressure of 140 psig. The well is not on production pending the approval of the Commission.

The estimated ultimate recovery for this well is 3.03 billion cubic feet.

Now going down to the proration unit data this shows that the proration unit consists of the west half of Section 10. There are 320 acres. It is a nonstandard proration unit and was authorized by Commission's Order NSP 974, which was dated October 31st, 1974.

The estimated recoverable gas in place for the 320-acre proration unit -- this is based on a volumetric calculation -- is 9.97 Bcf.

Q Mr. Lytle, were these two exhibits prepared by you or under your supervision?

Yes, sir.

A.

A.

Q Do you have anything else to offer in connection with either of these?

No, I believe not.

Q In your opinion will the approval of this application by Exxon prevent waste, protect correlative

rights as well as result in increased production from the reservoir?

Yes, in my opinion it will.

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

MR. NUTTER: Exxon Exhibits One and Two will be admitted in evidence.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. NUTTER:

Α.

Q. Mr. Lytle, you mentioned that the estimated recoverable gas in place under the 320 was 9.97 billion cubic feet of gas based on a volumetric calculation. Now what factors went into that volumetric calculation?

A. This is based on log data. It is based on the calculation of an average recovery per acre foot for the Eumont gas pay, and then applying an 80 percent recovery factor to that as being recoverable gas. And then applying the estimated acre feet of pay under the subject proration unit.

Q How did you obtain the estimated acre feet of pay under the proration unit?

A. This is based on the log estimation of net pay on the 320 acres. It was the Adkins Community No.
2 Well.

SALLY WALTON BOYD CENTERED BHONTKAND REPONTER 010 Phate Bandar (501) 411-442 Banda Pa, New Mardon 11301 1

2

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Ω Just based on that one well. 2 Α. Yes, sir. 3 You did say that that well has extended Ũ 4 over the 320. 5 Yes, sir. Λ. Now, you've also got an estimated ultimate Q. 7 recovery of 6.94 Bcf for the Adkins Com 1 and 3.03 Bcf for 8 the Adkins Com 2. Those obviously add up to the estimated 9 total recoverable gas under the proration unit. How did 10 you separate that 9.97 into two figures, then? 11 Well, the ultimate recovery for the Α. 12 existing well, the Adkins Com No. 1, is based on the cumula-13 tive production of 5.9 Bcf plus estimated remaining reserves 14 based on a decline curve analysis, of the declining trend of 15 that well. 16 So you took its actual production curve Q. 17 and took it down to some economic limit and determined it's 18 going to produce 6.94 billion? 19

A. Yes, sir, and then the difference is the
 amount of gas that is attributable to the new well.
 MR. NUTTER: Are there any other questions

of Mr. Lytle? He may be excused.

Y WALTON BOYD (D SHORTHAND REPORTER (ID SHORA (101) 111-1163 (IN BANDA (101) 111-1163 (IN 100) 111-1163

20

21

22

23

| | | | Page10 |
|--------------|-------------------------|------|---|
| $\widehat{}$ | | 1 | JOHN W. IRVING |
| | | 2 | being called as a witness and having been previously sworn |
| | | 3 | upon his oath, testified as follows, to-wit: |
| | | 4 | |
| | | 5 | DIRECT EXAMINATION |
| | | 6 | BY MR. COFFIELD: |
| | | 7 | 0 Mr. Irving, for the record in this case |
| | - | 8 | would you once again state your name, address, occupation, |
| | | . 9 | and employer? |
| | 0 2 3 | 10 | |
| | H BO | 11 | A. My name is John W. Irving, Midland, Texas. |
| Ś | LTON MILTON | - 12 | I'm a geologist with Exxon Company, U.S.A. |
| | V VA | 13 | Q. You have already stated your qualifications |
| | SALL CENTRU Banky | 14 | and they have been made a matter of record in a prior case, |
| | | 15 | and that they were acceptable. |
| | | | Are you also familiar with the application |
| | | 16 | of Exxon in this case? |
| | | 17 | A. Yes. |
| | | 18 | Q. And as well, the property and the proposed |
| | | 19 | well location? |
| | | 20 | A. Yes, I am. |
| | | 21 | MR. COFFIELD: Is the witness considered |
| | · · · · · | 22 | qualified? |
| 0 | | 23 | MR. NUTTER: Yes, he is. |
| | | 24 | Q. (Mr. Coffield continuing.) Please refer |
| | | 25 | to what we've already been discussing here, Mr. Irving, Ex- |
| | | | |

hibit One, and would you please explain the geological data shown on that exhibit?

A Yes, sir. The contours on this Exhibit Number One are structure contours on top of the Yates formation, which is the --- defined as the top of the Eumont pay. The contour interval is 50 feet. The rate of dip shown -well, first, the contours show a northwest/southeast trending anticline with dip to the northeast of about 200 feet per mile. And over on the west side it gets up to about 250 feet per mile.

Exxon's Adkins Com proration unit is located at a position near the structural axis of this anticline and the Adkins Com No. 2 Well has been drilled at a position at the -- at an optimum place on the proration unit coinciding with the structural position, also taking into consideration the possible drainage area of other wells.

Q All right. Let's go on to what we've marked as Exhibit Three, Mr. Irving, and please explain that exhibit.

A. Exhibit Three is what we refer to as a type log. It's a portion of the wire line log run on Humble Oil and Refining Company Knox No. 6 Well, located in Section 10, Township 21 South, Range 36 East, and that is -- that well is marked on Exhibit One over in the southeast quarter of Section 10, showing this tight log. This is a radio-

LY WALTON BOYD PESSHONTHUND REPORTER Date Blunch (565) 411-3462 2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

activity log run by Lane Wells in 1954. On the log we show the Yates, Seven Rivers,

Upper Queen, Lower Queen, and Grayburg formations, and then on the left side the Eumont Pool Interval is indicated to be from the top of the Yates to the top of the Grayburg.

Q Then in summary, Mr. Irving, would you say that it is your professional opinion, then, that from a geological standpoint that the location which has been selected here by Exxon is the best place to locate the well?

Yes, sir, I ---

I would.

On this acreage?

(ALTON BOY KORTKAND REPORT BATTON (505) 471-94 Now Martico 5759 2

3

5

8

7

8

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

22

23

24

25

Q Was geological data on Exhibit One and what we've marked as Exhibit Three prepared by you or under your supervision?

16 Α. Yes. 17 And in your opinion will the approval of 0. 18 the application of Exxon in this case prevent waste and 19 protect correlative rights and result in increased production? 20 I believe it will. Α. 21 From the proration spacing area? Q,

MR. COFFIELD: Mr. Examiner, I move the

admission of Exhibit Three.

Α.

Q.

A

MR. NUTTER: Exxon Exhibit Three will be admitted in evidence.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. NUTTER:

A.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Q Mr. Irving, in preparing Exhibit Number Two, the structure map, I presume you looked at the logs on a number of wells in the area?

Yes, sir.

Q You heard Mr. Lytle testify that he had obtained his volumetric calculation of reserves on the west half of Section 10 by taking the net pay shown on the log of the Adkins No. 1 Well and applying that to the entire 320 acres. Did you observe, when you were looking at those logs in the vicinity of this area that the net pay under one well would extend uniformly throughout the 320-acre tract?

Let me explain a little bit about the
 vintage of the basic data that we had to work with. On
 these older wells we only had the gamma ray neutron curves.
 0. Uh-huh.

A Very difficult to determine net pays, especially in gas zones, from the neutron curve, so for that reason I believe the log on the Adkins Com 2, the more recent log, a density log and neutron combination, was run on that well, and that's the reason it was used to pick net pay. We feel that the net pay is more accurate on the more recent

LLY WALTON BOYD FIFED SHOATHAND REPORTER FILLA BLINGA (505) 411-3412 2014 Po. Novy Maridoo 81701

Page _____ 1.4___

logs.

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, about all we get off of these old logs is correlations and from the later vintage log we can go back then and make comparisons and come up with a range of porosity estimates from the older logs.

Q. Well, now, you've got quite a bit of relief insofar as the top of the pool is concerned here. Is there a variation in the thickness of the pay also?

A Yes, sir, there is.

Q Well, can we take the log of one well and assume the net pay from that and transfer it to the entire 320 and make an accurate calculation of volumetric reserves under the 320?

A In a local area like this where we have the other well controls for guidance, the old neutron logs, I believe that we can. I wouldn't want to take a well several miles away, even a couple of miles away, because there is some variation throughout the reservoir in net pay.

> But you say in a local region you can. I think within a square mile.

Within a mile?

Yes, sir.

Q.

Α.

0.

A.

Å.

Q. And your unit here is a unit one mile long and half a mile wide?

Yes, sir.

SALLY WALTON BOYD CERTIPLED SHORTHAND REPORTER 1050 Planta Bladea (645) 411-445 Banka PA, Now Moridoo 57361


REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

SALLY WALTON BOY

I, SALLY W. BOYD, a court reporter, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing and attached Transcript of Hearing before the Oil Conservation Division was reported by me; that the said transcript is a full, true, and correct record of the hearing, prepared by me to the best of my ability from my notes taken at the time of the hearing.

Sally W. Boyd, C.S.R.

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a complete record of the proceedings in the Examiner hearing of Case No. heard by me, on heard by meron Examiner Oil Conservation Division

EXXON, A. J. ADKINS COM. LSE. EUMONT GAS FIELD, LEA CO., N. M.

WELL DATA

| Lease Name & Well No. | A. J. Adkins Com. #1 | A. J. Adkins Com. #2 | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Location | Unit L, Sec. 10-21.S-36E | Unit F, Sec. 10-215-36E 1650' FNL & 1650' FWL | |
| Spud Date | April 22, 1936 | July 5, 1979 | |
| Completion Date in Eumont Gas Field | October 30, 1952 | July 24, 1979 | |
| Completion Interval | 3375' - 3475' | 3388* - 3565* | |
| Initial Rate | 1910 Mcf/D, 3/4" choke, TP-230 psig | 931 Mcf/D, 1/2" choke, TP-140 psig | |
| Current Rate | 586 Mcf/D (June, 1979) | •• | |
| Cumulative Production | 5.90 Bef | | |
| Estimated Ultimate Recovery | 6.94 Bcf | 3.03 Bcf | |
| | wear | Thoduction deling | |
| Description | w/2 Sec. 10-21S-36 | | |
| No. Acres | 320 | reverves for # 2 | |
| Authority | Order No. NSP-974 1 | Dated 10-31-74 | |
| Estimated Recoverable Gas in Pla | ace 9.97 Bcf based | in volumetric calculation reliable as # 1 log | |
| JKL:dt 9-13-79 | mol too | to deter net say | |
| | BEFORE EXA OIL CONSERV <u>EXXON</u> EXHIL CASE NO. 66 | MINER NUTTER Ation Division | |

1

EXXON, A. J. ADKINS COM. LSE. EUMONT GAS FIELD, LEA CO., N. M.

| W | EL | L | DÆ | LΤ | A |
|---|----|---|----|----|---|
| _ | | _ | _ | _ | |

| Lease Name & Well No. | A. J. Adkins Com. #1 | A. J. Adkins Com. #2 | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| Location | Unit L, Sec. 10-215-36E | Unit F, Sec. 10-21S-36E 1650' FNL & 1650' FWL | | |
| Spud Date | April 22, 1936 | July 5, 1979 | | |
| Completion Date in Eumont Gas Field | October 30, 1952 | July 24, 1979 | | |
| Completion Interval | 3375' - 3475' | 3388' - 3565' | | |
| Initial Rate | 1910 Mcf/D, 3/4" choke, TP-230 psig | 931 Mcf/D, 1/2" choke, TP-140 psig | | |
| Current Rate | 586 Mcf/D (June, 1979) | •• | | |
| Cumulative Production | 5.90 Bcf | • • • | | |
| Estimated Ultimate Recovery | 6.94 Bcf | 3.03 Bcf | | |

| PRORATION UNIT | DATA |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Description | w/2 Sec. 10-21S-36E |
| No. Acres | 320 |
| Authority | Order No. NSP-974 Dated 10-31-74 |
| Estimated Recoverable Gas in Place | 9.97 Bcf |

JKL:dt 9-13-79

BEFORE EXAMINER NUTTER OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION <u>EXXON</u> EXHIBIT NO. 2 CASE NO. 6667

EXON COMPANY, U.S.A. POST OFFICE BOX 1600 . MIDLAND, TEXAS 79702

PRODUCTION DEPARTMENT MIDCONTINENT DIVISION

August 16, 1979

Request Simultaneous Dedication of 320 Acre Proration Unit, W/2 Sec. 10 T-21-S, R-36-E. Lea County, New Mexico, to A. J. Adkins Wells Nos. 1 & 2 (No. 2 New Completion)

Mr. J. D. Ramey, Secretary Director ECEIVED Energy and Minerals Department Oil Conservation Commission P. O. Box 2088 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION SANTA FE

Case 66667

Dear Sir:

Exxon respectfully requests administrative approval of simultaneous dedication of 320 Acre non standard unit, consisting of W/2 Sec. 10, T+21-S, R-36-E, Lea County, NSP 1N. M., to A. J. Adkins Com, Well No. 1 & 2, with authority to produce from either in any proporation. Well No. 1 is located in Unit "L" and No. 2 is located in JUNIT "F", Sec. 10, T-21-S, R-36-E. A plat of the area is attached. 320

Current production:

A. J. Adkins Com, Well No. 1 is a marginal well and has averaged 16,660/MCF/Mo. through May, 1979.

A. J. Adkins Com, Well No. 2 (new completion) Flow Test 7-23-79, 930 MCF/D.

Your consideration of this request will be appreciated.

Yours very truly,

D. L. Clemmer, Unit Head Revenue & Regulatory Accounting

DFL/DLC/dc Attachment - plat

cc: OCC, Hobbs, N.M.

Set for hearing and Rotify Exxon NSL and NSP & simultuneous dedication

A DIVISION OF EXXON CORPORATION

4.9 RAMSON œ? GE/FUBRTH 0000000 Bell . Romsoy 3 siale 2 51.11 STANDARD PARL \$ 3 Arco Continental GUIF Cities Service "AO" B+4 €8 , •⁸ • 16 1 Sotion . Sinta Ma-Tex Supply El Poso Not. Gas cont'l .6 , 2 Gʻ. ø' ''' ۲ *****7 1018/7.B 10/1.7 T.O. 11050 Marra Pon American (a)⁶ • 3 •'0 • 24 € 4.1 612/2.4 134/.1 Stole · Wolloce Gulf 360/5.8 2 $(\mathbf{\bullet})$ 159/1.10 212/8.2 landa (1)^o Guir-Stole 230 - ^B ริบท فَ 218/3.8 134/3.7 ,2 21 • 6 lacksquare4.0 163/1.0 Nere Romsoy 413/12.4 Cities Service ••• .1 (•) 73/3.3 8 8<u>9</u> 12569 Gui Humble 16156 10 Gulf ●^{1 E"} Cont'! Arco PonAm Skelly-3 3.8 •2 • Z R B McQuot Pers 8-9. **O**₁₃ Beil - State • Two State Arche ia States et al Due: 2 378/3.0 ۲ 270/2. M.L. McQuotters Sunroy DX Continental (F) (¢) **(**¥) 1115/6.5 856/10.2 511/5.8 33/1.5 Verer Sincloir • ³ Ø 12 S W MO 40/3.4 13 Soli Knox 17 16 314 Continental 15 • 6^{D-1115} • 7 Sulf Gυ Cont'! "B-14" • 3.4 ±1-8 ¢ 2 ¥2, -/4.0 (*) 14/4 Pacific Nestern Con+1 8-14 • • 50/4.0 ● ŀC • 3 6 (*) 188/2. 8e dewater "E" • '0 (0) 1. ų. 805/3.4 Skelly Ċ @¹² **G** Ceno s 5 **(** State 510 1271/5.6 No/s H C Collins •⁹ 20 • ^ 60.1 22 can Humble 37722 2 •7 23 ٤_ •⁵ (C)³ A 0 Ġ 678/6.7 630/3.0

| Exxon Lise No. | NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION |
|----------------|---|
| 8'até Lse. No. | WELL LOCATION AND ACREAGE DEDICATION PLAT |

Form C-102 Supersedes C-128 Effective 1-1-65

| Operator Exxon | Corporation | | Leose A. J | . Adkins | Com. | Well No. # 2, |
|-----------------------|---|---|--|----------------|--|--|
| Unit Letter | Section | Township | Range | C | county | |
| F Actual Footoge L | IO location of Well; | 21-5 | | 6·E | Lea | |
| 1650 | feet from the | North line | and . 1650 | leet fr | om the West | line |
| Ground Level Ele | Producing | | Pool | · · · | | Dedicated Acreoger |
| | | Queen (Gas) icated to the subjec | | umont | | 320 |
| interest | and royalty). | | | | | thereof (both as to wo f all owne rs been co |
| dated by | commutitization | , unitization, force-p f answer is "yes," ty | ooling. etc? pe of consolidati | ion <u>Cem</u> | munitiz | |
| forced-po sion. | ooling, or otherwi | se)or until a non-star | | | • | nmunitization, unitize a approved by the Cor |
| | | mmmer | | | | CERTIFICATION |
| | E - F - F - F - F | 2. | | | H H Company | certify shat the information train is true and complete by knowledge and belief. ba Kniplic coration Specialist Exxon Corporation Hidland. Texas |
| | 1 | | | | | |
| | L | KTRU | J | | l I hereby | • |
| *[| | Kannana | J | | I I hereby shown on notes of under my is true | certify that the well lo this plat was platted from actual surveys mode by supervision, and that the |
| *[| | | J | | I I I hereby shown on nates of under my is true e knowledg Date Survey 5 | certify that the well lo this plat was plotted from actual surveys made by supervision, and that the and correct to the best e and belief. and - 9 - 79 |
| * | | | J | | I I I hereby shown on nates of under my is true e knowledg Date Survey 5 | certify that the well low this plat was plotted from actual surveys made by supervision, and that the and correct to the best a and belief. red - 9-79 Prolessional Engineer d Surveyor |

EXON COMPANY, U.S.A.

POST OFFICE BOX 1600 . MIDLAND, TEXAS 79702

PRODUCTION DEPARTMENT MIDCONTINENT DIVISION August 16, 1979

Request Simultaneous Dedication of 320 Acre Proration Unit, W/2 Sec. 10 T-21-S, R-36-E. Lea County, New Mexico, to A. J. Adkins Wells Nos. 1 & 2 (No. 2 New Completion)

Mr. J. D. Ramey, Secretary Director Energy and Minerals Department Oil Conservation Commission P. O. Box 2088 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

Dear Sir:

Case 666> ECEIVED AUG 3 1879 CONSERVATION DIVISION SANTA FE

Exxon respectfully requests administrative approval of simultaneous dedication of 320 Acre non standard unit, consisting of W/2 Sec. 10, T-21-S, R-36-E, Lea County, N. M., to A. J. Adkins Com, Well No. 1 & 2, with authority to produce from either in any proporation. Well No. 1 is located in Unit "L" and No. 2 is located in Unit "F", Sec. 10, T-21-S, R-36-E. A plat of the area is attached.

Current production:

A. J. Adkins Com, Well No. 1 is a marginal well and has averaged 16,660/MCF/Mo. through May, 1979.

A. J. Adkins Com, Well No. 2 (new completion) Flow Test 7-23-79, 930 MCF/D.

Your consideration of this request will be appreciated.

Yours very truly,

D L'Ulemmer

D. L. Clemmer, Unit Head Revenue & Regulatory Accounting

DFL/DLC/dc Attachment - plat

cc: OCC, Hobbs, N.M.

A DIVISION OF EXXON CORPORATION



| Exxo | NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION |
|----------------|---|
| Stars Les. No. | WELL LOCATION AND ACREAGE DEDICATION PLAT |

Ē.

2

~

3.50

Porm C-102 Supersedes C-128 Effective 1-1-65

| Operator Exxon Corporation | | Lease A. J. | Adkins Cor | n. | Well No. サン | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| Unit Letter | Section | Township | Range | County | | <u> </u> |
| F | 10 | 21.5 | 36 | FE L | ea | |
| Actual Footage Lo | callon of Well; | | | | | · · · |
| . 1650 | feet from the | North line a | nd 1650 | feet from the | West | line |
| Ground Level Elev. | Ground Level Elev: Producing Formation | | Pool | | Dedi | ated Acreage: |
| | | Queen (Gas) | EU | Lmont | | 320 A |
| 2. If more t | | ated to the subject dedicated to the w | | | | |
| dated by Yes If answer this form No allowa | No If a ''no;' list the if necessary.) ble will be assign | different ownership i unitization, forse-po unswer is "yes," type owners and tract de ned to the well until) or until a non-stand | oling. etc? e of consolidations escriptions which all interests have | on <u>Comm</u> h have actually 1 ve been consolid | peen consolidated. ated (by communit | ノロン (Use reverse side ization, unitizati |
| | | | <u>B I</u> | A | | TIFICATION |
| Ε. | i i | 3 | 1 | | I hambi cartify | that the information o |
| | | 3 | I | | | true and complete to |
| i E | 60 | 3 | 1 | | | ledge and belief. |
| E | 1 2 | | 1. | | | |
| | | . 3 | | | <u></u> | |
| E | | | | | Name | ار بالمرمي |
| | E | ្រស្ម | G | H | melta | Kniplin |
| 16. | 50' 11-2 | | ł | | Position | on Specialist |
| E | | 3 | 1 | | Į | |
| E | | 3 | i | | 11 | Corporation |
| IE | ~ | | Í | | Box 1600 Midl Date | and, Texas |
| E | | | t | • | 5-11- | 761 |
| Ē | i | | 1 | | | 1 |
| Ē | Li | ĸġ | J | | 11 | |
| E | ł | | - 1 | | I bereby certifi | that the well locat |
| E . | · • | 3 | | | | at was plotted from fi |
| E . ★ | . ! | | · I 1 | | notes of actual | surveys mode by me |
| E | ļ | | 1 | | under my superv | ision, and that the so |
| Ē | l | 3 | i i | · · · | is true and coi | rect to the best of |
| E | 1 | | i | | knowledge and b | eli el . |
| E | | | · | | 11 | |
| E | Ξł. | | Ĩ | · • | | |
| E - | 1 | | Ì | | Date Surveyed | |
| E | 1 | 1 | ĺ | | 5-9- | 79 |
| E | | 3 | i | | Registered Profess | |
| E | | | i | | and/or Land Surve | joe J |
| | ا سیسیسیسی | | 1 | | 74.8.1 | esterte |
| | | | | | Certificate No. | E. |
| 0 330 66 0 | 100 1320 1680 19 | 0 2810 2640 20 | T 1 | 000 000 | ' / | 382 |

≄ :-

OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION P. O. BOX 2088 SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO 87501

August 24, 1979

Mr. D. L. Clemmer, Unit Head Revenue & Regulatory Accounting Exxon Corporation Post Office Box 1600 Midland, Texas 79702

> Re: A. J. Adkins Com Wells Nos. 1 and 2 Section 10, T-21-S, R-36-E

Dear Mr. Clemmer:

We are in receipt of your application dated August 16, 1979, for approval of simultaneous dedication for the above captioned wells. We are unable to approve this administratively and are therefore setting it for the examiner hearing to be held on September 19, 1979. A copy of the docket of this hearing will be forwarded to you as soon as it is printed.

Yours very truly,

Florene Davidson Administrative Secretary

Page 2 Examiner Hearing - Wednesday - September 19, 1979 Docket No. 36-79 CASE 6658: Application of Texas Pacific 011 Company, Inc. for an unorthodox well location and a non-standard provation unit, Lea County, New Nexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks approval of a 160-acre non-standard gas proration unit comprising the S/2 NE/4 and N/2 SE/4 of Section 14, Township 24 South, Range 36 East, Jalmat Gas Pool, to be dedicated to its J. W. Cooper Well No. 8 at an unorthodox location 2010 feet from the North line and 2310 feet from the East line of said Section 14. CASE 6659: Application of Amoco Production Company for an exception to Order No. R-3221, Eddy County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks an exception to Order No. R-3221 to permit disposal of produced brine in several unlined surface pits located in Sections 27, 34 and 35, Township 18 South, Range 31 East. Application of B. & W. Oil Reclaiming for an oil treating plant permit, Eddy County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks authority for the construction and operation of an oil treating plant for the purpose of treating and reclaiming sediment oil at a site in the NE/4 NE/4 NE/4 CASE 6660: of Section 34, Township 18 South, Range 26 East. Application of LaRue and Muncy for an exception to R-111-A, Eddy County, New Mexico. CASE 6661: Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks an exception to the casing-cementing rules of Order R-111-A to permit a well to be drilled in Unit C of Section 22, Township 18 South, Range 30 Bast, Leo Queen-Grayburg Pool, to be cased by setting surface casing at the top of the salt, circulating cement on the oil string, and omitting the intermediate casing required by R-111-A; applicant further requests special rules to apply to all of Sections 15 and 22 of said township to permit additional wells to be completed in the same manner. CASE 6662: Application of Supron Energy Corporation for a dual completion and downhole commingling, Rio Arriba County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks approval for the dual completion of its Jicarilla "A" Well No. 22Y located in Unit K of Section 24, Township 26 North, Range 4 West, to produce gas from the Blanco Mesaverde Pool through tubing and to commingle and produce the Wildhorse Gallup and Basin-Dakota zones through a parallel tubing string. Application of Doyle Hartman for an unorthodox well location and approval of infill drilling, Lea CASE 6663: County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks a waiver of existing well spacing requirements and a finding that the drilling of a well at an unorthodox location 330 feet from the South line and 2310 feet from the West line of Section 36, Township 23 South, Range 36 East. Jalmat Gas Fool, is necessary to effectively and efficiently drain that portion of the existing proration unit which cannot be so drained by the existing well, CASE 6664: Application of Doyle Hartman for an unorthodox well location, two non-standard proration units and approval of infill drilling, Lea County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks approval of a 40-acre non-standard proration unit comprising the NW/4 SW/4 of Section 27, Township 25 South, Range 37 East, Jalmat Pool, to be dedicated to El Paso Natural Gas Company's Harrison Well No. 1, and also a 120-acre unit comprising the E/2 SW/4 and SW/4 SW/4 of said Section 27 to be dedicated to a well to be drilled at an unorthodox location 330 feet from the South and West lines of the section; applicant further seeks a waiver of existing well spacing requirements and a finding that the drilling of said well is necessary to effectively and efficiently drain that portion of an existing proration unit which cannot be so drained by the existing well. (Continued from September 5, 1979, Examiner Hearing) CASE 6647: Application of O. H. Berry for an unorthodox gas well location, Les County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks approval for the unorthodox location of a Seven Rivers well to be located 1650 feet from the North line and 330 feet from the East line of Section 15, Township 24 South, Range 36 East, Jalmat Gas Pool, the NE/4 of said Section 15 to be dedicated to the well. CASE 6665: Application of Amax Chemical Corporation for the amendment of Order No. R-111-A, Eddy County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks the amendment of Order No. R-111-A to extend the boundaries of the Potash-Oil Area by the inclusion of certain lands in Sections 22 and 23, Township 19 South, Range 29 East, and Section 19, Township 19 South, Range 30 East. CASE 6666: Application of Exxon Corporation for a non-standard proration unit, Eddy County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks approval of a 377.57-acre non-standard gas proration unit comprising Lots 1, 2, 3, and 4 and the N/2 N/2 of Section 36, Township 26 South, Range 25 East, and Lots 3 and 4 and the N/2 NW/4 of Section 31, Township 26 South, Range 26 East, to be dedicated to a Morrow test well to be located in Unit A of said Section 36. CASE 6667: Application of Exxon Corporation for a non-standard proration unit, an unorthodox well location, and

Application of Excon Corporation for a non-standard protation unit, an unit house well location, and simultaneous dedication, Lea County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks the approval of a 320-acre non-standard gas protation unit comprising the W/2 of Section 10, Township 21 South, Range 36 East, Eumont Pool, to be simultaneously dedicated to its A. J. Adkins Com Well No. 1 located in Unit L, and to its Well No. 2, at an unorthodox location 1650 feet from the North and West lines of said Section 10.

| · | |
|--------------------------|---|
| | |
| e an dia amin'ny fisiana | |
| DRAFT dr/ | STATE OF NEW MEXICO ENERGY AND MINERALS DEPARTMENT OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION |
| 2.1 | IN THE MATTER OF THE HEARING CALLED BY THE OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONSIDERING: CASE NO. <u>6667</u> |
| | Order No. R- <u>6/36</u> |
| | APPLICATION OF EXXON CORPORATION |
| | FOR A NON STANDARD PROMATION UNIT, AN UNORTHODOX WELL LOCATION AND SIMULTANEOUS DEDICATION, LEA COUNTY, NEW MEXICO. |
| | ORDER OF THE DIVISION |
| | BY THE DIVISION: |
| | This cause came on for hearing at 9 a.m. on <u>September 19</u> |
| | 19 79, at Santa Fe, New Mexico, before Examiner Daniel S. Nutter |
| | NOW, on this day of <u>Other</u> , 1979 the Division |
| | Director, 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 Division has jurisdiction of this cause and the subject |
| | matter thereof. |
| | (2) That the applicant, Exxon Corporation authority to Simultaneously dedkate a seeks approval of 320 - acre non-standard gas provation unit |
| | comprising the $\frac{W/2}{10}$ of Section $\frac{10}{10}$, Town- |
| | ship 21 South, Range 36 East , NMPM, to be dedicated to |
| | its A. J. Adkins Com Well No. 1 drilled , located in |
| | Unit L/ and to its Well No. 2, at an unorthodox location 1650 feet of x satd x sattant from the North line and 1650 feet from the West line of said Section 10. (3) That the entire non-standard proration unit may reasonably |
| | be presumed productive of gas from theEumont |
| | Gas Pool and that the entire non-standard gas proration unit can |
| | be efficiently and economically drained and developed by the |
| | foresaid wells. |
| | |
| | |

and:

(4) That approval of the subject application will afford the applicant the opportunity to produce his just and equitable share of the gas in the <u>Eumont</u> Gas Pool, will prevent the economic loss caused by the drilling of unnecessary wells, avoid the augmentation of risk arising from the drilling of an excessive number of wells, and will otherwise prevent waste and protect correlative rights.

-2-

dedicate . IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED: Excon Corporation is hereby anthorized to Simultaneoule (1) That = 320 - acre non-standard gas provation unit in the Eumont Gas Pool comprising the ₩/2 _of Section 10 , Township 21 South Range 36 East , NMPM, Lea County, New Mexico, liched and dedicated to its A. J. Adkins Com Well No. , located in Unit $^{\rm L}$ XOFXSARA and it Well No. 2, at an unorthodox location 1650 feet from the North Section 2 line and 1650 feet from the West line of said Section 10. (2)That jurisdiction of this cause is retained for the entry of such further orders as the Division may deem necessary. DONE at Santa Fe, New Mexico, on the day and year hereinabove designated.