

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

23 August 1989

EXAMINER HEARING

IN THE MATTER OF:

Application of The Petroleum Corpora- CASE  
tion of Delaware for downhole comming- 9663  
ling, the amendment of Division Order  
R-7269, and the amendment of Division  
Administrative Order NSP-1290, Eddy  
County, New Mexico.

BEFORE: David R. Catanach, Examiner

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

A P P E A R A N C E S

For the Division:

For The Petroleum Corporat-  
ion of Delaware:

James Bruce  
Attorney at Law  
HINKLE LAW FIRM  
500 Marquette, N. W.  
Suite 740  
Albuquerque, New Mexico  
87102-2121

## I N D E X

## MICHAEL L. DUSING

Direct Examination by Mr. Bruce 4

Cross Examination by Mr. Catanach 7

## TOM SPRINKLE

Direct Examination by Mr. Bruce 8

Cross Examination by Mr. Catanach 15

## E X H I B I T S

Applicants Exhibit One, Structural Map 4

Applicants Exhibit Two, Cross Section 5

Applicants Exhibit Three, Graph 8

Applicants Exhibit Four, Schematic 9

Applicants Exhibit Five, Data 10

Applicants Exhibit Six, Data 13

Applicants Exhibit Seven, Affidavit 14

1 MR. CATANACH: Call next Case  
2 Number 9663. Application of The Petroleum Corporation of  
3 Delaware for downhole commingling, the amendment of Divi-  
4 sion Order No. R-7269, and the amendment of Division Ad-  
5 ministrative Order NSP-1290, Eddy County, New Mexico.

6 Call for appearances in this  
7 case.

8 MR. BRUCE: May it please the  
9 Examiner, I'm Jim Bruce with the Hinkle Law Firm in Albu-  
10 querque, New Mexico, appearing on behalf of The Petroleum  
11 Corporation of Delaware.

12 I have two witnesses.

13 MR. CATANACH: Will the wit-  
14 nesses please stand and be sworn?

15  
16 (Witnesses sworn.)  
17

18 MR. CATANACH: Mr. Bruce.  
19

20 (At this time Mr. Bruce made his opening  
21 statement.)  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 MICHAEL L. DUSING,  
2 being called as a witness and being duly sworn upon his  
3 oath, testified as follows, to-wit:

5 DIRECT EXAMINATION

6 BY MR. BRUCE:

7 Q Will you please state your name, place  
8 of residence and by whom you are employed?

9                   A                   Michael L. Dusing, Dallas, Texas. I'm  
10 employed by Presidio Oil Company.

11 Q And is The Petroleum Corporation of  
12 Delaware a wholly owned subsidiary of Presidio?

13 A Yes, sir.

14 Q Have you previously testified before the  
15 New Mexico Oil Conservation Division or one of its exa-  
16 miners as a geologist?

17 A Yes, sir.

18 MR. BRUCE: Is the witness  
19 considered qualified?

20 MR. CATANACH: He is.

21 Q Mr. Dusing, I refer you to Exhibit  
22 Number One. Please describe this for the Examiner.

23                   A                   Exhibit One is a structure map on the  
24 Basal Atoka Sand in the area (not clearly understood).

25 This shows a regional southeast dip with

1 a small nosing located around the No. 6 Well.

2 The numbers outlined in red are my picks  
3 for the Atoka Sands, showing neutron density crossover;  
4 greater than 6 percent porosity in the surrounding wells  
5 illustrates that the Petroleum Corp. No. 6 Well has ef-  
6 fective porosity greater than 6 percent. The surrounding  
7 wells do not.

8 Q I now refer you to Exhibit Number Two.

9 A Exhibit Number Two is a cross section  
10 with this location shown. It essentially goes to the  
11 nearest well to the west of the No. 6, heads east to the  
12 No. 6 Well and then down to the southwest. The closest  
13 wells to us, which most of them produce, would be from the  
14 Morrow. The No. 6 Well was completed in 1982 as a dual  
15 completion in the Morrow and the Strawn; produced, produc-  
16 tion started to decline in '87. At that time the Petroleum  
17 Corp. geologist and his staff got together, went in and  
18 picked three new sets of perfs which are shown on the cross  
19 section in red on the Superior No. 6 Well.

