STATE OF NEW MEXICO ENERGY, MINERALS AND NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION STATE LAND OFFICE BUILDING SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

1 March 1989

EXAMINER HEARING

IN THE MATTER OF:

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Application of Blackwood & Nichols Co., CASE Ltd. for an unorthodox coal gas well location and a non-standard gas proration unit, San Juan County, New Mexico, and

Application of Blackwood & Nichols Co., 9615 Ltd. for an unorthodox coal gas well location and a non-standard gas proration unit, San Juan County, New Mexico, and

Application of Blackwood & Nichols Co., 9616 Ltd. for an unorthodox coal gas well location and a non-standard gas proration unit, San Juan County, New Mexico.

BEFORE: Victor T. Lyon, Examiner

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

APPEARANCES

For the Division:

For Blackwood & Nichols William F. Carr
Co., Ltd.: Attorney at Law
CAMPBELL and BLACK, P. A.

P. O. Box 2208

Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

those two cases.

MR. LYON: We'll call Case Number 9614, application of Blackwood & Nichols for an unorthodox coal gas well location and a nonstandard gas proration unit, San Juan 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 Black-wood & Nichols Company, Limited, in this case.

This case and the two following cases involve adjoining nonstandard proration units that are nonstandard because of variations in the U.S. Public Lands Survey.

MR. LYON: Let -- let me call

MR. CARR: If we could consolidate them for purposes of testimony, we'd appreciate it.

MR. LYON: Case 9615, application of Blackwood & Nichols, Limited, for an unorthodox coal gas well location and nonstandard proration unit, San Juan, New Mexico.

Case 9616, application of Blackwood & Nichols, Limited, for an unorthodox coal gas well well location and nonstandard gas proration unit, San Juan County, New Mexico.

Cases 9614, 9615 and 9616 will

```
4
1
   be consolidated for purposes of testimony.
2
                                 MR.
                                      CARR: I have one witness
3
   who needs to be sworn.
                                 MR.
                                      LYON: Will you stand and
5
   raise your right hand?
6
7
                         (Witness sworn.)
8
9
                                 MR. LYON: Proceed, Mr. Carr.
10
11
                         WILLIAM F. CLARK,
12
    being called as a witness and being duly sworn upon his
13
    oath, testified as follows, to-wit:
14
15
                        DIRECT EXAMINATION
16
   BY MR. CARR:
17
                       Will you state your full name for the
             Q
18
    record, please?
19
                       William F. Clark.
             Α
20
             Q
                       Mr. Clark, where do you reside?
21
             Α
                       Durango, Colorado.
22
                       By whom are you employed and in what
             Q
23
    capacity?
24
                       By Blackwood and Nichols Company, Limit-
25
    ed, as an operations manager.
```

1 Q Have you previously testified before 2 Division or one of its examiners and had your cre-3 dentials accepted and made a matter of record? Yes, I have. Α 5 And how were you qualified at that time? Q 6 As a petroleum engineer. Α 7 Are you familiar with the applications Q 8 filed by Blackwood & Nichols Company, Limited, in each of 9 these consolidated cases? 10 Yes, I am. Α 11 Are you familiar with the subject area 12 the development of the Fruitland coal seams in this 13 area? 14 Yes, I am. Α 15 MR. CARR: Are the witness' 16 qualifications acceptable? 17 MR. LYON: Yes, they are. 18 Clark, would you briefly state what 19 Blackwood and Nichols seeks with this application? 20 Α Blackwood & Nichols requests approval of 21 unorthodox location of each of these wells and a non-22 standard proration unit for each of these cases, so they're 23 both nonstandard where the well is going to be located and 24 then the gas proration unit is of a nonstandard size. 25 Q Mr. Clark, have you prepared certain exhibits for presentation in this case?

A Yes, we have.

Q Initially I'd like you to just identify for Mr. Lyon what has been marked as Blackwood & Nichols Company Exhibits One-A, One-B and One-C.

A Exhibit One-A, One-B and One-C are the State of New Mexico -- or excuse me, the OCD Form C-102, which shows the dedicated acreage for these particular wells. You'll note that the east half of these particular sections are truncated due to the irregular public surveys.

Q The unorthodox locations for each of the wells are also shown on these exhibits, is that correct?

A That's correct. The footages are indicated.

Q Would you now go to Blackwood & Nichols Exhibit Number Two, identify that and review it, please?

A Exhibit Number Two is a plat showing the dedicated acreages for each of the proposed wells.

