

BEFORE THE
OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION
Santa Fe, New Mexico
June 28, 1961

CASE 2311

DEARNLEY-MEIER REPORTING SERVICE, Inc.

PHONE CH 3-6691

ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO



BEFORE THE
OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION
Santa Fe, New Mexico
June 28, 1961

EXAMINER HEARING

IN THE MATTER OF:)

Application of Continental Oil Company for an)
oil-oil dual completion, Lea County, New Mexico.)
Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks per-)
mission to complete its Britt B-15 Well No. 10,)
located in Unit F, Section 15, Township 29 South,) Case
Range 37 East, Lea County, New Mexico, as a dual) 2311
completion (conventional) in an undesignated)
Blinebry Pool and in the Monument-Tubb Pool, the)
production of oil from each pool to be through)
parallel strings of 2-inch tubing.)

BEFORE:

Elvis A. Utz, Examiner

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

MR. UTZ: Call Case 2311.

MR. MORRIS: Application of Continental Oil Company for
an oil-oil dual completion, Lea County, New Mexico.

MR. KELLAHIN: If the Commission please, Jason A.
Kellahin of Kellahin & Fox are representing the applicant; and we
will have one witness, Mr. John A. Queen.

(Witness sworn.)

MR. UTZ: Are there any other appearances? You may
proceed.

JOHN A. QUEEN,

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

DEARNLEY-MEIERS REPORTING SERVICE, Inc.

PHONE CH 3-6691

ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO



DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. KELLAHIN:

Q Will you state your name, please.

A John A. Queen.

Q By whom are you employed and in what position?

A Continental Oil Company, Division Engineer, New Mexico Division.

Q Have you previously testified before the Oil Commission as a petroleum engineer and had your qualifications made a matter of record?

A I have, and they have.

MR. KELLAHIN: Are the witness' qualifications acceptable?

MR. UTZ: Yes, sir; they are.

Q (By Mr. Kellahin) Mr. Queen, are you familiar with the application of Continental Oil Company in Case No. 2311?

A Yes, sir; I am.

Q Would you state what is proposed in this application?

A This is an application of Continental Oil Company for an oil-oil dual for its Britt B-15 Well No. 10, located in Unit F of Section 15, Township 20 South, Range 37 East, dual completion to be in a unit designated Elinebry Pool and Monument-Tubb Pool.

(Marked Applicant's Exhibits Nos. 1 through 4, for Identification.)

Q (By Mr. Kellahin) Mr. Queen, referring to what has been marked as Exhibit No. 1, would you discuss the information shown



on that exhibit?

A This is plat of the area in which the Britt B-15 lease is located. The plat shows the ownership of the various leases and also the formation from which the various wells are producing within the vicinity of the Britt B-15 Lease.

Q Now, will you discuss briefly the history of this well?

A Yes, sir. The well was originally completed in the Monument-Tubb Pool as a Tubb oil well flowing in excess of top allowable, and unsuccessfully attempted to be completed in the Drinkard Formation during its initial completion. The well was subsequently plugged back, and the Blinebry Formation was tested and a discovery of new oil in a new reservoir was completed.

Q Then, are we to understand that the Blinebry Zone in this area is a new discovery?

A Yes, sir; it is.

Q Is that the reason that prior approval of the dual completion was not sought?

A That is correct, sir. The Blinebry Pool is also undesignated at this time.

Q Referring to what has been marked as Exhibit No. 2, would you discuss that exhibit?

A Exhibit No. 2 is a schematic of the dual completion as it actually is now installed. As previously stated, this recompletion was a new development, and it was impossible to know the type of production or if actual production existed in the Blinebry



Pool, so the recompletion was made without obtaining an approval for the dual completion -- this is, actual installation of the equipment.

Q And the installation is as it is shown on this exhibit?

A That is correct, sir.

Q Does the exhibit likewise show the casing program?

A Yes, sir; it does.

Q Is there anything unusual about this dual completion?

A No, sir. The equipment used meets all the standards required by administrative approval under Rule 112-A and as revised by Order No. R1957.

Q Now, referring to what has been marked as Exhibit No. 3, would you discuss the information on that exhibit?

A This exhibit is a log, section of a log showing the formation tops in perforated intervals of the various zones. And you will note, a Drinkard Formation has been squeezed off and is not open to communication in the well bore.

Q And does it show the completion in the Blinebry and the

A Tubb.

Q -- Tubb?

A Yes, sir; it does.

Q Now, the installation has already been made; is that correct?

A That is correct.

Q Have you run Packer Leakage Tests on it?



A Yes, sir; we have.

Q Now, referring to Exhibit No. 4, would you discuss that exhibit.

A Exhibit No. 4 is a Packer Leakage Test as reported on the New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission Form, and indicates to me that there is no communications between zones within the well bore or behind the casing.

Q In your opinion, will this type of completion fully protect the producing horizons encountered in this well?

A Yes, sir; it will.

Q Both those which are open to the well bore and those which are encountered in the Drinkard Well which are not open?

A That is correct.

Q In your opinion, is this approval of this application in the interests of conservation -- and the prevention of waste?

A Yes, sir. In my opinion it is.

Q Were Exhibits 1 through 4 prepared by you or under your supervision?

A Yes, sir; they were.

MR. KELLAHIN: At this time, we would like to offer in evidence Exhibits 1 through 4.

MR. UTZ: Without objection, Exhibits 1 through 4 will be entered into the record.

(Marked Applicant's Exhibits Nos. 1 through 4, in evidence.)



MR. KELLAHIN: That completes the direct examination.

EXAMINATION

BY EXAMINER UTZ:

Q Mr. Queen, I noticed that when you quoted the upper completion you had forty-seven pounds decrease in the shutting zone; and I also note you attribute that to fluid. Now, what evidence do you have that it was loaded with fluid?

A The well had not stabilized in its bottom hole pressure, reservoir pressure at the time this test was made. And, this zone is an oil zone, and therefore an increase in fluid in the well bore will quite often cause a reduction in pressure above the fluid level.

Q On your second shut-in, it is actually quite a bit higher than the first shut-in. Why?

A Well, first let me ask you: At the seventy-two hour point when you opened the Brinebry Zone, did you dead-weight the lower tubing, dead-weight the 1504 -- on the graph?

A Would you repeat that, please?

Q The 1504 as shown on your Tubb Oil on your second shut-in on the Tubb Zone, was that dead-weighted at the time you opened the Brinebry Oil?

A I believe that is correct, sir.

Q Then, how do you explain that pressure? From the time you shut in the well, the 1504 reading does not start to decrease until you opened the upper zone.



A The cooling effect could have caused a decrease from 1504 to 1457 pressure. Is this the point that you are making, sir?

Q Yes sir.

A A cooling effect of the tubing could have caused such a decrease in pressure, expansion of gas.

Q Sub-oil is flowing through the tubing; is that correct?

A I believe that is correct, sir, but I would like to -- The tubing which is the lower zone -- This well is equipped with two strings of two-inch tubing.

Q And you actually attribute the 47 pounds decrease, not only --

A It could also be temperature.

Q You didn't shut in the well after the test? Take any more readings?

A No, sir; not that I know of.

Q Could you tell whether the pressure came up or not?

A No, sir; I can't answer the question. I don't know.

MR. UTZ: Are there any questions?

MR. MORRIS: No questions.

MR. UTZ: The witness may be excused. Are there other statements in this case?

The case will be taken under advisement.

DEARNLEY-MEIER REPORTING SERVICE, Inc.

PHONE CH 3-6691

ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO



