		Page 1
NEW M	EXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION	
• determinant of the second of	EXAMINER HEARING	
	SANTA FE , NEW MEXICO	
	•	
Hearing Date	JUNE 27, 1979	Time: 9:00 A.M.
NAME	REPRESENTING	LQCATION
dual Lacule	Linke Our family	12 De 10
illam of Eng	11	1-10
T-) ///	Campus Tours	Jugar 2
		Houston
Lee G. Neving	, Dere 6 /62016 000) C807	770032002
ECRGE H. WEEMS	BASS ENTERPRISES PROD CO	FT. WORTH, TX
M Housen	Bass Enterprises Prod. Co.	
A. Polivicki	Oil Progesser's	Mirement V.
- in le	- Oil Trocessing	monument 1
•		•
	•	to l

						Page 2		
	NEW MEX	ico oil	CONSERV	ATION COM	MISSION	•		
			EXAMIN	ER HEARIN	G			
			SA	NTA FE NEW	MEXICO			
Hearing Date_	JUNE 27, 1979				1979	Time: 9:00 A.M.		
NAME			REPRES	ENTING		LOCATION		
					3.			

STATE OF NEW MEXICO
ENERGY AND MINERALS DEPARTMENT
Oil Conservation Division
State Land Office Building
Santa Fe, New Mexico
27 June 1979

EXAMINER HEARING

)	
IN	THE	MATTER OF:)	
)	
		Application	of Bass Enterprises Production)	CASE
		Company for	a unit agreement, Lea County,)	6576
		New Mexico.	<u>-</u>)	
)	

BEFORE: Daniel S. Nutter

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

APPEARANCES

For the Oil Conservation Division:	Ernest L. Padilla, Esq. Legal Counsel for the Division State Land Office Bldg. Santa Fe, New Mexico 87503
For the Applicant:	Conrad Coffield, Esq. HINKLE, COX, EATON, COFFIELD & HENSLEY Midland, Texas

SALLY WALTON BOYD CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER 3020 Plaza Blanca (606) 471-2462 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

INDEX

GEORGE H. WEEMS

Direc	t Examination	by Mr.	. Coffield	3
Cross	Examination :	by Mr.	Nutter	9

JEM HOUSEN

Direct Examination by Mr. Coffield	10
Cross Examination by Mr. Nutter	15

EXHIBITS

Applicant Exhib	it One, Plat	5
Applicant Exhib	it Two, Contour Map	6
Applicant Exhib	it Three, Cross Section	6
Applicant Exhib	oit Four, Plat	12
Applicant Exhib	it Five, Unit Agreement	12
Applicant Exhib	it Six, Operating Agreement	13
Applicant Exhib	oit Seven, Letter	14

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 We'll call next Case Number MR. NUTTER: 2 6576. 3 MR. PADILLA: Application of Bass Enter-4 prises Production Company for a unit agreement, Lea County, 5 New Mexico. 6 MR. COFFIELD: Conrad Coffield, with the 7 Hinkle Law Firm, Midland, Texas, appearing on behalf of 8 the applicant, and I have two witnesses. 9 10 (Witnesses sworn.) 11 12

GEORGE H. WEEMS

being called as a witness and having been duly sworn upon his oath, testified as follows, to-wit:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. COFFIELD:

Q. Mr. Weems, would you state your name, address, occupation, and employer?

A. My name is George H. Weems. I live in Ft. Worth, Texas. I'm Exploration Manager for Bass Enterprises Production Company.

Q. Have you previously testified before the Oil Conservation Division as a geologist?

A. No, I have not.

Mr. Weems, would you please give a brief

And are you familiar with the property in

25

1

2

0.

