1 2	STATE OF NEW MEXICO ENERGY, MINERALS AND NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION STATE LAND OFFICE BUILDING SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO		
3	9 November 1988		
4			
5	EXAMINER HEARING		
6			
7	IN THE MATTER OF:		
8	Application of OGS Operating Company, CASE		
9	Inc. for compulsory pooling, Eddy 9523 County, New Mexico.		
10			
11			
12			
13	BEFORE: David R. Catanach, Examiner		
14			
15			
16	TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING		
17			
18	APPEARANCES		
19			
20	For the Division: Robert G. Stovall Attorney at Law		
21	Legal Counsel to the Division State Land Office Bldg.		
22	Santa Fe, New Mexico		
23	For the Applicant: W. Thomas Kellahin Attorney at Law		
24	KELLAHIN, KELLAHIN & AUBREY P. O. Box 2265		
25	Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504		

		-	
		2	
1			
2	INDEX		
3			
4	THOM O'BRIEN		
5	Direct Examination by Mr. Kellahin	4	
6	Cross Examination by Mr. Catanach	13	
7			
8	MICHAEL W. GATES		
9	Direct Examination by Mr. Kellahin	14	
10	Cross Examination by Mr. Catanach	20	
11			
12			
13	EXHIBITS		
14			
15	OGS Exhibit One, Packet	5	
16	OGS Exhibit Two, Montage	15	
17	OGS Exhibit Three, Certificate	21	
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

1 MR. CATANACH: We'll call next 2 Case Number 9523. 3 MR. STOVALL: Application of 4 OGS Operating Company, Inc., for compulsory pooling, Eddy 5 County, New Mexico. 6 MR. CATANACH: Are there ap-7 pearances in this case? 8 MR. KELLAHIN: Yes, Mr. Exa-9 miner. I'm Tom Kellahin of the Santa Fe law firm of 10 Kellahin, Kellahin & Aubrey. I'm appearing on behalf of 11 the applicant and I have two witnesses. 12 MR. CATANACH: Any other ap-13 pearances? 14 Will the witnesses please 15 stand and be sworn in. 16 17 (Witnesses sworn.) 18 19 MR. KELLAHIN: Mr. Examiner, 20 we have two witnesses. The first witness is Thom O'Brien. 21 He spells his first name T-H-O-M and the last name is shown 22 on the application. He is the O'Brien of the applicant, 23 O'Brien, Goins and Simpson. 24 25

THOM O'BRIEN,

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

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. KELLAHIN:

Q Mr. O'Brien, would you for the record please state your name and occupation?

A My name is Thom O'Brien. I'm the -primarily a landman with O'Brien, Goins, Simpson Exploration and also owner, part owner, of that concern.

Q Mr. O'Brien, have you had occasion to testify before the Oil Conservation Division before?

A Never.

Q Would you summarize for the Examiner what has been your educational and employment background that involved petroleum land matters?

A I was graduated from the University of Texas at Austin in 1975 with a degree in accounting.

I then went to work for the Midland National Bank in the Trust Department and handled oil and

gas properties owned in trust.

After that I went to work -- I worked there for about two years. I went to work after that with

Texas Oil and Gas Corporation as a landman in west Texas

Landman.

and southeast New Mexico; worked there for about three years.

Subsequent to that I went to work for The Superior Oil Company and handled -- as a landman; did work in west Texas and southeast New Mexico.

I worked there for about two years and since that time I have been associated with O'Brien, Goins.

I'm also a Certified Professional

Q Would you summarize what has been your personal involvement with regards to your attempts to formulate on a voluntary basis the spacing unit necessary for the drilling of the well that's the subject of this case?

A Since about June or July I've been in contact with Yates Petroleum, Amoco and Santa Fe Energy in various attempts to either secure their agreement to join in the drilling of the well or farmout on some basis.

MR. KELLAHIN: At this time, Mr. Examiner, we tender Mr. O'Brien as an expert petroleum landman.

MR. CATANACH: He is so qualified.

