

BEFORE THE
OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION
STATE OF NEW MEXICO

~~~~~  
TRANSCRIPTION OF HEARING

CASE NO. 287

June 21, 1951  
(DATE)

BEFORE THE  
OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION  
STATE OF NEW MEXICO

-----

Case 284: In regard to the Oil Conservation Commission's application upon its own motion for the extension of, correction of boundaries, consolidation of or creation of new pools, or for the purpose of placing in a pool certain wells in southeastern New Mexico.

-----

(Mr. Graham reads the notice of publication.)

MR. SPURRIER: Case 284 is one of our regular nomenclature hearings on which it is, as you know, the practice for us to receive information from the various companies as they bring in a well which will either extend or -- extend an existing pool or create a new pool. Now, if anyone cares to, or anyone is interested in any one of these extensions, we will read them off and discuss them. Otherwise, without objection, we will consider the testimony which has been submitted to us in writing and duly promulgate a nomenclature order. Mr. Morrell, do you have any comment?

MR. MORRELL: None, other than the fact that it is impossible to consider what the Commission has before it without knowing .....

MR. SPURRIER: That is quite true. And that is why I say if anyone cares to, I will be glad to read these over. The first one involved is a well known as "Y" No. 1, located 2310 feet from the north and 330 feet from the west, Sec. 5, 20S-27E. The request is that the MacMillan Pool be extended to include the west half of Section 5 on account of this well. Is there any comment?

MR. MORRELL: The only comment there, Mr. Spurrier, might be the case provides for communal boundaries, and the correction of the MacMillan definition might be taken that all .... at the same time to that extent.

MR. SPURRIER: Do you have a copy of that letter of yours? May I use it? Mr. Morrell has kindly called our attention to the fact that there is an error in the nomenclature of

the MacMillan-Seven Rivers Pool. The description is given as T. 19S-R32E. The range should be 27E. We are also reminded that the east half of Sec. 31, T.19S-27E has already been included in the MacMillan-Seven Rivers Pool and, therefore, that particular part of the description should be deleted from Order No. 76. That is R-76.

Now, the next correction which we should make involves Order R-55, the boundaries of the Bough and East Bough Pool in SEC. 7 and Sec. 18 of 9S-36E. Consequently, the Commission will need to amend Order R-55 so that that overlap will be corrected. I do not have the exact description.

MR. MORRELL: Do you have a recommendation for deleting East Bough and making it a single pool to be called Bough? ✓

MR. SPURRIER: You did not so recommend.

MR. MORRELL: I assumed that was what you meant. It wasn't quite stated. If you don't have the recommendation, I will make one to that effect now.

MR. SPURRIER: I will appreciate it if you will.

MR. MORRELL: It is so recommended.

MR. SPURRIER: I suggest also the same recommendation for Drinkard and North Drinkard, right? ✓

MR. MORRELL: Right. That will make it the Drinkard Pool, deleting the North Drinkard. That, as you may realize, does affect the allocation. There is a difference in allocation between North Drinkard and Drinkard.

MR. SPURRIER: Drinkard or Brunson? >

MR. MORRELL: I guess it is Brunson.

MR. SPURRIER: Here is another note we have to extend -- Mr. Morrell, I think you might be interested in this one. To extend the Empire Pool to include the No. 1-N Harbold. This letter says that since this well is only 339 feet deep we cannot give you any geological information for naming the pool. This is carried by the U.S.G.S. as an Empire extension. It is my opinion that the Empire Pool should be amended to include all of Sec. 6-27S-27E. The letter is signed by Owen Haynes.

MR. MORRELL: I have no objection.

MR. SPURRIER: You have no objection?

MR. MORRELL: It is a little bit large area, but it does not make any difference.

MR. SPURRIER: It would be our policy, I think, Mr. Morrell, to increase that by one-half.

MR. MORRELL: Half a section would cover it.

MR. SPURRIER: That's right. One half-section. ✓

MR. MORRELL: Mr. Spurrier, returning to MacMillan, I think we could take the recommendation I made there to add or extend the MacMillan Pool to include the NW/4 of Sec. 8 on which there is a productive well. Apparently, you have no application  
.....

MR. SPURRIER: That's right.

MR. MORRELL: So that the pool from its present definition which includes the E $\frac{1}{2}$  of 31-19-29 could be extended to include the W $\frac{1}{2}$  of Sec. 32-19-29, and in T. 20S, R. 27E the pool now includes all of 6 and the N $\frac{1}{2}$  of 7, which could be enlarged to include the W $\frac{1}{2}$  of 5 and the NW of 8.

MR. SPURRIER: Correct. Is there any objection to that?

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Morrell, what formation does that come under?

MR. MORRELL: Seven Rivers-Queen.

MR. SPURRIER: Now, we have a letter from R. S. Dewey, Humble Oil & Refining Co., in which he suggests that the Brunson Pool should be extended to include the S $\frac{1}{2}$  of Sec. 10-21S-37E because of the completion of a well known as "V" No. 3, located SWSE of that section. Is there any comment on that recommendation? Does anyone else have a comment? Mr. Morrell, you have one more suggestion here; that there is no such thing as Northwest La Plata.

MR. MORRELL: I have been unable to find it in the records.

MR. SPURRIER: We will check our records, and if we don't

find it, we will, from your recommendation at this hearing, delete it from our Order R-46.

If no one has any further comment on Case 284, we will take up the next case, 285.

STATE OF NEW MEXICO

ss

COUNTY OF BERNALILLO

I HEREBY CERTIFY That the foregoing transcript is a true record of the matters therein contained.

DATED at Albuquerque, N. M., July 6, 1951.

*E. C. Mason*

My Commission Expires: Aug. 4, 1952.