20 They perforated the three new sets some-  
21 time after that.

22 The OCD office in Artesia had notified  
23 us that the upper set of perforations by State correlations  
24 and tops was actually in the Atoka and not the Morrow;  
25 therefor, we did not perf all the Morrow that we had

1 thought.

2 This cross section shows the State tops,  
3 the blue being the recognized top of the Atoka, purple  
4 being a regional State marker correlation point, and the  
5 red being recognized Morrow, recognized top of the Morrow  
6 formation. The orange color denotes the correlative form-  
7 ation of the Basal Atoka Sand, if you will. It is either  
8 not present or low porosity (unclear) surrounding wells.

9 If you, I think if you look on the back  
10 of the completion reports by various operators, you can  
11 plot them on those wells and correlate them. The top of  
12 the Morrow may or may not go coincide with the same corre-  
13 lative points. Generally if I start working over in Lea  
14 County where I'm not real familiar with the formations,  
15 generally I'll get a log and just the OCD and he'll give me  
16 the recognized tops on one well, and then use those as a  
17 type log.

18 Q But unfortunately that didn't happen  
19 here, did it?

20 A Yes, that's correct.

21 Q Were Exhibits Number One and Two pre-  
22 pared by you or under your direction, Mr. Dusing?

23 A Yes, they were.

24 MR. BRUCE: We offer Exhibits  
25 One and Two into evidence.

1 MR. CATANACH: Mr. Dusing's  
2 credentials are accepted and Exhibits One and Two will be  
3 admitted as evidence.  
4

5 CROSS EXAMINATION

6 BY MR. CATANACH:

7 Q Mr. Dusing, I don't believe at the pre-  
8 sent time (not clearly audible) --

9 A Yes, it is. I don't believe it's pre-  
10 sent in the nearest well that penetrated the interval  
11 surrounding our well. As far as productive quality, I mean,  
12 You can see a little SP disruption on the cross section but  
13 you don't have a good gas effect or any evidence of good  
14 porosity, with 6 percent porosity generally being the cut-  
15 off for the Morrow and Atoka sands.

16 Q Do you know if the Artesia office has  
17 created a new Atoka pool for this production?

18 A No, I do not. I don't know how that  
19 works. I guess we have to get it approved by you prior to  
20 that or I don't know. I will check with Darrell Moore  
21 (sic) as soon as I get back and we'll work on that.

22 MR. CATANACH: That's all the  
23 questions I have of the witness at this time. He may be  
24 excused.  
25

1 T. L. SPRINKLE,  
2 being called as a witness and being duly sworn upon his  
3 oath, testified as follows, to-wit:

4  
5 DIRECT EXAMINATION

6 BY MR. BRUCE:

7 Q Will you state your name, occupation and  
8 employer, and where you reside?

9 A T. L. Sprinkle, Dallas, Texas. I'm a  
10 production engineer for Presidio Oil Company.

11 Q Mr. Sprinkle, have you previously testi-  
12 fied before the OCD and had your credentials accepted and  
13 made a matter of record?

14 A Yes.

15 MR. BRUCE: Is Mr. Sprinkle  
16 considered qualified?

17 MR. CATANACH: Yes, he is  
18 considered qualified.

19 Q Mr. Sprinkle, would you outline briefly  
20 the history of the well and the production from the well,  
21 and refer to Exhibit Number Three and discuss that exhibit?

22 A As indicated, the well was drilled in  
23 1982 and completed as a dual in the Morrow and Strawn for-  
24 mations, with the deeper Morrow being produced up the  
25 tubing with a packer set and the Strawn interval being pro-



1     duced up the 4-1/2 casing, 2-38ths tubing annulus to pro-  
2     duce from the casing.

3                     At the time the production trends  
4     indicate that -- they are slightly sporadic (not clearly  
5     understood) -- production through 1985 and 1986, mainly  
6     because of the curtailments and line pressure problems.

