

BEFORE THE
OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION
STATE OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE MATTER OF:

In the matter of the application of
Shell Oil Company for an order per-
mitting the delayed dual completion
of its Turner No. 2 Well, NW SW Sec-
tion 22, T. 21 S, R. 37 East, NMPM,
in such manner as to permit produc-
tion of gas from the Tubb formation
and oil from the Drinkard, said well
having been originally completed in
March 1948 at a total depth of 6627
feet as an oil well only.

CASE NO. 342

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

February 21, 1952

(Mr. Graham reads the notice of publication.)

MR. SCOTT: By means of this application, the Shell Oil
Company wishes to state the following:

(a) That Shell Turner 2, located in the NW/4 of the SW/4
of Section 22-21S-37E, was completed in March 1948 at a total
depth of 6627 feet. (Exhibit A marked for identification.) The
appended Exhibit A shows the location of this and all other wells
on the Turner lease, together with the locations of all offset wells.

At this time I would like to present our Exhibit No. A to
the Commission.

MR. GRAHAM: Do you propose to rework the well and drill?

MR. SCOTT: Yes, sir, within the bounds of the rules of the Commission, with regard to the rules of the Commission. I would like to present Exhibit B, which is a log of this well.

(Marked Exhibit B for identification.)

MR. SCOTT: The said well was completed as an oil well producing from perforated intervals between 6571 feet and 6615 feet in the Drinkard formation after having been drilled through the Tubb gas productive interval extending from approximately 6000 feet to 6260 feet. These data are depicted on the appended Exhibit B.

At this time I would like to present to the Commission Exhibit C, which shows the mechanical proposal with regard to the dual completion of this well. We propose to complete this well to produce oil from the Drinkard through the tubing and gas from the Tubb formation through the 5-1/2 inch casing. The manner and method of the proposed dual completion are shown on Exhibit C.

That the granting of this application for permission to produce daily oil from the Drinkard formation and gas from the Tubb formation is in the interests of conservation and the protection of correlative rights.

That the applicant will do such things as may be required of it by the New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission in the maintenance of separation of production from said two horizons.

We further wish to state that the manner and method of the proposed dual completion is mechanically feasible and practical.

Therefore, in view of this testimony we will request that the application be granted.

MR. SPURRIER: Does anyone have any questions of Mr. Scott?

MR. GRAHAM: You are familiar with the general type of order issued in dual completion?

MR. SCOTT: Yes.

MR. GRAHAM: As to the form?

MR. SCOTT: We are. In fact, I might add one other bit of data if you would like to have pressures. For the record, we estimate the Tubb bottom hole pressure to be approximately 2110 pounds per square inch. The last bottom hole pressure we took in the well on the Drinkard, Drinkard pressure, 1240 pounds per square inch.

MR. GRAHAM: Is that sweet gas or sour gas?

MR. SCOTT: That I am not prepared to answer at this time.

MR. GRAHAM: There is a difference in the quality?

MR. SCOTT: We can investigate that and let the Commission know before the application is decided upon.

MR. SPURRIER: Very well. Do you offer these Exhibits A through C in evidence?

MR. SCOTT: Yes, I do.

MR. SPURRIER: Without objection, they will be accepted. Any other questions?

MR. MACEY: I would like to ask a couple of questions. You have a west offset, the Dome well that is producing from the same zone at the present time.

MR. SCOTT: Yes.

MR. MACEY: Is that a dual completion? Do you know?

MR. SCOTT: I think it is.

MR. MACEY: You didn't drill stem test the section when you drilled the Drinkard Well to start with, did you?

MR. SCOTT: No, we didn't. I am sure that we didn't drill stem test it.

MR. MACEY: On the map I notice that they record the Tubbs drill stem test up to the North on this (indicating) and it is not on here. I took it for granted that you had tested that when you drilled the well.

MR. SCOTT: No, sir, probably we didn't. The Tubb and the Blinberry gas horizons in that area have come into notice by the operators as being productive after that Drinkard well was drilled, I am sure.

MR. SPURRIER: Any further questions?

MR. MACEY: What is the name of the field, is it the Tubbs gas field or what?

MR. SCOTT: I don't believe any name.

MR. SPURRIER: Probably no designation.

MR. SCOTT: I believe there is no designated pool there, just three or four Tubb gas wells. Maybe two, now completed and producing.

MR. SPURRIER: If no further questions, the witness may be excused. We will take the case under advisement and wait to hear from you, Mr. Scott, about the sulphur content of the gas. Otherwise, I would recommend to the Commission that your application be approved.

MR. SCOTT: That letter will be sent in due time.

MR. SPURRIER: There being no further business, the meeting is adjourned.

C E R T I F I C A T E

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing and attached Transcript of Hearing, in Case No. 342, before the Oil Conservation Commission, State of New Mexico, at Santa Fe, on February 21, 1952, is a true and correct record of the matters herein contained to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.

DATED at Albuquerque, New Mexico, this 23 day of Feb, 1952.


COURT REPORTER