

1R - 428-0

Generic
REPORTS

DATE:

2010

RICE Operating Company

122 West Taylor • Hobbs, New Mexico 88240
Phone: (575) 393-9174 • Fax: (575) 397-1471

March 30, 2011

Mr. Edward Hansen
New Mexico Energy, Minerals, & Natural Resources
Oil Conservation Division, Environmental Bureau
1220 S. St. Francis Drive
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505

RECEIVED

APR - 1 2011

Oil Conservation Division
1220 S. St. Francis Drive
Santa Fe, NM 87505

RE: JUNCTION BOX UPGRADE REPORT for 2010
HOBBS SWD SYSTEM
Lea County, New Mexico

Mr. Hansen:

Rice Operating Company (ROC) takes this opportunity to submit the Junction Box Upgrade results for the year 2010. Enclosed is a list of the completed junction boxes and their respective closure dates. These boxes are located in the Hobbs Salt Water Disposal (SWD) System.

Hobbs System Parties have decided to abandon the Hobbs SWD System. ROC completed 5 junction box sites in 2010. In 2011, the remaining junction boxes will continue to be evaluated and monitored with the objective of abandonment of the system.

ROC is the service provider (agent) for the Hobbs SWD System and has no ownership of any portion of the pipeline, well, or facility. The System is owned by a consortium of oil producers, System Parties, who provide all operating capital on a percentage ownership/usage basis. Upgrade/closure projects of this magnitude require System Party AFE approval and work begins as funds are received. The Hobbs SWD System has been abandoned.

Thank you for your consideration of this Junction Box Upgrade Report for 2009.

RICE OPERATING COMPANY

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "H. P. Conder", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Hack Conder
Environmental Manager

enclosures as stated

cc: SC, file, Mr. Larry Hill
NMOCD, District I Office
1625 N. French Drive
Hobbs, NM 88240

| Rice Operating Company Hobbs SWD System Junction Box Upgrade Project 2010 Completed Boxes | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|-------------------|-----|----|----|-----------------|---------------|-------------|
| | | Legal Description | | | | | | |
| | Jct Box Name | Unit | Sec | T | R | Completion Date | Report Status | Case Number |
| 1 | Jct. A-6 | A | 6 | 19 | 38 | 4/28/2010 | Terminated | 1R428-74 |
| 2 | F-24-3 vent | F | 24 | 18 | 37 | 9/8/2010 | Terminated | 1R428-46 |
| 3 | Jct. F-24-1 | F | 24 | 18 | 37 | 9/8/2010 | Terminated | 1R428-62 |
| 4 | M-20 vent | M | 20 | 18 | 38 | 9/30/2010 | Terminated | 1R428-48 |
| 5 | Jct. O-13 | O | 13 | 18 | 37 | 9/30/2010 | Terminated | 1R428-72 |

L. Peter Galusky, Jr. Ph.D., P.G.

Texerra

505 N Big Spring, Suite 404 Midland, Texas 79701

Tel: 432-634-9257 E-mail: lpg@texerra.com

March 10th, 2009

Mr. Brad Jones
New Mexico Energy, Minerals, & Natural Resources
Oil Conservation Division, Environmental Bureau
1220 S. St. Francis Drive
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504

Re: Comparison of Field versus Lab Compositing of BTEX soil samples
Rice Operating Company, Junction Box Upgrade Work Plan

Sent via Certified Mail w/ Return Receipt No. 7006 0100 0001 2438 3944

Dear Mr. Jones:

On behalf of Rice Operating Company (ROC) I am submitting the attached comparison and analysis of field versus laboratory soil compositing for soil BTEX samples. This is to address the question of whether it is better to mix multiple samples in the field or to do so in the laboratory in order to produce a composite, representative sample for analysis. This work was undertaken in support of ROC's Junction Box Upgrade Work Plan to ensure the quality of their field analysis program.

In brief, this work indicates that field compositing of soil samples generally gives rise to *slightly* higher BTEX values than does laboratory compositing of multiple samples. This is presumably due to the likelihood that field compositing and packaging of soil samples better preserves sample integrity. It would therefore appear that field compositing would represent the better method of procuring soil samples for subsequent analysis of BTEX.

Please call me if you have any questions or wish to discuss any of the details of this study.

ROC is the service provider (agent) for various Salt Water Disposal Systems (SWDs) and has no ownership of any portion of pipeline, well or facility. The SWD Systems that ROC operates are owned by a consortium of oil producers, System Partners, who provide all operating capital on a percentage ownership/usage basis.

Sincerely,



L. Peter Galusky, Jr. Ph.D.
Principal

Copy: Rice Operating Company,
Edward Hansen (NMOCD) sent certified mail w/ return receipt
No. 7006 0100 0001 2438 3937

Attachment: As noted, above.

Rice Operating Company

Comparison of Field Compositing versus Laboratory Compositing of Soil BTEX Samples¹

The careful mixing of multiple soil samples is critical in order to produce a representative, composite sample from a respective study area (such as an excavation face or bottom). Field technicians typically take four or five “grab” samples from excavation walls and/or bottom and send each of these to a laboratory for analysis of the composite, or mixed, sample. It would be far simpler, however, to composite such samples in the field. This study was undertaken to determine if field compositing produced results substantially different than laboratory compositing for the analysis of BTEX. Data were provided by Rice Operating Company encompassing 22 sampling locations over the period of 2004 through 2008.