7                     The additional perforated intervals that  
8     were indicated were added in May of 1987, and there is in-  
9     dicated a couple of months of slightly higher production;  
10    then the production trend resumed its -- a downward trend  
11    at that point and a slightly up and down, erratic trend;  
12    a sharp decrease in the middle of 1988, again because of  
13    high line pressure from the gatherer, El Paso Natural Gas.

14                    In the fourth quarter of 1988 compres-  
15    sion was added to this well for the Morrow interval, as it  
16    was on the offsetting wells in this Morrow/Strawn Field  
17    area. As indicated, the production has been higher and a  
18    little more stable but still this reflects the ability to  
19    overcome line pressure problems, keep the well producing at  
20    its deliverability.

21                    Q             Referring to Exhibit Number Four, would  
22    you describe the current completion status of the well?

23                    A             Yes. As indicated, the well was com-  
24    pleted with 4-1/2 inch casing to total depth through the  
25    Morrow interval. It was perforated in the Morrow section,

1 initially from 11,177 feet to 11,314 feet overall interval.  
2 Those perforations produced through the tubing until May of  
3 1987. Then the Upper Morrow perforations were added, which  
4 -- from 10,951 to 11,122 feet overall, and, as indicated,  
5 the uppermost set of perforations, 10,951 to 10,956 feet,  
6 appear to be in the Atoka section. These perforations, and  
7 the former Morrow perforations, have all been commingled  
8 since May of 1987, produced through the tubing in this well  
9 while the Strawn dual zone was completed up the casing  
10 annulus during this same period of time, so no separate  
11 pressure information is available for what is now the Atoka  
12 designated interval.

13 Q Have you made an estimate of the Atoka's  
14 contribution to production, and I refer you to Exhibit  
15 Five?

16 A Exhibit Five indicates the surface shut-  
17 in pressure data and history of the Morrow zone, and indi-  
18 cating that up until just prior to May of 1987 the pressure  
19 was on a trend, straight line trend, and about 1000 pounds  
20 surface shut-in pressure.

21 About -- after the additional perfora-  
22 tions in the Morrow were added it appears the pressure in-  
23 creased about 170 pounds and current information indicates  
24 that it is on a similar straight line decline trend with  
25 the former pressure information, except about 170 pounds

1 higher overall.

2 This indicates that the additional per-  
3 forations were not that different in pressure initially  
4 than the existing pressure in the Morrow perforated inter-  
5 val.

6 Q And using those pressures, what did you  
7 come up with as a percentage of production which should be  
8 allocated to the Atoka?

9 A It appears that the overall increase has  
10 been about 5 percent that could be allocated to the Atoka  
11 set of perforations.

12 The initial production rate after adding  
13 the three sets of perforations, which included two Morrow  
14 and one Atoka as now indicated added about 62 MCF per day  
15 and of that portion, about 25 MCF a day based on the volu-  
16 metric parameters of the zone's porosity thickness indi-  
17 cated it contributed about 41 percent but the -- in the  
18 total well production stream, 25 MCF per day represents  
19 about 5 percent of a 535 MCF a day current rate.

20 Q And what is your estimation regarding  
21 the potential cross flow between zones?

22 A The cross flow has probably been negli-  
23 gible, if any. The wellbore pressure, as indicated right  
24 after completion, adding the additional zones, did not re-  
25 flect any substantial increase in pressure. The well has

1 produced at capacity since before and after we added the  
2 perforations. The well, as indicated, is now on compres-  
3 sion and the flowing tubing pressure, compressor suction  
4 pressure is about 230 pounds at the wellhead, discharging  
5 into about a 500 pound line system.

6 Q Why did you request that separate  
7 testing not be required and that both the Morrow and Atoka  
8 be allowed to produce through the tubing?

9 A The Morrow formation has a history of  
10 damage susceptibility on drilling and completion work. The  
11 work that was done here in the Morrow to add perforations  
12 was done through tubing with the idea that we would mini-  
13 mize any possible damage to the existing perforations in  
14 the Morrow at that time.

15 Had we had -- if the well had to be  
16 isolated in the Atoka zone, we would have to, of course,  
17 kill the well, so to speak, and pull tubing and packer and  
18 perhaps have some potential damage from those fluids that  
19 might have to be used.

20 In addition, with the Strawn interval  
21 already present in the wellbore with open perforations, we  
22 would then have a triple completion requirement to produce  
23 all the zones or we would have to isolate one formation or  
24 the other, being the Atoka or Strawn, most likely, as the  
25 more marginal intervals, to defer recovery of whatever re-

1 serves remain at that point?

2 The cost even at that point would be  
3 again the damage possibility and another string of tubing  
4 and another packer, probably.

5 Q Referring to Exhibit Number Six, would  
6 you discuss the compatibility of the gas in the Atoka and  
7 the Morrow formations?

8 A Exhibit Six is the gas chromatigraph  
9 data of well stream gas analysis and the sampling dates  
10 indicating from just before adding the additional perfor-  
11 ations in the Morrow to just after and then to about six  
12 months ago or current.

13 The analysis indicates the components  
14 are almost identical on each item. The BTU around 1100 is  
15 almost identical. The liquid content of gas, of course,  
16 primarily the methane content, about 91 percent in all  
17 samples before, after and current.

18 And is interest ownership the same in  
19 the Atoka, Morrow and Strawn zones?

20 A Yes, it is.

21 Q In your opinion, Mr. Sprinkle, is the  
22 granting of this application in the interest of conserva-  
23 tion, the prevention of waste, and the protection of corre-  
24 lative rights?

25 A Yes.

1 Q And were Exhibits Three through Six  
2 prepared under your direction?

3 A Yes, they were.

4 Q All right.

5 MR. BRUCE: Mr. Examiner, I  
6 move the admission of Exhibits Three through Six.

7 MR. CATANACH: Exhibits Three  
8 through Six will be admitted as evidence.

9 MR. BRUCE: Two last items,  
10 Mr. Examiner. Exhibit Number Seven, which is submitted as  
11 the affidavit regarding mailing of notice to the offsets, I  
12 ask be admitted.

13 And, finally, regarding the  
14 nonstandard unit, Exhibit Number One submitted in Case 9342  
15 is a land plat which shows the governmental survey which is  
16 the reason for the nonstandard unit.

17 And that concludes my examina-  
18 tion.

19 MR. CATANACH: Mr. Bruce, were  
20 all the parties, or the offset operators to this unit, they  
21 were notified of the nonstandard proration unit and the  
22 downhole commingling?

23 MR. BRUCE: And the downhole  
24 commingling.

25 MR. CATANACH: Exhibit Number

1 Seven will be admitted as evidence.

2

3

CROSS EXAMINATION

4

BY MR. CATANACH:

5

6

7

8

Q Mr. Sprinkle, a little -- going over your production data a little bit further, when the appropriations were added in 1987 you said you had an increase of 62 MCF per day?

9

A Yes.

10

11

Q And of that you attributed approximately 25 MCF to the Atoka?

12

A Yes.

13

Q (Not clearly understood).

14

15

16

17

A Again that was based on porosity feel, net feet of pay, and average porosity of that pay in the interval and from log calculations.

18

19

20

Q Now, based on that have you calculated any reserves which might be in the Atoka, any remaining reserves? Or is there any way you could do that?

21

22

23

24

A Well, I -- with that contribution of the total well stream it indicated about 5 percent, but we would just have to proportionately allocate remaining reserves of the well likewise.

25

Q Now the 5 percent, that was the contri-

1 bution you felt of the 25 MCF at the time -- at that time?

2 A Yes.

3 Q So are there any liquids produced in the  
4 Morrow or Atoka?

5 A Very little. The well makes a few bar-  
6 rels of liquids a day; currently about 1.3 barrels a day.  
7 And of that amount only about .07 barrels could be attri-  
8 buted to the Atoka section.

9 Q That would be also based on the 5 per-  
10 cent?

11 A Yes.

12 Q Mr. Sprinkle, is this Morrow Pool,  
13 that's not a prorated pool, is it?

14 A No. We've been at full capacities,  
15 barring the pipeline, and market restrictions, since the  
16 inception of production in that well.

