CASE 6680: ROBERT C. ANDERSON FOR SUR-PACE CONSTRUCTING, SAN JUAN COUNTY, NEW NEXICO

Contraction and the state of the second s

CASE NO.

6680

APPlication, Transcripts, Small Exhibits,

ETC.



-		
		Page 2
	$\overline{}$	
	,	MR. STAMETS: We'll call next Case 6680.
	•	 ² MR. PADILLA: Application of Robert C. ³ Anderson for surface commingling, San Juan County, New Mexic
		MR. STAMETS: The Division has received
		⁵ a request to continue this case to the October 17th Examine:
		⁶ Hearing.
		7 It will be so continued.
		8
		9 (Hearing concluded.)
in an di <u>Animy Cas</u> alina. Sharifan ya kuta sa anayo ta	BOYD FPONTER 11-1411	10
		11
	A WAL	12
	SALL' SALL' bunk	13
		15
		16
		17
	· · ·	18
		19
		20
	•	21
	•	22
	O	23
		24 25
	- And Aller	
	an a	
		n senten in entre sin entre senten en senten en transformente de la construction de la factura de la construct La sentencia de la construction de l La sentencia de la construction de l

-

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS235-Filen

ALTON BO

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 home process the that the foregoing is a complete where of the proceedings in the Lxa, deer hearing of Case No. 6680 heard by me on 10=2 19. 79 Λ. au Examiner

Oll Conservation Division





1 MR. NUTTER: Call Case Number 6680. 2 MR. PADILLA: Application of Robert C. 3 Anderson for surface commingling, San Juan County, New 4 Mexico. MR. WEEMS: Mr. Examiner, Damon Weems, on 6 behalf of the applicant, and again I'll have the same wit-7 ness who has been sworn. MR. NUTTER: He is still under oath. MR. WEEMS: We will have two exhibits. Will his qualifications as an expert be accepted in this case? 12 MR. NUTTER: Yes, sir, he's qualified. ASHTON B. GEREN, JR. being called as a witness and having been previously sworn upon his oath, testified as follows, to-wit: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. WEEMS: Mr. Geren, are you familiar with the facts <u>Q</u> surrounding this application for surface commingling? Yes, sir. A. Did you prepare Exhibit One and Exhibit O. Two, or were they prepared under your supervision and direction?

5

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

A. They were both prepared under my supervision and direction.

1

2

3

5

8

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Would you describe for me, please, what Q. Exhibit One shows?

Exhibit One is our pipeline survey. A. It starts off there at Well No. 3, which is, oh, near the center of our gas well locations and proceeds south about 4-1/2 miles, and enters Southern Union Gas pipeline, and we intend to deliver gas into this low pressure line, oh, within a week or so. We have our contract signed and clearance from the tribe.

Two shows?

Q. Would you describe, please, what Exhibit

Exhibit Two has to do with asking for A. surface commingling, primarily to, well, to save expense because of our limited reservoir, which we know is fairly limited. And I plan to run all three of these wells through one dehydrator and production unit, which would be a considerable savings, and also to meter through one meter here and then we will have another meter at the Southern Union line, and also another dehydrator down there, which they will install.

And it would be easier to handle this -- any water that the wells might make by bringing it all to one central point and would certainly be less expensive to

operate this way. And the wells are all the same lease.
Q Is the ownership of all the interests in
these three wells identical?

Right.

A.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

NOL

Q Now, will there be topographical problems in disposing of water if this application is not granted?

A. Well, the No. 4 Well, which is the one that's on the extreme east, is in terrain such that it would be difficult to dispose of water in that area, and the same fairly well holds true of No. 1, and it would be -- well, cause less surface damage to bring all the water and fluids to one point.

Q Do you have a ballpark figure on the savings on equipment by granting this application?

A. Oh, I've already purchased one production dehydrator and I believe it's going to be around \$7500, so we'd be looking at a couple others that would be in that neighborhood plus installation, extra installation, and then of course, we'd be saving two pits which could be \$2000 or \$3000 each, and also a couple of meter runs that would be in the neighborhood of the same, probably \$2500 per meter run.

Q. How would you propose to establish the production capacity, capacity of production at any particular time, of the three wells?

