

NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

EXAMINER HEARINGSANTA FE, _____, NEW MEXICOHearing Date AUGUST 28, 1985 Time: 8:00 A.M.

NAME	REPRESENTING	LOCATION
Burt Hulen	Byram	Santa Fe
CJ Boyce	Amoco	Denver
Mike Logan	H.L. Brown, Jr	Midland
John Roe	Dugan Production	Farmington
Wm. P. Aycock	Doyle Hartman	Midland
Robert G. Stovall	Duga Production	Farmington
William J. Jew	Campbell and Slack	Santa Fe
W.A. McFarley	Concannon & Scott	Santa Fe
Ernst L. Keele	ATTY AT LAW	SF
Tom Dugan	Dugan Prod Corp.	Farmington
Kurt Fogdalis	Dugan Prod.	Farmington
Maer Grant	Grant Mangano	Brewell
Steve Simmons	Santa Fe Exploration Co	✓
Chad Keck	✓	✓
Ray Beck	✓	✓
W.T. Kelleher	Kelleher & Kelleher	Santa Fe

NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

EXAMINER HEARINGSANTA FE, NEW MEXICOHearing Date AUGUST 28, 1985 Time: 8:00 A.M.

NAME	REPRESENTING	LOCATION
Gary W. Faray	McCasland Disposal	Holtz
Egbert State	State Land Office	S.F.
Leslie M. Wilson	Rio Pecos CORP.	Midland, TX
L. B. Burleson	LBB, Inc.	Midland, TX
Steve R. Ring	"	Midland, TX
Roger T. Elliott	Rio Pecos Corporation	Midland, TX
STEVE RING	AMOCO PRODUCTION	DENVER, CO

STATE OF NEW MEXICO
ENERGY AND MINERALS DEPARTMENT
OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION
STATE LAND OFFICE BLDG.
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

28 August 1985

EXAMINER HEARING

IN THE MATTER OF:

Case 2355 being reopened on the motion CASE
of the Oil Conservation Division and 2355
pursuant to the provisions of Order
No. R-2051, as amended.

BEFORE: Michael E. Stogner, Examiner

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

A P P E A R A N C E S

For the Division:

Jeff Taylor
Attorney at Law
Legal Counsel to the Division
State Land Office Bldg.
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

For H. L. Brown, Jr.:

Ernest L. Padilla
Attorney at Law
P. O. Box 2325
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I N D E X

MIKE FEAGAN

Direct Examination by Mr. Padilla	4
Cross Examination by Mr. Stogner	13

E X H I B I T S

Brown Exhibit One, Booklet	6
----------------------------	---

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. STOGNER: We'll call Case Number 2355, which is being reopened.

MR. TAYLOR: In the matter of Case 2355 being reopened on the motion of the Oil Conservation Division and pursuant to the provisions of Order No. R-2051, as amended, which order promulgated temporary special rules and regulations for the Bluit-Wolfcamp Gas Pool in Roosevelt County, including a provision for 320-acre spacing units.

Operators in said pool may appear and show cause why the pool should not be developed on 160-acre spacing units.

MR. STOGNER: We will now call for appearances in this matter.

MR. PADILLA: Mr. Examiner, my name is Ernest L. Padilla, Santa Fe, New Mexico, for H. L. Brown, Jr., in this case.

I have one witness to be sworn.

MR. STOGNER: Okay, are there any other appearances in this matter?

Will the witness please stand and be sworn?

(Witness sworn.)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MIKE FEAGAN,

being called as a witness and being duly sworn upon his oath, testified as follows, to-wit:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. PADILLA:

Q Mr. Feagan, for the record would you please state your name and what your connection with H. L. Brown, Jr., is?

A Yes. My name is Mike Reagan. I'm employed by H. L. Brown, Jr., as a petroleum engineer, production engineer.

Q You work out of Midland, Texas. Do you reside in Midland, Texas?

A That's right.

Q Have you previously testified before the Oil Conservation Division and had your credentials accepted as a matter of record?

A I have not testified previously.

Q Would you please state your educational background and when and where you received your degree in petroleum engineering?

A Yes. I attended Texas Tech University; received my degree in 1981, BS in petroleum engineering; af-

1 ter which I was employed by Texaco, Incorporated, and worked
2 for a year and a half as a production engineer in Sundown
3 and Pinwell, Texas, and then transferred to the Midland Dis-
4 trict Office as a reservoir engineer for Texaco, Incorporated.
5 ated.

6 Q When did you start working for H. L.
7 Brown?

8 A February of 1984 I started working for H.
9 L. Brown, Jr., in the present capacity I'm employed.

10 Q And as a petroleum engineer what are your
11 duties with H. L. Brown?

12 A They really range -- with a small company
13 they range from production and a small amount of drilling
14 and anything that may pertain to regulations.

15 Q Have you made a study in connection with
16 this case of the Wolfcamp gas pool in Roosevelt County, New
17 Mexico.

18 A Yes, sir, I have.

19 Q Have you prepared certain exhibits or had
20 them compiled under your direction and supervision?

21 A Yes. I prepared the exhibit in front of
22 us based on some data gathered by an engineering, indepen-
23 dent engineering consulting firm.

24 Q Under your direction.

25 A Under my direction, correct.

1 MR. PADILLA: Mr. Examiner, I
2 tender Mr. Feagan as an expert in petroleum engineering.

3 MR. STOGNER: Mr. Feagan is so
4 qualified.

5 Q Mr. Feagan, would you please turn to what
6 we have marked as Exhibit Number One and generally describe
7 what that is?

8 A Exhibit Number One is our exhibit based
9 on data gathered by an independent engineering consulting
10 firm of Osborn and Uhl, Incorporated.

11 They prepared two studies for us, one in
12 September -- one in 1981 and the other updated study in 1984
13 on the Bluitt-Wolfcamp Field, and their findings and docu-
14 mentation are presented in this exhibit.

15 Q Will you give us a brief history of the
16 Bluitt-Wolfcamp Field?

17 A The Bluitt-Wolfcamp Field was discovered
18 by the completion of H. L. Brown, Jr. Federal Well No. 1 in
19 October of 1959. The field has been developed since 1959
20 through 1982 with the drilling and completion of thirteen
21 gas wells in the main Wolfcamp reservoir.

22 Twelve of these wells are currently oper-
23 ated by H. L. Brown, Jr., and one was recently sold by Sun
24 Exploration Company and I'm not sure who's operating that
25 well now.

1 As of January 1st, 1985, 319,915 barrels
2 of condensate and 16.9 BCF of gas have been produced from
3 the Bluit-Wolfcamp Field.

4 Q Okay, can you briefly describe the study
5 that was prepared by H. L. Brown in 1981 and what the pur-
6 pose of that study was for?

7 A The purpose of the study in 1981 was to
8 investigate the possibility of infill drilling the Bluit-
9 Wolfcamp Field on 160-acre spacing.

10 We found that it wasn't economically
11 feasible at that time to infill drill.

12 Q Did you update that study in 1984?

13 A Well, we didn't do it as far as updating
14 the economics. We did update the findings as far as pres-
15 sure data, data concerning infill -- I guess drainage of the
16 reservoir.

17 Q Is that pressure data contained in this
18 exhibit?

19 A Yes, sir, it is.

20 Q Would you refer to the pressure data,
21 please?

22 A Yeah. The estimated original reservoir
23 pressure was 2900 psig.

24 In 1980 H. L. Brown, Jr. subjected our
25 wells to long term pressure build-up tests. Using these

1 pressures an isobaric map, which is Figure No. 2 in this ex-
2 hibit, was constructed by Osborn and Uhl and was updated by
3 Figure No. 3 from pressure data gathered in September of
4 1984.

5 Q What are Figures 2 and 3?

6 A They're the isobaric maps based on pres-
7 sure data from 1980 and 1984. You'll notice when the two
8 isobaric maps are compared, similarities in the isobar
9 shapes can be seen and general reservoir pressure decline
10 can also be observed to essentially be uniform over the en-
11 tire reservoir.

12 Q What does that mean, the comparison of
13 those two isobaric maps?

14 A It's showing us that we have good pres-
15 sure communication between the wells and that we don't find
16 any undrained areas within the reservoir boundary. We're
17 adequately drawing the pressure down with the current wells.

18 Q Have you also made reserve calculations
19 for the field?

20 A Yes. We -- the well stream gas initially
21 in place was determined to be 40.4 BCF for the Bluit-
22 Wolfcamp Field. This volume was determined by a P/z plot,
23 or reservoir pressure divided by compressibility factor
24 versus the cumulative well stream production.

25 This is shown on Figure 4, P/z plot.

1 Q Would you turn to that and explain that
2 to the examiner?

3 A Yes. The P/z plot here was constructed
4 using the reservoir pressure in 1980 and then up -- from the
5 updated -- from the updated reservoir pressures found in
6 1984. We were able to circulate this to --

7 Q Does that P/z plot show uniform drawdown
8 of that reservoir?

9 A Well, actually this plot is just showing
10 us basically what our ultimate recovery is really predicted,
11 --

12 Q Okay.

13 A -- which is 40.4 BCF for the field.

14 Q Okay, what -- that's total estimated re-
15 serves in the field, is that correct?

16 A That's correct.

17 Q What do you estimate to be your ultimate
18 recovery from the wells currently in the field?

19 A Well, from Osborn and Uhl's updated study
20 of 1984, we projected ultimate recovery to be 35.3 BCF from
21 the field. This constitutes and 87.4 percent of the well
22 stream calculated initially in place to be recovered.

23 Q Is that a good recovery factor in your
24 opinion?

25 A Yes, we feel like that's a good recovery

1 factor for this field.

2 Q Now, what economic calculations or eval-
3 uations have you mde concerning infill drilling in the Blu-
4 itt-Wolfcamp Pool?

5 A We had a study done in 1981, again by Os-
6 born and Uhl, to infill -- look at the possibility of infill
7 drilling the Bluitt-Wolfcamp Field.

8 The economic comparisons of this study
9 are shown in Table II in this exhibit and it shows the case
10 of the infill drilling well, infill drilling to yield a cash
11 flow of \$1.3-million less than the described for the case of
12 continued current operatons, so we're showing that we would
13 be losing money by drilling the wells.

14 Even though a few more reserves were
15 generated from infill drilling the well, the increase in re-
16 serves wasn't sufficient enough to offset capital expendi-
17 ture required plus the increase in operating costs.

18 Q Now, is H. L. Brown intending to use an
19 alternate method of recovery in order to enhance production
20 from the field?

21 A Yes. We currently had approved by our
22 partners and are in the process of putting in a compression
23 facility out there at the Bluitt-Wolfcamp Field. It's our
24 intentions that the lower line pressures will yield a longer
25 life, thus more recovery, and help our recovery efficiency.

1 Q But you -- H. L. Brown deems this proce-
2 dure as a viable economic expenditure?

3 A Yes, sir. Our expenditure for the com-
4 pression facility will be approximately \$1.65-million, as
5 opposed to over, I believe it was \$8-million for cost of in-
6 fill drilling of the Bluitt-Wolfcamp Pool.

7 Q Have you updated the economic evaluation
8 in 1984?

9 A We've not updated the economics. The eco-
10 nomics in 1981 were based on a condensate price of \$40 a
11 barrel escalated at 8 percent per year to \$75 a barrel and
12 held constant thereafter.

13 A gas price of \$2.23 an MCF was used,
14 again escalating at 8 percent per year, reaching a ceiling
15 of \$10 per MCF and constant thereafter.

16 Operating costs were \$9000 per well, es-
17 calated at 8 percent. Drilling and completion costs were
18 estimated to be \$500,000 per well.

19 With our present prices of \$23 a barrel
20 for condensate and \$2.93 per MCF, we feel like the situation
21 of no escalation, prices used in the previous study, indi-
22 cate that with today's oil and gas markets an infill dril-
23 ling program would prove even less attractive than it did in
24 1981.

25 Q And in fact is it your testimony that you

1 would be spending money needlessly in trying to develop ad-
2 ditional reserves in the pool?

3 A Yes, that's correct.

4 Q What conclusions do you draw as far as
5 maintaining 320-acre spacing for this pool is concerned?

6 A It's our opinion that the reservoir in
7 the Bluitt-Wolfcamp Field is being drained efficiently and
8 economically with the present 320-acre spacing.

9 Uniform pressure drawdown indicates
10 drainage of the entire reservoir.

11 Infill drilling will not add enough re-
12 serves to offset the capital costs associated with drilling
13 these wells, nor will it add significantly to the projected
14 recovery factor of 87.4 percent of the well stream gas ini-
15 tially in place.

16 We request that the 320-acre spacing
17 units remain in effect for the Bluitt-Wolfcamp Field.

18 Q Mr. Feagan, do you have anything further
19 to add to your testimony?

20 A No, sir.

21 MR. PADILLA: Mr. Examiner, we
22 tender Mr. Feagan for questioning.

23 And I move the introduction of
24 Exhibit Number One.

25 MR. STOGNER: Exhibit Number

1 One will be admitted into evidence. Thank you, Mr. Padilla.

2

3

CROSS EXAMINATION

4

BY MR. STOGNER:

5

Q

Mr. Feagan, are you familiar with Order

6

Number R-2051-C?

7

A

No, sir.

8

Q

Are you familiar with any of the Orders

9

Number R-2051?

10

Are you referring to the ones that were

11

opened earlier asking -- bringing this case up?

12

Q

That was the order of the application of

13

H. L. Brown, Jr., and Clem E. George for establishment of

14

these special pool rules in the Bluit-Wolfcamp. Your com-

15

pany was the applicant.

16

Are you familiar with these orders?

17

A

No, sir.

18

Q

Well, in particular, Order No. R-2051-C,

19

order in paragraph number two says, the operator of the next

20

line connected to a pipeline in the Bluit-Wolfcamp Gas Pool

21

shall notify the Commission in writing of such fact and

22

that the the Commission will thereupon issue a supplemental

23

order designating exact date for reopening this case.

24

Do you know if H. L. Brown, Jr. Corpora-

25

tion abided by this order?

- 1 A I'm afraid I don't.
- 2 Q Do you know what the second well in this
3 pool was?
- 4 A The second well, I don't have that in
5 front of me, no, sir. I believe it was the Federal "A" No.
6 1.
- 7 Q Do you know who the operator of that well
8 was?
- 9 A H. L. Brown, Jr.
- 10 Q Is it still on line?
- 11 A Yes, sir.
- 12 Q Do you know when it was put on line?
- 13 A No, sir, I sure don't. I tell you what,
14 I may have that data.
- 15 Q Well, to save you and me some time, it
16 was put on line in November of 1964, so you've had approxi-
17 mately eleven years to abide by this order number.
- 18 A Uh-huh.
- 19 Q And I just wondered why H. L. Brown did
20 not.
- 21 A I'm afraid I'm not familiar with that.
- 22 Q Are you familiar with the general rules
23 and regulations of Rule 104?
- 24 A No, sir.
- 25 Q Are you familiar with the statewide rules

1 for Wolfcamp age spacing?

2 A No, sir.

3 MR. STOGNER: I have nothing
4 further for Mr. Feagan.

5 Is there anything further for
6 Mr. Feagan?

7 If not, he may be excused.

8 Is there anything further in
9 Case Number 2355 reopened at this time?

10 If not, this case will be taken
11 under advisement.

12

13 (Hearing concluded.)

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, SALLY W. BOYD, C.S.R., DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing Transcript of Hearing before the Oil Conservation Division (Commission) 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.

Sally W. Boyd CSR

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a complete record of the proceedings in the Examiner hearing of Case No. 2355 (Reopened) heard by me on 28 August 1985.
Michael E. Slogner, Examiner
Oil Conservation Division

Dockets Nos. 27-85 and 28-85 are tentatively set for September 11 and 25, 1985. Applications for hearing must be filed at least 22 days in advance of hearing date.

DOCKET: EXAMINER HEARING - WEDNESDAY - AUGUST 28, 1985

8 A.M. - OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION CONFERENCE ROOM,
STATE LAND OFFICE BUILDING, SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

The following cases will be heard before Gilbert P. Quintana, Examiner, or Michael E. Stogner, Alternate Examiner:

CASE 2355: (Reopened)

In the matter of Case 2355 being reopened on the motion of the Oil Conservation Division and pursuant to the provisions of Order No. R-2051, as amended, which order promulgated temporary special rules and regulations for the Bluit-Wolfcamp Gas Pool in Roosevelt County including a provision for 320-acre spacing units. Operators in said pool may appear and show cause why the pool should not be developed on 160-acre spacing units.

CASE 3544: (Reopened)

In the matter of Case 3544 being reopened on the motion of the Oil Conservation Division and pursuant to the provisions of Order No. R-3212 which order created the Tower Hill-Morrow Gas Pool in Eddy County and promulgated temporary special rules and regulations therefor including a provision for 640-acre spacing units. Operators in said pool may appear and show cause why the pool should not be developed on 320-acre spacing units.

CASE 4575: (Reopened)

In the matter of Case 4575 being reopened on the motion of the Oil Conservation Division and pursuant to the provisions of Order No. R-4193 which order established a limiting gas-oil ratio of 5,000 cubic feet of gas for each barrel of oil produced for the South Eunice-San Andres Pool in Lea County. Operators may appear and present evidence as to whether or not the Anadarko Production Company Lou Wortham Well No. 6 located in Unit E of Section 11, Township 22 South, Range 37 East, is in fact a gas well; whether or not the pool is in fact an associated reservoir; and whether or not the limiting gas-oil ratio should revert to 2000 to 1.

CASE 4815: (Reopened)

In the matter of Case 4815 being reopened on the motion of the Oil Conservation Division and pursuant to the provisions of Order No. R-4405 which order created the East Catclaw Draw-Strawn Gas Pool in Eddy County and promulgated temporary special rules and regulations therefor including a provision for 640-acre spacing units. Operators in said pool may appear and show cause why the pool should not be developed on 320-acre spacing units.

CASE 4826: (Reopened)

In the matter of Case 4826 being reopened on the motion of the Oil Conservation Division and pursuant to the provisions of Order No. R-4407 which order created the Catclaw Draw-Strawn Gas Pool in Eddy County and promulgated temporary special rules and regulations therefor including a provision for 640-acre spacing units. Operators in said pool may appear and show cause why the pool should not be developed on 320-acre spacing units.

CASE 5385: (Reopened)

In the matter of Case 5385 being reopened on the motion of the Oil Conservation Division and pursuant to the provisions of Order No. R-4951 which order created the High Hope-Abo Gas Pool in Eddy County and promulgated temporary special rules and regulations therefor including a provision for 320-acre spacing. Operators in said pool may appear and show cause why the pool should not be developed on 160-acre spacing units.

CASE 5438: (Reopened)

In the matter of Case 5438 being reopened on the motion of the Oil Conservation Division and pursuant to the provisions of Order No. R-4996 which order created the Fairview Mills-Wolfcamp Gas Pool in Lea County and promulgated temporary special rules and regulations therefor including a provision for 640-acre spacing units. Operators in said pool may appear and show cause why the pool should not be developed on 160-acre spacing units.

CASE 5777: (Reopened)

In the matter of Case 5777 being reopened on the motion of the Oil Conservation Division and pursuant to the provisions of Order No. R-5316 which order created the Horse Back-Pennsylvanian Gas Pool in Lea County and promulgated temporary special rules and regulations therefor including a provision for 640-acre spacing units. Operators in said pool may appear and show cause why the pool should not be developed on 320-acre spacing units.

CASE 8686: Application of Robert E. Chandler Corporation for compulsory pooling, Lea County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks an order pooling all mineral interests from the surface to the base of the Granite Wash formation underlying the NE/4 SW/4 of Section 7, Township 22 South, Range 38 East, to be dedicated to a well to be drilled at a standard location thereon. 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, designation of applicant as operator of the well and a charge for risk involved in drilling said well.

CASE 8664: (Continued from August 14, 1985, Examiner Hearing)

Application of Cities Service Oil and Gas Corporation for compulsory pooling, Harding County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks an order pooling all mineral interests in the West Bravo Dome Carbon Dioxide Area underlying all of Section 30, Township 18 North, Range 29 East, to be dedicated to a well to be drilled at a standard location thereon. 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, designation of applicant as operator of the well and a charge for risk involved in drilling said well.

CASE 8687: Application of Rio Pecos Corporation for an unorthodox gas well location, Lea County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks approval of an unorthodox gas well location 660 feet from the North and West lines of Section 34, Township 16 South, Range 34 East, Morrow formation, the N/2 of said Section 34 to be dedicated to the well.

CASE 8688: Application of Rio Pecos Corporation for compulsory pooling, Eddy County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks an order pooling all mineral interests from the top of the Wolfcamp formation to the base of the Morrow formation underlying the W/2 of Section 26, Township 17 South, Range 30 East, to be dedicated to a well to be drilled at a standard location thereon. 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, designation of applicant as operator of the well and a charge for risk involved in drilling said well.

CASE 8666: (Continued from July 31, 1985, Examiner Hearing)

Application of Amoco Production Company for NGPA Wellhead Price Ceiling Category Determination, San Juan County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks the determination that its Sammons Gas Com "I" Well No. 1 located 945 feet from the North line and 1580 feet from the East line (Unit B) of Section 6, Township 31 North, Range 10 West, Cedar Hill-Fruitland Basal Coal Gas Pool, meets the NGPA well category criteria for Section 107, High Cost Occluded Gas Produced from Coal Seams, under Section 107 of the Natural Gas Policy Act of 1978.

CASE 8689: Application of Doyle Hartman for compulsory pooling, Lea County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks an order pooling all mineral interests in the Jalmat Gas Pool underlying a previously approved 120-acre non-standard proration unit comprising the N/2 NW/4 and SW/4 NW/4 of Section 20, Township 25 South, Range 37 East, to be dedicated to its Justis Christmas Gas Com Well No. 1 located 2225 feet from the North line and 790 feet from the West line of said Section 20. 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, designation of applicant as operator of the well and a charge for risk involved in drilling said well.

CASE 8690: Application of Doyle Hartman for a non-standard proration unit, two unorthodox locations, and simultaneous dedication, Lea County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks a finding that the drilling of two wells to be located at unorthodox well locations, the first of which is to be at least 1325 feet from the South line but not more than 1650 feet from the South line and at least 660 feet from the West line but not more than 850 feet from the West line of Section 22, and the second of which is to be at least 250 feet from the North line but not more than 990 feet from the North line and at least 660 feet from the West line but not more than 1980 feet from the West line of Section 27, all in Township 25 South, Range 37 East, Jalmat Gas Pool and Langlie Mattix Pool, is necessary to effectively and efficiently drain that portion of a 240-acre non-standard gas proration unit in the Jalmat Gas Pool only, comprising the W/2 SW/4 of Section 22 and the NW/4 of Section 27, Township 25 South, Range 37 East, which cannot be so drained by the existing Jalmat wells. Applicant further seeks approval for the simultaneous dedication of said 240-acre non-standard Jalmat proration unit to the subject wells and the currently producing Carlson-Harrison Federal Com Wells Nos. 1, 2, and 3.

CASE 8678: (Continued from August 14, 1985, Examiner Hearing)

Application of Wilton Scott to vacate and void Division Order No. R-7983, Lea County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks to vacate and void Division Order No. R-7983 which promulgated temporary special pool rules and regulations for the Northeast Caudill-Wolfcamp Pool including a provision for 80-acre spacing.

(k) EXTEND the Querecho Plains-Upper Bone Spring Pool in Lea County, New Mexico, to include therein:

TOWNSHIP 18 SOUTH, RANGE 32 EAST, NMPM
Section 27: N/2

(l) EXTEND the Scharb-Wolfcamp Pool in Lea County, New Mexico, to include therein:

TOWNSHIP 18 SOUTH, RANGE 35 EAST, NMPM
Section 32: SE/4

(m) EXTEND the Wantz-Abo Pool in Lea County, New Mexico, to include therein:

TOWNSHIP 22 SOUTH, RANGE 37 EAST, NMPM
Section 14: NE/4

(n) EXTEND the North Young-Bone Spring Pool in Lea County, New Mexico, to include therein:

TOWNSHIP 18 SOUTH, RANGE 32 EAST, NMPM
Section 4: SW/4
Section 8: NW/4



TONEY ANAYA
GOVERNOR

STATE OF NEW MEXICO
ENERGY AND MINERALS DEPARTMENT
OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION

50 YEARS



1935 - 1985

POST OFFICE BOX 2088
STATE LAND OFFICE BUILDING
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO 87501
(505) 827-5800

August 12, 1985

Sun Exploration & Production Company
Box 1861
Midland, Texas 79702

Gentlemen:

In accordance with the provisions of Division Order No. R-2051, as amended, Case No. 2355 is being reopened in order to allow all operators in the Bluitt-Wolfcamp Gas Pool in Roosevelt County, New Mexico, to appear and show cause why the subject pool should not be developed on 160-acre spacing units.

Our records show that you have producing wells in this pool, and this letter is your notice that Case No. 2355 will be reopened and heard at the Examiner Hearing to be held on August 28, 1985, in the Oil Conservation Division Conference Room, State Land Office Building, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

A copy of the docket for this hearing will be mailed to you within the next week.

Sincerely,

Florene Davidson
Staff Specialist



TONEY ANAYA
GOVERNOR

STATE OF NEW MEXICO
ENERGY AND MINERALS DEPARTMENT
OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION

50 YEARS



1935 - 1985

POST OFFICE BOX 2088
STATE LAND OFFICE BUILDING
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO 87501
(505) 827-5800

August 12, 1985

Layton Enterprises Inc.
3103-79th St.
Lubbock, Texas 79423

Gentlemen:

In accordance with the provisions of Division Order No. R-2051, as amended, Case No. 2355 is being reopened in order to allow all operators in the Bluit-Wolfcamp Gas Pool in Roosevelt County, New Mexico, to appear and show cause why the subject pool should not be developed on 160-acre spacing units.

Our records show that you have producing wells in this pool, and this letter is your notice that Case No. 2355 will be reopened and heard at the Examiner Hearing to be held on August 28, 1985, in the Oil Conservation Division Conference Room, State Land Office Building, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

A copy of the docket for this hearing will be mailed to you within the next week.

Sincerely,

Florene Davidson
Staff Specialist

50 YEARS



TONEY ANAYA
GOVERNOR

STATE OF NEW MEXICO
ENERGY AND MINERALS DEPARTMENT
OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION



1935 - 1985

August 12, 1985

POST OFFICE BOX 2088
STATE LAND OFFICE BUILDING
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO 87501
(505) 827-5800

H. L. Brown, Jr.
Box 2237
Midland, Texas 79702

Gentlemen:

In accordance with the provisions of Division Order No. R-2051, as amended, Case No. 2355 is being reopened in order to allow all operators in the Bluitt-Wolfcamp Gas Pool in Roosevelt County, New Mexico, to appear and show cause why the subject pool should not be developed on 160-acre spacing units.

Our records show that you have producing wells in this pool, and this letter is your notice that Case No. 2355 will be reopened and heard at the Examiner Hearing to be held on August 28, 1985, in the Oil Conservation Division Conference Room, State Land Office Building, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

A copy of the docket for this hearing will be mailed to you within the next week.

Sincerely,

Florene Davidson
Staff Specialist