

BEFORE THE
Oil Conservation Commission
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO
April 20, 1955

IN THE MATTER OF:

CASE NO. 864 (g) Regular Hearing

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
April 20, 1955

IN THE MATTER OF:

The following portion of the Northwestern
New Mexico nomenclature case was continued
from the March 16 hearing.

(g) Extension of the Ballard-Pictured
Cliffs Pool to include:

TOWNSHIP 26 NORTH, RANGE 8 WEST
SW/4 Section 17; S/2 Section 18;
W/2 Section 20; W/2 Section 27;
all Section 28; N/2 Section 29;
N/2 Section 33; NW/4 Section 34

TOWNSHIP 26 NORTH, RANGE 9 WEST
All Section 9; N/2 Section 10;
N/2 Section 11; all Section 12;
N/2 Section 13; SE/4 Section 16;
NE/4 Section 21; N/2 Section 22;
NW/4 and SE/4 Section 23

Case No. 864 (g)

BEFORE:

Mr. E. S. (Johnny) Walker
Mr. William B. Macey

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

MR. MACEY: The next case on the docket is Case 864.

MR. WEBB: William G. Webb, representing J. Glenn Turner,
Dallas. It is my understanding from the representative of Skelly,
that the intendor propose in this hearing to introduce testimony
looking to the consolidation of the present Ballard-Pictured Cliffs
Pool with the South Blanco Pool. It is our position that the call,
as issued by this notice is insufficient from a legal standpoint,
upon which to base an order consolidating those pools, assuming

that testimony were introduced of sufficient caliber to induce the Commission to consolidate the pools. Therefore, we believe that the Skelly, if such is their present intention, should file a proper application with the Commission and that otherwise the case should be continued for a later hearing. It is our disposition to continue the case, if Skelly concurs. I believe they are the only other interested party.

MR. MACEY: Mr. Selinger?

MR. SELINGER: We would suggest that Case 864 (g) be dismissed; that the Commission issue a new notice covering the area outlined in Order R-577 in Case Number 816 and also the area involved in the extension of Case 864 (g). In that notice, put in the question of whether or not the Ballard-Pictured Cliffs Pools should be abolished, and whether or not the present boundaries of the South Blanco-Pictured Cliffs Pool should be extended to cover the areas outlined in the two Orders, R-577 and Case 864 (g).

MR. MACEY: In connection with what you just said, you more or less want the Commission to carry the ball as far as the application is concerned. The way I, personally, have always interpreted the Commission's applications on its own motion, that it was their responsibility to put the information into the record. Certainly, if you wish to apply for consolidation of the Ballard-Pictured Cliffs and South Blanco-Pictured Cliffs, we would certainly have the advertisement. The Commission's staff has recommended that they extend the Ballard-Pictured Cliffs Pool and they haven't gone any further than that. Would your company be willing to make application so that we could advertise the case properly, and hear

the matter next month?

MR. SELINGER: Nomenclature problems are generally upon the motion of the Commission. We won't quibble on words. We believe we have good substantial evidence to think we can convince the Commission that all the Pictured Cliffs is all one formation connected. If you desire for us to be the applicant, we will accept the responsibility. We will file an application. Our main objective is to oppose the Ballard extension in 864 (g), which, for the first time encroaches upon a unit established by this Commission. We have no interest in the original order establishing the Ballard-Pictured Cliffs as a separate field, we have no interest in that. Our only interest comes now in Case 864 (g). If Mr. Webb's client doesn't desire to assume the responsibility, or if the Commission Staff desires Skelly to have the responsibility, we will be glad to do so.

MR. MACEY: Can you give us an application in time for advertisement next month?

MR. SELINGER: I will send you an application Monday morning.

MR. MACEY: Mr. Webb?

MR. WEBB: In view of Mr. Selinger's position, I think it would be wise to consolidate his new application with the present application made by the Commission. We are not proposing anything except to support the Commission. Mr. Selinger's client is the one who is proposing something new.

MR. MACEY: Does anyone have anything further?

MR. WHITTAKER: Mr. Whittaker, Southern Union. I am going to concur with Mr. Webb because we definitely have an interest in

that case, too, insofar as it upholds what the Commission set out to do in this particular case in question.

MR. MACEY: Anyone else? We will continue Case 864 until next month, pending disposition of the case to be heard on Skelly's application, which will be forthcoming.

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

I, ADA DEARNLEY, 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 28th day of April, 1955.


Notary Public, Court Reporter

My Commission Expires:
June 19, 1955