Page	1

NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION

EXAMINER HEARING

SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

Hearing Date	JULY 23, 1998 Ti	me <u>8:15 A.M.</u>
NAME NAME	REPRESENTING	LOCATION
william of Jan	REPRESENTING Completel Com Cong Vienne	And The
Samuel moll		Fort With.
Sec-47.12111)	BassEntenprises Prollo	Fort Winth.
Simon Harge	Burnt ederprises	Fort worth
John Makao	Ocean Engry	Danven
ahod Johnson	Ocean Enorgh	Derver
Worth Captur	BASS ENTERPRISES	Fort Worth
CHARLES MURPIN	Vares RECENTEUM COX	PATEL A
James Brun		Santa Fo
John Jones	Scott Exploration	Roswell
Am Day	Store Propo	Charles C
Up 11 st of		
	1	į .

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. 12,010

APPLICATION OF BASS ENTERPRISES
PRODUCTION COMPANY FOR A NONSTANDARD
SUBSURFACE OIL WELL LOCATION/PRODUCING
AREA, LEA COUNTY, NEW MEXICO

ORIGINAL

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

EXAMINER HEARING

BEFORE: DAVID R. CATANACH, Hearing Examiner

State of New Mexico.

July 23rd, 1998

Santa Fe, New Mexico

This matter came on for hearing before the New Mexico Oil Conservation Division, DAVID R. CATANACH, Hearing Examiner, on Thursday, July 23rd, 1998, at the New Mexico Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources Department, Porter Hall, 2040 South Pacheco, Santa Fe, New Mexico, Steven T. Brenner, Certified Court Reporter No. 7 for the

* * *

I N D E X

July 23rd, 1998 Examiner Hearing CASE NO. 12,010

	PAGE
EXHIBITS	3
APPEARANCES	3
APPLICANT'S WITNESSES:	
WORTH CARLIN (Landman)	
Direct Examination by Mr. Carroll	5
Examination by Examiner Catanach	14
GEORGE HILLIS (Geologist)	
Direct Examination by Mr. Carroll	18
Examination by Examiner Catanach	33
REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE	37

* * *

EXHIBITS

Applicant's		Identified	Admitted
Exhibit	1	9	14
Exhibit	2	11	14
Exhibit	3	12	14
Exhibit	4	13	14
Exhibit	5	13	14
Exhibit	6	18	33
Exhibit	7	19	33
Exhibit	8	21	33
Exhibit	9	22	33
Exhibit	10	23	33
Exhibit	11	26	33
Exhibit	12	28	33
Exhibit	13	31	33
Exhibit		32	33
EXHIDIC	14	32	33

* * *

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPLICANT:

LOSEE, CARSON, HAAS & CARROLL, P.A. 311 West Quay
Post Office Box 1720
Artesia, New Mexico 88210
By: ERNEST L. CARROLL

ALSO PRESENT:

MARK W. ASHLEY NMOCD Environmental Geologist 2040 South Pacheco Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505

* * *

```
1
               WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were had at
 2
     8:19 a.m.:
               EXAMINER CATANACH: At this time we'll call Case
 3
     12,010, which is the Application of Bass Enterprises
 4
     Production Company for a nonstandard subsurface oil well
 5
 6
     location/producing area, Lea County, New Mexico.
 7
               Call for appearances in this case.
 8
               MR. CARROLL: Mr. Examiner, I'm Ernest Carroll of
     the Artesia law firm of Losee, Carson, Haas and Carroll.
 9
     I'm here today on behalf of the Applicant, and I will have
10
     two witnesses.
11
12
               EXAMINER CATANACH: Are there any additional
13
     appearances?
               Will the two witnesses please stand to be sworn
14
     in?
15
16
               (Thereupon, the witnesses were sworn.)
               MR. CARROLL: Our first witness, Mr. Examiner,
17
18
     will be Worth Carlin.
               This set, Mr. Catanach, has the original waivers
19
     in it, so --
20
               EXAMINER CATANACH:
21
                                    Okay.
               MR. CARROLL: -- as an exhibit, you have the
22
     originals.
23
               Do you want to have the witness sit up in this
24
     table stand?
25
```

