

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

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

5 September 1984

EXAMINER HEARING

IN THE MATTER OF:

Application of Amoco Production Company for an extension of the Gavilan-Mancos Oil Pool, Rio Arriba County, New Mexico.	CASE 8331
--	--------------

BEFORE: Gilbert P. Quintana, Examiner

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

A P P E A R A N C E S

For the Oil Conservation Division:	Charles E. Roybal Attorney at Law Energy and Minerals Dept. 525 Camino de Los Marquez Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501
---------------------------------------	--

For the Applicant:	William F. Carr Attorney at Law CAMPBELL & BLACK P. A. P. O. Box 2208 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

A P P E A R A N C E S

For Mesa Grande Resources: James G. Bruce  
Attorney at Law  
HINKLE LAW FIRM  
P. O. Box 2068  
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

For Benson-Montin-Greer: Ernest L. Padilla  
Attorney at Law  
P. O. Box 2523  
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

CHARLES BOYCE

Direct Examination by Mr. Carr	5
Cross Examination by Mr. Bruce	15

STATEMENT BY MR. PADILLA	21
--------------------------	----

STATEMENT BY MR. BRUCE	22
------------------------	----

STATEMENT BY MR. CARR	22
-----------------------	----

E X H I B I T S

Amoco Exhibit One, Map	6
Amoco Exhibit Two, Cross Section	8
Amoco Exhibit Three, Document	9
Amoco Exhibit Four, Dugan Letter	14

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. QUINTANA: Call Case 8331.

MR. ROYBAL: Case 8331.

Application of Amoco Production Company for an extension of the Gavilan-Mancos Oil Pool, Rio Arriba County, New Mexico.

MR. CARR: May it please the Examiner, my name is William F. Carr with the law firm Campbell & Black, of Santa Fe, appearing on behalf of Amoco Production Company.

I have one witness who needs to be sworn.

MR. QUINTANA: Are there any other appearances in this case?

MR. BRUCE: My name is Jim Bruce from the Hinkle Law Firm in Santa Fe, representing Mesa Grande Resources, Inc.

MR. QUINTANA: Do you have any --

MR. BRUCE: I have no witnesses at this time. I'm waiting for one to show up.

MR. QUINTANA: All right. Will the witnesses that are present now 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

CHARLES BOYCE,

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

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. CARR:

Q Will you state your full name and place of residence?

A My name is Charles Boyce, B-O-Y-C-E. I'm employed by Amoco Production Company in Denver, Colorado.

Q Mr. Boyce, have you previously testified before this Commission and had your credentials as an engineer accepted and made a matter of record?

A Yes, I have.

Q Are you familiar with the application filed in this case on behalf of Amoco Production Company?

A Yes.

Q Are you familiar with the subject area?

A Yes.

MR. CARR: Are the witness' qualifications acceptable?

MR. QUINTANA: What did you say your professional -- your profession is?

A I am a Senior Petroleum Engineering Associate with Amoco Production Company.

MR. QUINTANA: The witness is

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

considered qualified.

Q Mr. Boyce, will you briefly state what Amoco seeks in this case?

A Yes. At this time we are requesting an extension of the Gavilan-Mancos Oil Pool, which was originally established in Case Number 7980, Order R-7407.

The acreage to be included would be Sections 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 23 and 24, Township 24 North, Range 2 West, Rio Arriba County, New Mexico.

Q Have you had certain exhibits prepared for introduction in this case?

A Yes, I have.

Q Would you please refer to what's been marked for identification as Exhibit Number One and review that for Mr. Quintana?

A Exhibit Number One is a map of the general area, which includes the -- the established Gavilan-Mancos Oil Pool, shown by the legend in the dashed black line. That was established under Order Number R-7407.

The vertical line along the right side of Range 2 West shows the westernmost boundary of the West Puerto Chiquito-Mancos Pool.

The area that I've designated for our proposed expansion is shown by a solid black line. Also indicated therein are Amoco Production Company leases within the proposed expansion area, other existing oil wells or wells that are being drilled to or tested in the Mancos

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

within the general area.

Q Now, Amoco has a couple of wells currently spotted within the proposed area, is that not correct?

A Yes. These are generalized locations where we plan to drill two wells that we have authorized.

One will be in the northwest quarter of Section 11; the other will be in the northwest quarter of Section 14. These, to my knowledge, have not been permitted yet. They will be at locations which are permitted by the existing order in the Gavilan-Mancos.

Q If your application is granted, what will be the spacing requirements for each of those wells?