17 MR. CATANACH: That's all the  
18 questions I have of the witness.

19 He may be excused.

20 One more time, Mr. Bruce, the  
21 Division Order NSP-1490 has to be amended to add --

22 MR. BRUCE: The Atoka and the  
23 Strawn.

24 MR. CATANACH; -- the Atoka  
25 and the Strawn.



1 MR. BRUCE: Mr. Examiner, in  
2 answer to your last question of Mr. Sprinkle, the Burton  
3 Flat Morrow and Strawn are prorated but these are -- these  
4 wells, I believe, are in the East Burton Flats Strawn and  
5 Morrow, which are not prorated.

6 MR. CATANACH: That's all the  
7 questions I have.

8 Anything further in this case?  
9 If not, Case 9663 will be  
10 taken under advisement.

11

12 (Hearing concluded.)

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## C E R T I F I C A T E

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

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is  
a complete record of the proceedings in  
the Examiner hearing of Case No. 9663,  
heard by me on August 23 19 58.

David L. Catamuck, Examiner  
Oil Conservation Division

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

26 July 1989

EXAMINER HEARING

IN THE MATTER OF:

In the matter of cases called on this	CASES
date and continued or dismissed with-	9689
out testimony presented.	9698
	9700
	9703
	9706
	9709
	8668
	8769
	9663

BEFORE: David R. Catanach, Examiner

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

A P P E A R A N C E S

For the Division:

Robert G. Stovall  
Attorney at Law  
Legal Counsel to the Division  
State Land Office Building  
Santa Fe, New Mexico

## I N D E X

1		
2		
3	CASE 9689	3
4	CASE 9698	4
5	CASE 9700	5
6	CASE 9703	7
7	CASE 9706	8
8	CASE 9709	9
9	CASE 8668	10
10	CASE 8769	11
11	CASE 9663	6
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 MR. CATANACH: We'll call this  
2 hearing to order this morning for Docket No. 22-89.

3 We'll call the continuances  
4 and dismissals first.

5 Call Case 9689.

6 MR. STOVALL: Application of  
7 Yates Petroleum Corporation for a unit agreement, Lea  
8 County, New Mexico.

9 Applicant requests this case  
10 be dismissed.

11 MR. CATANACH: Case 9689 is  
12 hereby dismissed.

13  
14 (Hearing concluded.)  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 MR. CATANACH: Call Case 9698.

2 MR. STOVALL: Application of  
3 Yates Petroleum Corporation for an unorthodox gas well  
4 location, Chaves County, New Mexico.

5 Applicant requests this case  
6 be continued to August 9th, 1989, hearing.

7 MR. CATANACH; Case 9698 will  
8 be continued to August 9th.

9

10 (Hearing concluded.)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 MR. CATANACH: Call Case 9700.

2 MR. STOVALL: Application of  
3 Yates Petroleum Corporation for compulsory pooling, Eddy  
4 County, New Mexico.

5 Applicant requests this case  
6 be continued to August 9th, 1989.

7 MR. CATANACH: Case 9700 will  
8 be continued to August 9th.

9

10 (Hearing concluded.)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 MR. CATANACH: Call next Case  
2 9663.

3 MR. STOVALL: Application of  
4 The Petroleum Corporation of Delaware for downhole com-  
5 mingling, the amendment of Division Order R-7269, and the  
6 amendment of Division Administrative Order NSP-1290, Eddy  
7 County, New Mexico.

8 Applicant requests this case  
9 be continued to August 23rd, 1989.

10 MR. CATANACH: Case 9663 is  
11 hereby continued to August 23rd.

12  
13 (Hearing concluded.)  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25



1 MR. CATANACH: Call Case 9703.

2 MR. STOVALL: Application of  
3 Meridian Oil, Inc., for exemption from the Natural Gas --  
4 New Mexico Natural Gas Pricing Act, San Juan County, New  
5 Mexico.

