

STATE OF NEW MEXICO
ENERGY AND MINERALS DEPARTMENT
OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION
STATE LAND OFFICE BLDG.
Santa Fe, New Mexico

21 January 1987

EXAMINER HEARING

IN THE MATTER OF:

The hearing called by the Oil Conservation Division on its own motion for an order creating, abolishing, and extending certain pools in Chaves and Eddy Counties, New Mexico. CASE 9069

BEFORE: David R. Catanach, Examiner

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

A P P E A R A N C E S

For the Division: Jeff Taylor
Legal Counsel to the Division
Oil Conservation Division
State Land Office Bldg.
Santa Fe, New Mexico

For the Applicant:

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

MICHAEL E. STOGNER

Direct Examination by Mr. Taylor

E X H I B I T S

Division Exhibit One, Documents

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: We'll call next Case 9069, in the matter of the hearing called by the Oil Conservation Division on its own motion for an order creating, abolishing, and extending certain pools in Chaves and Eddy Counties, New Mexico.

Are there appearances in this case?

MR. TAYLOR: May it please the Examiner, I am Jeff Taylor, Counsel for the Division and I have one witness.

MR. CATANACH: Will the witness please stand and be sworn in?

(Witness sworn.)

MICHAEL E. STOGNER,
being called as a witness and being duly sworn upon his oath, testified as follows, to-wit:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. TAYLOR:

Q Would you please state your name, by whom you're employed and in what capacity?

A Michael E. Stogner, petroleum engineer

1 with the Oil Conservation Division here in Santa Fe.

2 Q Mr. Stogner, you've previously testified
3 before the Commission or its examiners and had your creden-
4 tials accepted?

5 A Yes, I have.

6 MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Examiner, I
7 tender the witness as an expert.

8 MR. CATANACH: The witness is
9 considered qualified.

10 Q Mr. Stogner, are you prepared to make re-
11 commendations to the examiner concerning the nomenclature of
12 certain pools in Chaves and Eddy Counties, New Mexico?

13 A Yes, I am.

14 Q Are your recommendations prepared in the
15 form of an exhibit?

16 A Yes, they are.

17 Q And how is that exhibit denominated?

18 A With the number one.

19 Q Exhibit One?

20 A Yes.

21 Q Would you please refer to this Exhibit
22 One and to the docket that's been prepared and distributed
23 at the hearing today and point out any difference between
24 the two?

25 A There is one difference. That is in par-

1 agraph (f), the East Carlsbad-Wolfcamp Gas Pool. On the
2 docket it appears as Township 21 South, Range 27 East.

3 That should read Township 22 South.

4 And that's the only change. I do have
5 one additional comment at this time.

6 Q So other than that change in paragraph
7 (f) the docket as listed in Case 9069 correctly shows the
8 nomenclature.

9 A That is correct.

10 Q Okay. And what's your additional com-
11 ment?

12 A On the 19th of January we received a let-
13 ter dated January 16th, 1987, from Lundberg Industries, Lim-
14 ited, concerning the proposed Getty Bone Spring Pool in
15 Township 20 South, Range 29 East, Section 15, the northeast
16 quarter.

17 They notified us that the discovery well,
18 the Williamson Federal No. 5, was approximately 2,250 feet
19 from their mine workings, known as the Lundberg Mine, down
20 in the Carlsbad area.

21 They do not oppose to the formation of
22 this pool at this time; however, we will be studying exten-
23 ding the R-111-A area in this particular location.

24 That's all I have on this.

25 Q Okay, thank you.

1 MR. TAYLOR: That's all we have
2 in this matter, Mr. Examiner.

3 MR. CATANACH: Mr. Stogner, the
4 -- in the nomenclature case you stated paragraph (f) was in-
5 correct. Is that incorrect on the docket?

6 A Yes, it's incorrect on the docket. That
7 should be 22 South.

8 Q Do you feel the Division should readver-
9 tise that?

10 A No, because what appears on the docket is
11 not advertised; only the name of the pool is advertised in
12 the papers.

13 Q Okay.

14 Is there anything further in
15 Case 9069?

16 It will be taken under advise-
17 ment.

18

19

20 (Hearing concluded.)

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, SALLY W. BOYD, C.S.R., DO
HEREBY CERTIFY 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. 9069,
heard by me on 1/21 1987 :

David R. Catanach, Examiner
Oil Conservation Division