| 1 2 3 | STATE OF NEW MEXICO ENERGY, MINERALS AND NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION STATE LAND OFFICE BUILDING SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO 18 January 1989 | | |
|----------|--|--|--|
| 4 | | | |
| 5 | EXAMINER HEARING | | |
| 6 | IN THE MATTER OF: | | |
| 7 8 | Application of Bran Oil Corporation CASE for compulsory pooling, Chaves County, 9584 New Mexico, and | | |
| 9 10 | Application of Stevens Operating Corporation for compulsory pooling, Chaves 9585 | | |
| 11 | County, New Mexico. BEFORE: Victor T. Lyon, Examiner | | |
| 12 13 | Barona, viced in ajon, Bhaminer | | |
| 14 | TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING | | |
| 15 16 | | | |
| 17 | APPEARANCES | | |
| 18 | the Division: Robert G. Stovall Attorney at Law | | |
| 19 20 | Legal Counsel to the Division State Land Office Bldg. Santa Fe, New Mexico | | |
| 21 | For Bran Oil Corporation William F. Carr and Stevens Operating Attorney at Law | | |
| 22 23 | Corporation: CAMPBELL and BLACK, P. A. P. O. Box 2208 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501 | | |
| 24 | | | |
| 25 | | | |
| | | | |

| 1 | | 2 |
|----------------------|--------------------------------------|----|
| 2 | INDEX | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | SAM D. GARDNER | |
| 5 | Direct Examination by Mr. Carr | 4 |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | F. ANDREW GROOMS | |
| 8 | Direct Examination by Mr. Carr | 12 |
| 9 | | |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | EXHIBITS | |
| 12 | | |
| 13 | Applicants Exhibit 1A, Document | 6 |
| 14 | Applicants Exhibit 1B, Document | 6 |
| 15 | Applicants Exhibit 2, Correspondence | 8 |
| 16 | Applicants Exhibit 3A, Map | 13 |
| 17 | Applicants Exhibit 3B, Map | 13 |
| 18 | Applicants Exhibit 4A, AFE | 14 |
| 19 | Applicants Exhibit 4B, AFE | 14 |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 24 | | |
| 2 4 25 | | |
| 4.) | | |
| | | |
| | | |

Case 9584.

ation.

MR. LYON: We will next hear

Case 9584. Application of Bran Oil Corporation from compulsory pooling, Chaves County, New Mexico.

MR. CARR: May it please the Examiner, my name is William F. Carr with the law firm Campbell & Black, P. A., of Santa Fe.

We represent Bran Oil Corpor-

At this time, Mr. Examiner, I would request that the Division also call Case 9585.

These cases involve compulsory pooling of two adjoining 160-acre tracts. We are pooling the same interest owner in both, an unknown -- an individual whose whereabouts is unknown, and we can consolidate the testimony but separate orders should issue in this matter.

MR. LYON: All right, Case 9584 and 9585 will be consolidated, 9585 being application of Stevens Operating Corporation for compulsory pooling, Chaves County, New Mexico.

MR. CARR: Mr. Examiner, I also represent Stevens Operating Corporation.

We have two witnesses.

4 1 (Witnesses sworn.) 2 3 MR. LYON: Proceed, Mr. Carr. 4 5 SAM D. GARDNER, 6 being called as a witness and being duly sworn upon his 7 oath, testified as follows, to-wit: 8 9 DIRECT EXAMINATION 10 BY MR. CARR: 11 Q Will you state your full name and place 12 of residence? 13 Α Sam D. Gardner, in Roswell, New Mexico. 14 Q By whom are you employed and in what 15 capacity? 16 Α By Stevens Oil Company as a landman for 17 the company. 18 Have you previously testified before 19 this Division and had your credentials as a landman accept-20 ed? 21 Α No, and I have not. 22 Would you briefly review for Mr. Lyon 0 23 your educational background and your work experience? 24 Α Yes. 1960, graduated as a geologist and 25 therein pursued a career in the oil business in the land

5 1 department with Continental Oil Company for some six years and then became an independent operator and as an independent landman working for major oil companies and an independent capacity for the last 25 years. 5 Q Are you familiar with the applications 6 filed in each of the consolidated cases? 7 Yes, I am. Α 8 Q Are you familiar with the subject area 9 and the proposed wells? 10 Α Yes. 11 MR. CARR: Are the witness' 12 qualifications acceptable? 13 MR. LYON: Yes, they are. 14 Q Would you please state what is being 15 sought in each of these cases? 16 Α Yes. What we are doing here is unit-17 160-acre quarter section for the purpose of drilling 18 an Abo, Pecos Slope Abo test, gas well. 19 And each of these wells will be located 20 at standard locations. 21 Α At standard locations. 22 Have you prepared certain exhibits for Q 23 presentation today? 24 Α Yes, I have. 25 Q Would you refer to what has been marked

that down here.

tinue.

as Exhibit One-A and One-B and review this for the Examiner, Mr. Lyon?

A Yes.

MR. CARR: The exhibits are marked for both cases. They're called Bran/Stevens Exhibits One-A and One-B, Case 9584-9585, and I'd also note, Mr. Lyon, that there are a number of exhibits that are parallel exhibits indicated with the letter A and B.

A throughout refers to the southeast quarter and the B always refers to the north-east quarter.

MR. LYON: Now, let me get

A is --

A Southeast quarter.

MR. CARR: Southeast quarter, which is Case 9584, and when we indicate an exhibit as Exhibit B it's the northeast quarter, which is Case 9585.

MR. LYON: Okay. Please con-

Q Would you please review Exhibit One-A

and One-B?

A Yes. Exhibit One-A deals with the southeast quarter of Section 32, Township 6 South, Range 26 East, Chaves County, New Mexico, for the unitization of 160

acres for a well to be drilled 660 from the east line and 1980 from the south line of said section, for an approximate 4400 foot Abo test.

The acreage breakdown in that quarter section is as follows: The west half and the southeast quarter is a Federal oil and gas lease and it is a Unocal farmout to Bran Oil Corporation, and the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter breaks out in Bran Oil Corporation owning 5 net acres in fee minerals and having a lease of five net mineral acres there.

Stevens Oil Company owns a 22.5 net acres under six separate fee leases, and we have the mission 7.5 net acres belonging to Pearl Young, whereabouts unknown.

Q Would you now refer to Exhibit One-B and review that, please?

A Exhibit One-B deals with the northeast quarter of Section 32, Township 6 South, Range 26 East, Chaves County, New Mexico. Unitized this 160 acres for the purpose of a 4300 foot Abo test.

This particular tract is broken up a little bit differently, dealing with the northeast quarter and the southeast quarter of that quarter section, that is a State oil and Gas lease owned by Stevens Oil Company, being a total of 80 net acres.

southeast quarter of that northeast

,

quarter is owned 22.5 net acres under six separate oil and gas leases. Bran Oil Corporation owns a 10 net mineral acres and Lily Pearl Young, whereabouts unknown, and the open acreage is 7.5 acres there.

We did not cover the northeast quarter

The

of that -- pardon me, northwest, that is Stevens Oil Company owns 3 oil and gas leases covering 32.5 net acres and Bran Oil Corporation owning 3.75 net acres in fee mineral interests.

Q The only interest owner in each of these cases that has not voluntarily committed their interest to the wells proposed is the interest of Lily Pearl Young, is that correct?

A Yes, that's right.

Q What percent of the acreage in each of these is voluntarily committed, do you know?

A Yes, 90 -- 95.3125.

Q And the balance belongs to Ms. Young?

A Ms. Young.

Q Would you refer to what has been marked as Exhibit Number Two and referring to this, summarize your efforts to locate the whereabouts of Lily Pearl Young?

A Well, to begin with, Lily -- Exhibit Two
A is my letter to a landman in Bakersfield, California, who

is experienced in looking for missing heirs and after a good deal of searching myself it was discerned that this Lily Pearl Young's last known address was Bakersfield area,

Therein I write this letter to this man and acquired his services to look for this lady, and in this letter that is marked Two, is marked number -- Exhibit Two, he tells us what he did to find them; an extensive effort was made by this gentleman. He, as you can see on here, he checked all the Kern County, California death records for Lily Pearl Young and her son, Lawrence David Ray; ran the grantee/grantor index records for Lily Pearl Young in Kern County; checked all the available public administration records for her. The lady was, as we were told by brothers and sisters we interviewed, was having some difficulties and we understand she ended up in sanitariums and nursing homes, and we checked those out without success.

We increased the broadness of the search to the entire State of California by running state death records, marriage records, divorce records for Lily Pearl, her daughter Patsy, for David Ray, her son. We only found the marriage certificate for the daughter, and that is -- and a search for the daughter was of no avail.

Numerous, numerous calls, of course, were made to the brother and sister of this person, who

California.

lives in Roswell and have not had contact with the lady in 25 years and they have no idea where she is or what she's done.

It just goes on and on in this Exhibit Two explaining what they have accomplished and what they weren't able to do.

Q Okay. Attached to the back of this exhibit is an additional letter. Would you identify that and explain why that's included?

A Yes. This has come from an acquaintance of mine who I also asked to check his available records that he has at -- this gentleman, Steve Wisniewski, is the ex-Chief of Police of Roswell, New Mexico, and he is a personal friend of mine, who is now the Chief of Police of the City of Hermosa Beach, and he was home during the Christmas vacation and I chatted with him and I asked him if he could give us a hand, and he said he'd be happy to, and this is the letter in return to him, from him, telling us that his computer, Hermosa Beach, he searched it for all the possible names that I had listed and all combinations thereof, without any success.

the Kern County Sheriff's Department, in an attempt to locate these people and without success, and he goes on to say that he has done about all that he can do without as-

```
11
1
   signing an investigator to it, and he is hesitant to do
2
   that for private enterprise.
3
                      In your opinion has a good faith effort
4
   been made to locate the whereabouts of --
5
             Α
                      Yes, sir.
6
                      -- of Ms. Young? Were Exhibits One-A,
            Q
7
    One-B, and Two compiled under your direction and super-
8
    vision?
9
                      Yes, they were.
             Α
10
                                MR. CARR: At this time, Mr.
11
    Lyon, we would move the admission of Bran/Stevens Exhibits
12
    One-A, One-B and Two.
13
                                MR. LYON: Is there objection?
14
                                 Exhibits One, One-A and Two
15
    are admitted into evidence.
16
                                MR.
                                              One-A, One-B and
                                     CARR:
17
    Two.
18
                                     LYON: One-A, One-B and
                                 MR.
19
    Two.
20
                                 MR. CARR: Yes, sir.
21
                                 MR. LYON: Okay.
22
                                 MR. CARR:
                                             That concludes my
23
    direct examination of this witness.
24
                                 MR. LYON: I have no questions
25
    for Mr. Gardner.
```

12 1 MR. CARR: At this time we 2 call Mr. Grooms. 3 F. ANDREW GROOMS, 5 being called as a witness and being duly sworn upon his 6 oath, testified as follows, to-wit: 7 8 DIRECT EXAMINATION 9 BY MR. CARR: 10 Q Will you state your full name and place 11 of residence, please? 12 F. Andrew Grooms, Roswell, New Mexico. 13 Q Mr. Grooms, by whom are you employed and 14 in what capacity? 15 Α I am Vice President of Bran Oil Corpor-16 ation of which I am a majority interest owner, and am em-17 ployed in the capacity of landman for the company. 18 Mr. Grooms, have you previously testi-19 fied before this Division? 20 Α Yes, I have. 21 Q Were your credentials accepted and made 22 a matter of record at that time? 23 Yes, sir, they were. Α 24 Q Are you familiar with the applications 25 filed in each of these cases?

13 1 Α Yes, I am. 2 Are you familiar with the subject area? 0 3 and the proposed wells? Α Yes, sir. 5 CARR: Are the witness' MR. 6 qualifications acceptable? 7 MR. LYON: Yes, they are. 8 Grooms, I'd like to direct your Q Mr. 9 attention to what has been marked as Exhibit Three-A and 10 Three-B in these consolidated cases. I'd ask you to iden-11 tify each and review the information contained on that 12 exhibit. 13 Exhibit Three-A is a petroleum ownership Α 14 map outlining the leasehold interest in the southeast quar-15 ter of Section 32, Township 6 South, Range 26 East, Chaves 16 County, New Mexico, which designates the 160-acre proration 17 unit for an Abo test well. 18 And the wells are to be at standard 19 locations? 20 Yes, sir, they are. Α 21 Okay, would you go to Three-B and just Q 22 identify that, please. 23

A All right, Exhibit Three-B is also a petroleum ownership map of Midland Map Company, designating the leasehold interest in the northeast quarter of Section

24

25

32, Township 6 South, Range 26 East, Chaves County, New Mexico, designating 160-acre spacing unit for an Abo test well.

Q Have Bran and Stevens both been involved in the development of the Abo formation in this area in the past?

A Yes, both companies have drilled wells in the area and operated wells.

Q Would you refer to Exhibits Four-A and Four-B, identify those and review them for Mr. Lyon?

A Exhibit Four-A is Authority for Expenditure prepared by the engineer employed by Bran Oil Corporation, indicating the cost to drill and complete an approximately 44-4500 foot Abo test well in the amount of \$231,083.

And the Exhibit B is an AFE prepared by Stevens Operating Corporation personnel outlining the cost to drill and complete an Abo test well approximately 43-4400 foot in the northeast quarter of said Section 32, in the amount of \$234,301.

Q These AFE's were independently prepared by each of the companies?

A Yes, sir, they were.

Q Are these costs in line with what is charged by other operators for Abo wells in the area?

Α

Oh, definitely, definitely are.

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24 25

Q Are you prepared to make a recommendation to the Examiner as to the risk penalty that should be assessed against the interest of Ms. Young if she can't be identified and located regarding the well?

Α Yes, sir, I am. I think it should be cost plus 200 percent in each case.

And what do you based that recommenda-Q tion on?

My recommendation is based on our company's studies of the offset proration units close to Section 32. We've made an examination of ten wells that have been drilled in the area between 1982 and 1985, eight of which were hooked up to a pipeline and excepting the six months that these wells were shut in due to the so-called arsenic problem, these wells in this area on an average basis produce about 188,000 cubic feet of gas per day. With these wells costing in the \$230,000 range, you're talking about a payout period for an average field well of about 3.6 to 4 years. The likelihood of drilling a dry hole is quite minimal; however, the possibility of drilling a marginal well is guite high and therefore we feel that such a risk charge is justified.

Is it your opinion that you could drill well in this area that would in fact not be a commercial success?

A Very much so, yes, sir.

Q Have you made an estimate of the overheard and administrative costs that will be incurred while drilling and then while producing a well?

A Yes, utilizing standard industry COPAS procedure guidelines, we recommend a drilling well overhead rate of \$3,500 per well on a monthly basis and a producing well overhead rate of \$350 per month on a per well basis.

Q And these costs are in line with what's being charged by other operators in the area?

A They are in line or less than what is being charged by most operators in the area.

Q And you recommend that these figures be incorporated into the order which results from today's hearing?

A Yes, sir.

Q Do you seek -- or who do you request be designated operator of each of these wells?

A We would request that Stevens Operating Corporation be designated as operator of each of these wells in a cooperative effort to develop the acreage.

Q The application was originally filed indicating that Bran would desire to be operator of the

17 1 well in the southeast quarter. You are changing that request, are you not? 3 Α Yes, sir. Have all of the other interest owners in 5 the well been notified and are aware and concur in this request? 7 Α Each and every interest owner within 8 either of these locations has been notified and is fully agreeable to that request. 10 What is the reason for requesting that 11 Stevens operate both wells? 12 Α The reason for the request is simply for 13 the cost efficiencies that would be accomplished by having 14 one operator handle the paperwork on both wells as well as 15 obtaining bids and we feel that that would accomplish a 16 significant cost savings. 17 your opinion will granting this In 18 application be in the best interest of conservation, the 19 prevention of waste, and the protection of correlative 20 rights? 21 A Yes, sir, I believe I would. 22 Q Were Exhibits Three-A and B and Four-A 23 and B compiled under your direction? 24 Α Yes, sir, they were.

A res, sir, they were

25

Q Have you reviewed them and can you tes-

```
18
1
    tify as to their accuracy?
2
                      Yes, sir, I can.
3
                                 MR. CARR: At this time, Mr.
4
    Lyon, we would move the admission of Exhibits Three-A,
5
    Three-B, Four-A and Four-B.
6
                                 MR. LYON: Is there objection?
7
                                 Exhibits Three-A,
                                                       Three-B,
8
    Four-A and Four-B will be admitted into evidence.
9
                                 MR. CARR: That concludes my
10
    direct examination of Mr. Grooms.
11
                                 MR. LYON: I have no questions
12
    at all.
13
                                 MR.
                                       CARR: I have nothing
14
    further.
15
                                 MR.
                                      LYON: The witness may be
16
    excused and we will take the case under advisement.
17
18
                       (Hearing concluded.)
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE

I, SALLY W. BOYD, C. S. R. DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing Transcript of Hearing before the Oil Conservation Division (Commission) 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.

Sally W. Boyd CSR

do hereby certify that the foregoing is a complete record of the proceedings in heard by me on Jan 1989.

Conservation Division, Examine