

BEFORE THE
OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION
STATE OF NEW MEXICO
Santa Fe, New Mexico

* * * * *

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

CASE NO. 730

Regular Hearing

BEFORE THE
OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION
Santa Fe, New Mexico
June 16, 1954

IN THE MATTER OF:

Southeastern New Mexico nomenclature case,
calling for creations and extensions of
pools in Lea and Chaves Counties, New
Mexico, as follows:

- (a) Creation of a new oil pool for Pennsyl-
vanian production, designated as the
Maljamar-Pennsylvanian Pool, described
as:

Township 17 South, Range 32 East
S/2 Section 16; SE/4 Section 17;
E/2 Section 20; all Section 21

- (b) Extension of the Drinkard Pool to
include:

Township 21 South, Range 37 East
W/2 Section 24

- (c) Extension of the Eunice-Monument Pool
to include:

Township 20 South, Range 36 East
E/2 Section 27

- (d) Extension of the Langlie-Mattix Pool
to include:

Township 25 South, Range 37 East
NW/4 NW/4, and S/2 NW/4 Section 18

- (e) Extension of the Lazy "J" Pool to
include:

Township 13 South, Range 33 East
E/2 Section 34

- (f) Extension of the Maljamar Pool to
include:

Township 17 South, Range 33 East
N/2 Section 34

- (g) Extension of the Teas Pool to include:

Township 20 South, Range 33 East
S/2 Section 11

Case No.
730

(h) Extension of the Terry-Blinebry Pool to include:

Township 21 South, Range 37 East
Lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 of Section 2

(i) Extension of the Drickey-Queen Pool (Chaves County) to include:

Township 14 South, Range 31 East
NW/4 Section 10; E/2 Section 11;
E/2 Section 16

(j) Extension of the Wantz-Abo Pool to include:

Township 21 South, Range 37 East
All Section 10; W/2 Section 11;
all Section 15; N/2 Section 22;
S/2 Section 3; Lots 15 and 16 and
SE/4 of Section 4

BEFORE:

Honorable Edwin L. Mechem
Mr. E. S. (Johnny) Walker
Mr. R. R. Spurrier

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

MR. SPURRIER: Case 730.

R. F. MONTGOMERY,

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

DIRECT EXAMINATION

By MR. KITTS:

Q State your name, please.

A Randolph F. Montgomery.

Q By whom employed and in what capacity?

A Geologist for the New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission.

Q Are you familiar with Case 730?

A Yes, sir, I am.

(Marked Commission's Exhibit Nos. 1 through 10,
for identification.)

Q I hand you what has been marked the Oil Conservation Commission's Exhibits 1 through 10, inclusive, and ask you what they portray?

A Exhibit Number 1 portrays in Case 730 a creation of new pool for Pennsylvanian production to be designated as the Maljamar Pennsylvanian Pool, to be accepted as advertised.

Q Does Exhibit 2 pertain to sub-paragraph (b) as it appears in the docket sheet here?

A Yes, sir, it does.

Q And Exhibit 3 pertains to (c) and so on?

A Yes, sir, they do.

Q What recommendation do you have, if any, as to this case?

A I recommend that all extensions and creations be adopted as advertised with the following exceptions:

In Case 730 (d) extension of the Langlie-Mattix Pool. In addition I would like to add the southwest quarter of Section 36, Township 24 South, Range 37 East.

And in Case 730 (e) the extension of the Lazy 'J' Pool, I would like to add the west half of Section 35, Township 13 South, Range 33 East.

And, in Case 730 (j) I would like to add the north half of Section 19, Township 21 South, Range 37 East and the east half of

Section 24 in Township 21 South, Range 37 East.

Q Mr. Montgomery, were Exhibits 1 through 10 prepared under your direction and supervision?

A Yes, sir, they were.

Q They are accurate as far as you know? You have checked them for accuracy?

A Yes, sir, I have.

MR. KITTS: We offer Commission's Exhibits 1 through 10 in evidence.

MR. SPURRIER: Without objection they will be admitted.

Q Do you have any further recommendations, Mr. Montgomery?

A No, sir, I do not.

MR. KITTS: That is all.

MR. SPURRIER: Mr. Porter?

By MR. PORTER:

Q I am wondering if Mr. Montgomery gave the name and locations at the top of the perforation of the discovery well in the Maljamar-Pennsylvanian Pool?

A No, sir, I did not. The well was the Buffalo Oil Company's M. A. Baisha No. 25 in unit (f) Section 21-17-32. The production was obtained in the Strawn, top of the pay, was 11,616. That would put it in the depth of 11 to 12,000 feet.

MR. PORTER: That is all.

By MR. YOST:

Q In connection with Paragraphs e and j, did I understand that you want to make extensions other than those mentioned in those

paragraphs?

A Yes, sir.

Q They are in addition to what was advertised?

A Yes, sir, they are.

Q The extensions indicated in Paragraphs d, e and j are correct?

A Yes, sir, they are. These are additions, they are contiguous additions.

Q d, e and j refer to extensions. You want to make additional extensions besides those that are indicated in those paragraphs?

A Yes, sir, that is correct.

MR. DAILEY: In this section, unless I am greatly mistaken, the proposed extension is already in the Cooper-Jal Pool.

A Yes, sir, it is. This extension is caused by Humble Oil and Refining Company's Winters Number 2, which is producing from the Queen Formation and the Cooper-Jal Pool vertical limits is the Yates and Seven Rivers. In order for this well to be in a pool we have to extend the Langlie-Mattix Oil Pool to overlie the Cooper-Jal.

MR. DAILEY: That isn't going to work out because the Langlie-Mattix is the Yates, Seven Rivers and Queen. The Cooper-Jal is Yates and Seven Rivers, and you wind up with two pools in the same place at the same time.

MR. MACEY: You have to delete the Cooper-Jal area from

that portion.

MR. SPURRIER: That will be readvertised.

A In some cases in this area, I am not positive, but we do have -- Well, it wouldn't make any difference.

MR. SPURRIER: Anyone else have a comment in Case 730?

By MR. MACEY:

Q I have got TC-1 23 on the Maljamar Pennsylvanian Pool creation. They suggest the Maljamar-Strawn. Do you know why the name was changed, the proposed name was changed to Pennsylvanian?

A It is a little broader term to the Strawn and we didn't restrict it to the Strawn.

Q The reason I think they restricted it to the Strawn was the fact they had another zone in the Pennsylvanian that was possibly productive in the same area. They were pretty sure that they were separate sources of supply?

A Yes, sir.

Q Therefore they requested that it be named Strawn to differentiate from any other zone in the Pennsylvanian that they might discover in that area.

A It would be my recommendation, if that other zone is potentially productive, that we do adopt the name Strawn then for Case 730 (a) instead of just the Maljamar-Pennsylvanian. We prefer to keep the names as short as possible.

Q Would you amend your application to change that from Pennsylvanian to Strawn?

A I recommend that we change Case 730, Section(a) to the Maljamar-Strawn Pool, outlined as previously described. I would like to make a statement back to Case 730 (d) regarding the Cooper-Jal and the Langlie-Mattix in this immediate area. We do have some Yates production that lies in the same 40. We have production down in the Queen, so that would be the difficulty there of possibly deleting part of the Cooper-Jal Oil Pool from a portion where we would have the Langlie-Mattix Oil Pool in the same area. That would prevent an operator from receiving two allowables.

MR. DAILEY: I just wonder on that, Mr. Macey, whether your gas pool delineation may help solve a portion of that. I just wondered. Perhaps this might not be, better to wait until that other delineation has been made.

MR. MACEY: I agree with you.

MR. DAILEY: It all ties in together.

MR. MACEY: It all ties in together. If the Langlie-Mattix is re-designated, the vertical limits of the Langlie-Mattix are re-designated in Case 673 and the Yates Zone is included in a gas pool, then it would take care of the situation.

MR. SPURRIER: Anyone else have a question of the witness? If not the witness may be excused.

(Witness excused.)

MR. SPURRIER: Does anyone else have a comment? If not we will take the case under advisement and also I think there are some readvertisements in order. I believe that completes the docket for the day. The rest of the sheet is dedicated to a hearing on June 21,

which is next Monday.

