

BEFORE THE
OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION
STATE OF NEW MEXICO
Santa Fe, New Mexico

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
CASE NO. 700
Regular Hearing

May 19, 1954

BEFORE THE
OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION
STATE OF NEW MEXICO
Santa Fe, New Mexico
May 19, 1954

IN THE MATTER OF:

Application of the Texas Company
for unorthodox gas proration unit.

Case No. 700

Applicant in the above-styled case, seeks an order authorizing the formation of a 160-acre unorthodox gas proration unit as an exception pursuant to provisions of Rule 7(a) of Order R-370-A and consisting of E/2 W/2 of Section 24, Township 19 South, Range 36 East, Lea County, New Mexico, in the Eumont Gas Pool.

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

MR. WHITE: Charles White appearing on behalf of Texas Company and our one witness is Mr. Mankin.

W A R R E N W. M A N K I N

the witness, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

By MR. WHITE:

Q Mr. Mankin, will you state your full name for the record, please?

A Warren W. Mankin.

Q By whom are you employed and in what capacity?

A Texas Company, as Petroleum Engineer.

Q Have you previously testified before the Commission?

A I have not.

Q Will you briefly give the Commission your professional qualifications and experience?

A Yes, sir. Graduated from West Virginia University, Petroleum Geology, and also in Petroleum Engineering. Worked on a masters

degree in Petroleum Engineering at the University of Oklahoma. Worked a year and a half as natural gas petroleum engineer in the fields of Pennsylvania and New York. Eight and a half years as petroleum engineer with the Texas Company in Texas and New Mexico, with a year and a quarter break in service to re-enter the service, Air Force.

Q Have you had an occasion to study the proposed unorthodox unit comprising the east half of the west half of Section 24, Township 19 South, Range 36 East? A I have.

Q I hand you what is marked Petitioner's Exhibit A and ask if that was prepared under your direction and supervision?

A It was.

Q Will you identify the same and state to the Commission what it is designed to show?

A This is a map of the Eumont, portion of the Eumont gas pool in which the Texas Company's proposed unit is outlined in red. The east half of the west half of Section 24, Township 19, South, Range 36 East, Lea County, New Mexico.

Q Does this Exhibit show the adjoining wells producing in the area? A It does.

Q What is the location of the proposed well?

A Location of the proposed well which is the Texas Company's State J Well No. 3 is 1980 feet from the north line, and 1980 feet from the west line of Section 24, Township 19 South, Range 36 East.

Q Is it impractical to attempt to unitize this area with the adjoining tracts within the respective quarter sections, and if so, why?

A Yes. It is impractical to unitize with other operators in

this particular section as will be noted from a previous case, No. 663, that was heard on February 17, Sun Oil Company, in their J. L. Barnum 3 was heard and proposed to form the west half of the west half of that same section which adjoins the proposed unit of the Texas Company.

Q Have you received waivers from the operator on the west or east which would be Gulf?

A We have not received or requested waiver, but Gulf had indicated to me a few moments ago as they had to leave and were not able to state that the unit was satisfactory to them as they have the west half of the east half of that same section which adjoins the Texas Company proposed unit.

Q In your opinion, is this area commercially productive of gas?

A It is.

MR. WHITE: We have no further questions unless the Commission wishes to ask some.

MR. SPURRIER: Anyone have a question of the witness?

MR. SELINGER: Skelly Oil Company, Selinger, owns the north offset and we have no objection to the granting of their application.

MR. SPURRIER: Mr. White, what did Gulf Oil Company say in this?

MR. WHITE: It was my understanding that they were going to offer no objection to it had they been able to remain.

MR. SPURRIER: If they had objection, I presume they would have remained.

MR. WHITE: I presume they would have.

MR. SPURRIER: Anyone else have a question of the witness?
If not the witness may be excused.

(Witness excused.)

MR. SPURRIER: We will take the case under advisement and move

on to Case 701.

MR. WHITE: We offer in evidence Exhibit A.

MR. SPURRIER: Without objection it will be received.

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, ADA DEARNLEY, Court Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing and attached transcript of proceedings in the matter of Case No. 700 was taken by me on May 19, 1954, that the same is a true and correct record to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.


Reporter