Q Mr. O'Brien, let me turn to the package of documents that we have marked as Applicant Exhibit Number One. We have then taken that package and numbered

each of the pages consecutively 1 through page 32, page 32 being the first page of the Model Form Operating Agreement.

Is this a package of exhibits and documents from your files?

A Yes.

Q And are you fully familiar with the contents of this exhibit?

A Yes.

Q Let me have you begin, sir, with page 1 of the exhibit and summarize for us what has caused you now to seek compulsory pooling against certain of the parties involved in the drilling of this well.

A Well, page 1 summarizes the leases that O'Brien, Goins owns and the dates which we acquired them.

In mid-August we -- we had been discussing trying to get a farmout from Enron Corporation, which owns a lease, a State lease in the south half of the northwest quarter of Section 5, and they at that time agreed to sell us their lease.

That lease expires January 1 of 1989. In order to protect that lease or perpetuate it, hopefully, we need to drill it by that date and that's why I need to get answers from Amoco, Santa Fe, and Yates as to whether or not they will participate or farmout or do something with them.

Q Despite your efforts as of this date, have you had unanimous voluntary agreement by all the working interest owners for the drilling of this well?

A Not unanimous. Santa Fe Energy has indicated verbally they would join.

Yates Petroleum has indicated that they will join or farmout.

And I have no such indication from Amoco.

Q Let me direct your attention now, sir, to page 2 and have you show us the various interests of Amoco, Yates and Santa Fe Energy when you look at the north half of Section 5.

A Okay. You see the north half of Section 5 is outlined in red and a red dot is our proposed location. A standard spacing unit for the Morrow and the Strawn is 320 acres.

The yellow acreage is -- are leases that we own, O'Brien, Goins owns.

Yates owns leases on Lots 1 and 2 in the southeast -- southwest quarter of the northeast quarter.

Amoco has a lease on Lot 3 and Santa Fe Energy has a lease on Lot 4.

Q Where is the proposed location for the well?

A It's in Lot 3. It's 990 from the north line and 1980 from the west line in Section 5.

Q Let's turn now, sir, to page 3 and have you summarize for us what has been your activities in an effort to get voluntary joinder from Santa Fe Energy.

A Well, on August 10th I wrote a letter to Santa Fe Energy requesting an option farmout of their interest in the north half of Section 5. We also own a lease on the south half of Section 32. We have re-entered that well, the HNG Moseley Springs Well, and I wanted an option and farmout in support of that test, and Santa Fe subsequently indicated that they would not farmout; that they were interested in joining and interested in drilling a Morrow test in the north half of Section 5.

A Pages 3 through Page Eight contains correspondence and notations with regards to your efforts to get voluntary joinder from Santa Fe Energy?

A That's correct.

Q And as of today's hearing what is the status of your efforts with Santa Fe Energy?

A They have verbally indicated that the AFE I sent them was acceptable; that the operating agreement, some minor changes may be indicated, having to do with their accounting procedures.

Q So as of today we don't have a written

commitment from them but you anticipate to have this completed by the time you commence the well?

A That's correct.

Q Let's turn now, sir, to your efforts to get Yates Petroleum to participate with you in the well, and specifically referring to your notations beginning on page 9.

A Okay. Initially we had been talking to Yates about the south half of Section 5 and that was a separate proposal altogether. Then our prospect somewhat expanded to the north and I made essentially the same proposal to them I made to Santa Fe on an option farmout, contingent upon us re-entering the well in Section 32, and we, Yates had been considering that proposal for quite some time, indicated that they would probably join in the well and has recently, I believe the date of the letter, dated 11-4-88, indicated in writing that they will either join or farmout to it, to the well in the north half of Section 5.

Q Your documentation concerning your efforts to obtain voluntary joinder by Yates Petroleum is pages 9 through 20, is it?

A That's correct.

Q And page 20, then, is the letter to nich you've just referred, is an indication from Yates

Petroleum Corporation that they will either join or farm

1 out to you. 2 Α Correct. 3 Q Turn now, sir, to page 21, which is your 4 notations with regards to your efforts on Amoco's interest? 5 That's right. Α 6 Q Summarize for us what have your efforts 7 been? 8 Α I made the same proposal to Amoco that I 9 made to Yates and Santa Fe. They have been considering it. 10 They have agreed to farmout to me in the south half. 11 did agree to farmout in both north and south halves, and 12 they are currently considering my proposal to drill a well 13 in the north half of Section 5 and I have not received any 14 indication from them what they want to do. 15 Q Do you have a recommendation to the Exa-16 miner as to overhead charges to be included in the pooling 17 order for the drilling of the well and the producing well 18 rate? 19 Yes, sir. Α 20 Is that shown on pages 29 and 30 of the Q 21 exhibit? 22 Yes, sir, it is. Α 23 What is the source of this information, Q 24 Mr. O'Brien? 25 Α It is based on a survey done by Ernst

```
1
    and Whinney of overhead rates and specifically overhead
2
    rates for gas wells in west Texas and eastern New Mexico.
3
                      When we look at page 30 can you show us
    that point in the tabulation that you're using for your
5
    proposed rates?
6
                      I believe it's on page 31. Well, for
             Α
7
    10,000 - 15,000 feet I'm using $4,500 drilling well and
8
    $450 per month for a producing well rate.
9
                      All right, sir, give me the numbers
             Q
10
    again.
11
                       $4,500 drilling well rate and $450 a
             Α
12
    month producing well rate.
13
                      And is that your recommendation to the
             Q
14
    Examiner for inclusion of those numbers in the forced
15
    pooling order?
16
             Α
                      Yes.
17
                      Let me turn now to the AFE which my
             Q
18
    exhibit shows to be 31.
19
                       I must have mine out of order, okay.
             Α
20
                      Page 31?
             Q
21
             Α
                       Okay.
22
                       I'll give you another set.
             Q
23
                       Thank you.
             Α
24
                       Is this the AFE you propose to utilize
             Q
25
    for the drilling of the well?
```

1 Α Yes. 2 And describe for us how it was prepared, 0 3 Mr. O'Brien. Well, it was prepared by my father and a 5 man that works for him. They're petroleum engineering con-6 sultants and drilling consultants. 7 Based upon your information and belief, Q 8 do you have an opinion as to whether this AFE is current and accurate to the best of your knowledge? 10 Α Oh, yes. 11 Have you utilized it in your negotia-Q 12 tions with the various working interest owners for this 13 well? 14 Yes. Α 15 And do you have agreement by any of Q 16 these parties that this AFE is to be utilized? 17 Santa Fe Energy has verbally agreed to 18 it and Yates has agreed to join or farmout, voiced no op-19 position or objection. 20 None of the parties have objected to any Q 21 of the costs shown on the AFE? 22 Α No. 23 Have you caused to be circulated a pro-Q 24 posed operating agreement for the well? 25 Α Yes.

		13		
1	Q	And is that shown commencing on page 32		
2	of the Exhibit One?			
3	A	That's right.		
4	Q	And is this a document that you caused		
5	to be prepared?			
6	А	Yes, I did.		
7	Q	At this point do you have signed oper-		
8	ating agreements by any of the parties?			
9	A	No.		
10	Q	Has any of the parties other than Santa		
11	Fe Energy responde	ed to your proposed operating agreement?		
12	А	No.		
13	Q	When do you propose to commence the		
14	well, Mr. O'Brien?			
15	А	Before the end of this year.		
16		MR. KELLAHIN: Mr. Examiner,		
17	that concludes my	examination of Mr. O'Brien.		
18		We move the introduction of		
19	his Exhibit Number	one.		
20		MR. CATANACH: Exhibit Number		
21	One will be admit	ced as evidence.		
22				
23		CROSS EXAMINATION		
24	BY MR. CATANACH:			
25	Q	Mr. O'Brien, have you had any response		

1 back from Amoco? 2 I've talked to him on the phone. Α Yes. 3 The last time I talked to him on the phone was November the I spoke with Tim Custer of that office and he indi-5 cated that they were still considering my proposal. 6 MR. CATANACH: No further 7 questions. The witness may be excused. 8 MR. KELLAHIN: Mr. Examiner, 9 my next witness is Michael Gates. He spells his last name 10 G-A-T-E-S. Mr. Gates is a geologist. 11 12 MICHAEL W. GATES, 13 being called as a witness and being duly sworn upon his 14 oath, testified as follows, to-wit: 15 16 DIRECT EXAMINATION 17 BY MR. KELLAHIN: 18 Mr. Gates, for the record would you Q 19 please state your name and occupation? 20 Α Mike Gates. I'm a geologist for OGS 21 Exploration, which is O'Brien, Goins and Simpson. 22 Mr. Gates, have you previously testified Q 23 as a petroleum geologist before the Oil Conservation Divi-24 sion of New Mexico?

I have.

Α

25

Q And have you made a geologic study with regards to this particular prospect that's the subject of this application?

A Yes.

MR. KELLAHIN: We tender Mr. Gates as expert petroleum geologist.

MR. CATANACH: He is so qualified.

Q Mr. Gates, have you prepared an exhibit for presentation today?

A I have.

Q Would you unfold that and display it before you?

Before we discuss the specific details of the display and your conclusions, Mr. Gates, would you take a moment and simply identify how you've arranged the exhibit?

A Basically we've got two objectives in the area and on the top, the top two maps show the Morrow structure on the left and the Morrow isopach on the right, which is our deepest objective.

A shallower objective is the Strawn and its two maps directly below, the structure on the left and the isopach, thickness map on the right.

Q What is the proposed drilling program to

let you test the Morrow and the Strawn formations?

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We'd like to drill a location 990 from Α the north and 1980 from the west in Section 5 to the Morrow and basically the Morrow is a channel sand in this area. If you look at the upper righthand corner at the Lower Morrow isopach you can see that there's one well that has been successful in the -- in testing the Lower Morrow sand. That's the Amoco State 1-1X immediately to the west of our acreage. This well had 17 feet thickness.

Based solely on that well and the lack any Morrow sand in the two wells, the well immediately north of our location and the well immediately south, about the only place you can put a Morrow channel in there is east/west trending through our location.

After we test the Morrow we would like to come back up the hole to the Strawn, which is basically reef build-up along the basin margin. You can see the steep dip to the east. We think environmental conditions were favorable for Morrow -- for, excuse me, for Strawn development along this north/south trend here through Section 5 and we would like to -- at that same location we think we'll encounter roughly 15-16 feet of Strawn porosity and be above the gas/water contact.

Have you determined a gas/water contact Q in the Strawn formation in one of the wells?

A Yes, we have. Based on the Moncrief Jernigan State in Section 8, in the north half of Section 8, this has been a successful gas well in the Strawn formation. Along with the gas it produces a fair amount of water. It's made approximately 20,000 barrels of water and we feel like if we move any further down dip, we will be below the gas/water contact.

Q When we move to the last bottom third of the display, what is shown on the bottom portion of the display?

A On the lefthand side we have a production data map, which just gives the cumulative -- the key for this map is down here on the very bottom -- it displays the cumulative production, the current daily production, the productive interval, and the date of completion for all the wells in the area.

Q In mapping the Strawn and the Morrow have you utilized all available wellbore information?

A We have.

Q And is this your own work?

A Yes.

Q When we look at the Morrow itself, do you have an opinion as to a risk factor penalty to be assessed against any of the nonconsenting working interest owners that are subject to participation in the well?

A I consider it to be fairly high risk based on the single well control for the Morrow channel and based on this high degree of risk I would request that we recover our cost plus 200 percent.

Q When we look at the Morrow do we have any well control east of your proposed well location?

A No, you'd have to go quite a ways. I guess you could conceivably call the well up there in Section 34 of 23 South, 25 East, a control point, but it's basically too far away to be of real use.

Q When we direct your attention to the Strawn formation, do you have a geologic opinion about the risk involved in attempting commercial production out of the Strawn formation at this location?

A Yes. This -- the Strawn we've had to trade off between trying to get the maximum thickness in the algal mound versus not getting too far down dip and being wet. Consequently our location at 1980 from the west, it's not at the thickest point in the Strawn but it's as far as we can go and still stay above the gas/water contact.

Q Where's your closest producing Strawn?

A Section 8, Moncrief Jernigan State.

Q And are there any other producing Strawn wells in the immediate area?

1 It's a single well field. That's the Α 2 only producer. 3 What then is your opinion with regard to Q the risk factor for drilling and producing commercial pro-5 duction from the Strawn formation? 6 I think it has some -- a degree of risk 7 in that we will not be nearly as thick as the Moncrief Well 8 and we don't have a real good handle on how much porosity 9 we will have there, and as I mentioned, we're playing with 10 the oil/water -- gas/water contact, so (not clearly heard). 11 The Examiner is allowed by statute to 12 assess a penalty that includes recovery of your cost out of 13 production plus a maximum of 200 percent. Within that 14 range, then, Mr. Gates, what is your opinion about the risk 15 that ought to be assessed against any nonconsenting inter-16 est owners in the Strawn formation? 17 Due to the nature of the Morrow and the 18 Strawn I would think that maybe a maximum would be 19 (unclear). 20 And is that your recommendation? Q 21 Α Yes, sir. 22 MR. KELLAHIN: That concludes 23 my examination of Mr. Gates. 24 We move the introduction of

25

his Exhibit Number Two.

MR. CATANACH: Exhibit Number

Two will be admitted as evidence.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. CATANACH:

Q Mr. Gates, which is your closest producing Morrow well in the -- in the area?

A That would be the well in Section 6, the Amoco 1-X in the east half there.

Q What is the well in the north half of the southwest quarter of 5? The H -- it says HNG?

A That was a Morrow attempt. They didn't have any porosity. Well, they had very little porosity. You can see on the Lower Morrow isopach, they had a total of 2 feet of porosity greater than 5 percent.

Q And the well just south of there is also a dry hole?

A Yes, it was a dry hole. It had no Morrow -- well, it had 8 feet of Morrow greater than 5, but very poor reservoir quality and it's a dry hole there; no -- no good Strawn Reef to produce from, either. You can see the Strawn B porosity isopach, it had 6 total feet, which is not sufficient to produce commercial quantities from the Strawn Reef.

Q What is the proposed location in the

south half of Section 5, is that --

Case 9523?

A That was our original idea. When we first started picking up acreage out here, we found there to be some open acreage immediately north of the Moncrief well and, as I mapped further, as Tom said, it began to grow, the prospect enlargement. Basically there are three wells we'd like to do in there, and currently we're reentering the well up in Section 32, and then we'd like to do this well, since our acreage is expiring, the well that we're addressing here, and eventually drill that proposed location to the south, if we're successful.

MR. CATANACH: I have no further questions of the witness.

He may be excused.

Is there anything further in

MR. KELLAHIN; Yes, sir, Mr.

Catanach. We have a certificate which I have signed showing that we have sent pursuant to notice rules certified mail return receipt notices to Yates, Santa Fe Energy and Amoco. We've attached the return receipt cards showing that we mailed them a copy of the application under cover letter prior to 20 days to today. We request that that be made a part of the record.

MR. CATANACH: That is Exhibit

Number Three? MR. KELLAHIN: Yes, sir. MR. CATANACH: Exhibit Number Three will be admitted as evidence in this case. Anything further in this case? MR. KELLAHIN: No, sir. MR. CATANACH: All right, it will be taken under advisement. (Hearing concluded.)

 CERTIFICATE

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. 953, heard by me on Navanae 9 1988.

Examiner, Examiner

Oil Conservation Division