

BEFORE THE  
**Oil Conservation Commission**  
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO  
September 16, 1954

IN THE MATTER OF:  
Regular Hearing  
CASE NO. 758

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

**ADA DEARNLEY AND ASSOCIATES**  
COURT REPORTERS  
ROOMS 105, 106, 107 EL CORTEZ BUILDING  
TELEPHONE 7-9546  
ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO

BEFORE THE  
OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION  
Santa Fe, New Mexico  
September 16, 1954

-----  
IN THE MATTER OF:

Application of J. W. Peery for permission  
to produce oil into a common tank battery  
from two wells on his Hardy (Federal)  
Lease, S/2 SE/4 Section 19, Township 21  
South, Range 37 East, in exception to Rule  
303. The wells concerned are the Hardy No.  
1, producing oil from the Grayburg forma-  
tion of the Penrose-Skelly Pool, and the  
Hardy No. 2, producing oil from the Drinkard  
zone of the Drinkard Oil Pool.

Case No. 758

-----  
BEFORE:

Honorable Edwin L. Mechem  
Mr. E. S. (Johnny) Walker  
Mr. William B. Macey

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

MR. MACEY: The next case on the docket is Case 758.

Is there

Is there anyone here representing J. W. Peery?

MR. HEDRICK: Yes, sir.

MR. MACEY: Step forward, please.

MR. MACEY: Do you have any witness or will you put  
the testimony on yourself?

O. F. HEDRICK, J. R. ,

having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

MR. MACEY: Will you state your name to the Commission?

A O. F. Hedrick, Jr.

MR. MACEY: Do you have a statement you wish to make and testimony that you wish to offer?

A Yes, sir.

MR. MACEY: Proceed.

A I would like to give a history of this lease so the Commission will be more familiar with our situation. The Number 1 Hardy well was completed in November, 1937 at a total depth of 3,778 feet, producing from the Grayburg. The well was acidized with 2,000 gallons and re-acidized with 3,000 gallons. It was then deepened to 3,821, and <sup>the</sup> interval, 3,725 to 3,821, shot with 300 quarts. The well flowed 57 barrels of oil per day, but steadily decreased to the limits of economic operation and in 1947 was temporarily abandoned.

We recently tested the well for three barrels of oil per day and an estimated 40,000 cubic feet of gas per day. We acquired this lease in July, 1953 and shortly thereafter drilled our Number 2 well to the Drinkard. Production from this well has decreased to about 14 barrels of oil per day and 80,000 cubic feet of gas per day. We later drilled this well into the water and plugged it off and now we don't anticipate being able to increase production in any manner. There is no horizontal division of the lease. Both wells are located on the same 40-acre tract so that any inaccuracies of measurement will not result in unfair royalty payment or unfair over-riding payment. We cannot justify installing a

a separate tank battery, separator and flow line for the shallow well; however, if we can comingle oil from these two wells we will recover additional quantities of oil and gas that otherwise would never be recovered.

In the event this permission is granted we will make periodic tests to ascertain production in each well and divide said production for proration purposes.

I have, also, a letter from Mr. H. A. DuPont, District Engineer with the United States Department of the Interior, which I would like to read to you.

"Dear Mr. Peery, Reference is made to your application of August 17, 1954, to the Oil Conservation Commission of the State of New Mexico, copy of which was furnished this office, requesting permission to comingle oil produced from the Penrose-Skelly Pool by your well No. 1 Hardy with the oil produced from the Drinkard Pool by your well No. 2 Hardy. Both wells are on the subject Federal leasehold in the SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$  Section 19, T. 21 S., R. 37 E., NMPM, Lea County, New Mexico. It is also noted that your application has been designated as Case 758 on the Oil Conservation Commission docket scheduled to be heard at the September 16, 1954 regular hearing.

The proposed comingling of oil described above was discussed with your representatives a few months ago. This letter will confirm our oral statement to the effect that we offer no objection to such comingling of oil, provided, however, that approval of such operations for proration purposes is obtained from the Oil Conservation Commission of the State of New Mexico.