A The spacing would be 320 acres for each Gavilan-Mancos oil well.

Q Now, Mr. Boyce, is you simply drilled these wells stepping out from the existing pool, the spacing would automatically be changed as you moved out, would it not?

A Eventually it would, yes, on a well by well basis under the present State rules.

Q Why are you seeking this change at this time?

A We have drilled and are completing a well in the northwest quarter of Section 24, 24 North, Range 2 West, the Amoco Federal Oso Canyon No. 1.

We have, as shown on the plat, additional acreage, additional drilling plans in the area.

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

To facilitate determining the ownership of the wells prior to drilling, we're requesting the area be spaced at this time rather than piecemeal as wells are drilled.

Q And if the application is granted, it will be on 320-acre spacing?

A That's correct.

Q Will you now refer to Amoco Exhibit Number Two and review this for Mr. Quintana?

A Exhibit Number Two is a two-well log cross section indicated by the dashed line A-A' on our Exhibit Number One.

This two-well section goes from the Northwest Exploration No. 1 Gavilan in the northeast northeast of 26, 25 North, 2 West. The log on the right is our Amoco No. 1 Federal Oso Canyon in the northwest quarter of Section 24 of 24 North, 2 West.

Q And what does this exhibit show?

A This exhibit shows the Niobrara section that was designated as the interval to be pooled in the Gavilan-Mancos pooling order. That goes from a depth on the Gavilan No. 1 from 6590 to 7574.

To compare the two wells we've shown the same general section in our well.

The similarity of the Mancos section is quite apparent from this log, particularly the Gallup member, which is that zone that is generally perforated, stimu-



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

lated, and produces oil from this pool.

On the Northwest Exploration Gavilan No. 1, more particularly the interval from approximately 6900 feet to 7150 feet, indicated by fairly high resistivity readings, on Amoco's No. 1 Oso Canyon a correlative interval would be from approximately 6810 to approximately 7025.

We do have one apparent developed interval above that from approximately 6780 or -- yes, 6780 to 6800 feet.

Q Mr. Boyce, was the Oso Canyon No. 1 Well an oil well?

A We have perforated the Oso Canyon No. 1 Well in the intervals 6786 to 6800; 6838 to 6850; 6908 to 6920; 7004 to 7016; stimulated that interval with 100,254 gallons of gelled water and 73,800 pounds of sand.

This data was reported on a summary notice dated August 13th, 1984.

The test results from that perforating and stimulation work are shown on our -- our Exhibit Number Three.

Q Would you go to that exhibit now and review that for Mr. Quintana?

A Exhibit Number Three is a listing of day-by-day swab tests of this well following the fracture operations.

The well is currently shut-in. We're installing pumping equipment and I have no further tests at

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

this time.

The swab tests are definite indication of oil productivity. The average swab production during the eight-day period after we saw our first show of oil on August 8th if related to a 24-hour period would be approximately 70 barrels of oil per day and 273 barrels of water per day.

There is certainly no exact correlation between swab rates and pump rates but the indications from these early swab rates are that the oil well will be successfully completed and that the productivity will be suitable to maintain economic production.

Q Do you believe there's any evidence of fracturing in this area?

A The drilling of this well, realizing that other wells in the area suffered quite severe lost circulation through this Mancos interval, was planned to try to minimize that, due to the damage, not permanent damage but temporary damage created by mud loss in these fracture systems, the mud weight was maintained as low as possible; however, at a depth of approximately 6300, which on our log is right at the top of it, we did lose approximately 200 barrels of mud.

Through the remainder of the Gallup section the mud weight was maintained as low as possible. It was 8.8 pounds per gallon and lost circulation material was utilized.

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

We didn't have reports of additional major lost circulation from there to total depth. Any minor amounts could have occurred.

With the -- with the loss of substantial mud immediately above the productive interval, gives indication of fracturing in this general area.

Q Mr. Boyce, were you present at the time of the hearing when the Gavilan-Mancos Oil Pool was approved by this Commission?

A Yes, I was.

Q And were you present when testimony was presented concerning fracturing of the reservoir?

A That's correct.

Q Would you anticipate that that testimony would apply to this area?

A Based on my experience in the Mancos in this area, and the logs that we have run and the early productivity following our stimulation operation, it gives definite indication of fracture-type productivity.

MR. CARR: May it please the Examiner, we would ask that you take administrative notice of Case 7980, which resulted in Order No. R-7407 in which that testimony is contained.

