:		BEFORE THE
	Gil Cons	ervation Commission
	SAN	TA FE, NEW MEXICO
		5 - C
	·	
IN THE MATTER O		
		S. S
CASE NO	98	
CASE NO.2)
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
·		
. :		
	TRANSCR	IPT OF PROCEEDINGS
т. -		
n in source State	·····	· · · ·
		-
-		
· .		
	ADA DEARN	LEY AND ASSOCIATES
	C	OURT REPORTERS

COURT REPORTERS 605 SIMMS BUILDING TELEPHONE 3-6691 ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO

BEFORE THE OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION Santa Fe, New Mexico January 20, 1956

CASE NO. 998: Southeastern New Mexico nomenclature case calling for the creation of new pools and the extension of existing pools in Lea County, New Mexico: (a) Creation of a new oil pool for Pennsylvanian production, designated as the SRR- Pennsylvanian, and described as: TOWNSHIP 9 SOUTH, RANGE 32 EAST Section 14: SW/4 Section 15: SE/4 Section 22: NE/4 Section 23: NW/4 (b) Creation of a new oil pool for Devonian production, : designated as the South Denton-Devonian pool. and described as: TOWNSHIP 15 SOUTH, RANGE 37 EAST Section 35: SE/4 Section 36: SW/4 TOWNSHIP 16 SOUTH, RANGE 38 EAST Section 4: Lots 3, 4, 5 & 6 Section 5: Lots 1, 2, 7 & 8 (c) Extension of the Hardy Pool to include: TOWNSHIP 21 SOUTH, RANGE 37 EAST Section 4: Lot 4 (d) Extension of the Langlie-Mattix Pool to include: : TOWNSHIP 25 SOUTH, RANGE 37 EAST Section 12: All 2 (e) Extension of the Skaggs Pool to include: TOWNSHIP 20 SOUTH, RANGE 38 EAST Section 5: SW/4 (f) Extension of the Terry-Blinebry Pool to include: TOWNSHIP 20 SOUTH, RANGE 38 EAST Section 33: NE/4 : :

2 (g) Extension of the Townsend-Wolfcamp Pool to include: : TOWNSHIP 15 SOUTH, RANGE 35 EAST Section 33: W/2TOWNSHIP 16 SOUTH, RANGE 35 EAST 1: W/2 Section Section 2: Lots 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, 15 & 16 **BEFORE**: Mr. E. S. (Johnny) Walker, Mr. William B. Macey. TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING MR. MACEY: The meeting will come to order. The next case on the docket is 998. Let the record show that Mr. Montgomery is being sworn also for Case 984. RANDOLPH MONTGOMERY called as a witness, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION, BY MR. GURLEY: Q State your name. A Randolph Montgomery. And what is your position? 0 Geologist, New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission. A Have you, in your official capacity, Mr. Montgomery, had an 0 opportunity to study the proposed creation of a new oil pool for Pennsylvanian production in the southeastern area? Yes. sir. I have. Α Will you state to the Commission your conclusions and recon-۵. mendations? In regards to Case 998, Section A, I recommend that the SRR-А Pennsylvanian pool be created as advertised. that being the SW/4

Section 14; SE/4 Section 15; NE/4 Section 22 and NW/4 Section 23. This was occasioned by the completion of the Amerada Petroleum Corporation's Federal E No. 1, Unit A, in Section 22, T9S R32E, recompleted from the Devonian to Pennsylvanian on 10-10-55, with top of perforation 9,208. I recommend the field be created as advertised.

3

Q Have you, in your official capacity had opportunity to study the proposed creation of a new oil pool designated as the South Denton-Devonian Pool?

A Yes, sir, I have.

Q State your recommendations to the Commission.

A I recommend that the South Denton-Devonian Pool be created as advertised. This was due to the recent completion of the Signal Oil and Gas Company's Gulf State No. 1, Unit D, of Section 4, T16S R38E, completed in the Devonian formation on 11-23-55, with top of perforation 13,110 feet. I recommend the pool be created as advertised.

MR. MACEY: Would you be more specific? The well's location is in Lot 4, Section 4?

A That is correct.

Q Have you, in your official capacity, had opportunity to study the proposed extension of the Hardy Pool?

A Yes, sir. I recommend the pool be extended as advertised.

Q And have you had the opportunity to study the proposed extension of the Langlie-Mattix Pool?

A Yes, sir, I have, and I recommend that pool be extended as advertised.

Q What are your recommendations as to the proposed extension of the Skaggs Pool?

A That it also be extended as advertised.

Q What are your feelings on the proposed extension in the Terry-Blinebry Pool?

A That that also be extended as advertised.

Q Mr. Montgomery, in your official capacity, have you had the opportunity to study the proposed extension of the Townsend-Wolfcamp Pool?

A Yes, sir, and I also recommend that that pool be extended as advertised.

MR. KITTS: Why?

A This was due to the recent completion of the Cabot Carbon Company's State of New Mexico A No. 1, Unit E, in Section 33, T15S, R35E, completed in the Wolfcamp formation on 10-20-55, with top of perforation as 10,548 feet. I think the well is in the west half of 1, but the legal description would be Lots 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13, 14, and the SW/4 of Section 1.

Q Do you have anything further to offer in this case, Mr. Montgomery?

A I have exhibits marked A through G, which have on them the names of the wells, the locations and they are the reasons for the extensions of the advertised pools.

MR. GURLEY: I would like to introduce the exhibits in evidence at this time.

MR. MACEY: Without objection they will be received.

MR. GURLEY: That is all.

MR. MACEY: Any questions of the witness? Will you tell me why the extension of section one?

A In regards to Paragraph G?

4

MR. MACEY: Yes, sir.

A This was in order to make the wellcontiguous, so we wouldn't have a bunch of little lots going out and it would be contiguous of the corner. We also have a recent completion in Section 1.

MR. MACEY: The other acreage is north of that acreage? A Yes.

MR. MACEY: There is a jog in the Township?

A Yes, sir.

MR. MACEY: Any questions of the witness?

If not, the witness may be excused in Case 998.

(Witness excused.)

* * *

STATE OF NEW MEXICO) : ss COUNTY OF BERNALILLO)

I, THURMAN J. MOODY, Court Recorter, do hereby certify that the foregoing and attached transcript of proceedings before the Oil Conservation Commission for the State of New Mexico, is a true and correct record to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.

WITNESS MY HAND, this, the 27th day of January, A. D. 1956.