

BEFORE THE
OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION
Santa Fe, New Mexico

February 7, 1962

EXAMINER HEARING

DEARNLEY-MEIER REPORTING SERVICE, Inc.

FARMINGTON, N. M.
PHONE 325-1182

IN THE MATTER OF:

Application of Gulf Oil Corporation for a triple completion, Lea County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks permission to complete its W. A. Ramsay (NCT-C) Well No. 3, located 1650 feet from the South line and 330 feet from the West line of Section 36, Township 24 South, Range 37 East, Lea County, New Mexico, as a triple completion (conventional), in the North Justis-Ellenburger, North Justis-Fusselman and North Justis-McKee Pools with the production of oil from all zones to be through parallel strings of 2 3/8-inch tubing.

CASE NO.
2487

BEFORE: DANIEL S. NUTTER, Examiner

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

MR. NUTTER: Now coming before the New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission, Case No. 2487.

MR. WHITFIELD: Case No. 2487. The Application of Gulf Oil Corporation for a triple completion in Lea County, New Mexico.

MR. KASTLER: I am Bill Kastler, appearing on behalf of Gulf Oil Corporation. We would like to call Mr. Hoover to the stand.

(Witness sworn.)

ALBUQUERQUE, N. M.
PHONE 243-6591



JOHN H. HOOVER,

called as a witness, having been first duly sworn on oath, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. KASTLER:

Q Will you state your name and where you are employed, by whom, and in what position?

A John H. Hoover, employed by Gulf Oil Corporation, Roswell, New Mexico, as petroleum engineer.

Q Will you please outline what Gulf is seeking in Case 2487?

A We are seeking a triple completion (conventional) for W. A. Ramsay, NCT-C Well No. 3, which is located 1650 feet from the south line and 330 feet from the west line of Section 36, Township 24 South, Range 37 East, Lea County, New Mexico, this completion to be in the North Justis-Ellenburger, Fusselman and McKee oil pools.

(Applicant's Exhibits 1 through 4 marked for identification.)

Q I would like to call your attention to the plat marked Exhibit 1 and will you state where the lease is located and the well in question.

A Yes, sir. On our Exhibit 1 we have outlined the W. A. Ramsay NCT-C lease in red and it covers all of Section 36. I would like to point out a few things on that. It might be noticed

DEARNLEY-MEIER REPORTING SERVICE, Inc.

FARMINGTON, N. M.
PHONE 325-1182

ALBUQUERQUE, N. M.
PHONE 243-6691



DEARNLEY-MEIER REPORTING SERVICE, Inc.

FARMINGTON, N. M.
PHONE 325-1182

ALBUQUERQUE, N. M.
PHONE 243-6691

in the Southwest quarter of Section 36 and the Southwest quarter of the Northwest quarter of this section, there are other wells, and it might be noted that Jack Frost is the operator of other wells on there and there is a dotted line to each of those wells, one, two, three, four, and five, which represents those. We have one other well up in the Northwest quarter as Gulf Well No. 1. Our Well No 2 is in the Southwest quarter of the Southwest quarter. It is a dual completion in the Ellenburger and McKee. Our Well No. 3 on this plat is circuled in red and has not been completed. as of this time.

Q It is completed drilling, is it not?

A The drilling is completed, but the completion is not done. Also, on this plat down in Lot 1 of Section 2 is the Amrodus, NJA, Well No. 1. It's to the southwest diagonally off-setting our Ramsay C. lease. It shows the Ellenburger, McKee and Fusselman. That is a triple completion in the same zones that we are asking for in our Well No. 3, but that was a three-string cemented in a common well bore where ours is not. Therefore, the reason for this hearing is because ours is a conventional triple completion. I believe that pretty well covers Exhibit 1.

Q Is that completed in the Fusselman, that diagonal off-set?

A Ellenburger, McKee, Fusselman, and Sularm.

Q May I call your attention to the electric log marked Exhibit 2? Will you please testify as to what is shown on that



pertinent to this case?

A This is the electric log for the Ramsay Well No. 3 and what we have shown on this log is the top and bottom of the formation in which we propose to triple complete, and we have shown the perforations in the various zones. I believe that is all.

Q Now, I wish to call your attention to the schematic diagram on the mechanical installations labelled Exhibit No. 3. Will you please outline what is shown on there that is pertinent to this case?

A Yes, sir. This well was spudded on November 7, 1961, and was drilled to a total depth of 8,520 feet and was plugged back to 8,510 feet. We show that 13 3/8-inch casing was set at the time at 979 feet and cement was circulated to the surface. We have 9 5/8-inch casing set at 3,661 feet and cement was also circulated to the surface. We have 7-inch casing set at 8,520 feet, cemented with 700 sacks of cement and temperature survey indicated the top of the cement at 4,380 feet.