3 A. I received a Bachelor of Science degree 4 in geology from Oklahoma City University in 1957. 5 And what about your work history? 6 whom were you --7 At that time I was employed by PanAmerican A. 8 Petroleum Corporation in the Oklahoma City Division Office, 9 and stayed with PanAmerican until 1973, for sixteen years, 10 and during that period of time had many exploration --11 totally exploration oriented jobs. 12 At one time I was operations geologist 13 for the Permian Basin Division of West Texas for PanAmeri-14 can. 15 I left Amoco in the spring of '73 and 16 joined Bass Enterprises Production Company in the capacity 17 of Chief Geologist, working primarily the Rocky Mountain 18 Region and the West Texas Region. 19 I am now currently Exploration Manager for 20 the Mid-Continent and the West Texas Division, working in 21 total exploration geology. 22 Mr. Weems, are you familiar with the Bass 23 application in this case? 24 Yes, I am.

resume, first of your educational background?

the proposed unit area involved?

A. Yes, I am.

MR. COFFIELD: Mr. Examiner, is the witness considered qualified?

MR. NUTTER: Yes, he is.

Q. (Mr. Coffield continuing.) Mr. Weems, would you please state briefly what Bass seeks to accomplish by this application?

A. Yes. We're applying for a 320-acre State unit in the Townsend Unit area. This will comprise approximately 320 acres, more or less, in the Township 15 South, 34 East.

Q. All right. Would you go to what we've marked as Exhibit One, please, and explain that to the Examiner?

A. Yes. Exhibit One is a land plat of the general area and surrounding areas, specifically showing the 320-acre tract located in the west half of Section 36, 15 South, 34 East.

This plat shows all well control in the area, the operators of those wells, the total depth of those wells, the date the wells were drilled.

It also shows the ownership of all the surrounding lease owners.

The yellow outline is the outline of our

acreage which we own with Samidan, as you can see, it's evidenced there on the exhibit, and it also shows the proposed location of the well we plan to drill, located in the southwest of the northwest of Section 36, 15 South, 34 East.

Q. All right, Mr. Weems, let's go now to both Exhibits Two and Three.

A. Yes.

Q. As I understand they can be explained together probably better than singly.

A. With the Examiner's permission, I would like to hang Exhibit Three on the wall. It's a cross section.

The map in front of you is the structure contour map on top of the Wolfcamp marker horizon. The Wolfcamp is productive in the Townsend Field to the south, as well as Morton Field to the north.

The Examiner will notice that we have no well control immediately north of the 320-acre unit area we are applying for, and I will state that we have ample seismic in this area that did influence our subsurface contouring in this area.

If you will note, the cross section N/S, north being the northernmost section as shown on Exhibit Two. It's turning in a southerly direction to Well No. 5 on the south. I'll now refer to that cross section.

The wells on each end, Well No. 5 is a Morrow producing well here. The cross section then extends north through our proposed location, which is shown on Exhibit Two as Well No. 2, and then on to the north, where again we have another Morrow producer.

Our feeling here is that where we get down into this Morrow Atoka wedge on this high, thin point as we move in a westerly direction, we will see this Morrow section thicken, as evidenced on Exhibit Three, where we think, or feel very strongly, that we will have an opportunity to encounter the Morrow gas production at this proposed location.

That is the primary reason we're asking for the 320-acre unit.

oil possibilities as evidenced by the Wolfcamp structural map you see in front of you, and also evidenced by two wells located in Section 36, one of which, Well No. 3 has made 63,000 barrels of oil. It is now an abandoned well from this horizon, and this horizon here, Strawn and Canyon.

MR. NUTTER: Well, it made its 63,000 barrels from what formation?

- A. From the Strawn and the Canyon.

 MR. NUTTER: No Wolfcamp, though.
- A. No, sir.

We feel, Mr. Examiner, that we will be structurally high to that well.

Q. Mr. Weems, then is it your opinion that this 320 acres, then, does comprise substantially all of the structure with which you're concerned due to the anomaly?

A. Yes. We do feel, from additional Isopaching of this Morrow section which, again, this interval,
we can see decided thickening of this Morrow on the west
side, and we feel that we will have a good Morrow opportunity
there.

And that is the primary basis for our application, with the possibility of oil being encountered in the Wolfcamp-Canyon-Strawn, probably Canyon and Strawn.

That really pretty well covers this case.

