FARMINGTON, N. M. PHONE 325-1182

BEFORE THE OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION Santa Fe, New Mexico June 26, 1963

EXAMINER HEARING

IN THE MATTER OF:

Application of Amerada Petroleum Corporation for a multiple completion, Lea County. New Mexico. Applicant. in the above-styled cause, seeks an amendment of Order No. R-1750-A to permit the multiple completion (tubingless), of its Wimberley Well No. 13, located in Unit M of Section 24, Township 25 South, Range 37 East, Lea County, New Mexico, to permit the production of gas from the Langlie Mattix Pool, the production of oil from the Justis-Blinebry Oil Pool, and the disposal of salt water into the San Andres formation through parallel strings of casing cemented in a common well bore.

Case 2839

BEFORE: Daniel S. Nutter, Examiner.

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

MR. NUTTER: The hearing will come to order, and the first Case will be Case 2839.

MR. DURRETT: Application of Amerada Petroleum Corporation for a multiple completion, Lea County, New Mexico.

MR. KELLAHIN: Jason Kellahin, Kellahin & Fox, representing the applicant. We have one witness I would like to have sworn, please.

(Witness sworn.)



FARMINGTON, N. M. PHONE 325-1182

(Whereupon, Applicant's Exhibits A through D were marked for identification.)

L. E. THOMAS

called as a witness, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. KELLAHIN:

- Q Would you state your name, please?
- A L. E. Thomas.
- Q By whom are you employed and in what position?
- A Employed by Amerada Petroleum Corporation as District Engineer.
 - Q In what district?
 - A In the New Mexico District.
- Q Have you ever testified before the Oil Conservation Commission and made your qualifications a matter of record?
 - A Yes, I have.

MR. KELLAHIN: Are the witness's qualifications acceptable?

MR. NUTTER: Yes, sir.

- Q Are you familiar with the application of Amerada Petroleum Corporation in Case 2839, Mr. Thomas?
 - A Yes, sir.



DEARNLEY-MEIER REPORTING SERVICE, Inc.

Q What's proposed in this application?

A We propose to triple complete the said well and change one of the completion strings.

Q Before we get into the details of it, would you refer to what has been marked as Exhibit No. A and identify that Exhibit, please?

A Exhibit A is a plat showing the location of the well in question.

Q And Exhibit B?

A Exhibit B is the application for dual completion of the two producing zones.

Q Exhibit C, would you identify it?

A Exhibit C is the schematic diagram of the completion of these wells.

Q Exhibit D?

A Is an electric log marked with the tops and perforated intervals in this well.

Q For the benefit of the Examiner, would you briefly outline the history of this well and its connection with this application, please?

A First, the location of the well specifically is 330 feet from the West line, 330 feet from the South line, Section 24, Township 25 South, Range 37 East. The well was drilled and



completed in 1960, and completed with two strings of 2-7/8 casing and one string of $3-\frac{1}{2}$ casing, as shown in the schematic diagram.

Prior to the completion of this well a hearing was held and permission was granted for a completion in the Langlie Mattix zone as a gas well, a Blinebry well as an oil well, and then to dispose of salt water near San Andres zone. This was granted by Order 1750 dated August, 1960. Upon completion of the well and examination of the electric log, a zone just above the Blinebry zone was believed to be productive and proved to be at a later date, was called an undesignated zone, and a hearing was had to receive permission to complete this triple well as a Blinebry oil well, an undesignated oil well, and salt water disposal well in the San Andres.

This order was No. 1750-A which superceded Order No. 1750.

Q Was this order issued as a result of a hearing before the Commission?

A It was. At a later date after this well was completed as designated in Order 1750-A, the Commission called a hearing and issued Order No. 1984, which caused the undesignated zone mentioned earlier to be combined with the Blinebry zone. At that time we were given an additional 18 months allowable in this undesignated zone. This time has now expired and we have an



extra string of casing.

The present application then is to complete the well Q as originally applied for in the first hearing, is that correct?

We request permission to plug back on the schematic diagram if you want to refer to that, the middle string shows the 2-7/8 casing was originally perforated at 5017 to 5057 in the undesignated zone. We have set a bridge plug in this 2-7/8 casing and have now perforated the Langlie Mattix zone at 2938 to 3189.

- 'Is the Langlie Mattix zone productive at that point?
- Yes, sir, gas productive.
- Gas productive. Is the well, other than this one change. Q to be changed as to the salt water disposal in any fashion at all?

There will be no changes made in the other two strings Α of casing. This will be the only change we will anticipate.

Were Exhibits A, B, C and D prepared by you or under your supervision?

A Yes, sir.

MR. KELLAHIN: At this time I offer Exhibits A, B, C and D.

MR. NUTTER: Amerada's Exhibits A through D will be admitted.



SANTA FE, N. M. PHONE 983-3971

FARMINGTON, N. M. PHONE 325-1182

(Whereupon, Applicant's Exhibits A through D were offered and admitted in evidence.)

MR. NUTTER: Any questions of Mr. Thomas?

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. NUTTER:

- Q When you set the bridge plug and ceased producing the formerly undesignated zone from 5017 to 57, what rate of production were you getting from that zone?
 - A Top allowable.
- Q At the time you plugged it back and set the bridge plug?
 - A Yes.
- Q Is it expected this will be produced through the Blinebry pipe?
- A This zone has been combined in the two zones, receive only one allowable and the bottom zone makes the top allowable which suffices for the well for the time being.
- Q In your opinion will the perforations in the Blinebry zone drain this other sand stringer also?
- A Well, it may be desired later on to go back and recomplete the present Blinebry well in those perforations.
- Q In other words, you didn't cement or squeeze these perforations in that interval, you just set the bridge plug?



FARMINGTON, N. M. PHONE 325-1182

- A Yes.
- Q Is it a drillable bridge plug?
- A Yes, sir.
- Q I see.
- A However, if we would go back into the zone we will go back into the string in the Blinebry.
 - Q And perforate the Blinebry string?
 - A In the undesignated zone.

MR. NUTTER: Any further questions of Mr. Thomas? He may be excused.

(Witness excused.)

MR. NUTTER: Do you have anything further, Mr. Kella-hin?

MR. KELLAHIN: No.

MR. NUTTER: Does anyone have anything they wish to offer in Case 2839? We will take the case under advisement.



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 6th day of July, 1963.

My commission expires: June 19, 1967.

> I do hereby certify that the foregoing is suplete record of the proceed! : Examiner hearing of Case