A comparison of lab-composited soil samples versus field-composited soil samples revealed a close correspondence for total BTEX between the two methods (Figure 1).




Figure 1 - Laboratory versus field-composited soil samples analyzed for BTEX.

The high R^2 value (0.9836) of the best-fit statistical regression line indicates a high degree of reliability in using the field-compositing method over the range of values observed. Below a “field-composited BTEX” value of 0.61 ppm the “lab-composited BTEX” values are slightly lower. However, above a field-composited BTEX value of 0.61 the lab-composited values run slightly lower. In other words, the field-composited values tended to produce slightly higher BTEX numbers above the point at which BTEX concentrations become significant.

There is a reason for this. BTEX is volatile and quickly biodegradable. The compositing and “packaging” of soil samples in the field minimize the handling and aeration that occur in the laboratory. Thus, field-composited soil samples lose less BTEX to evaporation and/or biodegradation prior to laboratory analysis. In other words, the field compositing and packaging of soil samples better preserves sample integrity, and for this reasons would appear to represent the better method of procuring soil samples for subsequent analysis of BTEX.

¹ Prepared 03-12-09 by L. Peter Galusky, Jr. of Texerra.

L. Peter Galusky, Jr. Ph.D., P.G.

Texerra

**75 Wuthering Heights Drive
Colorado Springs, CO 80921
Tel: 719-339-6791
E-mail: lpg@texerra.com**

March 29th, 2011

Mr. Edward Hansen
New Mexico Energy, Minerals, & Natural Resources
Oil Conservation Division, Environmental Bureau
1220 S. St. Francis Drive
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504

Re: Comparison of 2010 Laboratory versus Field Measured Soil Chloride Values
Rice Operating Company, Junction Box Upgrade Work Plan

Sent via Certified Mail w/ Return Receipt No. 7006 0100 0001 2438 4095

Mr. Hansen:

On behalf of Rice Operating Company (ROC) I am submitting the attached comparison and analysis of 2010 laboratory versus field measured soil chloride values. This work was undertaken in support of ROC's Junction Box Upgrade Work Plan to ensure the quality of their field analysis program.

In brief, this work indicates that Rice's 2010 field chloride measurement efforts provided reliable and accurate estimates of the laboratory measured values.

ROC is the service provider (agent) for various Salt Water Disposal Systems (SWDs) and has no ownership of any portion of pipeline, well or facility. The SWD Systems that ROC operates are owned by a consortium of oil producers, System Parties, who provide all operating capital on a percentage ownership/usage basis.

Please call me if you have any questions or wish to discuss this study.

Sincerely,



L. Peter Galusky, Jr. Ph.D.
Principal

Copy: Rice Operating Company
Attachment: As noted, above.

Rice Operating Company
Comparison of Laboratory to Field Measured Soil Chloride Concentrations
Based upon 2010 Field Data¹

A representative sample of 193 pairs of laboratory versus field measured soil chloride values was compared to determine how well field measurements matched laboratory measurements. It is assumed that laboratory measurements better represent the “true” values due to the controlled environment that a laboratory provides. A simple plot of the laboratory versus field measured soil chloride values is given below (Figure 1).




Figure 1 – Laboratory versus field measured soil chloride measurements (n = 193 paired sets).

A straight line fits the data well, and the reasonably high R^2 value (0.88), indicates that field measurements are highly reliable (repeatable and consistent) over a wide range of field-measured soil chloride concentrations. The best-fit regression equation illustrates that field-measure chloride values will somewhat overestimate the laboratory values up to a field-measured value of approximately 662 ppm. At substantially higher chloride concentrations, field-measured values will slightly underestimate the laboratory values.

Field measured values are slightly lower than (but w/in 10% of) laboratory values for extremely high (2,000 to 5,000 ppm) soil chloride concentrations, but are higher than laboratory values for low (< 250) soil chloride concentration. Taken together this comparison indicates that Rice’s 2010 field chloride measurement efforts provided reliable and reasonably conservative estimates of the true (laboratory measured) values.

¹ Prepared on 03-28-11 by L. Peter Galusky, Jr. of Texerra.

| Junction Box Upgrade Program Closure/Disclosure Submissions for 2010 | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|--|--|--|--|--|--|----------|-------------|
| Updated: 3-30-11 | | | | | | | | | |
| BD | | | | | | | | Closures | Disclosures |
| Closure | 26 | | | | | | | 26 | |
| Disclosure | 14 | | | | | | | | 14 |
| EME | | | | | | | | | |
| Closure | 39 | | | | | | | 39 | |
| Disclosure | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 |
| Vacuum | | | | | | | | | |
| Closure | 13 | | | | | | | 13 | |
| Disclosure | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 |
| Justis | | | | | | | | | |
| Closure | | | | | | | | | |
| Disclosure | 1 | | | | | | | 5 | 3 |
| Hobbs | | | | | | | | | |
| Closure | 5 | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 100 | | | | | | | 83 | 19 |

RECEIVED OCD
2011 APR -1 A 12: 53