STATE OF NEW MEXICO

ENERGY, MINERALS AND NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION

IN THE MATTER OF THE HEARING CALLED BY THE OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONSIDERING:

CASE NO. 13,330

APPLICATION OF MEWBOURNE OIL COMPANY FOR AN EXCEPTION TO DIVISION RULE 104.C.(2).(c), EDDY COUNTY, NEW MEXICO

ORIGINAL

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

EXAMINER HEARING BEFORE: RICHARD EZEANYIM, Hearing Examiner September 16th, 2004 Santa Fe, New Mexico

This matter came on for hearing before the New Mexico Oil Conservation Division, RICHARD EZEANYIM, Hearing Examiner, on Thursday, September 16th, 2004, at the New Mexico Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources Department, 1220 South Saint Francis Drive, Room 102, Santa Fe, New Mexico, Steven T. Brenner, Certified Court Reporter No. 7 for the State of New Mexico.

* * *

ÎNDEX

September 16th, 2004 Examiner Hearing CASE NO. 13,330

	PAGE
EXHIBITS	3
APPEARANCES	3
	,
APPLICANT'S WITNESSES:	•
STEVE COBB (Landman) Direct Examination by Mr. Bruce	4
BRYAN M. MONTGOMERY (Engineer)	
Direct Examination by Mr. Bruce	10
Examination by Examiner Ezeanyim	17
REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE	22

* * *

EXHIBITS

Applicant's	I	dentified	Admitted
Exhibit	1	5	10
Exhibit	2	6	10
Exhibit	3	11	16
Exhibit	4	(does	not exist)
Exhibit	5	9	10

A 3 11

* * *

APPEARANCES

FOR THE DIVISION:

GAIL MacQUESTEN
Deputy General Counsel
Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources Department
1220 South St. Francis Drive
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505

FOR THE APPLICANT:

JAMES G. BRUCE Attorney at Law P.O. Box 1056 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504

* * *

1	WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were had at
2	8:51 a.m.:
3	EXAMINER EZEANYIM: At this time I call Case
4	Number 13,330, Application of Mewbourne Oil Company for an
5	exception to Division Rule 104.C.(2).(c), Eddy County, New
6	Mexico. Oh, the same
7	Call for appearances.
8	MR. BRUCE: Mr. Examiner, Jim Bruce of Santa Fe,
9	representing the Applicant. I have two witnesses to be
10	sworn.
11	EXAMINER EZEANYIM: Any other appearances? No
12	other appearances, no?
13	Okay, may the witnesses stand to be sworn?
14	(Thereupon, the witnesses were sworn.)
15	EXAMINER EZEANYIM: Mr. Bruce, you may continue.
16	STEVE COBB,
17	the witness herein, after having been first duly sworn upon
18	his oath, was examined and testified as follows:
19	DIRECT EXAMINATION
20	BY MR. BRUCE:
21	Q. Would you please state your name and city of
22	residence for the record?
23	A. Steve Cobb, Midland, Texas.
24	Q. Who do you work for and in what capacity?
25	A. Mewbourne Oil Company as a landman.

1	Q. Have you previously testified before the Division
2	as a landman?
3	A. Yes, I have.
4	Q. And were your credentials as an expert accepted
5	as a matter of record?
6	A. They were.
7	Q. And are you familiar with the land matters
8	involved in this Application?
9	A. I am.
10	MR. BRUCE: Mr. Ezeanyim, I'd tender Mr. Cobb as
11	an expert petroleum landman.
12	EXAMINER EZEANYIM: Mr. Cobb, could you briefly
13	summarize your experience so I can just briefly.
14	THE WITNESS: I've been at Mewbourne for 13
15	this is my 14th year. Before that I worked for Santa Fe
16	Minerals in Tulsa, Oklahoma, for approximately 10 years.
17	That's as far as my land experience.
18	EXAMINER EZEANYIM: Okay, Mr. Cobb is so
19	qualified.
20	Q. (By Mr. Bruce) Mr. Cobb, before we get into the
21	specific request, could you just identify Exhibit 1 for the
22	Examiner?
23	A. Exhibit 1 is a nine-section area surrounding
24	the Our section in question here today is Section 20 of
25	20 South 22 East Eddy County New Meyico