In view of the marginal status of the two wells, your pro-

posed procedure may economically afford opportunity at the present time for additional recovery of oil and gas from the Penrose-Skelly Pool and in the future for possible recovery from the Drinkard Pool. Signed H. A. DuPont, District Engineer."

MR. MACEY: Do you have anything further?

A No, sir, I don't.

MR. MACEY: Any questions?

MR. KELLAHIN: Jason Kellahin, representing Continental Oil Company. What provision do you intend to make for meeting the oil from the two horizons?

A We can periodically test each well, say, once every three months or six months, or any interval which the Commission would so recommend, and in that manner keep the production accurate, I feel, to within three percent or at the most five percent.

MR. KELLAHIN: Is that the only provision you plan to make?

A Yes, sir.

MR. KELLAHIN: Do you have any objection to using an orifice meter or other system?

A It is doubtful either well will flow continually. At present our Drinkard is on an intermitter and I don't believe it would have good results with orifice meters on intermitent flow.

MR. KELLAHIN: I would like to state the position of the Continental. We realize this is in the nature of a hardship case and we certainly have no objection to co-mingling. We would like some assurance on the order that neither well would exceed the top allowable in any case, and there should be some provision in the

order to assure the Commission to constantly know, such as a periodic test. That is our objection we have to the application.

A I pointed out what the production of each well was. The Drinkard Well is 14 barrels per day and the top allowables for the field is 70 to 80 barrels and the Penrose-Skelly Well will make three barrels per day, and I believe the top unit allowable there is around 38 barrels.

MR. MACEY: You don't think there is much chance of making the top allowable then?

A I sure wish there were.

MR. MACEY: Mr. Hedrick, do you have any idea how much the installation of additional tankage, assuming you need, say, two, two fifty tanks and separator, do you have any idea what the cost figure of that wouldbbe, approximately?

A We wouldn't set the two two fifty, we could set two twenty, hundred barrel tanks are and the cost there would be \$2,800.00 to \$3,000.00 additional.

MR. MACEY: That is for the tankage, what about the separator and flow lines from the separator to the tank? A considerable lengthy pay-out if you ever get a pay-out.

A Just running tubing into the well, we estimate it would pay-out in two to two and a half years. If we are forced to set, or if we set a separator and flow lines the pay-out would be increased to six to eight years, depending on the rate of decline of the well. Now, I would like also to add that in the event we have to put this well to pumping we never would get a pay-out in either case.

MR. MACEY: Any further questions of the witness? If not the witness may be excused.

(Witness excused.)

MR. MACEY: The case will be taken under advisement.

MR. WALKER: Don Walker, Gulf Oil. In the opinion of Gulf Oil Company, Rule 303 is practical and should be kept in force. We realize in some cases a strict enforcement of this ruling can result in undue hardship, and only in such cases do we feel an exception to the rule should be granted.

MR. MANFIELD: Warren Manfield, Texas Company. The Texas Company as an offset operator, opposes this application in principal, for, if granted, it will establish a precedent. Undoubtedly, if this application is granted it will be followed by many more similar requests for exception under Rule 303, some of which would likely result in gross error and maintenance of production records from single sources of supply thus giving erroneous data for study of reservoir performance, Texas Company urges this application be denied.

MR. MACEY: Any further statements? If not we will take the case under advisement.

STATE OF NEW MEXICO )  
                              : SS.  
COUNTY OF BERNALILLO )

I, MARIANNA MEIER, Court Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing and attached transcript of proceedings before the New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission at Santa Fe, New Mexico, is a true and correct record to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have affixed my hand and notarial seal this 23rd day of September, 1954.

My Commission Expires:

April 8, 1956

ADA DEARNLEY & ASSOCIATES  
COURT REPORTERS  
ROOM 105-106, EL CORTEZ BLDG.  
PHONES 7-9645 AND 5-9546  
ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO

Court Reporter

*Marianna Meier*