

WILLARD C. FRANKS

Briggsdale, Colo.
Oct. 12, 1966

Oil Conservation Commission
P. O. Box 288
Santa Fe, New Mexico

Att: Mr. Kapteina

Dear Mr. Kapteina:

Re: LaRoe No. 2 well
NWSW 19 T 27 N R 22 E
Colfax County, N. M.

RECEIVED

I am leaving this morning for New Mexico to check on the
LaRoe No. 2 well and report to you.

1966 OCT 14 AM 7 59

In our moving sometime ago we lost records of the two LaRoe
wells and one here in Colorado but on going through my old
checks I find one paid to the Graham Ready Mix Company of
Raton, N. M., in payment for cement run in the LaRoe No. 2.

I had the two wells confused in my mind as it was the No. 1
that had the 100 sacks of cement set in the bottom and not the
No. 2. I have tried to find the bill or sales slip for the
No. 2 cement but it strikes me that I sent it to you with my
report. I regret that I made this mistake.

I shall check the No. 2 and determine the present depth with
the cement that has gone down to the bottom and will call you
that your representative may come up to Maxwell, N. M., and I
shall do the work. The 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ " inch hole with the cement in it
will be considerably less than 1800' in depth.

Yours very truly,

Willard C. Franks

WILLARD C. FRANKS

Briggsdale, Colo.
Oct. 6, 1966

Ph. 656-2516

Cil Conservation Commission
Santa Fe, New Mexico

Att: Mr. Kapteina

Dear Sir:

Re: LaRoe No. 2 well

NW3SW - S 7 T 27 N R 22E
Sulfax County

Regarding the additional work that may be required to plug the LaRoe No. 2 well, I would appreciate your suggestion that I may have some idea of the kind of equipment that I shall have to engage to do this work. 1966 OCT 10 AM 8 17

I plan to go to New Mexico the early part of next--possibly Tuesday---which I think will be possible by taking an extra dosage of penicilan. I'll get down there all right.

Am enclosing an air mail stamp for a reply to my address here for your convenience.

The well will be plugged under your supervision after which we shall proceed to sue the Layne-Western Company for ~~dereliction~~ dereliction of duty in failing to perform as they were directed to do.

Yours very truly,

Willard C. Franks

Willard C. Franks
GEOLOGY - OIL OPERATOR
BOX 144
BRIGGSDALE, COLO.
Sept. 22, 1966

Ph. 656-2514

MAIL OFFICE

PH 3 00
SEP 26 1966

File # 2
Cover

Mr. J. E. Kapteina, Engineer
Oil Conservation Commission
P. O. Box 2088
Santa Fe, New Mexico

Dear Mr. Kapteina:

Your letter of Sept. 20, 1966 regarding the LaRoe No. 2 well, Sec. 19, Twp 27 N R 22 E Colfax County, N. M., was the greatest shock and surprise that I have had.

As stated in my report to you the cementing company brought out readi-mix cement for the 100 sack bottom hole plug and the 25 sacks to be set at 100', also 12 sacks of dry cement for the surface plug and the marker pipe.

A wooden plug had been prepared to place at the bottom of the second plug to hold the cement from going down into the well below and when I returned from using the hpone the cement had been run so I was certain the wooden plug had precened the setting of the 25 sack plug.

The drilling Company wanted to move the rig off the hole after dismissing the cement truck prior to their running of the surface plug by hand which they were to do. I was called home after their assurance that the 10 sack plug would be run after removal of the heavy blowout preventor which might not be for a couple of days.

It appears that there was no arresting plug run below the 25 sack plug nor was there below the 10 sack surface plug or the present situation would not exist.

I shall do whatever is necessary to take care of this negligence on part of the Layne-Western Drilling Company of Denver, and satisfy you at the very earliest date. Their word doesn't seem to be good in many respects.

I should like to know what you may require over and above the 100' foot plug and the surface plug. The loss of fluid below must be due to the exceeding dry formation that has absorbed the water from the drilling mud as the mud stood up into the surface pipe at the time the 25 sacks were run at the top.

The light gas loss there from the shale that always bears a small amount of gas in that country and was not noticeable as it was in the LaRoe No. 1 which would build up 4 pounds of pressure now and then at night but soon faded on opening of the valve.

I would assume that a wire line would enable me to determine the present fluid level in the well and whatever I may have to do there will be done in keeping with your instructions.

I would appreciate doing it with as little expense as I can as I am desperately short of money now but the job must be done and I shall do it.

Yours very truly,

Howard E. Frank

OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

P. O. BOX 2088

SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

September 20, 1966

Mr. Willard C. Franks
P. O. Box 144
Briggsdale, Colorado

Dear Sir:

A field inspection was made on September 19, 1966, of LaRoe Well No. 2 located in Unit L of Section 19, Township 27 North, Range 22 East, NMPM, Colfax County, New Mexico, to determine whether or not the well had been plugged in accordance with the report filed by you and dated April 19, 1966. From surface evidence it has been determined that the well has not been plugged as reported. On Form C-103 filed March 28, 1964, on La Roe Well No. 1, you reported a showing of gas at 1309; while standing close to the 8 5/8-inch casing protruding from LaRoe Well No. 2, gas or air can be heard bubbling through water at some depth inside the casing. A pebble dropped in the hole took several seconds to drop to the water level. From this evidence it is concluded that the plug at surface, the 10 sacks set in surface casing, and the 25 sacks set at 100 feet are non-existent. Another field inspection of the well is scheduled within the next 30 days and it is expected that the above situation will be corrected. In view of the fact that you have not performed the work as reported, this office desires to witness the proper plugging of LaRoe Well No. 2, and would appreciate being informed at least 24 hours prior to the time plugging operations are started.

Your cooperation in resolving this problem is respectfully solicited.

Very truly yours,

J. E. KAPTEINA
Engineer

JEX/og

Willard

3805 XOB 0 7
 001XN WEN 22 4740

Mr. William C. Weeks
P. O. Box 144
Bridgewater, Colorado

time plugging operation was started.

2, and would appreciate being informed at least 72 hours prior to the
this office desires no witness who cannot identify the well No.
In view of the fact that you have not performed the work as requested,
30 days and it is expected that the above situation will be corrected.
Another field the section of the well all as abbreviated within the next
surveys being, and the 21 meter set at 100 feet non-existent.
evidence it is concluded that the plug at surface, one 10 sacks set in
the hole took several seconds to drop to the water level. Upon this
through water at some depth inside the casing. A person dropped in
proceeding from Lakeland, Fla. It was on this day he heard bubbling
showing up gas at 1800'. While working, a 6-inch casing
G-103 filed March 19, 1964, on the Red Hill No. 1 you reported a
mentioned that the well has not been plugged as required. On form
not the well had been plugged in accordance with the report filed by
21 East, N.W., Collier County, Florida, to determine whether or
Well No. 2 located in Unit B of Section 11, Township 23 North, Range

Your cooperation in resolving this problem is respectfully solicited.

2007-08-01

RECEIVED
1954

CO. TEL.

Willard C. Franks

GEOLOGY - OIL OPERATOR
BOX 144
BRIGGSDALE, COLO.

April 20, 1966

MAIN OFFICE OCC

APR 21 PM 1:10

New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission
Santa Fe, New Mexico

Att: Mr. Kapetina

Dear Mr. Kapteina:

In mailing my plugging report yesteray covering the:

LaRoe No. 2 well
NWSW Sec. 19 Twp. 27 " R 22 E
Colfax County,

I failed to enclose the customer's statement from the
Graham Ready Mix Company, Raton, New Mexico as I had
promised to do. So am sending it herewith.

Yours very truly,

Willard C. Franks

Enc. 1