1	STATE OF NEW MEXICO ENERGY AND MINERALS DEPARTMENT			
2	OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION STATE LAND OFFICE BUILDING SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO			
3	6 August 1986			
4				
5	EXAMINER HEARING			
6				
7				
8	IN THE MATTER OF:			
9	Application of Tenneco Oil Company CASE for an unorthodox oil well location, 8966 Lea County, New Mexico.			
10	arm or more menages v			
11				
12				
13				
14	BEFORE: Michael E. Stogner, Examiner			
15				
16				
17	TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING			
18				
19	APPEARANCES			
20	For the Oil Conservation Jeff Taylor			
21	Division: Attorney at Law Legal Counsel to the Division			
22	State Land Office Bldg. Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501			
23				
24	For the Applicant: W. Thomas Kellahin			
25	Attorney at Law KELLAHIN & KELLAHIN P. O. Box 2265 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501			

1		2	
2	INDEX		
3			
4	GARY C. FITZSIMMONS		
5	Direct Examination by Mr. Kellahin	4	
6	Cross Examination by Mr. Stogner	10	
7			
8			
9			
10 11			
12			
13	ЕХНІВІТЅ		
14			
15	Tenneco Exhibit One, Plat	4	
16	Tenneco Exhibit Two, Structure Map	6	
17	Tenneco Exhibit Three, Porosity Map	8	
18	Tenneco Exhibit Four, Return Receipts	9	
19			
20			
21			
23			
24			
25			

```
3
1
2
                                MR. STOGNER: Call Case Number
3
   8966.
                                MR. TAYLOR: The application of
5
   Tenneco Oil Company for an unorthodox oil well location, Lea
   County, New Mexico.
7
                                     STOGNER: Call for appear-
                                ER.
   ances.
9
                                     KELLAHIN: If the Examiner
                                MR.
10
   please, I'm Tom Kellahin of the Santa Fe law firm of Kella-
11
   hin and Kellahin, appearing on behalf of the applicant, and
12
   I have one witness to be sworn.
13
                                MR.
                                     STOGNER:
                                                Are there any
14
   other appearances?
15
                                Will the witness please stand
16
   and be sworn at this time?
17
18
                          (Witness sworn.)
19
20
                       GARY C. FITZSIMMONS,
21
   being called as a witness and being duly sworn upon his
22
   oath, testified as follows, to-wit:
23
```

24

25

1

2

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

3 BY MR. KELLAHIN:

4 Q Mr. Fitzsimmons, for the record would you

please state your name and occupation?

6 A Gary Fitzsimmons. I'm a Senior Geologist

7 for Tenneco Oil.

8 Q Mr. Fitzsimmons, as a geologist for Ten-

9 neco have you previously testified before the Oil Conserva-

10 tion Division?

11 A Yes, I have.

Pursuant to your employment have you made

13 a study of the geology surrounding Tenneco's application for

14 an unorthodox oil well location as advertised before the

15 Division today?

16 A Yes, I have.

MR. KELLAHIN: We tender Mr.

18 Fitzsimmons as an expert petroleum geologist.

MR. STOGNER: Mr. Fitzsimmons

20 is so qualified.

21 Q Mr. Fitzsimmons, let me direct your at-

22 tention to Exhibit Number One and have you first of all

23 identify the proposed oil well location that you seek appro-

24 val for.

A Okay. The proposal is the location lo-

```
1
   cated 330 from the north, 330 from the -- from the west, in
2
   the northwest quarter of the northeast of Section 24.
3
                       The proposed oil well is to be drilled to
   attempt a completion in what formation?
5
                       The Range Lake zone of the Pennsylvanian.
             Α
6
                       And is this zone designated as a pool un-
             Q
7
   der the rules of the Oil Conservation Division?
8
             Α
                      As we understand it, yes.
9
                       And this is located in Lea County,
             Q
                                                             New
10
   Mexico.
11
             Ά
                       Yes.
12
                      What are the spacing rules for the Ranger
13
   Lake Penn Pool, Mr. Fitzsimmons?
14
             Α
                       Well, this location, if it was going to
15
   meet the general rules, would have to be 660 off the north
16
   and 660 off the west line of the northest quarter.
17
             Q
                      And how many acres would you have to de-
18
   dicate to the well?
19
                       80.
             A
20
                       What is the proposed orientation or dedi-
21
   cation of acreage to the well?
22
                       Well, upright, as far as I know.
             Α
23
             Q
                        What is the closest well that has been
24
   completed and produces out of the Ranger Lake Zone?
25
             Α
                       The closest well to our proposed location
```

is a well that we drilled in the southwest of the -- southeast of southwest quarter of Section 13, which is the State
"QE" 13-1. We've had this well on production over, a little
over a month.

5

6

7

8

Q Let's turn, sir, now to Exhibit Number Two and would you identify for us Exhibit Number Two?

A Well, Exhibit Number Two is a seismically integrated structure map on the Penn marker that we use to determine the structure at that level.

Orient us as to the information depicted on Exhibit Number Two, Mr. Fitzsimmons, by explaining to us where the proposed location lies in relation to established production.

A Okay. The proposed location lies in Sec-15 tion 24. It's captioned, so captioned.

The bulk of the production for the Ranger

Lake Zone is located in Section 23, 26, and 27, which is

from the same zone that we're producing from our well in

Section 13.

The bulk of production seen in 14 is from a different zone higher up in the section. What we're dealing with is a stratigraphic trapping situation.

Original interpretation, we shot two seismic lines, a diagonal designated 10,127, and a north/south,
this is a 10,126, were proprietary lines which we shot. Our

original interpretation had us being structurally equivalent to what we see in the field, the Range Lake Field, which is that located in 23, 26, and 27.

