

BEFORE THE
OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION
STATE OF NEW MEXICO

Transcript of Hearing

Case No. 318

October 23, 1951

E. E. GREESON
ADA DEARNLEY
COURT REPORTERS
BOX 1303
PHONES 5-9422 AND 5-9546
ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO

BEFORE THE
OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

- - - -

IN THE MATTER OF:

Application of Blackwood and Nichols
Company for approval of the Northeast
Blanco Unit Area embracing a total
of 32,991.40 acres of land in Townships
30 and 31 North, Ranges 6, 7 and 8 West,
San Juan and Rio Arriba Counties, New
Mexico.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

Case No. 318

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

October 23, 1951

MR. SPURRIER: The next case on the Docket is Case No. 318.

(Mr. Kellahin reads the notice of publication.)

MR. SPURRIER: Let the record show that the land description has been read.

MR. OLIVER SETH: We have two witness. If the Commission please this is an application by the partnership of Black and Blackwood and Nichols for approval of a unit agreement by the name of the Northeast Blanco Unit. The land is located in Northwestern New Mexico on Ranges 6 and 7 west, 30 and 31 North. A portion in 8 west, 30 north and 8 west 31 north. The petition and application is in the usual form, and as the notice indicated, embraces approximately 33,000 acres of land. As indicated also in the application, there are approximately 26,000 acres of Federal land, 3,753 acres of state land, and 3,161 acres of patented land. We would like to call as our first witness Mr. Bill Nye.

BILL NYE,

having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

By MR. OLIVER SETH:

Q Would you state your name please?

A Bill Nye.

Q What is your position and occupation, Mr. Nye?

A I own an abstract plant in San Juan County.

Q Are you familiar with the ownership of the lands that are within the proposed northeast Blanco Unit Area, Mr. Nye?

A Yes, sir, I am.

Q Would you please refer to the exhibit attached to the application together with the recapitulation portion and state to the Commission approximately the acreage committed to the unit agreement at the present time?

A Are you talking about the Federal?

Q Would you take each classification separately, Federal land, state and patented. What was the total state acreage approximately?

A The state acreage is 41.3 per cent committed, and 58.7 not committed. Do you have the Federal there?

Q Of a total of approximately how much state land there, Mr. Nye?

A 3,752 acres.

Q Now would you give the same testimony as to the Federal acreage?

A On the Federal acreage the fully committed is 24,411 acres.

Q Continue.

A The acreage partially committed is 3553 acres. Now, that is all on the Federal.

Q And do you have the information on the patented available?

A I do, sir.

Q What is the figure on that?

A Well, we don't have a recapitulation on this patented.

Q Well, would you state total figures for the whole north-east Blanco Unit, fully committed, partly committed and not committed?

A Leases fully committed, 24,700 acres, 73.99 per cent; leases partly committed, 3,553 and the percentage is 10.77; and the leases not committed, 15,026 acres, and the percentage is 15.24. Which means that there is approximately 84 per cent committed.

Q You are generally familiar with the ownership of the lands within the proposed Unit Agreement?

A Yes, sir.

Q And these approximate figures you have mentioned in your opinion accurately set forth the lands committed so far as you know?

A They are correct, yes, sir.

Q Does the Unit Agreement itself give the opportunity for those -- for the not committed acreage -- to participate at anytime it wishes to join?

A It does.

MR. OLIVER SETH: I believe that is all the direct testimony.

MR. KELLAHIN: I have a question, Mr. Nye.

Q I notice your description in Township 30 north, range

7 west, you list tracts 39 through 46 and again under Township 31 north, range 7 west, you list tracts 49 through 52. Is that description taken from a legal survey or an official plat?

A Now wait a minute.

MR. J. O. SETH: I might state there has been a resurvey of the Township by the Federal Government and each patented piece was given a tract number. That is what it means.

MR. SPURRIER: Does anyone have any other questions of this witness? If not, the witness may be excused.

(Witness excused.)

PAUL H. UMBACH,

having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

By MR. OLIVER SETH:

Q Mr. Umbach, would you state your name please?

A Paul Umbach.

Q What is your occupation, Mr. Umbach?

A I am a geologist for the Stanolind Oil and Gas Company.

Q Have you previously qualified as a geologist before this Commission?

A I have.

Q And given testimony at previous hearings?

A I have.

Q Are you familiar with the geology in the area covered

by the proposed northeast Blanco Unit?

A I am.

Q Would you describe to the Commission briefly the indication of a structure, if there is one, within this area?

A The map presented --

Q Would you identify -- are you familiar with this map that I hand you now?

A Yes, I am.

Q I hand you what has been marked Exhibit A for identification, and ask you to state to the Commission what this map is and what it represents.

A This is a magnetometer map which has been worked by the Stanolind Oil and Gas Company. It represents the outline, or it is the map on which the outline of the unit area was based upon.

Q Does the proposed unit area embrace the indicated structure on Exhibit A?

A Yes, it does.

Q In your opinion, after examination of this map, and based upon your knowledge of the geology in the area, will a unit covering this area tend to promote the best, and enable the best, recovery of oil in this area?

A It will.

Q And tend to promote conservation?

A It will.

MR. OLIVER SETH: I believe that is all the direct testimony.

MR. SPURRIER: Does anyone have any question of this witness? If not, the witness may be excused.

(Witness excused.)

MR. OLIVER SETH: I would like to offer Exhibit A in evidence.

MR. SPURRIER: The exhibit will be received.

MR. OLIVER SETH: That's all.

MR. SPURRIER: Does anyone have any comment, any further comment in this case? If not, we will take it under advisement and go on to Case No. 320.

- - - -

STATE OF NEW MEXICO)
: SS
COUNTY OF BERNALILLO)

I HEREBY CERTIFY, that the foregoing and attached Transcript of Hearing before the Oil Conservation Commission in Case No. 318, taken on October 23, 1951, at Santa Fe, is a true and correct record of the same to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.

DATED at Albuquerque, New Mexico, this 19 day of November, 1951.

E. E. Freeman
REPORTER