age_	<u> </u>	

NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

 EXAMINER	HEARING		
SANTA	मम	NEU	MEYICO
SANTA	FE	NEW	MEXIC

Hearing Date AUGUST 8, 1979 Time: 9:00 A.M.

NAME REPRESENTING LOCATION

CRACE Petr Corp Mipland 7

Max Douglas
Don W. Frickson
David Pearcy
Tom Yellalin

Pand survite Lement d'Ariffin 5. J. Talley

John Emment

DAMON WEEMS

Andrew LATTE

Lee G. Nering

William F. Can

Comment of Can

One of China

Grace Pet. Corp.
Grace Pet. Corp.
Tenneco Oil Co.
Kulla Cin I M. Cali.

Penroe Oil Corp

E (Maro 7 wo . Sas 6.

El Paso Net Ges Co.

Horray E. VATES & Belco Petroleum

Campbell + Black.
Southland Korally
Thinks Com Finn

Midland, TX

OKC, OK

San Antonio TX

Benta Am

Artesia, N.M. Midland, Texas Midland Tx

Sant F. Will

Formington NM

Midland, Tx Houston, Tx

Form for Mudden Danso.

•		Page 2
NEW ME	EXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION	
	EXAMINER HEARING	
·	SANTA FE , NEW MEXICO	
Hearing Date	AUGUST 8, 1979	Time: 9:00 A.M.
NAME	REPRESENTING	LOCATION
George Yates 301 Condle Jan Dendal	HEYOO Effor gatural Its Co.	Rosned N.M. Cl Pary, TX
Wes Hagnath	Toraco Inc.	Hobbs, NM
Reboth Termen	Texaco Dre.	Hosbo, 11.01.
Robert H. Strand	HEYED	Roswell, NM
Borle kell	rulte Kord Helly et al	S.F
ROBERT N. JOHNSON	J CABOT CORP	Pampa, TX
m. a. Crester Ja	Mewbourne Rif Co.	Alidional
ROVALD MCWILLIAMS	CONOCO, INC.	HOBBS
Hugh Ingram	Consco	Hobbs

STATE OF NEW MEXICO
ENERGY AND MINERALS DEPARTMENT
Oil Conservation Division
State Land Office Building
Santa Fe, New Mexico
8 August 1979

EXAMINER HEARING

IN THE MATTER OF:

Application of Grace Petroleum Corporation for a unit agreement, Lea) 6613 County, New Mexico.

BEFORE: Richard L. Stamets

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

APPEARANCES

For the Oil Conservation Ernest L. Padilla, Esq.
Division: Legal Counsel for the Division
State Land Office Bldg.
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87503

.

For the Applicant: Conrad L. Coffield, Esq. HINKLE, COX, EATON, COFFIELD

& HENSLEY Midland, Texas

SALLY WALTON BOYD CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER 3010 Plaza Blanca (608) 471-3462 Santa Fe, New Mexico 81501

INDEX

KENNETH M. GRIFFIN

Direct Examination by Mr. Coffield

Cross Examination by Mr. Stamets

WILLIAM J. HENRY

Direct Examination by Mr. Coffield

EXHIBITS

Applicant Exhibit One, Unit Agreement 5

Applicant Exhibit Two, Map 9

Applicant Exhibit Three, Contour Map 11

Applicant Exhibit Four, Isopach 12

Applicant Exhibit Five, Cross Section 13

I am Kenneth H. Griffin, 501 Petroleum

Building, Midland, Texas. I'm an independent petroleum land-

24

25

1	MR. STAMETS: We'll call next Case 6613.
2	MR. PADILLA: Application of Grace Petro-
3	leum Corporation for a unit agreement, Lea County, New
4	Mexico.
5	MR. STAMETS: Call for appearances in this
6	case.
7	MR. COFFIELD: Conrad Coffield, with the
8	Hinkle Law Frim in Midland, Texas, appearing on behalf
9	of Grace Petroleum Corporation.
10	I have two witnesses.
11	MR. STAMETS: I'd like to have them both
12	stand and be sworn, please.
13	
14	(Witnesses sworn.)
15	
16	KENNETH H. GRIFFIN
17	being called as a witness and being duly sworn upon his
18	oath, testified as follows, to-wit:
19	
20	DIRECT EXAMINATION
21	BY MR. COFFIELD:
22	Q. Mr. Griffin, would you please state your
23	name, address, occupation, and employer?

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

man with Griffin and Burnett, representing Grace Petroleum at this time.

0. Mr. Griffin, have you previously testified before the Oil Conservation Division as a landman?

I have.

And were your qualifications made a matter 0. of record and accepted by the Division?

Yes.

Are you familiar with the application of Grace Petroleum Corporation in this case?

Yes, I am.

And are you familiar with the land ownership and the property involved?

> Α. Yes.

MR. COFFIELD: Mr. Examiner, is the witness considered qualified?

> MR. STAMETS: He is.

(Mr. Coffield continuing.) Mr. Griffin, Q. would you please briefly state what it is that Grace seeks by this application?

All right. Basically, this is an application by Grace Petroleum Corporation to form a 1600 acre State and Federal approved unit in Township 20 South, Range 33 East, Lea County, New Mexico.

All right, Mr. Griffin, would you please

refer to what has been marked as Exhibit One and explain this and what it represents?

A. Exhibit One is the proposed unit agreement for the Smith Ranch Unit area. It follows the 1968 standard reprint with the proper modifications to modify the form to fit with the Commissioner's office on the land in the State of New Mexico.

It provides for the formation, drilling, and development of the unit area.

To this agreement is attached a land plat, which is Exhibit A to the agreement. The land plat shows the 1599.96 acres being included in the proposed unit.

This acreage is 1279.96 acres of Federal land, or 79.9 percent, and it's 320 acres of State land, or 20.1 percent.

We at this point have contacted all owners within the proposed unit area and anticipate 100 percent sign-up.

Exhibit B is a schedule of the leases to be included in the unit area. It includes all of the tracts showing both the ownership, the expiration dates, the lessor/lessee, and the overriding royalty owners.

Q. Mr. Griffin, do you actually have joinder by these parties named in this --

A. We, at this point, do not have the agreement

signed but we do have confirmation from all parties that
the agreement will be signed, subject only to submitting
the proper operating agreement that goes with it as support
factors.

- Q. Are you prepared to submit at this time a copy of the operating agreement?
- A. The operating agreement is in the process of being prepared. It is not ready at this time.

I will be filed, of course, upon request for final approval.

- Q. Mr. Griffin, what contact have you made with the Commissioner of Public Lands for the State of New Mexico in connection with this unit?
- A. We have contacted the Commissioner's office set forth our proposed unit area, and at this point have been advised that they see no objection to the formation, the formation of this unit.
- Q. Mr. Griffin, likewise, with respect to the Federal offices, the USGS specifically, what contact have you made with them?
- A. We are at this point waiting for the final approval from the USGS but we have had several preliminary conversations with them. It has been filed with them for final approval, and again, we have been informed that we should anticipate any difficulty.

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

25

2

	Q.	Do	you	have	anything	to	add	in	connection
with	this								

- A. I believe that pretty well covers the formation at this stage.
- Q Was this Exhibit One prepared by you or under your supervision?
 - A. Yes, it was.
- Q In your opinion will the approval of this application by Grace prevent the drilling of unnecessary wells and otherwise prevent waste and protect correlative rights?
 - A. Yes, I believe it will.

MR. COFFIELD: Mr. Examiner, I move the admission of this exhibit.

MR. STAMETS: The exhibit will be admitted.

MR. COFFIELD: And I have no further

questions of Mr. Griffin at this point.

MR. STAMETS: Any questions of the witness?

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. STAMETS:

Q. Mr. Griffin, I see that the -- it does not appear to me that the plan requires that the Division approve plans of development or participating area, is that correct?

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

		Page	8
1	A.	This would be normally done exact	:ly as
2	do through the C	ommissioner's office, and it was m	y im-
3	pression that th	ey always seek your concurrence on	that
4	before they appr	ove it.	
5	Q.	So such a requirement would not p	resent
6	a problem?		
7	A.	No, it would be no problem.	
8	Q.	Does the agreement provide for Di	visior
9	approval of a ch	ange in unit operator?	
10	A.	There again, this is a standard r	eprint

we

require your approval of it, as I recall.

Q Okay.

MR. STAMETS: Any other questions of the witness? He may be excused.

and I believe that we have to advise you but it does not

WILLIAM J. HENRY

being called as a witness and having been duly sworn upon his oath, testified as follows, to-wit:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. COFFIELD:

Mr. Henry, would you please for the record state your name, address, occupation, and employer?

A. My name is Wîlliam J. Henry and I'm a

consultant petroleum geologist in Midland, Texas, and I'm representing Grace Petroleum.

Q Have you previously testified before the Division as a geologist?

- A. Yes, I have.
- Q. And were your qualifications made a matter of record and accepted by the Division?
 - A. Yes, they were.
- Q. Are you familiar with Grace's application in this case?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Are you familiar with the geology in this area generally?
 - A. Yes, I am.
 - Q And this particular property specifically?
 - A. Uh-huh.

MR. COFFIELD: Is the witness considered qualified?

MR. STAMETS: Yes.

- Q. (Mr. Coffield continuing.) Mr. Henry, would you please refer to what has been marked as Exhibit Two, identify that exhibit?
- A. Exhibit Two is a commercial land map which shows the ownership and general information of the area.

 I would like to point out that the proposed unit that we

are seeking is outlined in red, colored in yellow.

I'd like to also point out that this unit is joined on the north by Union of California's Laguna

Deep Unit, which was a Devonian prospect which they drilled to Devonian, had a show, but was not commercial, and they recompleted in the Morrow Sand for about 2-million a day.

And this is -- it would have been the last five or six months this happened.

Down to the south there is some shallow Yates production that Anadarko is operating, and there is one Morrow well, the ARCO Mahaffey that was drilled many years ago that is still producing dually from the Bone Springs and the Morrow.

And this is just general information on this.

I would like to point out one thing before we move on, which is relevant to this case. You will note the KGS by Yates there in the Section 11, the southeast corner. By request of the USGS we limited our unit there because this is a litigation which they feel will be some time in being concluded and they recommended that we eliminate the south tier of these sections because of this.

And, also, I'll present later, we have a Devonian map which we have some minor faulting and they suggested that we limit this with a fault. This is why the

unit is cut off there.

MR. STAMETS: I'm not clear what -- what KGS has got to do with the unit.

A. Well --

MR. STAMETS: Would you explain that a little more?

USGS did not accept their bid and so they say it will be some time before it's settled, so there is nothing you can do about the acreage, and there's more than one than one tract that's involved in this. There's another one, I believe, over in 10, so they suggested that this will always be a thorn in your side and eliminate it --

MR. STAMETS: This is not included because you have an ownership problem?

A. Sir?

MR. STAMETS: This is not included because you have an ownership problem.

A. They suggested we could never solve it.

But I mean this was pointed out to us by them. Okay?

Q. Okay, Mr. Henry, let's go then to Exhibit
Three. Please discuss this and explain what the purpose
is?

A. Exhibit Three is the Lower Morrow structure which this -- our proposed reservoir objective in this unit

is the Morrow Sand, and I show in green on this map, a line of cross section, which is my last exhibit which I will discuss later.

I'll point out that Amoco drilled a Morrow well to the south end of the section in Section -- of the cross section in Section 27; unsuccessful in the Morrow; completed from the Atoka. This is fairly recent.

The ARCO Mahaffey in Section 14, which is a Bone Springs-Morrow producing well; and then the Union well to the north, and a dry hole on up to the north, which is the Amerada Laguna Plata Well, which was a Bone Springs well at one time; dry in the Morrow.

And at the USGS' suggestion we put the fault, which has very little throw on it, across this section, which as my interpretation doesn't control the Morrow, but they suggested we put it in, so we did.

I think it's been proved that the faulting doesn't control the Morrow production, but this was one of the problems that we had on the south end of the unit.

MR. STAMETS: That's an administrative fault.

- A. If you say so, yes, sir.
- Q Going on to what has been marked as Exhibit Four.
 - A. Exhibit Four is an Isopach of the gross

Morrow Sands of reservoir quality which we think we will encounter as we -- the unit will prove as we drill up the Smith Ranch Unit.

As you can see, the Mahaffey had quite a bit of sands and thinning sands to the north to the Union Well, and to the Laguna Plata and the Morrow being stratigraphic, we feel like that we're in good position for Morrow production.

Q. Now to Exhibit Five, Mr. Henry. Would you please explain that to the Examiner?

A. Exhibit Five is a stratigraphic Morrow cross section showing the Morrow Sands; the production from the Amoco well, Sinclair Mahaffey, and the Union well is shown in red as we move up the section from north to south south to north, and then the Laguna Plata Well is up to the north.

As you'll notice, the sands in this particular area are -- they are thin, but there are quite a few of them in some of the wells; some of them don't have as much.

Q. Is it your opinion, Mr. Henry, that all, or substantially all, of the structure with which we're concerned here is embraced within the unit area?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you have anything further on this?

25

		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
1	Q. M:	r. Henry, were these exhibits Two, Three,
2	Four, and Five pre	pared by you or under your supervision?
3	A. Ye	es, they were.
4	Q. A:	nd in your opinion will the approval of
5	this application by	y Grace prevent the drilling of unnec-
6	cesary wells and o	therwise prevent waste and protect cor-
7	relative rights?	
8	A. A.	osolutely.
9	M.	R. COFFIELD: Mr. Examiner, I move the
10	admission of Exhib	its Two through Five.
11	M.	R. STAMETS: These exhibits will be ad-
12	mitted.	
13	M	R. COFFIELD: And I have no other questions
14	of Mr. Henry.	
15	M	R. STAMETS: Are there any questions of
16	the witness? He m	ay be excused.
17	A	nything further in this case?
18	T	he case will be taken under advisement.
19		
20	(Hearing concluded.)
21		
22		
23		

SALLY WALTON BOYD CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, SALLY W. BOYD, a court reporter, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing and attached Transcript of Hearing before the Oil Conservation Division was reported by me; that the said transcript is a full, true, and correct record of the hearing, prepared by me to the best of my ability, from my notes taken at the time of the hearing.

Sally W. Boyd, C.S.R.

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a complete record of the proceedings in the Examiner hearing of Case No. 66 heard by ne on

Oll Conservation Division