5

6

7

8

9

Subsequent to drilling the well we came in approximately 50 feet to our prognosis, which really created problems for us because in the northeast quarter of Section 35 there is a dry hole that tested oil and water just slightly structurally lower to our location up in Section 13.

10 subsequent re-interpretation of the 11 seismic indicated that structurally, by going into an ortho-12 dox location in Section 24, we want to run a real risk of 13 being located structurally down dip to this dry hole that 14 did test oil and water, and considering the risks, the ini-15 tial risk of having our original interpretation being wrong, 16 we felt that we needed to reduce the structural risk as much 17 possible while locating as up dip as possible in that 18 particular location, which would be the request we're making 19 now.

20 Q If you follow the oil/water contact
21 that's indicated on Exhibit Number Two, first of all ident22 ify how you have labeled or interpreted the location of the
23 oil/water contact on the exhibit.

A Okay. The oil/water contact is designated by that dashed line, hachured line, that is so marked,

oil/water contact, and assuming that that does indicate an oil/water contact, that structural contour slightly down dip to that well location, should approximate that line, and then I just projected that contour interval up to the prospect area.

As you have interpreted the proposed or the anticipated oil/water contact, if the proposed location is at a standard location, it is your opinion, then, that there's a significant risk that you would be down structure into the water.

11 A Yes, that's our interpretation at this
12 time.

And the proposed unorthodox location places you at a point that you interpret to be above the oil/water contact.

16 A Yes.

1

5

7

8

10

17 Q Let's turn to Exhibit Number Three, and 18 have you identify that exhibit.

A What this is is a total porosity map using a 6 percent cutoff, which means that anything less than
percent porosity as determined by log analysis was not
considered to be effective porosity for -- for our needs.

24 ject a thick trend of porosity thickness across the prospect 25 area. As you can see, we ended up with about 9 feet of effective porosity, which is much less than what you see in the main producing trend of the field. And 9 feet isn't necessarily bad but it certainly creates problems as to determining where to go next as far as where the porosity could thicken up, and at this point we simply do not know what to expect in any offset location that does not go directly towards the field.

So what you see is an interpretation that does create some potential to the northwest and some slighter potential to the southeast but the reality is that we just don't know.

So there is a real, significant risk involved with the porosity development, and again, that's why we want to get in as close as we can to the original well because that does reduce our risk in finding adequate porosity.

Were Exhibit Two and Three prepared by you?

 $^{\text{A}}$  Yes.

MR. KELLAHIN: Mr. Examiner,

Exhibit Number Four represents the return receipts by which

our firm has notified the offset operators to the location.

In addition your file will show that we have waivers from all those operators.

That concludes our presentation

```
1
   on behalf of Tenneco and we move the introduction of
2
   Exhibits One through Four.
3
                                MR.
                                      STOGNER:
                                                  Exhibits One
4
   through four will be admitted into evidence.
5
6
                        CROSS EXAMINATION
7
   BY MR. STOGNER:
8
            Q
                       One little discrepancy here I'd like to
   get cleared up.
10
                      Has the well been drilled yet?
11
            A
                      For the proposed location, no, it has not.
12
                      Okay. I advertised it as being 2308 feet
13
   from the east line. I show -- where I got that information
14
   was the copy of the C-102 which came with the application
15
   and all other shows 2310 feet. That's a 2-foot discrepancy
16
   and I believe we can overlook that since you have waivers at
17
   this time, and we'll go ahead and continue with the adver-
18
   tisement as is, unless, Mr. Kellahin, you have any -- any-
19
   thing to add to that.
20
                                MR. KELLAHIN: No, sir.
21
            О
                       Let's refer back to Exhibit Number One.
22
   What is Tenneco's relationship to Union Texas Exploration
23
   with this particular 80 acres?
24
                      Well, we have a farmout option from them
            Α
25
   and we have a time restraint.
```

```
11
1
            Q
                     What is that time restraint?
2
                      Well, we -- at the present time we have
            Α
3
   to spud in and be drilling by September lst or we lose the
   lease.
5
                      Okay. Are you familiar with the Ranger
6
   Lake Pennsylvanian Pool rules?
7
            Α
                      Well, I have experience with them. I'm
8
   not an expert on the rules.
9
                      Okay.
            Q
10
            A
                      I know we have 80-acre spacing in the
11
   field.
12
                      Okay. So this is unorthodox because the
13
   pool rules state that you have to be 150 foot from the cen-
14
   ter of either --
15
            Α
                      Yes.
16
            Q
                      -- quarter quarter section?
17
            A
                      Yes, that's -- that's the rules that ap-
18
   ply.
19
                     All right.
            Q
20
                                MR. STOGNER: I have no further
21
   questions of Mr. Fitzsimmons at this time.
22
                                Are there any other questions
23
   of this witness?
24
                                MR. KELLAHIN: No, sir.
25
                                MR. STOGNER: Mr. Fitzsimmmons
```

```
12
 1
   may be excused.
 2
                                  Is there -- does anybody else
   have anything further in Case Number 8966?
3
                                 If not, this case will be taken
5
    under advisement.
6
 7
                         (Hearing concluded.)
 8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1 2 CERTIFICATE 3 I, SALLY W. BOYD, C.S.R., DO HEREBY 5 CERTIFY that the foregoing Transcript of Hearing before Oil Conservation Division (Commission) was reported by that the said transcript is a full, true, and correct record 8 of the hearing prepared by me to the best of my ability. 9 10 11 Solly W. Boyd CSR 12 13 14 15 16 I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a complete record of the proceedings in 17 the Examiner hearing of Case No. 8966. iheard by me on to Sugart 1986. 18 Station, Examiner 19 Oil Conservation Division 10/15/86 20 21 22 23 24 25