6 Applicant requests this case  
7 be continued to August 9th, 1989.

8 MR. CATANACH: Case 9703 is  
9 hereby continued to August 9th.

10

11 (Hearing concluded.)

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



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

MR. CATANACH: Call Case 9706.

MR. STOVALL: Application of  
Bahlberg Exploration for an unorthodox oil well location,  
Lea County, New Mexico.

Applicant requests this case  
be continued to August 9th, 1989.

MR. CATANACH: Case 9706 is  
hereby continued to August 9th.

(Hearing concluded.)

1 MR. CATANACH: Call Case 9709.

2 MR. STOVALL: Application of  
3 Pacific Enterprises Oil Company for compulsory pooling, Lea  
4 County, New Mexico.

5 Applicant requests this case  
6 be continued to August 9th.

7 MR. CATANACH: Case 9709 is  
8 hereby continued to August 9th.

9

10 (Hearing concluded.)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 MR. CATANACH: Case 8668.

2 MR. STOVALL: In the matter of  
3 the -- of Case No. 8668 being reopened upon application of  
4 Howard Olsen to reconsider the provisions of Division Order  
5 No. R-8031 issued in said Case No. 8668, dated May 27th,  
6 1985.

7 Applicant requests this case  
8 be continued to August 9th, 1989.

9 MR. CATANACH: Case 8668 will  
10 be continued to August 9th.

11  
12 (Hearing concluded.)  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 MR. CATANACH: Call Case 8769.

2 MR. STOVALL: In the matter of  
3 Case No. 8769 being reopened upon application of Howard  
4 Olsen to reconsider the provisions of Division Order No.  
5 R-8091 issued in said Case 8769.

6 Applicant requests this case  
7 be continued to August 9th, 1989.

8 MR. CATANACH: Case 8769 is  
9 hereby continued to August 9th.

10

11

(Hearing concluded.)

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## C E R T I F I C A T E

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

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is  
a complete record of the proceedings in  
the Examiner hearing of Case No. \_\_\_\_\_,  
heard by me on July 26, 1988.

David E. Cribb, Examiner  
Oil Conservation Division

1 STATE OF NEW MEXICO  
2 ENERGY, MINERALS AND NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT  
3 OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION  
4 STATE LAND OFFICE BUILDING  
5 SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

6 12 July 1989

7 EXAMINER HEARING

8 IN THE MATTER OF:

9 Application of The Petroleum Corpor- CASE  
10 ation of Delaware for downhole com- 9663  
11 mingling, the amendment of Division  
12 Order No. R-7269, and the amendment  
13 of Division Administrative Order NSP-  
14 1290, Eddy County, New Mexico.

15 BEFORE: Michael E. Stogner, Examiner  
16

17 TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

18 A P P E A R A N C E S  
19

20 For the Division:

21 For the Applicant:  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 MR. STOGNER: At this time I'm  
2 going to call Case Number 9663, which is the application of  
3 Petroleum Corporation of Delaware for downhole commingling,  
4 the amendment of Division Order No. R-7269 and the amend-  
5 ment of Division Administrative Order NSP-1290, Eddy  
6 County, New Mexico.

7 At the applicant's request  
8 this case will be continued to the Examiner's hearing  
9 scheduled for July 26th, 1989.

10 And with that, the hearing is  
11 adjourned.

12  
13 (Hearing concluded.)  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25



## C E R T I F I C A T E

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

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is  
a complete record of the proceedings in  
the Examiner hearing of Case No. 9663,  
heard by me on 12 July 1989.

M. H. Hogue

, Examiner

Oil Conservation Division

1 STATE OF NEW MEXICO  
2 ENERGY, MINERALS AND NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT  
3 OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION  
4 STATE LAND OFFICE BUILDING  
5 SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

6 12 July 1989

7 EXAMINER HEARING

8 IN THE MATTER OF:

9 Application of The Petroleum Corpor- CASE  
10 ation of Delaware for downhole com- 9663  
11 mingling, the amendment of Division  
12 Order No. R-7269, and the amendment  
13 of Division Administrative Order NSP-  
14 1290, Eddy County, New Mexico.