1 A. Well, we have designed a manifold system where the wells could be periodically tested to prorate, you 2 know, the production from each well, and report on that 3 basis. 5 And would you describe just in detail how 0. 6 that might work? 7 A. Well, just to set up a valve in the mani-8 fold and we'd just shut off two of the other wells and run 9 the single well through the meter periodically, and whatever 10 the board might require, and then the gas could be prorated 11 on that basis. 12 In your opinion would the granting of Q. 13 this application be in the interest of conservation, pre-14 vention of waste, and the protection of correlative rights? 15 A. Yes, I do. 16 MR. WEEMS: I have no further questions. 17 18 CROSS EXAMINATION 19 BY MR. NUTTER: 20 Q. Well now, Mr. Geren, this production unit 21 is installed at the site of the No. 3 Well, is that correct? 22 A. Yes, sir. 23 And what does the production unit consist Q. 24 of besides the dehydrator? 25 It would be a three-phase production unit A,

	Page
	¹ and will separate any oil that might, you know, but
	2 Q. So you will be able to separate liquid
	3 hydrocarbons as well as water and gas?
	4 A. Yes, sir.
	5 Q. Uh-huh, and then you will have an Anderson-
-	6 operated meter at that site?
	7 A. Right.
	8 Q And then it goes into your flow line down
	9 to Southern Union's dehydrator
1	A. Through their dehydrator.
1	0 and then through a Southern Union
1	meter.
1	A. And they will pay us on the basis of their
1	Meter, and our meter will be a check meter and also we'll
1	⁵ report to the Commission based on these tests frequently.
1	6 Q. Now, you've got these three wells here.
1	7 Have these wells been tested, Mr. Geren?
1	8 A. Yes, sir.
1	9 Q. What is the range of productivity on these
2	vells?
2	A. Oh, the No. 4, I can't remember offhand;
2	that may be in our records, but I we're fairly close.
Z	We have fracted the No. 4 Well and I believe it tested about
24	4 1,800,000. That was the AOF, if I'm not mistaken.
2	And the others are in the neighborhood,

SALLY WALTON BOYD CENTIPED SHORTHAND REPORTER 3020 Plaza Blanca (505) 471-2462 Blanta Po, Now Mostico 57501

		Page8
	1	natural, of about 300,000, and they will probably be fracted
	2	later. Shutin pressure about 760.
	3	These are shallow wells, 20 to 300 feet.
	4	Q. This is west of where most of the Dakota
	5	production is occurring then, isn't it?
	6	A. Yes, sir. This is on the west side of the
	7	hogback and it's, you know, completely isolated from any of
	8	the other stuff.
	9	Q. Uh-huh. Now, will the wells have sufficient
30YI) Ponter 71-24-15	ĨŨ	pressure to flow through this production unit down to Southern
	11	Union's line without compression?
WALTON Bhated ((11) 2, New Mazia	12	A. Initially, and at the point where we re-
SALLY CENTIPIED 8 3938 Plana Po	13	quire it, we will put in compression.
	14	Q. But no compressors are necessary at this
	15	time?
	16	A. We feel like that it is not necessary with
	17	that kind of pressure in the and the wells indicate that
	18	they will certainly produce at that distance.
	19	Q. What pressure does that Southern Union line
	20	run?
	21	A. I think around 250, something in that range.
	22	Maybe a little bit below that. I'd say in the neighborhood
3	23	of 200.
	24	Q. 200 to 250? And you will be able to shut
	25	two wells in and obtain a productivity test on the third
***** Status the position in the second state of the second sta	an a	

•

÷

-			Page9
\sim	1	well by in to th	e pipeline?
	2	А.	Yes, sir.
	3	Q.	And ownership of all wells is identical
	4	throughout.	
	5	А.	Everything is the same. We own the sur-
	6	rounding acreage	, oh, around northeast and west.
•	7		MR. NUTTER: Are there any further questi
	8	of Mr. Geren?	He may be excused.
	9		Do you have anything further, Mr. Weems?
			MR. WEEMS: No, sir.
			MR. NUTTER: Does anyone have anything
		they wish to off	er in Case Number 6680?
		they wish to offe	
			We'll take the case under advisement.
	15		
	16		(Hearing concluded.)
	17		
	18		
	19		
	20		
	21		
	22		
	23	· · · ·	
	24		
	25		
محجد بالطور ومجانا	ne serietar estatue en des series, series 	Manda Sundara (normalistic single si	n en
	. •		

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, SALLY W. BOYD, a Court Reporter, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing and attached Transcript of the Hearing before the Oil Conservation Division was reported by me; that 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.F. Sally W. Boyd, C.S.R.

10

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a complete record of the proceedings in the Examiner licening of Case No. 6680 neard by he on 10/17 19. 79. , Examiner Oil Conservation Division

5 6 7 8 9 10 FIED SHORTHAND REPORTE! SALLY WALTON BOYI Nov Marico 171.4 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

1

1

2

3





1 MR. NUTTER: Call Case Number 6680. 2 MR. PADILLA: Application of Robert C. 3 Anderson for surface commingling, San Juan County, New Mexico. MR. WEEMS: Mr. Examiner, Damon Weems, on 6 behalf of the applicant, and again I'll have the same wit-7 ness who has been sworn. MR. NUTTER: He is still under oath. g MR. WEENS: We will have two exhibits. 10 Will his qualifications as an expert be accepted in this 11 case? 12 MR. NUTTER: Yes, sir, he's qualified. 13 14 ASHTON B. GEREN, JR. 15 being called as a witness and having been previously sworn 16 upon his oath, testified as follows, to-wit: 17 18 DIRECT EXAMINATION 19 BY MR. WEEMS: 20 Mr. Geren, are you familiar with the facts Q. 21 surrounding this application for surface commingling? 22 A. Yes, sir. 23 Did you prepare Exhibit One and Exhibit a 24 Two, or were they prepared under your supervision and 25 direction?

A. They were both prepared under my supervision and direction.

Q. Would you describe for me, please, what Exhibit One shows?

A. Exhibit One is our pipeline survey. It starts off there at Well No. 3, which is, oh, near the center of our gas well locations and proceeds south about 4-1/2 miles, and enters Southern Union Gas pipeline, and we intend to deliver gas into this low pressure line, oh, within a week or so. We have our contract signed and clearance from the tribe.

13 TWO

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Would you describe, please, what Exhibit Two shows?

A Exhibit Two has to do with asking for surface commingling, primarily to, well, to save expense because of our limited reservoir, which we know is fairly limited. And I plan to run all three of these wells through one dehydrator and production unit, which would be a considerable savings, and also to meter through one meter here and then we will have another meter at the Southern Union line, and also another dehydrator down there, which they will install.

And it would be easier to handle this -- any water that the wells might make by bringing it all to one central point and would certainly be less expensive to

CERTIFIED SHORTHAND F CERTIFIED SHORTHAND F 1938 Plants Blanta (201) Blanta Po, New Mexido operate this way. And the wells are all the same lease.
Is the ownership of all the interests in
these three wells identical?

A. Right.

Q Now, will there be topographical problems in disposing of water if this application is not granted?

A. Well, the No. 4 Well, which is the one that's on the extreme east, is in terrain such that it would be difficult to dispose of water in that area, and the same fairly well holds true of No. 1, and it would be -- well, cause less surface damage to bring all the water and fluids to one point.

Q. Do you have a ballpark figure on the savings on equipment by granting this application?

A Oh, I've already purchased one production dehydrator and I believe it's going to be around \$7500, so we'd be looking at a couple others that would be in that neighborhood plus installation, extra installation, and then of course, we'd be saving two pits which could be \$2000 or \$3000 each, and also a couple of meter runs that would be in the neighborhood of the same, probably \$2500 per meter run.

Q. How would you propose to establish the production capacity, capacity of production at any particular time, of the three wells?

LY WALTON BOYD NED SHORTHAND REPORTED NED SHORTHAND REPORTED NET BLINGA (606) 411-246 A FP. New Misidios 415-01 6

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

A Well, we have designed a manifold system where the wells could be periodically tested to prorate, you know, the production from each well, and report on that basis.

Q. And would you describe just in detail how that might work?

N. Well, just to set up a value in the manifold and we'd just shut off two of the other wells and run the single well through the meter periodically, and whatever the board might require, and then the gas could be prorated on that basis.

Q In your opinion would the granting of this application be in the interest of conservation, prevention of waste, and the protection of correlative rights?

Yes, I do.

MR. WEEMS: I have no further questions.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. NUTTER:

λ.

A.

Q Well now, Mr. Geren, this production unit
 is installed at the site of the No. 3 Well, is that correct?
 A. Yes, sir.
 Q And what does the production unit consist
 of besides the dehydrator?

It would be a three-phase production unit

LY WALTON BOYE TED SHORTHAND REPORTE AND REPORTE A PO, New Meridon 51701 1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	and will separate any oil that might, you know, but
2	Q So you will be able to separate liquid
3	hydrocarbons as well as water and gas?
4	A. Yes, sir.
5	Q. Uh-huh, and then you will have an Anderson-
6	operated meter at that site?
. 7	A. Right.
8	Q And then it goes into your flow line down
9	to Southern Union's dehydrator
10	A. Through their dehydrator.
11	9 and then through a Southern Union
12	meter.
13	A. And they will pay us on the basis of their
14	meter, and our meter will be a check meter and also we'll
15	report to the Commission based on these tests frequently.
16	Q Now, you've got these three wells here.
17	Have these wells been tested, Mr. Geren?
18	A. Yes, sir.
19	Q What is the range of productivity on these
20	wells?
21	A. Oh, the No. 4, I can't remember offhand;
22	that may be in our records, but I we're fairly close.
23	We have fracted the No. 4 Well and I believe it tested about
24	1,800,000. That was the AOF, if I'm not mistaken.
25	And the others are in the neighborhood,
1	

SALLY WALTON BOYD CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER 2020 Place Bandor (606) 171-3462 Banda Po, Now Marido 87801

)

ļ

1 natural, of about 300,000, and they will probably be fracted 2 later. Shutin pressure about 760. 3 These are shallow wells, 20 to 300 feet. Q This is west of where most of the Dakota 5 production is occurring then, isn't it? 6 A. Yes, sir. This is on the west side of the 7 hogback and it's, you know, completely isolated from any of 8 the other stuff. 9 Uh-huh. Now, will the wells have sufficient 0.1 10 pressure to flow through this production unit down to Southern 11 Union's line without compression? 12 Initially, and at the point where we re-A 13 quire it, we will put in compression. 14 Q. But no compressors are necessary at this 15 time? 16 We feel like that it is not necessary with A. 17 that kind of pressure in the -- and the wells indicate that 18 they will certainly produce at that distance. 19 What pressure does that Southern Union line Q. 20 run? 21 I think around 250, something in that range A. 22 Maybe a little bit below that. I'd say in the neighborhood 23 of 200. 24 200 to 250? And you will be able to shut Q. 25

two wells in and obtain a productivity test on the third

Y WALTON BOYD ED SHUNTHAND REPORTER IN BIRDOA (645) 471-3445 Po, Now Marico 37501

	1	well by in to the pipeline?						
-	2	A. Yes, sir.						
	3	Q And ownership of all wells is identical						
-	4	throughout.						
	5	A. Everything is the same. We own the sur-						
-	6	rounding acreage, oh, around northeast and west.						
	7	MR. NUTTER: Are there any further question						
	8	of Mr. Geren? He may be excused. Do you have anything further, Mr. Weems?						
	9							
	10	MR. WEEMS: No, sir.						
N BOYD D REPORTER () 471-946 doo 87101	11	MR. NUTTER: Does anyone have anything						
ALTON MTHAND 1 MATHAND 1 Martin Mexico	12							
	13	they wish to offer in Case Number 6680?						
SALI CENTE CENTE Sent	14	We'll take the case under advisement.						
-	15							
	16	(Hearing concluded.)						
	17							
	18							
	19							
	20							
	21							
	22							
	23							
	24							
	25							
	4							
antiklikkin uniter an artes	n an	an a						
7								
		•						

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE I, SALLY W. BOYD, a Court Reporter, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing and attached Transcript of the Hearing before the Oil Conservation Division was reported by me; that 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 WALTON BO Sally W. Boyd, C.S.R. I do have an energy that the foregoing is en and the proceedings in a col the execution maring of Gasa No. 6683 heard by me on 10/17 _, Examiner Oil Conservation Division



STATE OF NEW MEXICO ENERGY AND MINERALS DEPARTMENT **OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION**

BRUCE KING LARRY KEHOE

November 6, 1979

POST OFFICE BOX 2088 STATE LAND OFFICE BUILDING BANTA FE, NEW MEXICO 87501 (505) 827-2434

Mr. Damon Weems Attorney at Law 2901 East 20th Farmington, New Mexico 87401

Applicant:

ORDER NO. R-6165

CASE NO.

Robert C. Anderson

6680

Dear Sir:

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

Re:

Pours very truly, JOE D. RAMEY Director

JDR/fd

Copy of order also sent to:

Hobbs OCD	x
Artesia OCD	X
Aztec OCD	X

Other

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. 6680 Order No. R-6165

APPLICATION OF ROBERT C. ANDERSON FOR SURFACE COMMINGLING, SAN JUAN COUNTY, NEW MEXICO.

ORDER OF THE DIVISION

BY THE DIVISION:

This cause came on for hearing at 9 a.m. on October 17, 1979, at Santa Fe, New Mexico, before Examiner Daniel S. Nutter.

NOW, on this <u>2nd</u> day of November, 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, Robert C. Anderson, is the operator of three Dakota gas wells in Section 14, Township 31 North, Range 16 West, NMPM, San Juan County, New Mexico, being his Ute Mountain Ute Wells Nos. 1, 3, and 4, located in Units L, F, and J, respectively.

(3) That said wells are approximately 5 miles removed from the nearest gas transmission line, and the operator of said wells proposes to install a gathering system and production unit, gather the gas from said wells and commingle it, and thence transport it to the transmission line through a three-inch flow line which he is constructing.

(4) That the ownership of all three wells is identical throughout.

-2-Case No. 6680 Order No. R-6165

(5) That the applicant proposes to determine the individual production from each well on the basis of periodic tests which would be conducted by shutting in two wells and metering the production from the third.

(6) That approval of the application will not cause waste nor impair correlative rights.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:

(1) That the applicant, Robert C. Anderson, is hereby authorized to commingle undesignated Dakota gas production from his Ute Mountain Ute Wells Nos. 1, 3, and 4, located in Units L, F, and J, respectively, of Section 14, Township 31 North, Range 16 West, NMPM, San Juan County, New Mexico.

(2) That the applicant shall install a production unit and orifice meter at his commingling point, and shall ascertain the productive capacity of each well into the pipeline every six months, and shall allocate production to each of the aforesaid wells on the basis of such tests.

(3) 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.



fd/

STATE OF NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION PIVISION DOE D. RAMEY Director

1980'f/s/ & 660 f/wl. Sec 14 T3IN RI6V We// #/ ine heater instalation of necessiry at this & MO. Compressor 1.300,000 mile T.A. Anderson Oil Properties Dakota commingle project San Juan County, New Mexico ine hunc (a) 200-25'0,000 2200-2300 feet weel loe ? Three well gathering manifold attached to production unit 1201 ŧ orfice meter Anderson oil company BEFORE EXAMINER NUTTER CASE NO. OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION EXHIBIT NO. 6680 00 000 Well #3 2310' f/n1 & w1. Sec.14 T31N R16W Steelweld model . Ho to pit oit to tak set on well #3 location ined !! r e later . production unit (coof 7,500) les -Gas a. of New Mex. dehydrator Line de hydradoe Well #4 NW & SEX Sec IA T JIN RIGW , Gas a of New Mex heater installation of live 1.8 MM ALST orfice meler ۶

1 STATE OF NEW MEXICO ENERGY AND MINERALS DEPARTMENT 2 Oil Conservation Division State Land Office Bldg. 3 Santa Fe, New Mexico 2 October 1979 4 EXAMINER HEARING 5 8 IN THE MATTER OF: 7 Application of Robert C. Anderson CASE 8 for surface commingling, San Juan 6680) County, New Mexico. 9 -----SALLY WALTON BOYD CENTIFIED SHONTHAND REPORTER 10 BEFORE: Richard L. Stamets 11 8 12 TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING 13 14 APPEARANCES 15 16 For the Oil Conservation Ernest L. Padilla, Esq. 17 Legal Counsel for the Division Division: State Land Office Bldg. 18 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87503 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

			Page	2
	\sim	1	MR. STAMETS: We'll call next Case	6680.
		2	2 MR. PADILLA: Application of Robert	с.
	•	3	3 Anderson for surface commingling, San Juan County, Ne	w Mexico.
	•	4	MR. STAMETS: The Division has rece	ived
		6	⁵ a request to continue this case to the October 17th E	xaminer
		6		
			It will be so continued.	
		8		"
		9 2 2 3 - 10		
	•			
	\sum			
	- - -			
		15		
		16		
	*	17		
		18		
		19		
		20		
		21		
		23		
		24		
	• .	25		
	^{n ten} Hall <mark>ing og han som e</mark> n som	د. مود به منتظر معتور بیزی در میرو زیرها ماند. در	د. در ام و ما استهام مصافر با استهامی با میچند میشود میشود با میشود میشود میشود میشود. می و میشود می با استان می و	una de l'anne a sant state
		a i		
n an an Anna An Anna Anna Anna Anna Anna Anna		<u>.</u>		·. · ·
te de la construcción de la constru Maria de la construcción de la const		1000 - 1000		

NOTES 12

Alter Park

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

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.

, Examiner

Oil Conservation Division

Page 2 of 6

Examiner Hearing - Wednesday - October 17, 1979

CASE 6680: (Continued from October 2, 1979, Examiner Hearing)

Application of Robert C. Anderson for surface commingling, San Juan County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks approval for the surface commingling of all production from his Ute Mountain Ute Lease, Wells Nos. 1, 3 and 4, located in Section 14, Township 31 North, Range 16 West.

CASE 6631: (Continued from August 22, 1979, Examiner Hearing)

Application of Reserve 0il, Inc. for downhole commingling, Lea County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks approval for the downhole commingling of Jalmat gas and Langlie Mattix oil production in the wellbore of its Cooper Jal Unit Well No. 149-306 located in Unit J of Section 18, Township 24 South, Range 37 East.

- CASE 6700: Application of Doyle Hartman for an unorthodox well location, a non-standard proration unit, and approval of infill drilling, Lea County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks approval of a 120-acre non-standard proration unit comprising the NW/4 NW/4 and S/2 NW/4 of Section 29, Township 25 South, Range 37 East, Jalmat Gas Pool, to be dedicated to a well to be drilled at an unorthodox location 2310 feet from the North line and 330 feet from the West line of said Section 29; 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 the existing proration unit which cannot be so drained by the existing well.
- CASE 6701: Application of Doyle Hartman for compulsory pooling, non-standard gas proration unit, unorthodox well location, and approval of infill drilling, Lea County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the abovestyled cause, seeks an order pooling all mineral interests in the Seven Rivers-Queen formations underlying the SE/4 of Section 30, Township 21 South, Range 36 East, Eumont Gas Pool, to form a 160-acte non-standard gas proration unit to be dedicated to his J. K. Rector Well No. 1 at an unorthodox location 2310 feet from the South line and 330 feet from the East line of said Section 30. Also to be considered will be the cost of drilling and completing said well and the allocation of the cost thereof as well as actual operating costs and charges for supervision. Also to be considered will be the designation of applicant as operator of the well and a charge for risk involved in drilling said well. 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 the existing proration unit which cannot be so drained by the existing well.

CASE 6676:. (Continued from October 2, 1979, Examiner Hearing)

Application of Doyle Hartman for an unorthodox well location and a non-standard proration unit, Lea County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks approval of an 80-acre nonstandard gas proration unit comprising the SW/4 NE/4 and SE/4 NW/4 of Section 36, Township 24 South, Range 36 East, Jalmat Gas Pool, to be dedicated to a well to be drilled at an unorthodox location 2310 feet from the North line and 1650 feet from the East line of said Section 36.

CASE 6664: (Continued from September 19, 1979, Examiner Hearing)

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 Cas 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.

CASE 6662: (Continued from September 19, 1979, Examiner Hearing)

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.

CASE 6702: Application of El Paso Natural Gas Company for downhole commingling, Rio Arriba County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks approval for the downhole commingling of South Blanco-Pictured Cliffs and Blanco Mesaverde production in the wellbore of its San Juan 27-5 Unit Well No. 67 located in Unit B of Section 31, Township 27 North, Range 5 West. Page 2 of 4

Examiner Hearing - Tuesday - October 2, 1979

Docket No. 38-79

CASE 6644: (Continued from September 19, 1979, Examiner Hearing)

Application of Tenneco Oil Corporation for downhole commingling, San Juan County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks approval for the downhole commingling of Fruitland and Pictured Cliffs production in the wellbores of its State K Com Well No. 12 located in Unit E of Section 16, Township 30 North, Range 9 West, and its Florence Well No. 60R in Unit L of Section 1, Township 29 North, Range 9 West.

Application of Gifford, Mitchell & Wisenbaker for a unit agreement, Lea County, New Mexico. CASE 6675: Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks approval for the Pawnee Unit Area, comprising 3,840 acres, more or less, of State and federal lands in Township 26 South, Range 36 East.

(Continued from September 19, 1979, Examiner Hearing) CASE 6671:

> Application of Chapman and-Schneider for salt water disposal, Lea County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks authority to dispose of produced salt water in the Seven Rivers Reef formation in the open-hole interval from 3422 feet to 3504 feet in its I. B. Ogg "A" Well No. 3 located in Unit E of Section 35, Township 24 South, Range 36 East, Jalmat Pool.

- Application of Doyle Hartman for an unorthodox well location and a non-standard proration unit, CASE 6676: Lea County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks approval of an 80-acre non-standard gas proration unit comprising the SW/4 NE/4 and SE/4 NW/4 of Section 36, Township 24 South, Range 36 East, Jalmat Gas Pool, to be dedicated to a well to be drilled at an unorthodox location 2310 feet from the North line and 1650 feet from the East line of said Section 36.
- Application of Texas Pacific Oil Company, Inc. for Jownhole commingling, Lea County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks approval for the downhole commingling of Arrowhead-Grayburg and Eumont production in the wellbore of its Elliott B-6 Well No. 1 located in Unit M of CASE 6677: Section 6, Township 22 South, Range 37 East.
- CASE 6678: Application of Texas Pacific Oil Company, Inc. for downhole commingling and a special casinghead gas allowable, Lea County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks approval for the downhole commingling of Blinebry and Tubb production in the wellbore of its Eva Owens Well No. 1 located in Unit M of Section 25, Township 21 South, Range 37 East. Applicant further seeks an increase in the casinghead gas allowable for said well.
- CASE 6660: (Continued from September 19, 1979, Examiner Hearing)

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 of Section 34, Township 18 South, Range 26 East.

- Application of El Paso Natural Cas Company for a gas storage unit agreement, Eddy County, New CASE 6679: Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks approval of the Washington Ranch Morrow Unit Area comprising the Morrow formation and the first 100 feet immediately above and below said formation underlying all or parts of Sections 21 thru 23, 26 thru 29, and 32 thru 36, Township 25 South, Range 24 East; Sections 1 thru 5 and 9 thru 14, Township 26 South, Range 24 East; and Sections 6, 7, and 18, Township 26 South, Range 25 East, Washington Ranch-Morrow Gas Pool, Eddy County, New Mexico. Said unit area would be for the purpose of conducting a gas storage project and would comprise 12,158 acres, more or less, of State, federal and fee lands.
- CASE 6630: (Continued from August 22, 1979, Examiner Hearing)

Application of El Paso Natural Gas Company for downhole commingling, Rio Arriba County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks approval for the downhole commingling of Basin-Dakota and BS Mesa-Gallup production in the wellbore of its San Juan 27-4 Unit Well No. 37 located in Unit N of Section 33, Township 27 North, Range 4 West.

CASE 6680: Application of Robert C. Anderson for surface commingling, San Juan County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks approval for the surface commingling of all production from his Ute Mountain Ute Lease, Wells Nos. 1, 3 and 4, located in Section 14, Township 31 North, Range 16 West.

Application of Yates Petroleum Corporation for an unorthodox gas well location, Eddy County, New CASE 6681: Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks approval for the unorthodox location of a Wolfcamp-Mississippian test well to be located 660 feet from the South line and 1100 feet from the West line of Section 31, Township 18 South, Range 26 East, the S/2 of said Section 31 to be dedicated to the well.

Oil Conservation

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AND MINERALS OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION

STATE OF NEW MEXICO

Application of ROBERT C. ANDERSON for surface co-mingling of production on the UTE MOUNTAIN UTE LEASE #M-00-C-1420-1709 in SECTION 14, TOWNSHIP 31 NORTH, RANGE 16 WEST, N.M.P.M., SAN JUAN COUNTY, NEW MEXICO

No. 6680

APPLICATION FOR SURFACE CO-MINGLING

Robert C. Anderson, by and through his attorney, respectfully requests that the Division grant an exception to Rule 403 to allow all production from the Robert C. Anderson Ute Mountain Ute Number 1, the Robert C. Anderson Ute Mountain Ute Number 3, and the Robert C. Anderson Ute Mountain Ute Number 4, to be co-mingled at the surface.

As grounds for the granting of this application, Applicant states:

 Robert C. Anderson Ute Mountain Ute Number 1 is located in the Southwest Quarter (SW%) of Section 14, Township 31 North, Range 16 West, N.M.P.M., San Juan County, New Mexico.

2. Robert C. Anderson Ute Mountain Ute Number 3 is located in the Northwest Quarter (NW%) of Section 14, Township 31 North, Range 16 West, N.M.P.M., San Juan County, New Mexico.

3. Robert C. Anderson Ute Mountain Ute Number 4 is located in the Southeast Quarter (SE¹/₃) of Section 14, Township 31 North, Range 16 West, N.M.P.M., San Juan County, New Mexico.

4. Each of the aforementioned quarter sections is leased by the terms of lease #M-00-C-1420-1709. Lessor of said lease is the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe of Indians.

5. The operator of the aforedescribed lease is Robert C. Anderson. 6. Ownership of of all interests in the three quarter sections above-described is identical.

7. The granting of this exception would be in the interest of conservation, the prevention of waste, and the protection of correlative rights.

Further, Applicant would ask that the Division allow that all production be accounted for on a lease basis instead of a well basis.

> Applicant requests a hearing on this matter. Respectfully submitted.

Damon L. Weems

Attorney for Robert C. Anderson 2901 East 20th Farmington, New Mexico 87401 327-4469 ROUGH

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. 6680 Order No. R-6/65

APPLICATION OF ROBERT C. ANDERSON FOR SURFACE COMMINGHING , SAN JUAN COUNTY, NEW MEXICD

ORDER OF THE DIVISION

BY THE DIVISION:

This cause came on for hearing at 9 a.m. on <u>October 17</u> 19<u>79</u>, at Santa Fe, New Mexico, before Examiner <u>DSN</u> NOW, on this <u>day of <u>October</u>, 19_, the Division Director, having considered the testimony, the record, and the recommendations of the Examiner, and being fully advised in the premises,</u>

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, Robert C. Cenderson, is the operator of three Dakota gas weeks in Section 14, Township 31 North, Range 16 West, NMPM, San Juan County, New Mexico, Jeening his the maintain Ute weeks nos. 1, 3, and 4, located in Units L. F, and J, respectively. (3) That said wells are approximatel. 5 miles nemouse from the nearest gas pipe line, and the aperator of said wells proposes to install a gathening spilen and production mint, gather the gas from said wells and commings it, and thence transport in to the por transmit line through a three-inch flow, line which he is constructing.

(4) That the cornership of all three weds is identical throughout. (5) That the applicant proposes to determine the individual production from each user on the teasis of periodic tests which would læ conducted by shutting in the roduction from the third. (4) That approval of the application will ush Cause waste nor impair correlations rights IT IS THERE PORE DRDERED! (1) That the applicant, Robert C. anderson is hereby anthorized to communication produce tion from his the mountain lite lites Das, 1, 3, and 4, located in Units L, F, and J, respective of Section 14, Township 31 North, Range 16 West, MMPM, San Juan County, new magico. 2) That the applicant shall install a production with and origine meter at his comming point. and chase assertain the productive capacity of lack used into the gipeline time every six months, and shall allocate production to lach of the aforesaid wrees on the leaves of such tests. 3) Jurisdiction DONE at