1	Q. And today we're here for the north half of
2	Section 20?
3	A. That's correct.
4	Q. All of Section 20 is one single federal lease, is
5	it not?
6	A. That's correct.
7	Q. Okay. Now, there's an existing well on the
8	proration unit, the north-half unit. What is that well?
9	A. The existing well is the Jetta Foal 20 Federal
10	Number 1 well in the northwest quarter.
11	Q. Okay, in the northeast quarter of the northwest
12	quarter?
13	A. Right.
14	Q. And referring to Exhibit 2, what is the well that
15	Mewbourne proposes to drill?
16	A. Our Dinero 20 Number 2 well.
17	Q. And what quarter quarter section is that well
18	located in?
19	A. That's in the southeast northeast.
20	Q. And again, the north half will be dedicated to
21	both wells, correct?
22	A. That's correct.
23	Q. And Exhibit 2 is just a copy of the Form C-102
24	for the well?
25	A. Right.

1	Q. Now, with respect to the north half, the Foal
2	Federal Who operates the Foal Federal 20 Number 1?
3	A. Jetta Production Company.
4	Q. And today you are here proposing that Mewbourne
5	be the record operator of the Dinero 20 Federal Number 2?
6	A. That's correct.
7	Q. And therefore you seek an exception to
8	104.C.(2).(c); is that correct?
9	A. Correct.
LO	Q. What formation is the Jetta Foal 20 Federal
L1	Number 1 producing from?
12	A. From the Morrow formation. \checkmark
13	Q. And is the Morrow formation the primary target of
L4	Mewbourne's well?
L 5	A. Yes, it is.
L6	Q. However, Mewbourne does request that it be
L7	allowed to operate the well, regardless of whether it's a
L8	Morrow, Atoka or Strawn well; is that correct?
L9	A. Correct.
0 20	Q. Anything spaced on 320 acres?
21	A. That's right.
22	Q. Mr. Cobb, there was a couple of questions asked
23	in the last case, and let me ask you them now. Mewbourne
24	has had a couple of these cases before the Division now,
5	has it not?

1	A. We have.
2	Q. And they are both on federal land?
3	A. Correct.
4	Q. Has Mewbourne discussed with the BLM in Roswell
5	these applications?
6	A. We have.
7	Q. And has the BLM expressed any objection to having
8	two operators on a 320-acre well unit?
9	A. No, they have not.
LO	Q. Okay. One other matter. With respect to the
l1	Jetta well, who are the interest owners in the Jetta well?
L2	A. I believe it's Jetta, 75 percent, and Nearburg,
L3	25 percent.
L4	Q. Is there different ownership in Mewbourne's well?
L5	A. Yes, there is.
L6	Q. Who are the owners, and what are their
L7	approximate interests in the Dinero well?
18	A. It's Mewbourne, Jetta, Nearburg and EOG.
L9	Q. Okay.
20	A. And we own approximately 47 percent, Jetta 22,
21	Nearburg 15 and EOG 15.
22	Q. Okay. So there will be a difference in ownership
23	between the two wells?
24	A. Correct.
5	Q. Were all of the working interest owners notified

of this hearing? 1 Yes, they were. 2 Α. And would you refer to Exhibit Number 5, the 3 Q. affidavit of notice, Mr. Cobb? 4 5 Α. Right. There's a notice letter that went out to Jetta, 6 0. 7 Nearburg and EOG. Those are the only other working 8 interest owners besides Mewbourne; is that correct? 9 Α. That's correct. 10 Q. Now, notice was also given to Dominion Oklahoma 11 Texas Exploration and Production, Inc. Do they own an 12 interest in the north half? 13 A. No, they do not. They only own in the south half. 14 Okay, so that was just a mistake to notify them? χ 15 Q. 16 Right. Α. 17 Mr. Cobb, were Exhibits 1, 2 and 5 prepared by Q. you or under your supervision or compiled from company 18 19 business records? 20 Α. Yes, they were. 21 Q. And in your opinion, is the granting of this Application in the interests of conservation and the 22 23 prevention of waste? 24 Α. Yes, it is. 25 Mr. Examiner, I'd move the admission MR. BRUCE:

1	of Mewbourne Exhibits 1, 2 and 5.
2	EXAMINER EZEANYIM: Exhibits 1, 2 and 5 will be
3	admitted into evidence.
4	MR. BRUCE: I pass the witness, Mr. Examiner.
5	EXAMINER EZEANYIM: Thank you. Gail?
6	MS. MacQUESTEN: No questions.
7	EXAMINER EZEANYIM: Okay, I may have to ask you
8	some of the questions that I asked the other
9	MR. BRUCE: Yeah, and I do have an engineer,
10	also, to testify briefly, Mr
11	EXAMINER EZEANYIM: Okay, yeah, but Okay,
12	maybe I can resolve my question after the testimony.
13	MR. BRUCE: Okay.
14	EXAMINER EZEANYIM: Okay.
15	BRYAN M. MONTGOMERY,
16	the witness herein, after having been first duly sworn upon
17	his oath, was examined and testified as follows:
18	DIRECT EXAMINATION
19	BY MR. BRUCE:
20	Q. Would you please state your name for the record?
21	A. My name is Bryan Montgomery.
22	Q. Where do you reside?
23	A. I reside in Tyler, Texas.
24	Q. Who do you work for and in what capacity?
25	A. I work for Mewbourne Oil Company as the manager

of reservoir engineering. 1 Have you previously testified before the Division 2 Q. as an engineer? 3 Yes, I have. A. And were your credentials accepted as a matter of 5 Q. record? 6 7 A. Yes, they were. 8 Q. For the Examiner, could you briefly go over your 9 educational and employment background? 10 A. Yes, I received a bachelor's of science degree in 11 petroleum engineering at University of Oklahoma in 1984 and 12 a master's of business administration in 1992 at the University of Texas at Tyler and have worked since 1984 for 13 Mewbourne Oil Company, for about 20 years. 14 15 Q. And does your area of responsibility at Mewbourne include southeast New Mexico? 16 17 Yes, it does. A. As well as other areas? 18 Q. 19 Yes. A. 20 MR. BRUCE: Mr. Examiner, I'd tender Mr. 21 Montgomery as an expert petroleum engineer. 22 EXAMINER EZEANYIM: Mr. Montgomery is so 23 qualified. 24 Q. (By Mr. Bruce) Mr. Montgomery, could you refer 25 to Exhibit 3 and describe the wells drilled in the north

half of 20 and some of the adjoining wells? 1 Yes, this exhibit was put together by myself and 2 Α. our staff to help show what's going on on the ground out 3 The section was first drilled in 1980. 4 see in the south half, the Jetta-operated Federal AE Number 5 6 1 Delaware producer --7 EXAMINER EZEANYIM: Excuse me, where is --THE WITNESS: The color plat. 8 MR. BRUCE: If you don't have it, here's an extra 9 10 copy. EXAMINER EZEANYIM: Okay, okay, here. 11 So in 1979, in the south half of 12 THE WITNESS: 13 Section 20 where we see the words "Jetta Operated Federal 14 AE #1 Delaware Producer", Amoco actually spudded that well, 15 tested the Morrow, tested some other zones and temporarily 16 abandoned the wellbore. 17 Then in 1984 when they temporarily -- or they plugged it and pulled casing, there was no activity until 18 1997 when Santa Fe re-entered that wellbore and drilled an 19 80-acre Delaware horizontal well. 20 At that point -- or prior to that, just prior to 21 22 that, in 1996, Santa Fe also spudded and drilled and 23 completed the Foal 20 Number 1 in the northwest quarter as a Morrow well, and --24 25 Q. (By Mr. Bruce) It's still producing from the

1

Morrow?

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

It's still producing from the Morrow. In June of Α. '02, Jetta took over operations of both those wells in a purchase when they bought a package of wells. After that, Mewbourne put together to drill in the section, and we began in 2004 by spudding and drilling and completing in BIMEND the Morrow, the 20 Number 1 in the south half, and we are the operator of that well. It's currently in the Morrow producing at about a million a day, and it's been on production just a couple of months. It's actually productive in the lower Morrow and the middle Morrow.

If I back up, the Foal Number 1 tested wet and nonproductive in the lower Morrow but is producing out of the middle Morrow.

And then just recently we have spudded and aven 2 drilled and are testing the Morrow formation in the 20 Number 2, which is the well that we are discussing today in the north half. You see it in the northeast, the MOC Dinero 20 Number 2. It says producer; we're still testing. We're in the lower Morrow; it doesn't look very good. The middle Morrow does look like it's going to be productive.

- Now, Jetta bought these properties, but has it Q. expressed a desire to sell their properties in this section?
 - A. Yes, they have. We've talked to Jetta. In fact,

we've seen the sale package where the wells are for sale. 1 2 Q. Okay. 3 Α. Yes. Is that one reason why -- I mean, you don't have 4 any problem with Jetta as an operator, as such, do you? 5 No, they've done a fine job. They haven't Α. 6 7 been active doing anything in the last couple years, but no 8 problem. But if the properties are sold -- you don't know 9 Q. who the next operator will be, correct? 10 That's correct, there's no way to know who that 11 will be and how that will impact us from an operations 12 standpoint, as far as reporting to the Commission. 13 Are there any other reasons why Mewbourne wants 0. 14 15 to have two operators in the north-half unit? Yes, one strong reason is just the ability to be 16 Α. able to have efficiencies in production and operations, \ 17 physical operations. We plan to drill the Dinero 20 Number 18 3, you can see it on the plat. 19 20 Right now we are selling gas to El Paso on the 20 21 Number 1. It's a better contract than the Jetta well has. 22 We will tie in our Dinero 20 Number 2 at a common point at 23 the 20 Number 1 and hopefully the 20 Number 3, which will 24 also provide us a better place to compress gas in the

future and that type of stuff that an operator can do with

25

15 1 multiple wells in an area. Assuming the Division approves this request, will 2 0. production from the Mewbourne well in the northeast guarter 3 of Section 20 have separate facilities from the Jetta well? 4 5 Α. Yes. 6 Q. Separate surface facilities? 7 A. Yes, absolutely. 8 Q. Okay. Now, you indicated Jetta has put these 9 wells in a package. Is this an area where Mewbourne has 10 been active in New Mexico for a while? 11 Α. Yes, that's correct, we have drilled many Morrow 12 wells in this area in Eddy County, near Carlsbad, over the 13 last five -- or two years, we've drilled, I think, a total 14 of 55. And in this area maybe -- there were 25 of them. 15 And we're continuing, as you see, on the 20 Number 3 and in 16 other sections very near here to drill more Morrow wells. 17 Q. Okay, and has Mewbourne been active in New Mexico 18 for some time? 19 Yes, we started in the early 1970s and have been Α. operating since then consistently and growing and have a 20 21 long, strong record of operations in New Mexico.

- Q. And many of those are Morrow wells or deep gas wells?
 - A. That's correct, that's our primary target.
 - Q. Was Exhibit 3 prepared by you?

22

23

24

25

1	A. Yes, it was.
2	Q. And in your opinion is the granting of this
3	Application in the interests of conservation and the
4	prevention of waste?
5	A. Yes, it would be.
6	MR. BRUCE: Mr. Examiner, I'd move the admission
7	of Exhibit 3.
8	EXAMINER EZEANYIM: Exhibit 3 will be admitted
9	into evidence.
10	MR. BRUCE: And that concludes my presentation of
11	this witness, Mr. Examiner. I would note for the record
12	that there is no Exhibit 4. Late last night I was
13	numbering these and
14	EXAMINER EZEANYIM: I was wondering about that.
15	MR. BRUCE: skipped.
16	EXAMINER EZEANYIM: Yeah, so that's an omission,
17	right?
18	MR. BRUCE: Yes.
19	EXAMINER EZEANYIM: Okay, Mr. Montgomery Do
20	you have any questions for this witness?
21	MS. MacQUESTEN: No, but I just wanted to ask,
22	did we admit Number 3 yet?
23	EXAMINER EZEANYIM: Yeah.
24	MR. BRUCE: Yeah, I think we did.
25	EXAMINER EZEANYIM: I did.

EXAMINATION 1 BY EXAMINER EZEANYIM: 2 Mr. Montgomery, you say you are -- that Mewbourne 3 Q. is trying to sell the interest in this unit; is that --4 That Jetta is selling the interest in the unit. 5 A. To you guys? 6 Q. No, Jetta has a sale package to the general 7 Α. public, to sell all their properties in this area and a lot 8 9 of west Texas, of which these two will be included, and it 10 has just been publicized. We don't feel we will buy it. 11 It's a large package, we will not bid on it, but others will, and it will probably sell in the next few months. 12 Okay, along that same line, you are saying you Q. 13 discussed with them about this -- where you want to drill 14 in that unit, and they have no problems? 15 That's correct. Yes, we made a deal with them 16 Α. for their interest to drill this infill well, and then we 17 also discussed the operations issues that we're talking 18 19 about today, and they have no problem with that either. 20 Okay. And as we discussed in the other one, I Q. know Mr. Bruce asked you about the federal land. This is a 21 22 federal lease, right? 23 That's correct. Α. And you made mention that you discussed with the 24 Q.

25

BLM before --

1 A. That's correct, Mr. Cobb did, yes. 2 And then do you know what the discussions were, Q. 3 what --4 No, I wasn't part of that conversation on any of Α. their concerns, but it was my understanding that they were 5 6 okay with us as the second operator. 7 And they didn't talk about who reports production Q. from that unit. Do you know whether they discussed that? 8 No, I was not part of that conversation. 9 A. And then you said -- How did you acquire interest 10 Q. in this unit? 11 I would be guessing, but it's my recollection A. 12 that we got a big part of our interest from Jetta, and then 13 others maybe also, but it's not something I'm intimately 14 familiar with. 15 Uh-huh. . Q. 16 I'm sure Mr. Cobb can come back up and answer any 17 A. of those questions. 18 And see, I ask this question again, and maybe you 19 Q. might help me since you are -- and -- I don't know, it 20 seems to me that in that unit, because you are here in a 21 different 160. You know, did anybody ask that question, 22 because testimony about getting an NSP for that? 23 24 I'm just asking this question because it might 25 We are trying to revise this rule, and I'm asking help us.

this question for the general public to be able to see if there is any input you could give us here, but did you ever think about getting an NSP into a 160?

- A. I did not, I have to tell you, explore that. It would be an interesting thing to do. I don't know about the ownership of the two wells and how it would all work out, if that would be the way to go, to get two operators.
- Q. Yeah, but Mewbourne understands that we normally issue administratively those NSPs? You know that we do that, right?
 - A. Sure, yes.

MR. BRUCE: Mr. Examiner, again, I kind of feel like Mr. Carr. I think Mr. Carr and I were in a battle over NSPs a couple years ago, and I think it was the Commission would not approve an NSP.

an NSP, how does that affect the working interest where there's already different working interest in the two wells, you know? There might be a wellbore assignment or something of that nature which would complicate if -- it might complicate the title issues involved, especially if -- perhaps, say, down the road, if a third well was drilled in the north half, let's say that Jetta well was plugged and abandoned and somebody drilled a third well. Would the working interest be what it is under the north half, or

would it be under, you know -- would it be the 75/25
percent split that's in the first well, or would it be

what's in the second well, or issues like that? So it

could complicate that also.

EXAMINER EZEANYIM: Yeah -
MR. BRUCE: That would be a case-by-case basis,

but --

understand what you're saying. But you know, if you submit an application, we have to review all those and see whether we can approve it, because we only do administrative applications; it's more time -- I mean less time-consuming than going to hearing, and that's why I'm asking the question. I'm not saying necessarily what you do, but I'm asking, did you consider that, you know, and then submit an Application and we said no? You know, that's really the question I'm making. It's not that you should do that, I'm not saying you should do that. I'm trying to get some information on --

THE WITNESS: Well, we would be open to discussing that in the future, for sure, on a case-by-case basis.

EXAMINER EZEANYIM: Okay. Do you have any more questions?

MS. MacQUESTEN: No.

1	EXAMINER EZEANYIM: Okay, you may be excused.
2	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
3	EXAMINER EZEANYIM: With that, Case Number 13,330
4	will be taken under advisement.
5	(Thereupon, these proceedings were concluded at
6	9:11 a.m.)
7	* * *
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	I do hereby centry that the foregoing is
15	the Examiner hearing of Cyse No. 333
16	heard by me on 1 Landing
17	Concervation (Maton
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

STATE OF NEW MEXICO)

OUNTY OF SANTA FE)

I, Steven T. Brenner, Certified Court Reporter and Notary Public, HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing transcript of proceedings before the Oil Conservation Division was reported by me; that I transcribed my notes; and that the foregoing is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative or employee of any of the parties or attorneys involved in this matter and that I have no personal interest in the final disposition of this matter.

WITNESS MY HAND AND SEAL September 17th, 2004.

STEVEN T. BRENNER

CCR No. 7

My commission expires: October 16th, 2006