

BEFORE THE
OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION
STATE OF NEW MEXICO

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING
Case No. 323

November 20, 1951

BEFORE THE
OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION
STATE OF NEW MEXICO

- - -

In Re:

In the Matter of the application of)
the Oil Conservation Commission upon)
its own motion for an order for the)
extension of existing pools, consoli-) Case No. 323
dation of existing pools, or the cre-)
ation of new pools in Lea, Eddy, and)
Chaves Counties, New Mexico, as follows:)

(a) To consolidate the existing Brunson (Ellenburger) and North Brunson (Ellenburger) pools in Lea County, New Mexico, into a single pool, to be known as the Brunson (Ellenburger) Pool, and to correct Order R-92.

(b) To extend the Grayburg-Jackson Pool, Eddy County, New Mexico, to include the S.2 of Section 5, Township 17 South, Range 31 East, NMPM.

(c) To extend the Langlie-Mattix pool, Lea County, New Mexico, to include the E.2 of Section 35, Township 23 South, Range 37 East, NMPM.

(d) To extend the Denton-Wolfcamp Pool, Lea County, New Mexico, to include all of Section 1, Township 15 South, Range 37 East, NMPM.

(e) To extend the Crossroads (Pennsylvanian) Pool, Lea County, New Mexico, to include the W/2 Section 28, all Section 29, E/2 Section 30, all in Township 9 South, Range 36 East.

(f) To create a new pool, to be designated as the North Cary Pool, to include the W.2 SW/4 Section 28, and the W/2 NW/4 Section 33, all in Township 21 South, Range 37 East, Lea County, New Mexico; or, in the alternative, to extend the McCormack Pool, Lea County, New Mexico, to include the SW/4 Section 28, and the NW/4 Section 33, all in Township 21 South, Range 37 East, NMPM.

(g) To extend the Paddock (Pennsylvanian) Pool, Lea County, New Mexico, to include the NW/4 Section 23, Township 22 South, Range 37 East, NMPM.

(h) To create a new pool to include all of Sections 28, 29, 32 and 33, Township 24 South, Range 38 East, NMPM, and all of Sections 4, 5, 8 and 9, Township 25 South, Range 38 East, NMPM, Lea County, New Mexico. Suggested name: West Dollarhide.

- - - - -

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

November 20, 1951

(Notice of publication read by Mr. Kellahin.) Robert Blymn, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: Direct examination by Mr. Kellahin.

Q Will you state your name and position?

A R. S. Blymn. Engineer, District One, and District Two, Oil Conservation Commission.

Q Mr. Blymn, in your capacity as an inspector for the Oil Conservation Commission, have you investigated the proposed changes in the existing pools and the creation of new pools as proposed by Case No. 323?

A I have.

Q In connection with that investigation the first proposal (a) is to consolidate the existing Brunson (Ellenburger) and North Brunson (Ellenburger) pools in Lea County, New Mexico, into a single pool, to be known as the Brunson (Ellenburger) pool, and to correct Order R-92. What is your recommendation on that?

A I have prepared here an exhibit. I haven't numbered it pending the hearing. We will number it here. That shows the existing Brunson pools, North Brunson pool, and there is an overlap in the northeast quarter of 10, Order R-92, which extended the Brunson pool to include all of Section 10. I would recommend that Brunson and North Brunson be consolidated into a Brunson pool because neglecting that overlap there, there is a one-half mile of continuing boundary between the

two pools, and both pools are producing from the Ellenburger, the lower Ellenburger.

Q Both pools are approximately the same depth range?

A Yes.

Q In the second item, item (b) to extend the Grayburg-Jackson Pool to include the S/2 of Section 5, in Township 17 South, Range 31 East, NMPM. Did you investigate that?

A Yes.

(Marked Exhibit No. 1, Case 323.)

MR. KELLAHIN: I would like to offer in evidence the plat of the pertinent portions of the Brunson, North Brunson Pool.

CHAIRMAN SPURRIER: Without objection it will be admitted.

Q As to the Grayburg-Jackson Pool, Mr. Blymn, what recommendation do you make?

A I recommend that the S/2 of Section 5, Range 31, Township 17 South, Range 37 East be included in the Grayburg-Jackson Pool as requested by the Sinclair on their C-123. That has a one-mile continuous boundary with the already established Grayburg-Jackson Pool. I have prepared here an exhibit showing Grayburg-Jackson in red and proposed inclusion in green.

Q You do not recommend, at this time, that the pool be combined with the Square Lake Pool?

A No.

Q There is a common boundary for the distance of one

mile if this pool change is made.

A That is right. There will be both to the east and to the west of this one mile of continuing boundary, there will be gaps in there, and if the Grayburg-Jackson and the Square Lake Pool were consolidated there would be considerable area of undrilled acreage or unproductive acreage. I don't know which it would be. I know it is undrilled. I don't know whether it is unproductive or not, or undeveloped acreage, that would be included in the pools. I would recommend that we ignore the fact that those two pools do have a one-mile common boundary if this inclusion be made.

(Marked Exhibit No. Two.)

MR. KELLAHIN: I would like to offer for the record the plat marked as Commission's Exhibit No. Two, showing the boundaries of the two pools.

CHAIRMAN SPURRIER: Without objection, it will be received.

Q The next section is designated to extend the Langlie-Mattix Pool, Lea County, New Mexico, to include the E/2 of Section 35, Township 23 South, Range 37 East, NMPM.

A I would recommend that this half section be included in the Langlie-Mattix Pool as requested.

Q Do you have a plat of that?

A Yes.

(Marked Exhibit No. 3, Case 323.)

MR. KELLAHIN: I want to offer in evidence the plat marked Commission's Exhibit Three, showing extension of the Langlie-Mattix Pool.

CHAIRMAN SPURRIER: Without objection, it will be received.

Q Next is the extension of the Denton-Wolfcamp Pool, Lea County, New Mexico, to include all of Section 1, Township 15 South, Range 37 East. Do you have a recommendation on that.

A Yes. I recommend that the request be granted as made. There is a 320 acre area, the north half of Section 1 might not necessarily be included in that but I think there are probably some drill stem tests that indicate that the Wolfcamp will be productive to include all of Section 1, so I will recommend that Section 1 be included in the Denton-Wolfcamp.

Q You say the north half?

A That's right. Dickenson A-2 is in the northeast of the southwest.

Q In the other portions of the section, are there any producing wells at the present time?

A Not at the present time.

(Marked Exhibit Number Four, Case 323.)

MR. KELLAHIN: I would like to offer Exhibit Four.

CHAIRMAN SPURRIER: Without objection, it will be received.

Q The next case proposed to extend the Crossroads (Pennsylvanian) Pool, Lea County, New Mexico, to include the W/2 Section 28, all of Section 29, and the E/2 of Section 30, all in Township 9 South, Range 36 East. Have you checked on that proposal?

A Yes, I see no justification for extending that pool to those limits at the present time. I would recommend that all of Section 29, and the W/2 of 28 be included in Crossroads (Pennsylvanian), the E/2 of Section 30 and the inclusion of that in Crossroads (Pennsylvanian) be deferred at the present time.

Q At the present time is there more than one producing well within the boundaries of the proposed extension?

A There is just one.

Q Is that located in the north half of Section 21?

A Yes, it is.

(Marked plat Exhibit Number Five, Case 323.)

MR. KELLAHIN: I would like to offer in evidence Commission's Exhibit Number Five.

CHAIRMAN SPURRIER: Without objection, it will be received.

Q The next case proposed to create a new pool to be designated as the North Cary Pool, to include the W/2 SW/4 Section 28, and the W/2 NW/4 Section 33, all in Township 21 South, Range 37 East, Lea County, New Mexico, or, in the

alternative, to extend the McCormack Pool, to include the SW/4 Section 28, and the NW/4 Section 33, all in Township 21 South, Range 37 East. Do you have a recommendation on that?

A I would recommend that the west half of 28 or the west half of the SW/4 of 28 and the west half of the NW/4 of 33 be included in the McCormack Pool rather than the creation of a new pool. We do not have in our office evidence that Carson 16 is a separate reservoir even though it produces from a formation of older age than the McCormack Pool produces from. They produce from approximately the same depth and approximately the same elevation. In my opinion there is a strong possibility that the McCormack Pool cuts across age limitations and constitutes a common reservoir. Until we get evidence to the contrary I would recommend that this area be included in the McCormack Pool. I have prepared a plat showing that proposed inclusion.

(Marked Exhibit Number Six, Case 323.)

MR. KELLAHIN: I offer in evidence Commission Exhibit Number Six showing the proposed extension of the McCormack Pool.

CHAIRMAN SPURRIER: Without objection, it will be received.

Q The next case proposes to extend the Paddock (Pennsylvanian) Pool in Lea County, New Mexico, to include the NW/4 of Section 23, Township 22 South, Range 37 East. Is that

extension justified?

A Yes, it is. I have prepared a plat on that.

CHAIRMAN SPURRIER: Showing the relationship to that Paddock Pool?

A Yes.

(Marked Exhibit Number Seven, Case 323.)

MR. KELLAHIN: I offer the exhibit.

CHAIRMAN SPURRIER: Without objection, it will be received.

Q The next case designated as (h) in the advertisement proposes to create a new pool to include all of Sections 28, 29, 32 and 33, Township 24 South, Range 38 East, and all of Sections 4, 5 8 and 9, Township 25 South, Range 38 East, Lea County, New Mexico. The suggested name for this pool is the West Dollarhide. In connection with your investigation of that proposal, do you find more than one producing well?

A There is only one producing well at the present. That is Skelly Oil Company, Mexico J-1, producing from the Ellenburger in the SE SE of Section 32.

Q Would you recommend to the Commission that they include the eight proposed sections?

A Inasmuch as this proposed pool lays along the side of the Dollarhide Pool of Texas, I would recommend that this entire area be included in a new Ellenburger Pool in New Mexico. I cannot recommend that it be named West Dollarhide because this, because on the basis of drill stem testing this

is a multiple pay oil field, and later we will be in the position then of having three-word pool names, that is West Dollarhide, Ellenburger. West Dollarhide, Devonian. West Dollarhide, Tubbs and possibly one more. I would recommend that this field name be limited to one name and then the ensuing pool names be designated by this field name plus the formation from which these pools will later be developed when they produce.

Q Are there a number of actively drilling wells in that area at this time?

A There are a number of drilling wells in this, half a dozen.

Q Do you have a plat?

A I have prepared a plat showing the relationship of west, the proposed pool to the State of Texas.

(Marked Exhibit No. Eight, Case 323.)

MR. KELLAHIN: I offer in evidence Commissions Exhibit Eight, showing the proposed West Dollarhide Pool.

CHAIRMAN SPURRIER: Without objection, it will be received.

MR. KELLAHIN: If it please the Commission, I have nothing further.

CHAIRMAN SPURRIER: Does anyone have a further question of this witness?

MR. SANDERS: I would like to ask him one question.

Do you have a name to recommend for this pool?

A Not at the moment, Mr. Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: That is all the questions I have.

CHAIRMAN SPURRIER: Anyone else?

MR. KELLAHIN: Do you have any questions, Mr. White?

MR. WHITE: One question, Mr. Blymn. In these instances where you have recommended a pool to be extended, is the reservoir common as to each extension?

A In my opinion it is.

MR. WHITE: The formations are similar in depth?

A A common reservoir in every case.

MR. WHITE: That is all.

CHAIRMAN SPURRIER: The witness will be excused. The case will be taken under advisement. The next case is 324.