15 BEFORE: Michael E. Stogner, Examiner

16 TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

17 A P P E A R A N C E S

18 For the Division:

19 For the Applicant:

1 MR. STOGNER: At this time I'm  
2 going to call Case Number 9663, which is the application of  
3 Petroleum Corporation of Delaware for downhole commingling,  
4 the amendment of Division Order No. R-7269 and the amend-  
5 ment of Division Administrative Order NSP-1290, Eddy  
6 County, New Mexico.

7 At the applicant's request  
8 this case will be continued to the Examiner's hearing  
9 scheduled for July 26th, 1989.

10 And with that, the hearing is  
11 adjourned.

12  
13 (Hearing concluded.)  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

## C E R T I F I C A T E

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

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is  
a complete record of the proceedings in  
the Examiner hearing of Case No. 9663,  
heard by me on 12 July 19 59.  
Michael S. Higgins, Examiner  
Oil Conservation Division

1 STATE OF NEW MEXICO  
2 ENERGY, MINERALS AND NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT  
3 OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION  
4 STATE LAND OFFICE BUILDING  
5 SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

6 21 June 1989

7 EXAMINER HEARING

8 IN THE MATTER OF:

9 Application of Union Texas Petroleum CASE  
for exemption from the New Mexico 8413  
Natural Gas Pricing Act, (NMPA), and

10 Application of The Petroleum Corpora- 9663  
tion of Delaware for downhole comming-  
11 ling, the amendment of Division Order  
12 No. R-7269, and the amendment of Div-  
13 ision Administrative Order NSP-1290,  
Eddy County, New Mexico.

14  
15 BEFORE: David R. Catanach, Examiner

16  
17 TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

18  
19 A P P E A R A N C E S

20 For the Division:

21 Robert G. Stovall  
22 Attorney at Law  
23 Legal Counsel to the Division  
24 State Land Office Building  
25 Santa Fe, New Mexico

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

I N D E X

2

CASE NO. 8413

3

CASE NO. 9663

4

1 MR. CATANACH: The hearing  
2 will come to order for Docket Number 19-89.

3 We'll call the dismissals and  
4 continuances first this morning.

5 Call Case 8413.

6 MR. STOVALL: The application  
7 of Union Texas Petroleum for exemption from the New Mexico  
8 Natural Gas Pricing Act.

9 The applicant requests this  
10 case be dismissed.

11 MR. CATANACH: Case 8413 is  
12 hereby dismissed.

13

14 (Hearing concluded.)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 MR. CATANACH: Call Case 9663.

2 MR. STOVALL: Application of  
3 the Petroleum Corporation of Delaware for downhole com-  
4 mingling, the amendment of Division Order No. R-7269, and  
5 the amendment of Division Administrative Order NSP-1290,  
6 Eddy County, New Mexico.

7 Applicant requests this case  
8 be continued to July 12th, 1989.

9 MR. CATANACH: Case 9663 will  
10 be continued to the July 12th, 1989 docket.

11

12 (Hearing concluded.)

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



## C E R T I F I C A T E

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

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is  
a complete record of the proceedings in  
the Examiner hearing of Case No. 8413 9663  
heard by me on June 21 19 85.

David R. Cutamb, Examiner  
Oil Conservation Division

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

7 June 1989

EXAMINER HEARING

IN THE MATTER OF:

In the matter of cases called on this  
date and continued or dismissed with-  
out testimony presented.

CASES  
8413  
9123  
9124  
9663  
9639  
9641

*Transcript in  
Case 8413*

BEFORE: Michael E. Stogner, Examiner

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

A P P E A R A N C E S

For the Division:

Robert G. Stovall  
Attorney at Law  
Legal Counsel to the Division  
State Land Office Building  
Santa Fe, New Mexico

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

10 May 1989

EXAMINER HEARING

IN THE MATTER OF:

In the matter of cases called on this  
date and continued or dismissed with-  
out testimony presented.

CASES  
9654  
9682  
9663  
9639  
9641

*Transcript in Case 9654*

BEFORE: Michael E. Stogner, Examiner

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

A P P E A R A N C E S

For the Division: