

dearnley-meier

SPECIALIZING IN: DEPOSITIONS, HEARINGS, STATEMENTS, EXPERT TESTIMONY, DAILY COPY, CONVENTIONS

209 SIMMS BLDG. • P.O. BOX 1092 • PHONE 243-6691 • ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO 87103

FIRST NATIONAL BANK BLDG. EAST • ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO 87108

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

BEFORE THE
NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION
CONFERENCE ROOM, STATE LAND OFFICE BUILDING
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO
April 5, 1972

EXAMINER HEARING

IN THE MATTER OF:

Application of Jack L.
McClellan for a waterflood
expansion, Chaves County,
New Mexico.

Case NO. 4686

BEFORE: Daniel S. Nutter
Alternate Examiner.

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

1 MR. NUTTER: Call next case number 4686.

2 MR. HATCH: Case 4686. Application of Jack
3 L. McClellan for a waterflood expansion, Chaves County, New
4 Mexico.

5 ME. KELLAHIN: If the Examiner please, Jason
6 Kellahin, Kellahin and Fox, Santa Fe, appearing for the appli-
7 cant. We have one witness I would like to have sworn.

8 (THEREUPON, the witness was duly sworn.)

9
10 WILLIAM J. LeMAY

11 was called as a witness in behalf of the applicant, and having
12 been first duly sworn, testified upon his oath as follows,
13 to-wit:

14
15 DIRECT EXAMINATION

16 BY MR. KELLAHIN:

17 Q Would you state your name, please?

18 A William J. LeMay.

19 Q What business are you engaged in, Mr. LeMay?

20 A I am a consulting geologist in Santa Fe, New
21 Mexico.

22 Q In connection with your work as a consultant
23 geologist, have you done any work for the Jack L. McClellan
24 in preparation for case number 4686?

25 A Yes, sir, I have.

1 Q Have you testified before the Oil Conservation
2 Commission and made your qualifications a matter of record?

3 A Yes, I have.

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

6 MR. NUTTER: Yes, they are.

7 Q Mr. LeMay, what is proposed by the applicant
8 in case 4686?

9 A Jack McClellan proposes in case 4686 to gain
10 approval for three water injection wells in his waterflood
11 of the Sulimar-Queen field in Chaves County. Also, he
12 requests that future injection wells be approved administra-
13 tively by the Commission.

14 Q And that would be whether there has been a
15 response to the waterflood project or not, is that correct?

16 A That's correct. He is injecting water at the
17 present time and depending upon the production, oil production
18 of current wells, and the need for additional injection
19 wells, he will expand the flood as needed.

20 Q Now, would you describe the wells which are
21 proposed to be included as injection wells?

22 A Yes, sir. As advertised on the docket, the
23 three wells which are proposed for approval by the Commission
24 are the Smernoff Federal number one, located in unit B of
25 Section 24, 15 South, Range 29 East. That well is colored

1 orange on the enclosed exhibit. The Carthel Federal number
2 two in unit P of Section 23, same township and range, and
3 the LaRue Federal number in unit D of Section 25, 15 South,
4 29 East.

5 Q Do you know whether the use for these wells of
6 water injection has been approved by the U.S.G.S.

7 A Yes, sir, I understand that the U.S.G.S. has
8 approved the wells for injection.

9 Q And as far as you know they are presently
10 being used for injection?

11 A That's correct. They have -- there has been
12 water injected in those wells.

13 Q And that necessitated this hearing?

14 A Yes, sir.

15 Q These wells were not included in order number
16 R-4214 which approved the Sulimar-Queen waterflood project,
17 were they?

18 A No, they were not, and in talking to the engi-
19 neer with Mr. McClellan, he indicated some change was
20 necessary in the injection pattern, because of the production
21 on the Lisa C. federal lease, which includes the east half
22 of Section 24 with the exception of the two forks as shown
23 on the exhibit.

24 This lease, four wells are currently producing
25 sixty-three barrels of oil per day, and as it is a little too

1 good to inject water in, is what it amounts to right now,
2 so this necessitated in plans in the injection pattern that
3 was initially approved by the Commission.

4 Q Now, water is being injected in this project,
5 is it not?

6 A That's correct. My understanding is as of the
7 first of April, 1972, a total of a hundred and twenty-two
8 thousand nine hundred and eighty-eight barrels of oil had been
9 injected into the formation.

10 MR. NUTTER: Of water?

11 A Water, I'm sorry; barrels of water.

12 Q Hasn't the project received a response as yet?

13 A No, it hasn't.

14 Q Would you anticipate a response with that
15 volume of water?

16 A No, I would not. They anticipate a response in
17 three to four months, and possibly longer, unless the volume
18 of water injected in the formation is increased.

19 Q Was exhibit number one prepared by you or under
20 your supervision?

21 A Yes, sir, it was.

22 MR. KELLAHIN: I would like to offer in evidence
23 exhibit number one.

24 MR. NUTTER: McClellan Exhibit Number One will
25 be admitted in evidence.

1 MR. KELLAHIN: That's all I have of this
2 witness.

3
4 CROSS EXAMINATION

5 BY MR. NUTTER:

6 Q Mr. LeMay, the construction of these wells for
7 water injection purposes hasn't been mentioned. We did
8 approve certain wells for water injection purposes after the
9 hearing in Hobbs for this -- or in Roswell --

10 A Roswell.

11 Q -- Roswell, for this project, a typical well
12 construction program was submitted at that time and approved.

13 A That's correct.

14 Q Are these wells completed in a similar plan?

15 A Yes, sir, they are all completed as indicated
16 by the order, the packers placed approximately fifty above
17 the pay zone, or the injection zone, and corrosion is con-
18 trolled by treatment, United Chemical is treating the water
19 prior to injection, because there is no plastic linking on
20 the tubing.

21 Q And in each of these it is going down tubing
22 under a packer's arm?

23 A That's correct, and the annulus is monitored
24 at the surface with other fluids.

25 MR. NUTTER: Are there any other questions of

dearnley-meier

SPECIALIZING IN: DEPOSITIONS, HEARINGS, STATEMENTS, EXPERT TESTIMONY, DAILY COPY, CONVENTIONS

209 SIMMS BLDG. • P.O. BOX 1092 • PHONE 243-6691 • ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO 87103
FIRST NATIONAL BANK BLDG. EAST • ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO 87108

1 Mr. LeMay? He may be excused.

2 (THEREUPON, the witness was excused.)

3 MR. NUTTER: Do you have anything further,

4 Mr. Kellahin?

5 MR. KELLAHIN: That's all, Mr. Nutter.

6 MR. NUTTER: You did wish that this order

7 that authorized the water flood be amended to also include

8 administrative procedure in the future?

9 MR. KELLAHIN: That's correct.

10 MR. NUTTER: For additional wells with that

11 response?

12 MR. KELLAHIN: That's right.

13 MR. NUTTER: Does anyone have anything

14 further to offer in case number 4686? We'll take the case

15 under advisement.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF NEW MEXICO)
 2) SS.
 3 COUNTY OF BERNALILLO)

4 I, LINDA MALONE, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, do
 5 hereby certify that the foregoing and attached Transcript of
 6 Hearing before the New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission was
 7 reported by me; and that the same is a true and correct
 8 record of the said proceedings, to the best of my knowledge,
 9 skill and ability.
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

Linda Malone
 CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a
 a complete and correct transcript of the
 the foregoing hearing before the
 before by me on 4/5 1972 4686
Joanne
 New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission

dearnley-meier

SPECIALIZING IN: DEPOSITIONS, HEARINGS, STATEMENTS, EXPERT TESTIMONY, DAILY COPY, CONVENTIONS

209 SIMMS BLDG. • P.O. BOX 1092 • PHONE 243-6691 • ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO 87103

FIRST NATIONAL BANK BLDG. EAST • ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO 87108

I N D E XPAGE

1.	The Witness - WILLIAM J. LeMAY	
	Direct Examination by Mr. Kellahin	3
	Cross Examination by Mr. Nutter	7
	Witness Excused	8
2.	Reporter's Certificate	9