Q Now, Mr. Boyce, why did you -- did Amoco select this particular area as an extension of the Gavilan-Mancos Oil Pool?

A The area was basically selected as a re-

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

sult of the well we drilled, the Amoco No. 1 Federal Oso Canyon No. 1, which was drilled on a lease which was expiring some time in the near future.

Once we had logged that well, realized the comparison of the pay with that to the north, and having a fairly substantial acreage picture in the area, we then recommended an area which included the Oso Canyon Well to the south and also based on existing wells in the -- in the Gavilan-Mancos Pool, included an area where we did have some well control.

At the time that the Gavilan-Mancos Pool was established, during the -- the hearing that I referred to previously, testimony was presented that very possibly fracturing in the Mancos was developed north and south of the area outlined; however, the parties that recommended that different outline limited it to the well control only. So there was belief at that time that the area north and south would probably be related and in my opinion the initial shows of our well does give evidence to the south.

Q Mr. Boyce, in your opinion if this application is granted, will it result in better control of the development of this area?

A In my opinion it will, yes.

Q Does Amoco have additional drilling plans for the area which is governed by this application?

A Yes, we do.

Q Do you believe that this proposed expan-

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

sion will prevent economic loss caused by the drilling of unnecessary wells?

A I believe it will.

Q Do you believe it would prevent reduced recovery of hydrocarbons which might result from the drilling of an excessive number of wells?

A I do.

Q In your opinion will granting this application be in the best interest of conservation, the prevention of waste, and the protection of correlative rights?

A I believe it will, and particularly since we are, of course, requesting, and it would be mandatory that the temporary special rules for the Gavilan-Mancos Pool, which will be re-heard in three years, would -- would apply to this area.

With that temporary nature and the review of -- of data within three years, in my opinion it would be the best way to develop this particular pool.

Q Were Exhibits One through three prepared by you or under your direction?

A Yes.

MR. CARR: At this time, Mr. Quintana, we would offer into evidence Amoco Exhibits One through Three.

MR. QUINTANA: Amoco Exhibits One through Three will so be admitted.

MR. CARR: Mr. Quintana, a few

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

minutes ago we were handed a letter from Dugan Production Company in support of Amoco's application and would ask that it be incorporated into the record.

MR. QUINTANA: Did you wish to include this as an Exhibit Four or --

MR. CARR: If you'll note, it's just a letter from Mr. Dugan and it would -- if you'd like it marked as an exhibit, we can do that. He requested it be incorporated into the record.

I'll be glad to mark it as an exhibit, if you'd like me to.

MR. QUINTANA: Mark it as an exhibit.

MR. CARR: I'd move the admission of Exhibit Number Four.

MR. QUINTANA: Let the record show that Exhibit Number Four for Amoco Production will so be admitted.

That exhibit is a letter from Dugan Production to Amoco Production in support of their application of today.

MR. CARR: And, Mr. Quintana, that concludes my direct examination of Mr. Boyce.

MR. QUINTANA: Let me make a correction on that.

That letter was addressed to Joe Ramey.

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

Are there any questions of the witness?

MR. BRUCE: Yes, I have a few, Mr. Examiner.

MR. QUINTANA: You may proceed.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. BRUCE:

Q Mr. Boyce, I didn't have Exhibit Number One but what is the current boundary of the Gavilan-Mancos Pool?

(Thereupon a copy of Exhibit Number One was provided to Mr. Bruce.)

So the Gavilan-Mancos Pool at the present time ends on the northern boundary of the area you seek extension from?

A The -- the pool, as defined in Order R-7407 establishes that point. To my knowledge there haven't been completed Mancos wells which would have extended it.

Q Okay. And you said that Amoco, if I read this map right, you said that Amoco currently has no --no wells drilled in Township 24 North, 2 West, 2 North -- or 2 West, except for the Amoco No. 1 Oso Canyon?

A Wells that have penetrated the Mancos, no.

1  
2 Q And how many wells do you have proposed  
3 for this area of extension?

4 A The two that our management has author-  
5 ized would be in, as shown in the not exact locations, the  
6 quarter section locations, in the northwest quarter of 11  
7 and the northwest quarter of 14 of 24 North, 2 West.

8 Q But these have not yet been permitted or  
9 drilled?

10 A No, they have not been drilled. If per-  
11 mits have been issued within the past few days, I'm not  
12 aware of them.

13 Q What is the approximate distance between  
14 the Northwest Exploration No. 1 Gavilan and the Amoco No. 1  
15 Oso Canyon?

16 A It -- one, two, three, four, it's approx-  
17 imately five miles.

18 Q And there are no wells on the cross sec-  
19 tion that you had between these two wells?

20 A No.

21 Q So it is possible that there -- that  
22 there -- the zone could possibly be noncontinuous or they  
23 could be separate zones.

24 A As far as this cross section is con-  
25 cerned, I'm drawing the conclusion that they are continuous.

The -- the only other well closer to our  
well than Northwest Gavilan, basically two of the McHugh,  
No. 1 Rightway and the McHugh No. 1 Mother Lode, which are



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

two miles closer, and those wells are quite highly productive in the Mancos.

So there would be basically a three mile interval where we have no log control.

Q Why weren't the McHugh wells used in the cross section?

A The Northwest Exploration No. 1 Gavilan was utilized to define the interval spaced in the original area. I've seen the logs on other wells in the area. There is no major difference in the -- in the appearance of the logs; therefore I did not include them.

Had they shown me something markedly different, we would have included them.

Q But using these wells would have shown that the reservoir was closer, is that correct?

A To my knowledge, yes, it would have.

Q With respect to your Oso Canyon No. 1 Well, was there any gas production from this well?

A The swab results that I have presented on the -- on Exhibit Number Three showed no particular measurable gas with -- with nearly 1655 barrels of load water recovered, and with really a fairly brief swabbing period.

I wouldn't expect large amounts of gas particularly with these fairly low oil rates during the 9-hour swab period; no measured gas.

Q Was there any evidence of Dakota production in this well?

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

A           The Dakota production, or the Dakota horizon, as reported on our sundry notice of July 30th, 1984, was perforated and fractured as indicated on our sundry notice of August 13th, 1984, which I referred to previously.

          The Dakota perforations which were perforated and tested were cement squeezed prior to opening the Mancos formation.

          The Dakota production was indicated to be noncommercial and it was squeezed.

Q           However, there is Dakota production in the No. 1 Gavilan Well, is there not?

A           Yes, there is.

Q           So in short, there's not continuous Dakota production for that five mile stretch.

A           Well, I certainly don't believe I've mentioned anything that would imply that. The Dakota in the Oso Canyon was perforated, fractured, tested. It swabbed shows of oil. It was a wildcat well and our next objective was the Mancos and the decision was made to squeeze off the Dakota at that time feeling it was probably not of a commercial enough quantity to justify temporary bridge plug, et cetera.

          The Dakota is productive in -- in the two wells that I mentioned, which are two miles closer to the Oso Canyon. That would be the McHugh No. 1 Rightway in Section 2 and the McHugh No. 1 Mother Lode; therefore the Dako-

1  
2 ta is present in all of the wells I've mentioned. It does  
3 show indications of oil production and I have no information  
4 which would lead me to believe that it's not present in the  
5 area.

6 Q You stated that extension of the Gavilan-  
7 Mancos Pool by these seven sections would result in better  
8 control of development in this area. Why would it result in  
9 better development control?

10 A Because the wells to the north are spaced  
11 on 320-acre spacing. Evidence presented at the original Ga-  
12 vilan-Mancos hearing supported the fact that very probably  
13 fracture productivity is controlling this area.

14 With 640-acre Gallup spacing to the east,  
15 it's my opinion and I certainly support the testimony pre-  
16 sented, that initial development in this area in the Mancos  
17 on reasonably wide spacing is certainly the best way to pro-  
18 ceed.

19 With that type of spacing the area can be  
20 developed with a minimum number of wells still at a density  
21 that appears will -- will ultimately drain the area. If the  
22 evidence obtained from that drilling shows at some later  
23 time, particularly three years from now when this is re-  
24 viewed, that some other spacing is necessary, then it would  
25 be considered then.

Based on that I feel that this extension  
would lead to orderly development.

Q Mr. Boyce, the proposed Amoco well in the

1  
2 northwest quarter of Section 11, that would already be con-  
3 trolled by the current Gavilan-Mancos rules, would it not?

4 A Under State rules a well that is com-  
5 pleted in a zone that is spaced, within a mile of that zone  
6 must be drilled and spaced, so yes, it -- it would, to my  
7 knowledge, be spaced on 320-acre spacing.

8 Q And then if you drilled that well, then  
9 the second Amoco proposed well in the northwest quarter of  
10 Section 14 would also be within that mile rule and would be  
11 subject to those same Gavilan-Mancos rules, would they not?

12 A If they were drilled in that sequence.  
13 That's our problem. We have several leases to develop in  
14 this area with fairly short fuses and the timing of wells  
15 may not allow that -- that advantage. That's one of the  
16 reasons we're asking that the entire area be spaced. It --  
17 it gives us the opportunity to develop at our choice rather  
18 than step-wise.

19 Q So in other words, there is really a  
20 mechanism to expend as least effort to hold your leases as  
21 possible.

22 A No, it's not a mechanism and this -- I  
23 think our testimony is based on the Oso Canyon well, and the  
24 log indications, the early production indications, in my  
25 opinion support the recommendation that the area we've re-  
commended is -- is a part of the pool to the north and I  
think the sooner that's recognized and is spaced, the better  
able all operators will be to develop the acreage.

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

Q Well, what harm would occur to Amoco by a piecemeal extension, in other words, stepping out from the current Gavilan-Mancos Pool?

A Well, as far as harm goes, one -- one problem I think I alluded to is not knowing what the ultimate ownership will be, determining who will actually join in a given well when we're drilling on the Mancos, which, if not within a mile of this area, would be on 40-acre spacing.

Knowing what I know and if drilling proceeds to the south, in the one, two, three step fashion, we will know then information that we can determine right now by I think doing the proper thing.

As far as a loss, I don't see any immediate cause for loss, no.

Q Well, I recognize you're not a landman, but doesn't Amoco generally have title opinions on this area before it goes --

A Certainly would, yes.

MR. BRUCE: I have no further questions except for a closing statement at the end.

MR. QUINTANA: Any other questions of the witness?

Any closing statements?

MR. PADILLA: Mr. Examiner, I'd like to enter an appearance.

My name is Ernest L. Padilla on behalf of Benson-Montin-Greer Drilling Corporation, and we

1  
2 would urge the approval of the application.

3 MR. QUINTANA: Let the record  
4 so be noted.

5 If there's no further questions  
6 of the witness, the witness may be excused.

7 MR. BRUCE: All I would like to  
8 say, Mr. Examiner, is that Mesa Grande Resources urges that  
9 this application be denied based upon the -- it is highly  
10 speculative that the formations are continuous and further-  
11 more, we believe it's premature to extend the pool at this  
12 time without any drilling in this area. Only the one Amoco  
13 well has been drilled and we do not think that that shows  
14 that the zone is continuous.

15 MR. CARR: May it please the  
16 Examiner, we believe that granting the application will re-  
17 sult in prudent development of the area very simply if Amoco  
18 drills in this same formation, and we believe it isn't spe-  
19 culative. It's been established that the zones do correlate  
20 by the evidence presented here today; that if Amoco drills  
21 in this Mancos formation in excess of a mile from the exist-  
22 ing pool boundary, that they would have to dedicate 40 acres  
23 to the well.

24 We believe that that is not  
25 supported by the evidence presented in this case and in the  
prior case, and as the pool expanded could result in a read-  
justment of equities in terms of those individuals who par-  
ticipated in the drilling of the well.

1  
2 We submit that the prudent  
3 thing to do is to extend the pool and let this additional  
4 area be included in the Commission's review of this overall  
5 pool which will take place in approximately three years, and  
6 we ask that the application be approved.

7 MR. QUINTANA: Anything further  
8 in Case 8331?

9 Case 8331 will be taken under  
10 advisement.

11 (Hearing concluded.)  
12  
13  
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 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 and true copy of the transcript in the Examiner hearing of 8331 heard by me on SEPT. 5 84  
Gilbert P. Quintana, Examiner  
Oil Conservation Division



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

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

12 December 1984

COMMISSION HEARING

IN THE MATTER OF:

Application of Amoco Production  
Company for an extension of the  
Gavilan-Mancos Oil Pool, Rio  
Arriba County, New Mexico.

CASE  
8331

BEFORE: Richard L. Stamets, Chairman  
Commissioner Ed Kelley

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

A P P E A R A N C E S

For the Oil Conservation  
Division:

For the Applicant:

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. STAMETS: We'll call next Case 8331. Application of Amoco Production Company for extension of the Gavilan-Mancos Oil Pool, Rio Arriba County, New Mexico.

At the request of the applicant this case will be continued to the Commission Hearing on January 10, 1985.

(Hearing concluded.)

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 Con-  
servation Division was reported by me; that the said tran-  
script is a full, true, and correct record of the hearing,  
prepared by me to the best of my ability.

Sally W. Boyd CSR