- Q. Mr. Weems, were these Exhibits One, Two, and Three prepared by you or under your supervision?
- A. No, they were not. They were prepared by Frank Keefer, who recently testified before the Commission, but they were prepared under my supervision and I did review all of the exhibits after their completion, and I am in total agreement with the exhibits.
- Q. Mr. Weems, in your opinion will the approval of this application be in the interest of conservation and prevent the drilling of unnecessary wells, and

otherwise	prevent	waste	and	protect	correlative	rights?

A. Very definitely, yes, sir.

MR. COFFIELD: Mr. Examiner, I move the admission of Exhibits One, Two, and Three.

MR. NUTTER: Applicant's Exhibits One, Two, Three will be admitted in evidence.

MR. COFFIELD: And I have no other questions of this witness on direct examination.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. NUTTER:

Q. Mr. Weems, Well No. 4 there on your cross section looks like it has considerable Morrow pay, but it's not shown as a Morrow producer on Exhibit Number Two. It didn't make a well in the Morrow?

A. No, it didn't. They tested it here and this was the only interval that had any porosity on the porosity log, and it swabbed it dry. This is an inverse SP here, and I -- it looks like it's got plenty of resistivity but it was not tested during drilling.

And I will point out, many of these are quite old wells.

MR. NUTTER: Before the Morrow was really recognized.

A. Before it was recognized as a real potential.

I think -- I think a lot of people, sir, were not going on down to the Mississippian, which we feel is imperative these days, you know.

MR. NUTTER: And utilizing normal drilling methods sometimes they may have mudded out of the Morrow formation.

A. I would even go so far as to suggest, without having a well -- specific well record, that perhaps there was not a gas detector on it. I would even question possibly once they got through the real pays in the Wolf-camp, perhaps they may not have even had a geologist on the wells.

MR. NUTTER: Are there any further questions of the witness? He may be excused.

JENS HANSEN

being called as a witness and having been duly sworn upon his oath, testified as follows, to-wit:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. COFFIELD:

- Q. Mr. Hansen, would you please state your name, address, occupation, and employer?
- A. My name is Jens Hansen. I live in Arlington, Texas. I am a Division Petroleum Landman. I work for Bass Enterprises Production.

Q.

	9	
1	Q.	Mr. Nansen, have you previously testified
2	before the Divis	ion as a landman?
3	А.	No, I have not.
4	Q.	Would you state for the Examiner your
5	educational back	ground first?
6	А.	I received my BA in constitutional law
7	at Texas Tech Un	iversity in 1971.
8	Q.	And what has been your work experience
9	since your gradu	ation?
10	А.	I have been a landman for eight years.
11	Q.	With various major companies?
12	А.	That's correct. For the first year I was
13	out of school I	was an independent. I mainly directed my
14	efforts in title	examination and lease acquisition. I
15	then became asso	ciated with Coastal States Gas Producing
16	Corporation in C	orpus Christi, Texas from 1972 to 1975.
17		In 1975 I worked for Walter Duncan in
18	Oklahoma City, a	nd in '78 I came with Bass Enterprises.
19	Q.	Mr. Hansen, are you familiar with Bass'
20	application in t	his case?
21	А.	I am.
22	Ω.	Are you familiar with the property owner-
23	ship and also th	e proposed well location and so forth
24	А.	Yes, I am.

-- in this case?

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. COFFIELD: Mr. Examiner, is the witness considered qualified?

> MR. NUTTER: Yes, he is.

(Mr. Coffield continuing.) Mr. Hansen, please refer to what we have marked as Exhibit Four and explain that very briefly to the Examiner.

A. Exhibit Four is a plat reflecting our prospect area, which is outlined in green, and the proposed unit area, which is outlined in red.

It also shows the proximity of the prospect which is several miles west of Lovington, the City of Lovington.

Okay, go on to what we've marked as Exhibit Five, please, and explain that.

Exhibit Five is the proposed unit agreement for the State unit, 320 acres, consisting of the west half of Section 36.

The unit form is the form prescribed by the Commissioner of Public Lands. This particular unit is identical to the form sent to us by the Commissioner, and he has issued us a letter of approval as to the form of this unit agreement.

Are all the lands involved in this particular unit State of New Mexico oil and gas lease involved?

