STATE OF NEW MEXICO
ENERGY AND MINERALS DEPARTMENT
OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION
STATE LAND OFFICE BLDG.
Santa Fe, New Mexico
14 November 1979

EXAMINER HEARING

IN THE MATTER OF:

Application of Depco, Inc., for a) CASE unit agreement, Chaves County, New) 6713
Mexico.

BEFORE: Daniel S. Nutter

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

APPEARANCES

For the Oil Conservation Ernest L. Padilla, Esq.
Division: Legal Counsel for the Division
State Land Office Bldg.
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87503

For the Applicant: Jason Kellahin, Esq. KELLAHIN & KELLAHIN 500 Don Gaspar

Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

INDEX

ROY EDMONDSON

Direct Examination by Mr. Kellahin

Cross Examination by Mr. Nutter

LARRY SERIGHT

Direct Examination by Mr. Kellahin

EXHIBITS

Applicant Exhibit One, Unit Agreement Applicant Exhibit Two, Plat Applicant Exhibit Three, Plat Applicant Exhibit Four, Operating Agreement Applicant Exhibit Five, Report Applicant Exhibit Six, Map Applicant Exhibit Seven, Letter

for --

1 MR. NUTTER: We'll call Case Number 6713. 2 MR. PADILLA: Application of Depco, Inc. 3 for a unit agreement, Chaves County, New Mexico. 4 MR KELLAHIN: Jason Kellahin, appearing 5 for the applicant, and we have two witnesses to be sworn. 6 7 (Witnesses sworn.) 8 9 ROY EDMONDSON 10 being called as a witness and having been duly sworn upon 11 his oath, testified as follows, to-wit: 12 13 DIRECT EXAMINATION 14 BY MR. KELLAHIN: 15 Would you state your name, please? 16 Roy Edmondson. A. 17 What business are you engaged in, Mr. 18 Edmondson? 19 I'm a self-employed petroleum landman from 20 Denver, Colorado. 21 And what is the nature of your business? 0. 22 I specialize in the formation and operation A. 23 of units. 24 And do you negotiate the unit agreements Q.

1	A.	Ye	s, sir	•						
2	Q.		oilc	ompa	nies?					
3	A.	I	do, si	r.						
4	Õ [.]	Di	d you	have	anytl	hing	to do	with	the u	ınit
5	agreement o	f Depco,	Incorp	orat	eđ, wl	hich	is th	e sub	ject m	nat-
6	ter of this	hearing?	•							
7	A.	I	did.							
8	Õ.	An	ıd what	, wh	at di	d you	do w	ith t	hat?	
9	A.	₩e	:11, I	prep	ared	the u	nit a	greem	ent, u	ınit
10	operating a	greement,	and I	hav	e subi	mitte	d it	along	with	
11	various app	lications	to th	ne Un	ited S	State	s Geo	logic	al Sur	vey
12	and to the	Land Offi	ce of	the	State	of N	ew Me	xico.		
13	<u></u>	No	w, ref	erri	ng to	what	has	been	marked	as
14	the Applica	nt's Exhi	.bit Nu	mber	One,	is t	hat a	сору	of th	ne
15	unit agreem	ent?								
16	A.	Tł	at it	is.						
17	Q.	Ar	nd is t	hat	unit	agree	ment	in a	form t	that
18	has heretof	ore been	approv	red b	y the	Oil	Conse	rvati	on Div	/i-
19	sion?									
20	A	. It	has,	yes,	sir.	It	has a	lread	y beer	ı re-
21	viewed by t	his State	e Land	Offi	ce, y	es, s	ir.			
22	Q.	ı'ı	m talk	king	about	the	Oil C	onser	vation	n
23	Division.									
24	А	. It	is.	It f	ollow	s one	: I've	prev	riously	Y
25										