Case Number 9614 for the Northeast Blanco Unit No. 453, which will be located 930 feet from the south line and 610 feet from the west line of Section 6, Township 30 North, Range 7 West, will have an acreage dedication being the west half -- excuse me, the east half of Section 6 and the southwest of Section 31. That's indicated in the pink on Exhibit Number Two.

Well number -- Case Number 9615, the Northeast Blanco Unit No. 449, which will be located at 320 feet from the south line, 1250 feet from the west line of Section 19, Township 31 North, Range 7 West, will have the acreage dedicated as indicated, being the east half of Section 19 and the very top northwest part of Section 30, as indicated on Exhibit Two in yellow.

Case Number 9616 for the Northeast Blanco Unit No. 457, will be drilled at a proposed location at 2,255 feet from the north line and 340 feet from the west line in Section 31, Township 31 North, Range 7 West. In Section 31 the northwest corner is dedicated to this well with the addition from Section 30, the southwest quarter of Section 30 and the southwest of the northwest of Section 30, as indicated in green on Exhibit Two.

Q Now, Mr. Clark, would you refer to Exhibit Number Three and again the subject proration units are color coded as on the prior exhibit. Would you review the other information contained on this plat?

A Exhibit Number Three is the Northeast Blanco Unit area map. You see the cross hatched line approximately one section to the east of the three proposed nonstandard dedicated proration units that continued up and goes around on the side around the top of the yellow one continuous.

The majority of the wells indicated there with the circle are Mesaverde wells. The wells with triangles are either proposed or currently drilled Fruitland coal wells.

You will note that for Case Number 9614 and Case Number 9616 there are no offsetting operators.

The -- those proration units are entirely surrounded by Northeast Blanco Unit dedicated acreage.

On the -- Case 9615 is indicated in yellow, does have an offsetting operator, in this case to the north and to the east, being Northwest Pipeline. The Northwest Pipeline additionally has an ownership in the Northeast Blanco Unit under the unitized lands of approximately 5 percent.

Q And have you obtained from Northwest a waiver of objection to the proposed location?

A Yes, that's -- we do have that and that will be introduced a little later as Exhibit Five.

Q Now, I think it would be helpful if you would explain to Mr. Lyon exactly why these particular non-standard units are now being proposed.

A These nonstandard units are a reflection of what has already been previously proposed and approved by the OCD for the existing Mesaverde wells on this irregular town -- or irregular land survey. The acreage is dedi-

cated 296.02 for Case 9604 and 259.82 for Case 9615 and 250.65 for Case Number 9616, are the same as the Mesaverde ones which are previously approved.

MR. CARR: Mr. Examiner, those Mesaverde approvals were in Division Orders R-749, R-750=A, and 751.

Q What are the standard spacing requirements for Basin Fruitland Coal wells.

A Order R-8768, the special pool rules for the Basin Fruitland Coal wells, requires in Rule 4 a standard dedication of 320 acres.

Rule 5 allows a deviation of plus or minus 25 percent, which would be a minimum of 240 acres; therefore, all of these wells' dedications are permissible; that is, they're greater than 240 acres; however, Rule 6 goes on and addresses the irregular shapes due to public land surveys. They also require that it be in a particular section and that's the necessity of this hearing is because our proposed gas proration units are not within a particular governmental half section.

Q Why is Blackwood and Nichols requesting the unorthodox locations that are proposed?

A We are requesting the unorthodox --well, these wells are unorthodox under the Basin Fruitland special rules because they are closer than 790 feet to the

outer boundaries. That is necessitated by the extreme topography in this area next to Navajo Lake.

Q Would you refer to Blackwood and Nichols Exhibits Four-A, Four-B and Four-C and review those for the Examiner?

A Yes, I would. Exhibit Four-A is for the Case 9614 and is a vicinity map for the Northeast Blanco Unit Number 449. You'll see the proposed location, the topography is fairly severe and a good part of that section is in Navajo Lake and the banks of it or the (unclear) going off the cliffs are fairly severe.

Exhibit One --

Q Four.

Q Excuse me, Exhibit Four-B, for Case 9615, is the vicinity map for the Northeast Blanco Unit No. 457. Again you will see fairly severe topography in this area. You'll also note that in this particular one we are twinning an existing well as opposed to going in and disturbing additional territory around this recreational area.

Exhibit Four-C, the Northeast Blanco Unit No. 453, is very similar to the Exhibit Four-B. It shows that we are twinning, offsetting the well, and again in the rough topography.

Q In making the selection of the well locations have you been required to work with government

officials?