The proposed mechanical installation is a Baker Model J packer set at approximately 8,430 feet, a Baker Model J dual snap packer set at approximately 8,015 feet. We show the Fusselman perforations at 7,001 feet to 7,021 feet; McKee perforations at 8,030 feet to 8,087 feet; Ellenburger perforations at 8,445 feet to 8,463 feet. We propose to utilize the three strings of 2 3/8-inch tubing. The long string will set into the Baker Model D packer. The intermediate string will lash into the Baker Model



J packer by the use of the parallel snap latch seal. The short string will be hanging free.

Q What are the bottomhole pressures and gravity in the three zones which you propose to complete?

A We have on the drillstem test in the Fusselman, the initial shut-in pressure was 2679 pounds. The gravity of the fluid was 35.7 degrees. We have bottomhole pressures that were actually taken in our Well No. 2, in the Ellenburger-McKee -- I will give those at this time. For the McKee, the bottomhole pressure was 2,929 pounds at a minus 4250 feet. The gravity of the fluid was 45.1 degrees.

In the Ellenburger, the bottomhole pressure was 2687 pounds at a minus 5050. The gravity was 45.4 degrees.

Q For Exhibit No. 4, you have included copies of specifications of the Baker Model J dual snap set packer. Will you please testify, referring to Exhibit No. 4, the features and specifications of this?

A Yes. This exhibit was presented just for a picture of the packer. There is nothing unusual about the packer, more or less standard equipment, but there are some features of this particular packer that I would like to mention. On this double grip feature, it has slips at the bottom which are activated by setting down the weight with a long string which activates those slips out to catch to the casing wall there by holding the packer in place from going down. Then, by applying additional set-down weight



on the long string, up to about 6,000 pounds, sets the packer. The other grip feature is built-on-type hooks at the top of the packer which are activated by any differential ⁱⁿ pressure from below. The packer forces these pistons out, which grip against the wall and prevent the packer from moving up the hole or unseating in the event there was a differential pressure from below. The other features of the packer are more or less conventional with existing dual completion equipment.

Q Is this a retrievable packer?

A Yes, it is retrievable.

Q And the Baker Model D packer, is it retrievable?

A It is not retrievable.

Q What was the saving involved in making the proposed triple completion?

A Our estimated cost to dual this well in the Ellenburger and McKee is \$180,000. If we provided a single-zone Fusselman well, it would cost an additional \$79,000, making a total for two wells of \$259,000. Our estimated cost to triple this well is \$198,500, which represents a saving of some \$60,500.

Q Have all of the offset operators been notified of the pendency of this application?

A Yes, sir, they were.

Q Have any complaints been received?

A None to my knowledge.

Q Is this application, in your opinion, in the interest



of the prevention of waste?

A Yes, it is.

Q Does it impair correlative rights in any way?

A No, sir.

Q Were Exhibits 1, 2, 3, and 4 prepared by you or under your direction and supervision?

A Yes, they were.

MR. KASTLER: That concludes my questions, Mr. Nutter. I would like to move that Exhibits 1, 2, 3, and 4 be admitted into evidence.

MR. NUTTER: Gulf's Exhibits 1 through 4 will be admitted.

Are there any questions of Mr. Hoover?

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. NUTTER:

Q There was recently held a meeting in Hobbs, New Mexico, of the industry's interpretations of the top and bottom of the McKee zones in the North Justis Pool. Does the perforated intervals of this well conform with the findings of that meeting?

A Yes, it is my understanding it does. Our geologist picked these tops and bottoms and they were in on that meeting and it is my understanding that they do.

Q These are McKee perforations?

A Yes, sir.

Q One other thing, Mr. Hoover. What was the bottomhole



pressure taken in the No. 2 McKee well?

A 2,929.

MR. NUTTER: Any further questions of Mr. Hoover?

You may be excused.

(Witness excused.)

MR. NUTTER: Do you have anything further, Mr. Kastler?

MR. KASTLER: No.

MR. NUTTER: Does anyone have anything they wish to offer in Case 2487?

We will take the case under advisement and call the next case.

* * * * *

DEARNLEY-MEIERS REPORTING SERVICE, Inc.

FARMINGTON, N. M.
PHONE 325-1182

ALBUQUERQUE, N. M.
PHONE 243-6691



NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

EXAMINER HEARING - DANIEL S. NUTTER

SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

REGISTER

HEARING DATE FEBRUARY 7, 1962 . TIME: 9 A.M.

NAME:	REPRESENTING:	LOCATION:
Booker Kelly	Gulf Oil	S F.
C.R. Black	Texaco Inc.	Midland
John H. Hooper	Gulf Oil Corp	Roswell
Wm. V. Foster	"	"
Jason Kellaher	Kellaher & Co	Santa Fe
Frank Gray	Caulkins Oil Co.	Farmington
R. J. Davenport	Western Development Co.	Artesia
J. L. Loefer	Loefer & Stewart	Artesia
M. E. Spitzer	Western Development Co.	Box 427 Artesia
The Potts	Water-Flood Associates Inc	Box 376 "
R. R. Austin	Branke, Austin & Co	Roswell
Pete Parker	OCC	Santa Fe.