submitted to the --

ll			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
1		Q.	It's the same as one that was approved	
2	some time	ago?		
3		Α.	Yes, sir.	
4		Q.	And has that unit agreement been submitted	
5	to the Sta	ate Land	Commissioner?	
6		Α.	Yes, sir.	
7		Q.	For his approval?	
8		Α.	Yes, sir.	
9		Q.	Were there some changes requested?	
10		Α.	Yes, sir.	
11		Õ.	Are they incorporated in the agreement	
12	which is marked as Exhibit Number One?			
13		Α.	They are incorporated.	
14		Q.	So that would be the final draft, insofar	
15	as you kno	ow?		
16		Α.	Yes, sir.	
17		Q.	Now, Exhibit Number Two, is that Exhibit A	
18	to the unit agreement?			
19		Α.	Yes, sir.	
20		Q.	And what information does it contain in it?	
21		Α.	Well, that's the land plat which is speci-	
22	fied in th	ne unit a	agreement, and it sets out the legal sub-	
23	divisions	and the	acreage in each section and the ownership,	
24	lease expi	ration.	and tract numbers, and follows the 1978	

form of unit agreement as amended by $\operatorname{\mathsf{--}}$ required by the State

of New Mexico.

Q. Now, Exhibit Number Three, Exhibit B to the unit agreement, is that the same information as --

A Basically, yes, sir, other than it's more in detail and describes the lands, the number of acres in each lease, and of course the tract number, expiration date, whether it's Federal, State, or fee, the lessee of record, and the overriding royalty interest owners, and the working interest owners.

Now, is the acreage all Federal, State, or fee, or what is that?

A. There's three categories of acreage in this unit, Federal, State, and patented.

Q. And what is the percentage of each? Could you tell us that?

A. Federal is 15,989.63, or 84.33 percent. State is 1368.15 acres, or 7.21 percent, and patented is 1604, or 8.46 percent.

Now, have the working interest owners agreed to the form of unit agreement?

A. The owners have been contacted and they have been furnished a copy of the unit and unit operating agreements, and we anticipate that we'll be in a position to submit the unit for final approval with excess of 85 percent of the commitment in the near future.

1	Q.	Now what about the royalty owners?			
2	А.	They have also been contacted.			
3	Q.	Do you anticipate that you'll have a sub-			
4	stantial percentage of the royalty owners?				
5	А.	So that the proponent will have effective			
6	control, yes, sir.				
7	Ω.	Other than the State and Federal govern-			
8	ment?				
9	А.	Right, sir.			
10	Ω.	Now, what about the overriding royalty			
11	owners?				
12	А.	They are also contacted.			
13	Q.	And are you anticipating a substantial			
14	number of them	will agree?			
15	А.	I anticipate substantial commitment.			
16	Q.	Now, turning to Exhibit Number Four, is that			
17	the unit operating agreement?				
18	Α.	That is the unit operating agreement, which			
19	has been submitted.				
20	Q.	And you said submitted to whom?			
21	А.	Well, to the I've submitted it to the			
22	Commission, or	you did, and also to the working interest			
23	owners.				
24	Q.	And have you had substantial agreement to			
25	that form of ur	it operating agreement?			

25

		·			
2	Q.	Is it the same type of operating agreement			
3	that has been utilized in other cases?				
4	А.	True.			
5	Q.	And approved by this the Commission?			
6	А.	Approved by the Commission, yes, sir.			
7	Q.	And as I understand, you have submitted the			
8	unit agreement an	d unit operating agreement to the United			
9	States Geological	Survey?			
10	A.	Yes, they have reviewed that.			
11	Q.	Now, taking the exhibit out of order,			
12	Exhibit Number Seven, would you identify that exhibit?				
13	А.	Yes. That is a letter from the United			
14	States Geological	Survey, which is a preliminary approval			
15	of the area and d	epth application, and that's a prerequisite			
16	of being filin	g the unit for final approval with that			
17	agency.				
18	Q.	And it will be filed when you have sub-			
19	stantial commitme	nt?			
20	A.	Commitment, yes, sir.			
21	Q.	You have anything else to add, Mr. Edmondson?			
22	A.	No, sir.			
23		MR. KELLAHIN: That's all I have of this			

At this time I'd like to offer in evidence Appli-

cant's Exhibits One, Two, Three, Four, and Seven.

I have, sir.

A.

MR. NUTTER: Exhibits One through Four and Seven will be admitted in evidence.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. NUTTER:

O. Now, you stated that you expected within the near future to have 85 percent of the working interests.

A. In excess of, yes, sir.

Q. What percent have actually agreed to the unit agreement as of now?

A. Well, frankly I didn't run a check on it.

I have received a number of the joiners back already, and

frankly, I used the percentage of 85 percent. That is a

bare minimum that is required for final approval by the

Survey. Frankly, I anticipate commitment of well in excess

of 90 percent.

MR. NUTTER: Apparently not in any big hurry for this, anyway, Jason. We're having trouble getting this legal advertisement on this case right in the Roswell paper.

MR. KELLAHIN: I understood that.

MR. NUTTER: You know, the first time around they left out the name of the county, so we got a free ad from them to replace that one, and then this time they left out the fact we were going to have a hearing, so

I guess you get what you pay for. We're going to ask for one more free ad.

We'll actually have to continue this case to December the 12th. That's the earliest it can be advertised for a hearing again, but we can get this part of it done.

MR. KELLAHIN: That won't pose a problem, will it, Mr. Edmondson?

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

MR. KELLAHIN: I'd like to call Mr. Seright, please.

LARRY SERIGHT

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

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. KELLAHIN:

- Q. Would you state your name, please?
- A. Larry Seright.
- Q. By whom are you employed and in what position, Mr. Seright?
- A. I'm employed by Depco, Incorporated, in Midland, Texas, and I'm the District Exploration Manager

1	there, for Depco			
2	Q	Have you ever testified before the Oil		
3	Conservation Div	ision or one of its examiners?		
4	Α.	Yes, sir, I have.		
5	Q.	Made your qualifications a matter of re-		
6	cord?			
7	А.	Yes, I have.		
8		MR. KELLAHIN: Are the witness' qualifi-		
9	cations acceptable?			
10		MR. NUTTER: Yes, they are.		
11	Q.	(Mr. Kellahin continuing.) Mr. Seright,		
12	have you had any	thing to do with the Depco unit agreement,		
13	the subject matte	er of this hearing?		
14	A.	Yes, to the extent of preparing the geol-		
15	ogical report and	d submitting as an exhibit a geological map.		
16	Õ.	Now turning to what has been marked as		
17	Exhibit Number F	ive, would you identify that exhibit, please		
18	The geological re	eport?		
19	A.	Yes. The geological report on the that		
20	was initially pre	esented to the USGS as a requirement, on the		
21	location, unit p	roposal, a general geologic discussion, pre-		
22	vious drilling w	ithin the proposed unit area, a delineation		
23	of the			
24	Q.	Is there any particular information there		

you want to call to the attention of the Examiner?

In the report, I'm talking about?

A. You mentioned that we will have this case again because of the problem with the ad in the newspaper?

MR. NUTTER: Yes, sir, it has to be readvertised.

A. Now, will this be a rerun of what we're doing today?

MR. NUTTER: Except it won't be necessary to have any appearances, even.

A. Oh, is that right?

MR. NUTTER: Just open the case up again and see if there's objection to the unit, which I doubt seriously, but we'll have to withhold any order until we have had a chance to re-open it and ask for opposition.

A. Okay, good.

I could give a brief rundown here on the reason we are attempting to put this unit together.

Q. Is this an exploratory unit?

A. It is an exploratory unit. It sure is, yes.

Q. Would you discuss the reasons for it?

A. Yes. The proposed unit outline that is shown on , I believe that's Exhibit, what, Six?

MR. NUTTER: Yes, the structure and the -The map that's shown on Exhibit Six, yes,

A.

Exhibit Six, first of all, is an Isopach map of the gross sand thickness in the Atoka-Morrow.

The proposed unit outline encompasses a local area here of thick Atoka-Morrow Clastic deposition and is flanked by numerous shows of gas and thinner sand deposition.

Exhibit B, as I mentioned, or I should say

Exhibit Six, is an Isopach of the gross sand thickness.

The regional dip in this area is to the east. The deposition al limits of the Atoka-Morrow Clastic is up-dip to the west.

Depositional strike is north/south. Regional Isopaching we've done in this area indicates -regional Isopaching on the Atoka-Morrow -- indicates several
depositional systems converging in this area, and on that
basis we feel that the anomalous thick we have shown here
encompassed by the unit area, is in all probability, an
offshore bar, and this is what we want to explore and evaluate.

We should, or we feel we should, have some thicker, cleaner sand stratigraphically trapped here, hopefully with good potential gas reserve. The gas accumulation in the -- in these reservoir sands would be trapped by gradual thinning and loss of quality reservoir sand developed shoreward, which would be up-dip to the west, and

increased shale facies basinward, which is to the east.

The delineation of the unit, which is probably one of the more important parts of this, I think, the western boundary is defined by all sections that are cut — this terminology here is really more for the USGS, which I'm sure you're familiar with, as defined by all sections of which 50 percent or more are cut by the 100-foot Isopach contour line; which defines the minimum gross sand thickness up-dip that would relate to quality reservoir sand.

Up-dip, this is to the west, again, we have one well outside the unit area that was tight. We have one well that is a submarginal producer. We interpret this as being on a flank, hopefully, of something bigger and better, knowing also that we're losing sands additionally and thinning to the west.

The southern boundary is defined by loss of reservoir conditions in the sand development, and this is evidenced by several tight wells that are indicated in Section 21 outside the unit boundary.

The north boundary we feel on the basis of the, again, 100-foot contour interval, which is pretty much of a go-by here as far as good sand development is concerned, we feel the north end is analogous to the south end that respect, based on the 100-foot contour interval.

The eastern boundary, again, as I mentioned

before, is basinward. We feel that the 100-foot Isopach contour here is defining the minimum gross sand thickness down-dip, or basinward, that would relate to quality reservoir sand development, and this is evidenced by shows of gas in the Atoka-Morrow in two wells within the unit area. These two wells were not tested in the Atoka-Morrow, but they did have mud logging units on them and shows of gas were reported, but obviously the operator did not feel they were commercial enough, or significant enough, to test, and this again, is related to the down-dip position of these wells.

We propose to drill our well in the thicker interpreted area there in Section 8.

And I believe that's all I have on that.

- Q. Did I understand your principal objective is the Atoka-Morrow, is that correct?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. Is the unit confined to those formations?

 Or are you unitizing all formations?
 - A. All formations here.
- Now, does the unit operating agreement require you to drill this initial well?
 - A. Yes, it does.
 - Q. And it will be drilled, you say, in Section
 - A. Section 8, the southeast of the northwest

1 of Section 8. 2 And that will be the first well. 3 A. Correct. We are only obligated to drill one well here, and this is based, again, on the number of 5 acres within the unit area, as far as the USGS is concerned. 6 Now, what is your drilling obligation, to 7 what depth? 8 To a depth of 9800 feet or 50 feet into 9 the top of the solid Mississippian lime, whichever is the 10 lesser. 11 Q. Were Exhibits Five and Six prepared by you 12 or under your direction? 13 Yes, they were prepared by me. 14 MR. KELLAHIN: At this time I'll offer 15 Exhibits Five and Six. 16 MR. NUTTER: Depco Exhibits Five and Six 17 will be admitted in evidence. 18 MR. KELLAHIN: That completes our presenta-19 tion, Mr. Nutter. 20 MR. NUTTER: Are there any questions of 21 Mr. Seright? He may be excused. 22 You have nothing further, Mr. Kellahin? 23 That's all, Mr. Nutter. MR. KELLAHIN: 24 MR. NUTTER: Does anyone have anything

they wish to offer in Case Number 6713?

If not, we'll continue the case to December 12th at 9:00 o'clock and re-advertise.

(Hearing continued to 12 December, 1979.)

REPORTER CERTIFICATE

I, SALLY W. BOYD, a Certified Shorthand 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 from my notes taken at the time of the hearing.

Sally W. Boyd, C.S.R.

11/14 79

Oil Conservation Division