A That's correct. Blackwood and Nichols has worked closely with the New Mexico State Park personnel and the Bureau of Reclamation personnel, which are jurisdictional agencies over the Navajo Reservoir and we selected these locations so that they would not have an adverse environmental impact on the people recreating on the Navajo waters.

Q Now, would you identify what has been marked as Blackwood & Nichols Company Exhibit Number Five?

January 9th, 1989, which was sent certified to Northwest Pipeline. They signed and returned it to us dated January 24th, 1989. This was to advise them of the Northeast Blanco Unit Well No. 449, specifically Case 9615, would have a nonstandard location and a nonstandard gas proration unit dedication and they waived their objection to both.

Q Mr. Clark, these were originally proposed for administrative approval, is that correct?

A That is correct and then the Division scheduled them for hearing.

Q And that was because the nonstandard units cross the section line, was that the reason given?

A That would be my understanding.

Q How soon are you prepared to go forward

1 with the drilling of these wells? 2 We are currently waiting on working in-3 owner approval but we anticipate we would be drilling these wells within 30 to 60 days. 5 In your opinion will granting these ap-Q 6 plications be in the best interest of conservation, the 7 prevention of waste, and the protection of correlative 8 rights? Yes. these locations will be those 10 things in giving us the best available drainage pattern for 11 this part of the unit.

And were Exhibits One-A, B and C, Exhibits Two, Three, Four-A, B and C, and Five prepared by you or compiled under your direction and supervision?

> Yes, they were. Α

MR. CARR: May it please the Examiner, at this time we'd move the admission of Blackwood & Nichols Exhibits One through Five and all sub-parts thereof.

Is there objection? MR. LYON: The exhibits you've enumerated will be admitted into evidence.

MR. And that concludes CARR: my direct examination of Mr. Clark.

25

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. LYON:

Q Mr. Clark, the coal gas order requires wells to be located either in the northeast quarter or the southwest quarter, is that not correct?

A That is correct.

Q And I believe that your wells are so located except for No. 457, which is located in the northwest quarter.

A That's correct, sir.

Q Or the equivalent thereof. And your reason for doing that is that you're drilling a well near -- I don't remember if this is the one that is twinned.

A That's by the 66-A, that's correct, it's a twin location.

Q This is a twin well, so you're minimizing surface standards by locating at that place, is that right?

A That being a fact and then also with the Navajo Lake there, how we had to move other wells and then trying to maintain the most reasonable drift drilling drainage patterns for each of these wells. So it's -- it's kind of a twofold decision of -- there is an existing location there offsetting the 457 but then we also look at

A

where are the other wells that due to topography are having to be shifted and where would this well be best or ideally located.

Q All right. Now, as you've testified, you're drilling fairly close to Navajo Lake.

A That's correct.

Q Are any of these wells in the state park?

A No, sir, none of these wells are in the state park. There is a well, or there is another piece of acreage that's extremely or just directly south of the pink acreage, the Well 453, that we are currently discussing with the state park people and their concerns about that one, but none of these three -- or let me put it this way: They are not in the developed part of the state park. Part of the acreage dedicated may be in the state park but these three parties -- or these three particular wells, they do not have any problems and we have worked to identify these locations.

I'm aware that there's a concern on what will be proposed at a later hearing, the Northeast Blanco Unit No. 461, which is to the south of this existing -- the wells we're talking about, and that one will have to be located in the state park and we're currently evaluating proposals to try to come up with a least -- location with the

1 least impact. 2 Yeah. So you are working with -- with Q 3 the --That's correct, sir, and that's why we Α 5 include it on this one because we're not quite sure 6 where is the best location to drill that well at this par-7 ticular time. 8 Q Okay, that -- that -- these wells do not 9 impact that park. 10 Α That is correct. 11 Q And I assume that you will take every 12 precaution to prevent any pollution of the lake during your 13 operations. 14 Α That's correct. All of these wells, I 15 believe, are -- have Federal APD's which will require us to 16 line the pits, cut them into the up-hill side, line the 17 pits, and take other precautionary methods. 18 Q Very good. 19 MR. LYON: Are there any other 20 questions of Mr. Clark? 21 MR. CARR: No further ques-22 tions. 23 MR. LYON: Clark may be Mr. 24 excused and we'll take the cases under advisement. 25 Α Thank you. (Hearing concluded)

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 COR

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a complete record of the proceedings in the Examiner hearing of Case No. 964. heard by me on March 1989.

Oil Conservation Division