

## MEMORANDUM

To: The Oil Conservation Commission

From: W. B. Macey

Subject: Cases 582 through 590: General rules for the prorationing of gas in the Jalco, Langmat, Eumont, Arrow, Amanda, Blinebry, Tubb, Justis and Byers-Queen Gas Pools.

In accordance with Mr. Spurrier's request, following are my recommendations pertaining to the above listed Cases held in Santa Fe, on October 26 through 28. In order to evaluate the basic recommendations the following history of these cases should be observed.

1. The Commission originated hearings on a general four county area (Lea, Eddy, Chaves and Roosevelt Counties) on March 17, 1953 under Case 521. The purpose of this hearing was to establish means and methods of prorating gas in this four county area. In April, 1953 this Case was consolidated with Case 245 in accordance with Order No. 264 issued in Case 245. (Case 245 and subsequent Order R-264 established the defined limits and producing intervals of gas pools in Southeast New Mexico.) As a result of the March 17th hearing, the Commission appointed a Committee to propose suggested rules in Case 521 and suggested revisions in Case 245. The final report of the committee, containing recommendations in both Case 245 and Case 521 was made on August 20, 1953 and on August 28, 1953 the Commission issued Order R-356 in Case 321 outlining "Stand-by" rules for the four-county area. (No additional order has been issued in Case 245 as yet). The Commission then advertised nine gas pool cases for hearing on September 17, 1953, the Commission's advertisement requesting an order establishing pool rules and other related matters insofar as they were set forth in Order R-356. Some testimony was received at this time and as a result of these hearings, Orders were issued in each Case requesting operators and other interested parties to show cause why the rules as outlined in Order R-356 should not be put in effect on November 1, 1953. The hearings were conducted on October 26, 27 and 28 with extensive testimony being given in each case. The testimony and evidence given in these hearings is the basis for the following recommendations. Since the Rules as outlined in Order R-356 are numerical in sequence the following comments and recommendations will be made in the same numerical order.

Rule 1: The recommended provisions of Rule 1 should be changed since they apply solely to a defined gas pool. The rule provides an exception to some of the provisions of statewide Rule 104. The exception however, should only apply to paragraph (a) and paragraph (d) of the Rule 104 since they are solely concerned with gas pools in particular. Also a further provision should be included as sub-paragraph (c) of the Rule to provide as follows:

(c) When the well is located upon a tract of not less than a quarter section of approximately 160 surface contiguous acres substantially in the form of a square which shall be a legal subdivision (quarter section) of the U. S. Public Land Survey.

Rule 2: The provisions of this rule should be placed in effect in all nine pools.

Rule 3: An appropriate revision of Rule 3, pertinent to each pool name should be inserted in each set of pool rules.

Rule 4: This provision should be set forth in each set of pool rules.

Rule 5: This Rule and a portion of Rule 8 pertaining to Proration units and the formation of unorthodox gas units should be amended in such a manner to limit the standard proration unit to a legal quarter section of approximately 160 acres and allowing exceptions thereto only after notice and hearing. Exceptions should be limited to only extreme cases where Communitization is impractical because of the presence of a well which has been producing for considerable length of time, or where acreage is so situated that well locations can be adequately placed so as to insure adequate unit drainage in spite of the unorthodox unit and the correlative rights of everyone are protected. Furthermore, a policy of not approving unorthodox units where another unorthodox unit is formed thereby (thus starting a chain reaction) should be strictly adhered to. It is recognized that this policy which in effect promotes the formation of communitization or pooling agreements will cause some more work on the part of everyone concerned but the inequities which could arise from a large number of unorthodox units far out-weighs the work involved.

Since it is contemplated that the proration period in each pool will start January 1, 1954, it is entirely possible that a great number of Communitization Agreements will be delayed in execution until after the start of the proration period or after the completion of the well. Therefore, it is recommended that each pool order contain a provision outlining a policy which would allow the total acreage formed by the agreement, and thus dedicated to a well, be made retroactive to the first day of the proration period or the first day the well produces, whichever date is the later, provided, that the executed Communitization Agreement is in force and effect on the last day of the proration period.

Rules 6 and 7: The provisions of these rules should be placed into effect in each pool as outlined.

Rule 8: The first sentence of Rule 8 should be included as the last paragraph and the remaining provisions of the rule deleted from all pool rules. This will require the re-numbering of Rules 9 through 15. The reason for the deletion of that portion of Rule 8 is outlined in my remarks under Rule 5.

Rules 9 through 15: The provisions of these rules should be incorporated in each set of pool rules without any changes.

Further Recommendations:

It is further recommended that the Commission place in the hands of all operators, "preliminary" nomination forms so that the Commission may consider the nominations for each of the 9 pools for the first six month period of 1954 at the regular November hearing on November 19th. Instructions should be sent out with the forms stating that the nominations should apply to only those wells which are considered gas wells and which are not on the oil proration schedule.

Initially each purchaser or taker of gas should also include with his nominations the well or wells from which he desires to purchase gas January 1, 1954. This would allow the Commission staff an opportunity to check to see that each well to be listed on the schedule is known beforehand and that the well is not also listed on the oil proration schedule.

In this connection I believe it also advisable to point out that a provision should be inserted in each pool order stating that the Commission will continue to prorate those oil wells which lie within the productive limits of defined gas pools as oil wells pending a complete study and redesignation of some of the oil wells and possibly a re-definition of both oil pools and gas pools. In order to facilitate this study, all operators in all of the producing pools should be required to submit to the Commission an electric log or sample log, if available, on each well producing from the same zone within the defined limits of each gas pool.

It is also recommended that an Order be entered immediately in Case 245 outlining the recommended changes in pool nomenclature as made by the sub-committee in this case at previous hearings. It is also suggested that as soon as this Order is entered, the Hobbs office sent out Form C-123 requesting pool extensions which have not yet been made so that a hearing can be held in December to consider these pool extensions.

Due to the fact that considerable testimony was entered by the Pipeline Companies in the 9 pool cases requesting some form of a deliverability formula it is recommended that the Commission, through its staff, take immediate steps to outline an adequate gas well testing program to govern all gas wells in south-eastern New Mexico. In connection with this, the Commission should supply adequate tables and forms in order that any deliverability formula can be properly evaluated after the necessary well tests are performed. In this connection each pool order should contain a provision that well tests in that particular pool should be made in accordance with testing procedure approved by the Commission.

It is also recommended that the Commission carefully consider the advisability of refusing to approve any subsequent dual completions (gas-oil or gas-gas) where the recompletion information shows that the well is not located upon a standard 160 acre proration unit. It should also be noted that some operators might construe approval of a dual to mean also approval of an unorthodox gas unit.

With reference to the Rhodes storage area of the Jalco Pool, a provision should be inserted in the order pertaining to the Jalco Pool which states that those storage wells in the Rhodes Unit Area should not be governed by the pool rules. Provided, however, that the operator of the storage area submits periodic reports of storage and withdrawal of gas from the unit area.

With particular reference to the Blinbry Pool a study should be made immediately on the withdrawals of gas and oil from this reservoir and a determination made after proper notice and hearing of some volumetric withdrawal formula.

October 30, 1953