

STATE OF NEW MEXICO  
ENERGY, MINERALS AND NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT  
OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION

CASE NO. 12793  
Order No. R-11728-B

APPLICATION OF THE OIL CONSERVATION  
DIVISION FOR AN ORDER CREATING,  
CONTRACTING VERTICAL LIMITS, AND  
EXTENDING HORIZONTAL LIMITS OF  
CERTAIN POOLS IN CHAVES AND LEA  
COUNTIES, NEW MEXICO.

NUNC PRO TUNC ORDER

BY THE DIVISION:

It appearing to the New Mexico Oil Conservation Division ("Division") that Order No. R-11728, as amended, dated February 20, 2002, does not correctly state the intended order of the Division,

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED THAT:

(1) Ordering Paragraph No. (g) on page 5 of Order No. R-11728 is hereby amended to read in its entirety as follows:


"(g) A new pool in Lea County, New Mexico classified as a gas pool for Mississippian production is hereby created and designated as the Sand Springs-Mississippian Gas Pool, consisting of the following described area:

TOWNSHIP 11 SOUTH, RANGE 35 EAST, NMPM

Section 6: E/2 SW/4, SE/4, and Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6"

(2) The corrections set forth in this order shall be entered retroactively as of February 20, 2002.

DONE at Santa Fe, New Mexico, on this 17<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2004.



SEAL

STATE OF NEW MEXICO  
OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Mark E. Fesmire".

MARK E. FESMIRE, P.E.  
Director

## Catanach, David

---

**From:** Kautz, Paul  
**Sent:** Monday, November 15, 2004 2:03 PM  
**To:** Catanach, David  
**Subject:** RE: Sand Springs-Mississippian Pool

This is what I can remember from memory. There was a well that only dedicated the west half of a section. As it turned out, it was a short section. Therefore this well only had somewhere between 160 and 240 acres dedicated to it. Therefore, either we had Yates request or Yates requested a non-standard proration unit consisting of all the section. The intent for the nomenclature was to place all of the section in the pool. I do not know how only the west half was placed in the pool. I do know that somewhere along the line it was changed from the west half to all of the section.

Paul

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Catanach, David  
**Sent:** Monday, November 15, 2004 1:01 PM  
**To:** Kautz, Paul  
**Subject:** FW: Sand Springs-Mississippian Pool

Paul, do you remember anything about this? Your exhibit shows the whole irregular section was to be included in the new pool, but when the order came out, only a portion was included. This wasn't intentional, was it?

DRC

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Catanach, David  
**Sent:** Monday, November 15, 2004 8:41 AM  
**To:** Mull, Donna  
**Cc:** Davidson, Florene  
**Subject:** Sand Springs-Mississippian Pool

Donna,

As per your inquiry, there appears to be mistake on a nomenclature order. In Case No. 12793, the exhibit for the Sand Springs-Mississippian Pool shows that the pool will comprise the E/2 SW/4, SE/4, and Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. In Order No. R-11728 issued on February 7, 2002, the subject pool was created comprising the E/2 SW/4, and Lots 3, 4, 5 and 6. It appears that Lots 1 and 2, and the SE/4 were excluded.

We will double check on this and if there was a mistake made, we will fix it.

DRC