> Yes. A.

And in your exhibit here, you reflect the ownership of the leases, and so forth.

A. That's correct.

Q. And have the interest owners, working interest owners, joined in the execution, all interest owners?

A. Yes, they have. That is correct.

Q. Okay. Go on to exhibit -- what's been marked as Exhibit Six and explain that to the Examiner, please.

A. Exhibit Six is the standard AAPL operating agreement, 1977. It's in the standard form. It sets out the date, the location of the test well. It provides for a 100 - 300 percent penalty for nonconsenting parties at casing pulling election time. It sets out the interests on Exhibit A. Exhibit B is a plat showing the interests within the prospect area, and Exhibit C is the copus setting forth the current charge, overhead charges for drilling and operating costs.

Q. And again, have all of the leasehold owners, working interest owners, as reflected on Exhibit B to the unit agreement, joined in the execution of this unit operating agreement?

A. Yes, they have.

Q. Okay. Please go to what we've marked as

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Exhibit Seven is a letter dated June 20th. 1979, from the Commissioner of Public Lands to Bass Enterprises Production Company approving our proposed unit agreement as to form and setting out several requirements which we will meet within the next week.

0. All right. Mr. Hansen, do you have any particular well obligations or problems in that regard which you wish to bring to the attention of the Examiner?

Yes, I do.

Exhibit Seven and identify that exhibit.

0. All right.

The rig that will be used for this well is currently being used on another well we are now completing, or preparing to complete, and we will be moving that rig within the next week or ten days to this location for the drilling of this well.

And do you have a commencement -- com-0. mencement date problem as far as -- in other words, are you requesting the Examiner to give early consideration to the issuance of the order?

- A. I am.
- All right, Mr. Hansen, were these Exhibits 0. Four, Five, Six, and Seven prepared by you?
 - Yes, they were. They were prepared by me.
 - And, in your opinion, will the approval

of this application be in the interest of conservation, the prevention of waste, and the protection of correlative rights?

A. Yes, it will.

MR. COFFIELD: Mr. Examiner, I move the admission of these Exhibits Four through Seven.

MR. NUTTER: Applicant's Exhibit Four through Seven will be admitted in evidence.

MR. COFFIELD: And I have no other questions of Mr. Hansen on direct examination.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. NUTTER:

Q. Mr. Hansen, why have you unitized 320 acres here rather than communitized?

A. For two basic reasons.

Number one, under this unit agreement in the event we drill a -- have a dry -- get a dry hole, we will have a certain time period, six months, in which to commence another well within the unit area.

Under a communitization agreement, if our well were dry, and we drill in the northwest quarter, which it is our plan to do, the well in the -- the lease in the southwest quarter would expire, because we would not have the provision to drill additional wells.

In addition to that, if we were to complete the well in an oil producing zone with spacing less than 320 acres, the lease itself, its quota would expire, and we would have an offsetting open acreage.

Q. So in the event you get a Wolfcamp oil producer here in less than 320, you'ld be covered with this unit agreement.

A. Yes, sir, and then we would be -- would file a plan of development, for additional development for the rest of the unit area.

Q Does that unit agreement plan for expansion? Have provision for expansion of the unit area?

A. I believe so, yes.

Q. And contraction?

A. I don't think we're agreeing to put any contraction pages in there, as small as the unit is.

Q. Okay.

MR. NUTTER: Are there any further questions of Mr. Hansen? He may be excused.

Do you have anything further, Mr. Coffield?
MR. COFFIELD: No, sir, I do not.

MR. NUTTER: Does anyone have anything they wish to offer in Case Number 6576?

We'll take the case under advisement.

(Hearing concluded.)

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, SALLY W. BOYD, a court reporter, DO HEREBY

CERTIFY that the foregoing and attached Transcript of

Hearing before the Oil Conservation Division 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, knowledge, and skill, from my notes taken at the

time of the hearing.

Sally W. Boyd, C.S.R.

I do hereby costify that the foregoing & a complete resource of the proceedings in

the Examiner libering of Case No. 65

heard by me on_

_, Examin**e**€

OII Conservation Division