EXAMINER CATANACH: Please. 1 2 WORTH CARLIN, the witness herein, after having been first duly sworn upon 3 his oath, was examined and testified as follows: 5 DIRECT EXAMINATION 6 BY MR. CARROLL: Would you please state your full name, address 8 and occupation for the record, sir? 9 Α. My name is William Worth Carlin. I reside at 3809 Fox Hollow, Bedford, Texas, 76021. 10 All right, and what is your occupation again? 11 12 Α. Oh, I am a landman for Bass Enterprises Production Company. 13 Now, Mr. Carlin, have you an opportunity to 14 15 testify before the New Mexico Oil Conservation Division in 16 the capacity as a petroleum landman? 17 Α. Yes, sir. 18 And have you had your credentials accepted as an 19 expert in that field? 20 Α. Yes, sir. MR. CARROLL: Mr. Examiner, I would tender Mr. 21 22 Carlin as an expert in the field of petroleum land 23 management. EXAMINER CATANACH: Mr. Carlin is so qualified. 24 25 Q. (By Mr. Carroll) Mr. Carlin, we are here today

on an Application of Bass, seeking an unorthodox bottomhole oil well location for a well that is presently to be drilling. Are you familiar with that Application?

A. Yes, I am.

- Q. Briefly, would you state for the Examiner's information why this Application has been made?
- A. The Application has been made for the purposes of conducting a side-track off of the Monteith "C" Number 1 well, which was a vertical well. The sidetrack bottomhole location will fall outside the 300-foot box that is presently required under the present field rules for the Penn formation in the Lovington Southeast field.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Examiner, I've just noticed, the Application states that this is for Eddy County, New Mexico. It is not; it is Lea County. The advertisement was done for Lea County. I'm not exactly sure why it didn't get corrected, but somehow it slipped up. But I think it has been properly notified, all the people, as to the actual location, but there is a slip-up, at least in my copy of the Application. I'm not sure if the one file contains that.

But I'd like to move to amend that to show its proper county.

EXAMINER CATANACH: The Application that you filed shows Eddy County?

```
1
               MR. CARROLL: Well, the copy I have in my file.
 2
     I don't know if the one that got up to the Commission.
 3
     it is, I'd like to amend it. And I see that in the opening
     statement -- or the heading, "in the matter of". And in
 5
     paragraph 1 it does say Eddy County.
 6
               EXAMINER CATANACH: I'm sorry, where are you
 7
     looking at, Mr. Carroll?
 8
               MR. CARROLL: The actual -- Do you have a copy of
     the Application that is filed?
 9
               EXAMINER CATANACH: I don't know that -- This was
10
11
     set by Mike Stogner --
12
               MR. CARROLL: Right, that's correct.
               EXAMINER CATANACH: -- filed this
13
14
     administratively.
15
               MR. CARROLL:
                             There's some corrections here.
               EXAMINER CATANACH:
16
                                   Okay.
               MR. CARROLL:
                             They have made some of them. I
17
     just -- Here's what I was noticing, that in the Application
18
     it says Eddy County, and here -- feet from the east line of
19
20
     Section -- Eddy County.
21
               EXAMINER CATANACH: Okay, we must have caught
     that and corrected it.
22
               MR. CARROLL: I think it was, but I just wasn't
23
     sure, but I want the record to adequately reflect, because
24
25
     the advertisement is correct.
```

EXAMINER CATANACH: The advertisement is correct, and your -- I presume your notice is correct.

MR. CARROLL: Yes.

EXAMINER CATANACH: Okay.

- Q. (By Mr. Carroll) Mr. Carlin, would you briefly tell the Examiner the history of how this well was first proposed, drilled and then what led to the Application, the circumstances?
- A. This well was drilled for the purpose of evaluating the Strawn formation, which, as I alluded to earlier, is based on 80-acre spacing within a hundred -- the legal location has to be within 150 feet of the center of a governmental quarter-quarter section, and the well initially was drilled as a legal location.

The Strawn formation out here has been evaluated by 3-D seismic interpretation, which George Hillis will explain in more detail later. The Strawn features are very small in nature.

We felt like that we could evaluate this Strawn feature adequately at a legal location, but upon drilling the vertical hole and evaluating the Strawn formation, our seismic was confirmed that we really needed to be over to the west a little bit to properly evaluate the formation.

So that was the purpose of conducting a sidetrack a few hundred feet to the west, which under normal field

rules would still be at a legal location.

- Q. The way this case was originally started, it was done through contacting Mr. Stogner, was it not?
- A. Yes, it was. When we reached TD on the vertical hole and logged the Strawn formation and saw that we were just on the very edge of the feature, we contacted both Mr. Stogner as well as Chris Williams in the Hobbs office to explain to them that, you know, we had a drilling rig out there, we had already expended, you know, \$600,000, \$700,000 and, you know, we would like to do a sidetrack to protect our correlative rights and develop this feature.
- Q. So the reason the drilling went ahead instead of waiting for this hearing or the Application to be granted was mainly a problem of economic, because you already had the rig out there on location, and you elected to proceed ahead after notification to both the Hobbs office and to the Santa Fe office of the New Mexico OCD?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. All right. You've prepared some exhibits to help illustrate what's going on out here with respect to this Application, have you not?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Would you turn to Exhibit Number 1 and, Mr. Carlin, if you would, identify what this exhibit is for the record, and then if you would explain the items that are

depicted here.

A. Okay. Exhibit 1 is a land plat focusing on Section 13 of Township 16 South, 36 East, wherein outlined in green -- being the west half of the northeast quarter -- is the spacing unit for the Monteith "C" Number 1, showing the surface location at 660 from the north, 1830 from the east line.

The red box there next to the surface location is the 300-foot box that falls within the pool rules to stay legal.

We also show the first sidetrack TD being off to the west of the initial surface location, and it's denoted as the first sidetrack because after we got the first sidetrack down, we stuck the drill pipe in the hole and weren't able to complete it.

As Mr. Hillis will explain later, we did encounter significantly higher -- or thicker Strawn sands, and so therefore we are presently conducting a second sidetrack, just paralleling the first sidetrack to drill around the junk in the hole.

I have also outlined around the 80-acre tract to the north the offset operators and mineral owners which have been notified, and Tract 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 are also identified for purposes of explaining who the mineral owners are in those tracts. This is a fee tract, and it is

a lot of mineral ownership in this section.

- Q. All right, now, with respect to the issues of notification, you've prepared some other exhibits which actually show the ownership of the minerals, and that's on Exhibit Number 2, is it not?
 - A. Yes, sir.

- Q. And what you have is, there's multiple pages, and each one of these pages are headed up with a heading such as Tract 1, Tract 2, Tract 3, and that corresponds with the tract notations on your Exhibit 1, do they not?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Okay. And that's all that's contained in Exhibit 2, is the actual notation, who owns it, whether it's a working interest or an unleased mineral interest, correct?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. Now, according to the rules, though, notice had to be given to the persons closest to the location; is that correct?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. And what tracts were the ones that notice was given to, then?
- A. Notice was given to the parties in Section 12 to the north, and --
 - Q. And that's operated by Matador Petroleum?
 - A. Matador Petroleum, and Rio Pecos also owns a

leasehold interest in there. So both parties were
notified.
 Q. All right.

- A. Tracts 2 and Tract 3, adjoining the west side of our 80-acre spacing unit, which is denoted as Tract 1, those parties were notified.
- Q. One of the things in all the additional tracts,
 Bass is probably one of the single largest mineral interest
 owners in every one of these tracts surrounding except
 possibly for the Yates tract; is that correct?
 - A. That is correct.

- Q. All right. Exhibit 3, would you tell us what this is?
- A. Exhibit 3 is the APD, the application for permit to drill, the initial permit filed for the Monteith "C" 1.
- Q. All right. This is the application under which the original straight-hole location was drilled; is that correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. And this is just presented to the Examiner so he can have it available to him for informational purposes, correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. All right, would you turn to Exhibit 4 and would you identify what Exhibit 4 is for the record?

Exhibit 4 is the notice -- evidence of notice 1 Α. sent to all of the parties in Section 12 to the north and 2 Tracts 2 and 3 to the west. 3 4 Q. All right, this contains copies of the initial 5 letter that put them on notice of filing of the Application 6 and then the change in hearing dates from the original July 7 9th date to the July 23rd, today's date; is that correct? Α. That's correct. MR. CARROLL: Mr. Examiner, if you will note that 9 all of these letters do have the proper county designation 10 on them. 11 12 Q. (By Mr. Carroll) Exhibit Number 5, Mr. Carlin, would you explain -- describe it for the record and explain 13 what's contained therein? 14 15 Α. Exhibit 5 are copies -- except the Examiner has the originals -- of waivers that we received for our 16 Application. 17 All right. So out of the people notified, you 18 did receive 19 waivers with respect to this hearing; is 19 that correct? 20 21 Α. Yes, sir. 22 All right. Mr. Carlin, in your opinion will the Q. 23 granting of this Application by the New Mexico OCD prevent

waste and protect correlative rights?

Yes, it will.

24

25

Α.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Examiner, I would move 1 2 admission of Bass Exhibits 1 through 5 at this time. EXAMINER CATANACH: Exhibits 1 through 5 will be 3 admitted as evidence. 4 MR. CARROLL: Mr. Examiner, I have no further 5 6 questions of this witness at this time. 7 **EXAMINATION** BY EXAMINER CATANACH: Okay. Mr. Carlin, in Section 12 is there 9 Q. 10 actually any producing wells? Yes, there is. Matador Petroleum operates the 11 Α. well -- and I believe it's denoted in the northeast of the 12 13 southeast quarter. Is that -- Do you know if that's a Pennsylvanian 14 15 or a Strawn well? It is a Strawn well. 16 Α. 17 ο. Okay. You don't now what acreage is dedicated to 18 that well? 19 I don't know what acreage is dedicated, no. 20 0. But Matador and Rio Pecos are the lessees of the remainder of that section, or --21 22 Α. The title up there is also -- It's a state lease, but there's multiple working interest owners. And Rio 23 Pecos was the only owner of operating rights, based on our 24 25 record research, that was not a party to the operating

agreement for the -- that governs this well.

Matador and several other parties are working interest owners in the well, and my understanding is that the operator needs to be notified for that purpose.

And then, like I said, our records research showed that Rio Pecos also owned an operating-rights interest in that state lease but did not turn up as being a working-interest owner in the well.

- Q. Okay. I'm not sure it's a big issue because you're not actually encroaching to the north --
 - A. Right.

- Q. -- so they're really not affected.
- A. Right.

EXAMINER CATANACH: Okay.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Examiner, the giving the notice to the Rio Pecos Corporation was just in an abundance of caution. We think we're covered by doing it to the operator, but since they weren't a party to the operating agreement, we went ahead and -- what's another 30-some-odd cents or whatever letter it costs to get it notified?

EXAMINER CATANACH: Okay.

Q. (By Examiner Catanach) As far as you know, the interest owners that you have cited in Tracts 2 and 3, those are the interest owners in their entirety in those two tracts?

A. Yes.

- Q. Including any royalty or overrides or anything, or did you --
- A. No, all they represent is leasehold owners and unleased mineral interest owners. So any overrides would be a party to any leasehold interest.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Examiner, you will note that we have denoted whether they are a leaseholder or an unleased mineral interest, and that's what the "MI" designation would be, an unleased mineral interest owner.

- Q. (By Examiner Catanach) Have you received any correspondence from these parties with any concerns about your location?
 - A. No, sir.
- Q. You've actually received waivers from a lot of them?
 - A. From a lot of them, yes, sir.
- Q. Your notice letter to these parties -- Okay, what I was looking at is your waivers. Does that accurately reflect the approximate bottomhole location that you're drilling to, the 607 from the north line, 2454 feet from the east line?
- A. At the time that the waiver letters were sent out, our sidetrack operation was currently in progress, so we really didn't know what -- This was an estimate or a

guesstimate of where we thought our bottomhole location was going to be at the conclusion of our sidetrack procedure, because the waivers went out immediately when we got -- you know, notified the OCD verbally of what our plans were and basically got their okay to -- you know, to do it.

We immediately sent out waivers to all the affected parties, and then as a result the sidetrack -- you know -- the sidetrack -- the true bottomhole is reflected on Exhibit 1, but this was just where we thought that the bottomhole was going to be at the time that the waivers were sent out.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Catanach, if you will note, that the actual location is -- our waiver had it actually being closer to the two closest boundary lines than it actually did.

I will also put on testimony concerning what the new sidetrack is, and we actually believe we're sidetracking underneath the lost fish, which will -- in all likelihood, we will even be farther away from those lease lines, either right directly below the fish or closer back to the orthodox location.

- Q. (By Examiner Catanach) Okay. The well is currently drilling?
- A. Yes.

Q. Okay.

Α. And Mr. Hillis will be able to answer any up-to-1 2 date questions on that. 3 EXAMINER CATANACH: I think that's all I have. MR. CARROLL: I have no further questions. 4 I have given you Mr. Hillis's exhibits in that 5 6 envelope, Mr. Examiner. 7 EXAMINER CATANACH: Okay. MR. CARROLL: Are you ready to proceed now? 8 EXAMINER CATANACH: Yes. 9 GEORGE A. HILLIS, 10 11 the witness herein, after having been first duly sworn upon 12 his oath, was examined and testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION 13 BY MR. CARROLL: 14 Mr. Hillis, would you state your full name and 15 Q. address and place of employment? 16 My name is George A. Hillis. I reside at 8824 17 Α. Glenhollow Drive, Forth Worth, Texas, and I'm division 18 19 geologist with Bass Enterprises Production Company of Forth 20 Worth. 21 You have attached your personal résumé as Exhibit 22 6, have you not? Yes, sir. 23 Α. And Mr. Hillis, you have had occasion to testify 24 25 before the New Mexico OCD and have your credentials as an

expert in the field of petroleum geology accepted, have you not?

A. Yes, I have.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Examiner, we would tender Mr. Hillis as an expert in the field of petroleum geology.

EXAMINER CATANACH: Mr. Hillis is so qualified.

- Q. (By Mr. Carroll) Al right. Mr. Hillis, let us -- First of all, you are familiar with the Application that is before this Examiner today, are you not?
 - A. Yes, I am.
- Q. You have prepared a group of exhibits to help illustrate the matters contained in this particular Application, have you not?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. If you would, would you turn to your first exhibit beyond your personal résumé, and that would be Exhibit Number 7? Would you identify this exhibit for the record and then explain its significance with respect to this Application?
- A. Exhibit 7 illustrates the location of the Bass
 Monteith "C" Number 1 relative to Strawn production in the
 Lovington field area. The red sector of the production
 bubbles reflects the total gas production, while the green
 part of the bubble reflects the total oil production on the
 well through July of this year.

The blue rectangle in the center of the exhibit illustrates the proration unit for the Monteith "C" Number 1, and the solid pink dot within that is the location of the vertical hole that we drilled first, and to the west of the vertical hole the location where the sidetrack well cut the top of the Strawn and the location of the TD of the sidetrack well are also illustrated.

- Q. Now, Mr. Hillis, this particular Strawn play, this is a relatively older play, is it not?
- A. It's an older play which has been greatly rejuvenated in the past four or five years, using 3-D seismic.
- Q. Are these items or the structure of the points that are going after by drillers, the people that are drilling are exploring in this area, are they large in size, or are they very restricted in size?
 - A. They tend to be very restricted in size.
- Q. All right. Is this indicative of the objective that Bass had in mind when it proposed this well and spudded it?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. Now, you have personally worked in this field since the early 1980s, have you not?
- A. That's correct.
 - Q. And were actually responsible for the drilling of

1 the first Bass well, this well down in the southeast corner 2 of Section 13, right? That's correct. 3 Α. 4 Q. Okay. Anything else that you would like to bring 5 to the Examiner's attention with respect to Exhibit Number 7? 6 7 Α. No. 8 0. All right. If you would turn, then, to Exhibit Number 8, and would you again identify the exhibit for the 9 Examiner and then explain its significance with respect to 10 11 this Application? Exhibit 8 illustrates the structure of the Strawn 12 Α. for a nine-square-mile area centered on Bass's Monteith 13 The subsea data point of minus 7406, located in the 14 15 northwest of the northeast quarter of Section 13, is from the vertical hole in the Monteith "C" Number 1. 16 Basically, the Monteith "C" 1 is located on the 17 northeast flank of a southeast-to-northwest-trending 18 structural nose located in the southwestern sector of the 19 20 map. 21 All right. Is structure a controlling factor in determining where you're going to drill in this field here? 22 No. 23 Α. 24 Any other issues that you'd like to point out to

the Examiner with respect to this exhibit?

1	A. No.
2	Q. All right. Then let us turn to your next
3	exhibit, which would be Exhibit 9, I believe.
4	A. Exhibit 9 It's a three-page exhibit.
5	The first page is a summary of the well history
6	of the Monteith "C" Number 1.
7	The second page is a sketch of both the sidetrack
8	and the vertical hole on the wells.
9	And the third page of Exhibit 9 depicts the fish
10	that we had to leave in the hole on the sidetrack well.
11	We spudded the vertical well back on the 20th of
12	April. We reached TD near the end of may. We logged and
13	drill-stem-tested the Strawn, found it to be tight.
14	With the additional data from the vertical hole,
15	we were able to refine the 3-D seismic, and that's what
16	encouraged us to commence drilling a side frac in a
17	westerly direction.
18	And we commenced that in early June. We reached
19	TD in the middle of June, TD of 11,598 feet, measured
20	depth.
21	While were doing a survey at TD, we got stuck.
22	We worked the stuck pipe for over a week, and we eventually
23	had to leave a fish in the hole. The top of the fish is
- 1	

We ran 5-1/2-inch casing down to 11,400, above

covering the pay that we encountered in the Strawn.

24

the Strawn. We attempted to make an open-hole completion there, but with the fish across the pay and the cuttings in the well, we were unsuccessful. So we decided we would have to whipstock around it.

We began that around the 9th of July. We -- Two attempts at it. We were not able to get around the fish. We drilled into the fish the first two times, and we're currently going for third-time lucky.

- Q. With respect to the intended location, when you -- If this third attempt is lucky, where will the bottomhole be located in reference to this first attempted whipstock?
- A. The TD of this whipstock will be below the sidetrack hole, so the TD will actually be a little further to the east of the current TD of the sidetrack hole.
 - Q. Okay, closer, then, to the orthodox position?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. All right. Anything further that you'd like to point out with respect to this exhibit?
 - A. No.

- Q. Okay. Let's turn, then, to Exhibit 10, if you will. Would you again identify this exhibit for the record and discuss its significance?
- A. Exhibit 10 illustrates the location of the vertical and sidetrack holes for the Monteith "C" 1 again,

and this time relative to the Strawn reservoir anomaly,

identified by the 3-D seismic.

The original vertical hole is located on the eastern edge of the area for an orthodox location, and the location of where the sidetrack hole cuts the top of the Strawn is just west of the area for an orthodox location. That's number 1 on the map.

And then number 2 on the map is the TD of the sidetrack hole.

- Q. The -- I suppose it was very hard to draw locations on top of another. The way this -- The fact that the number 2 is located more to the west differs from your testimony is just -- that's because of the problem of drawing the exhibit; is that correct?
- A. Well, number 2 is the actual TD of the sidetrack hole.
- Q. Okay, is that the sidetrack of the original, the original sidetrack?
 - A. The original sidetrack.
- Q. Okay, so the number 1, then, is where the sidetrack -- you expect it to be located if it's successful?
 - A. No, the TD of the new sidetrack or the second sidetrack, the whipstock, should be just a little east of Number 2 --

Q. Uh-huh.

- A. -- but not as far east as Number 1.
- Q. And again, this relationship deals with trying to depict things that are vertically above and under things, as opposed to just a flat plane that we have here?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Now, you have a blue line that is labeled the "Strawn Reservoir Anomaly (3D)". Would you describe exactly what is meant and how the boundaries or the positioning of that line were drawn?
- A. If you note on the exhibit, Exhibit 10, there's a pink line that follows the proration unit kind of on the east half and then along the south half. That's the edge of the 3-D seismic survey that we had available to us. So we were kind of on the edge of it.

We thought we had a larger anomaly that went more on the eastern part of our proration unit, and that's why we drilled a vertical hole at the unorthodox location. We were wrong.

Once we got the well down and we got a sonic log on that well, we were able to refine the 3-D data, and it showed us that we were on the edge of a much smaller anomaly than what we had originally hoped to be.

Q. You have depicted that most of the anomaly is still located within the 80-acre proration unit that has

been dedicated to this well; is that correct? 1 That's correct. 2 Α. Is that interpretation based on your new data 3 0. from the drilling of the first straight hole and that 3-D 4 5 seismic? 6 Α. It's based on integration of both those sets of 7 data. All right. And you feel that that is a Q. 8 reasonable depiction, to the best of your knowledge, of 9 10 what -- of where that producing part of this reservoir would lie? 11 Yes, I do. 12 Α. Anything further with respect to Exhibit 10, Mr. 13 Q. Hillis? 14 15 Α. No. If you will, then, turn to Exhibit 11 and 16 Q. 17 identify it for the record and explain what is depicted here with respect to Bass's Application. 18 Exhibit 11 basically enlarges upon the previous Α. 19 20 exhibit, Number 10. And what it does, it details the distances form the north and west lease lines of the 21 proration unit for the critical sectors of the sidetrack 22 23 hole. The sidetrack encountered the top of the Strawn, 24

as indicated, 469 feet from the west lease line and 649

feet from the north lease line.

Continuing on, the top of the reservoir was encountered 405.5 feet from the west lease line and 641 from the north lease line.

Then the base of the reservoir that we cut in the sidetrack was encountered 343.3 feet from the west lease line and 633 feet from the north lease line.

- Q. All right. And is this the same part of the reservoir that you're trying to target with this latest sidetrack attempt?
- A. Correct. We're between the top and the base of the reservoir; that's the area we're trying to target. And we will be just below that, so the top and the base will probably move a little bit to the east.
- Q. All right. Anything further with respect to Exhibit 11 that you'd like to bring to the Examiner's attention?
- A. Really only two things, I guess. Just -- these measurements -- I put this together to show that we're really not encroaching on the north lease line. And we are, in my opinion, a fair distance away from our west lease line also.
- Q. Were you an original party to the development of the special field rules?
 - A. No, I wasn't.

Q. The interesting thing about the application that -- with respect to the application of normal statewide rules, would this bottomhole location be an unorthodox location?

- A. For where we encountered the reservoir, if it was statewide rules with 330 from the legal center, it would be a legal location, it would be orthodox.
- Q. All right. Okay, let us turn, then, to Exhibit

 12. Would you identify it for the record and describe its

 significance?
- A. Okay. If you refer back to Exhibits 10 and 11, showing the areal view of the sidetrack hole and the vertical hole setup, this Exhibit Number 12 is a cross-section which illustrates the location of the vertical and sidetrack holes in the vertical dimension for the Monteith "C" Number 1.

The log on the mud log for the original vertical hole are shown on the right-hand side. You can see that we touched the very edge of the Strawn down around 11,340. We DST'd it, we got a little oil, but the pressures indicated we were tight, we could not make a completion. So that encouraged the sidetrack after we refined these logs wit the 3-D data.

On the left-hand side, then, of the cross-section are the mud log, on the extreme left, the mud log for the

sidetrack hole and the measured depth. And just over to the right of there is a TVD, or a true vertical depth, log of the drill rate of the sidetrack.

As I mentioned before, we were not able to obtain electric logs on the sidetrack after we got stuck. So we just have our mud log. But it indicates that we in the sidetrack hole encountered approximately 60 feet of gross pay in the center of the reservoir.

- Q. All right. So what you've tried to do by this particular cross-section is attempt to equate the only information you have on the sidetrack, which is a mud log, with the information that you got on the original logging of the straight hole; is that correct?
 - A. That's correct.

- Q. Okay. And this particular log, what is shown here on this cross-section does show a significant difference in size of reservoir, does it not, from what the first hole was, to the sidetrack?
- A. Thickness of reservoir, correct, and also the drilling shows associated with the drill break.
- Q. In your opinion, is it reasonable for Bass to expect that a completion could be made in this part of the reservoir, as is shown from the mud log?
 - A. We believe so.
 - Q. Now, this particular operation on Bass's part has

been -- has turned out to be a very costly one, has it not?

- A. It's been a very tough hole.
- Q. All right.

- A. I think our original AFE for the hole was around \$723,000, and yesterday morning when I checked before I came here, we were pretty close to \$1.2 million. So it's going to be a tough hole to make a lot of money on.
- Q. Yes. Now, Mr. Hillis, one of the normal concerns that the New Mexico Conservation Division has to do when it's judging what should happen with respect to an unorthodox location is that they want to know, of course, the ultimate issues about preventing waste and protecting correlative rights, and whether or not they're giving an unfair advantage to an operator by granting an unorthodox location.

With respect to the exhibits that you have presented and dealing with those issues of allowing Bass to seek to protect its correlative rights and also prevent the waste or the leaving of unproduced oil out here, with respect to all of those issues I wish you would make a statement to the Examiner, tie those in with this issue of whether or not there should even be considered a penalty because we are at an unorthodox location.

A. Well, personally, I don't believe there should be a penalty applied.

We thought we had a larger anomaly, we drilled the vertical hole, logged it, refined the data from that with our 3-D seismic, find that we had a much smaller anomaly than we had hoped for.

But more importantly, we believe that anomaly is essentially restricted to within our proration unit. And as I mentioned earlier, we're not encroaching on the north lease line and in my opinion we're a fair distance from the west lease line also.

So there's some oil there that will not go to waste.

- Q. So you -- in granting -- in consideration of whether or not this Application should be granted, are you of the opinion that it will prevent waste and protect the correlative rights that exist out here?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. All right. With respect to that Exhibit 12, are there any other issues that you wish to bring to the attention of the Examiner?
 - A. No, sir.
- Q. Why don't we then turn to Exhibit 13, and if you would describe it for the record and explain its significance.
- A. Exhibit 13 is a wellbore diagram that illustrates the proposed and actual of the side frac on the Monteith

"C" 1. This data was provided to Bass by Anadrill, a division of Schlumberger.

The red line on the exhibit illustrates the actual sidetrack hole, whereas the blue line was the one that was originally planned, and the red then being the actual, so...

I've indicated on there the critical entry points by the wellbore for the Strawn and the sidetrack, but I guess the one thing to really point out is that we did not go as far to the west, the actual sidetrack, as we thought we would have.

- Q. All right. This basically, then, confirms the earlier exhibits, and Exhibit 14 is actually the recorded data from which these graphs are drawn, is it not?
 - A. That is correct.

- Q. So the purposes of Exhibit 13 and 14, then, were to confirm for the Examiner the actual location of this sidetracked operation?
- A. That's correct. Basically, these two exhibits are the documentation from Anadrill, from which we obtained the distances which we have included in all the other exhibits.

MR. CARROLL: All right. Mr. Examiner, I would move, then, admission of Exhibits Numbers 6 through 14 at this time.

1 EXAMINER CATANACH: Exhibits 6 through 14 will be 2 admitted as evidence. All right, and Mr. Examiner, I 3 MR. CARROLL: would have no further questions to ask of this witness. 4 **EXAMINATION** 5 BY EXAMINER CATANACH: 6 7 Okay. Mr. Hillis, you say that your sidetrack Number 2 is going to be located further to the east. 8 you know how much further? 9 10 Α. I don't. Do you have an estimate, maybe? 11 Q. I would -- I'm not a drilling person, but the way 12 Α. I understand it, we would put a motor on. We're trying to 13 whipstock below the actual fish. And I'm told that we 14 should stay within like 10 feet parallel to the wellbore at 15 that point. 16 So for the top and the base of the reservoir, I 17 think you're just talking, you know, five to ten feet 18 further to the east. It's not a major distance. We're to 19 stay as close to where we've seen the oil shows. 20 Now, your estimate of what the configuration of 21 0. 22 this structure looks like comes from 3-D seismic and the data that you've obtained from drilling the well? 23 Correct. On the vertical well we ran a sonic 24 Α.

log, which helps us tie into the seismic a lot better, and

that helped us refine the seismic interpretation through there, to refine where the anomaly really was.

And as I say, we were actually -- Going back to Number 10, we were on the edge of our 3-D, and typically that quarter-mile edge is kind of scary, the data you get from there. So that's where we went wrong in the vertical hole.

- Q. Did you gain enough data from the sidetrack number 1 to show that you're in a good position to drain that reservoir at that point?
- 11 A. We believe we pretty much have hit it dead center now.
 - Q. Okay.

- A. As I said, we have like 60 feet of gross pay by the drill rate and the mud-log shows, and when you compare that to production from other wells in the area, 50 to 60 feet of gross pay is about average for the center of these anomalies.
- Q. Is this, in your opinion, probably a one-well structure?
 - A. This is a one-well structure.
 - Q. So if you don't get it, chances are it won't be produced?
- A. That's correct.
 - Q. Have you guys done any estimates, or is that

possible at this point, of oil in place?

- A. No, because -- We've tried to do that on some of the other producing wells, and the problem there is, we don't have 3-D coverage over them, so we don't know the areal extent of that particular anomaly. So we haven't really developed a good relationship between anomaly size areally and ultimate production.
- Q. Was that actually -- Sidetrack number 1, was that tested? Did you guys test that?
- A. No -- Well, we did, yes. If you go back to Exhibit Number 9 --
- Q. Uh-huh.

- A. -- on the first page, on the summary of the well history --
 - O. Yeah.
- A. -- when we had the fish in the hole, the top of the fish is about 11,435, which covers the Strawn and a little bit above the Strawn. We were able to get 5-1/2-inch casing down to 11,400. We went ahead and released the rig, and we brought in a workover rig. We drilled out our cement down to the casing shoe and we washed the open-hole section from 11,400 to 11,435, where we had a lot of cuttings came up.

We attempted then to complete the well over a five-day period, and on the best two days -- I believe one

1 day we swabbed like nine barrels of oil in the whole day, and one other day I think we got as high as 19, with some 2 3 And it wouldn't flow, we had to swab it each time, so... We believe there's pay down there, and we believe 5 the reason it wouldn't flow for us is the fact that the 6 7 fish is -- and the cuttings are kind of holding everything 8 back. And you know, with the money we've spent on the 9 well, we feel we need to get a fresh cut at the pay zone to 10 try and get some of our money back. 11 EXAMINER CATANACH: I have nothing further, Mr. 12 Carroll. 13 MR. CARROLL: Mr. Examiner, I do not either. 14 This would then conclude the presentation that Bass has for 15 16 you today. EXAMINER CATANACH: Okay. There being nothing 17 further in this case, Case 12,010 will be taken under 18 advisement. 19 (Thereupon, these proceedings were concluded at 20 9:06 a.m.) 21 22 hereby certify that the foregoing is a complete record of the proceedings in the Examiner hearing/of Case No./200 23 reard by me on_ 24 , Exeminer eund K (e.tam 25 Of Conservation Division

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

STATE OF NEW MEXICO)
) ss.
COUNTY 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 July 24th, 1998.

STEVEN T. BRENNER

CCR No. 7

My commission expires: October 14, 1998