1 2	STATE OF NEW MEXICO ENERGY, MINERALS, AND NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION STATE LAND OFFICE BLDG. SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO
3	4 November 1987
4	EXAMINER HEARING
5	
6	THE MARKED OF.
7	IN THE MATTER OF:
8	Application of Yates Petroleum Cor- CASE poration for a unit agreement, 9244 Lea County, New Mexico.
9	
10	
11	
12	BEFORE: Michael E. Stogner, Examiner
13	The state of the s
14	
15	
16	TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING
17	
18	APPEARANCES
19	
20	For the Division: Jeff Taylor
21	Attorney at Law
22	Legal Counsel to the Division State Land Office Bldg.
23	Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501
24	Par the Applicants Coultr's
25	For the Applicant: Chad Dickerson Attorney at Law DICKERSON, FISK, & VANDIVER Seventh and Mahone/Suite E Artesia, New Mexico 88210

BARON FORM 25C16P3 TOLL FREE IN CALIFORNIA 800-227-2434 NATIONWIDE 800-227-0120

INDEX NORBERT REMPE Direct Examination by Mr. Dickerson Cross Examination by Mr. Stogner JIM BALL Direct Examination by Mr. Dickerson Cross Examination by Mr. Stogner EXHIBITS Yates Exhibit One, Structure Map Yates Exhibit Two, Cross Section Yates Exhibit Three, Unit Agreement Yates Exhibit Four, Operating Agreement Yates Exhibit Five, Letter

STOGNER: Call Case Number

MR. TAYLOR: The application of

MR.

Yates Petroleum Corporation for a unit agreement, Lea

1

2

5

9244.

County, New Mexico.

 \mathbf{C}

```
1
    Artesia, New Mexico.
2
                       Mr. Rempe, you have previously testified
3
    as a geologist before this Division and your credentials are
    a matter of record, are they not?
5
                       Yes, sir, I have.
6
             0
                        Are you familiar with the application
7
    that Yates has filed in Case 9244 for approval of its pro-
8
    posed Lazy Tree --
             A
                       Yes, I have.
                       -- Unit Area? And have you made a geolo-
10
11
    gical
           study of the acreage proposed to be dedicated to this
12
    unit?
13
             Α
                       Yes, I have.
14
                                 MR. DICKERSON: Tender Mr. Rem-
15
    pe as an expert geologist, Mr. Examiner.
16
                                 MR.
                                      STOGNER:
                                                 Mr. Rempe is so
17
    qualified.
18
                       Mr. Rempe, what is the purpose of Yates'
19
    application in Case 9244?
20
                       The purpose is to form a state unit which
21
    encompasses Sections 1, 2, 12, and the east half of Section
22
    11, Township 13, 33, as well as Sections 6, 7, 8 in the
23
    north half of Section 18, the northwest quarter of Section
24
    5, Township 13, 33, encompassing a total of 4640 acres.
```

What is the proposed location and depth

```
of your unit test well?
```

A The initial test well is to be drilled in a location 660 feet from the north line, 660 feet from the east line, Section 11 -- Section 12, Township 13, Range 32 East.

Q Okay, will you refer to what we have submitted as Exhibit Number One, Mr. Rempe, and tell the Examiner what you have shown on that map?

A Exhibit Number One is a structure map on the Wolfcamp XX marker, which is based on subsurface data from surrounding wellbores and it shows an east/southeast plunging anticline which extends over the proposed unit acreage.

Superimposed on this anticline is shown the outline of the carbnate mound forming the hydrocarbon reservoir. Previous test wells are clearly located on the flanks of this mound and therefore they tested tight for lack of porosity, permeability, or both.

Porosity but no permeability was found in many zones in the Amerada well in Section 5, Township 13, Range 33 East, which was re-entered by HEYCO in 1985.

Q Mr. Rempe, turn to Exhibit Number Two, if you would, and tell the Examiner what you have shown by that cross section.

A Exhibit Number Two is a cross section

which intersects this anticline that's shown on the geological map at more or less perpendicular to the axis of the anticline, and it shows the structurally high position of the proposed test well.

Q Can you briefly summarize for us, Mr.

Rempe, the geological basis for the formation of this unit?

A We have wells surrounding the structure on which we want to drill which show ample porosity and they

show at least incipient or small shows of hydrocarbons. We feel that if we drill in the center of this structure we should have enhanced porosity and especially enhanced per-

12 meability.

Q Mr. Rempe --

A Thus we should be able to produce the reservoir.

Q -- in your opinion will the approval of this application be in the interest of conservation, the prevention waste, and the protection of correlative rights?

A Yes.

Q Were Exhibits One and Two prepared by you?

A Yes.

MR. DICKERSON: Move admission of Yates Exhibits One and Two, Mr. Examiner, and I have no further questions of this witness.

STOGNER: Exhibits One and

1

2

3

5 BY MR. STOGNER:

7

8

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

MR.

CROSS EXAMINATION

Mr. Rempe, when I look at the southern portion of this unit there's a dry hole in Section 18 that

shows it went to the TD, I assume, of 4776 feet.

Two will be admitted into evidence.

Would you elaborate on that, why this particular acreage was included?

I believe that is a Yates lease and there might be a chance still in the northern part of that sec-You see the dry hole in the northeast of 18, in the tion. northeast of the northeast of 18, was not deep enough to really test the objective; therefore we cannot rule out that we might have reserves in there.

And again what is your main objective?

Main objective is the Permo Penn. Α among them, there are several objectives, and main them the various Bough zones, but also some deeper zones which are various -- which are sometimes names, Ranger Lake, and a variety of other names for those zones, as well.

What is the closest Permo Pennsylvanian production around this unit?

> Α It's to the south and it's indicated

```
the cross section. It is right at point A on the cross sec-
1
    tion in Section 14 of 13, 32. That produced from a zone in
2
    one of the lower Bough -- or from a lower Bough zone indi-
3
    cated on your cross section.
                       It's the one on the left.
5
                       This is a relatively new well in itself,
6
    isn't it?
7
                        This well was drilled in -- or was com-
             Α
8
    pleted in 1984, yes, and it have a very good potential. It
    flowed originally 880 barrels of oil. I'm sorry, 390 barrels
10
    of oil, and it has -- it has produced until December or
11
    through December, '86, 136,870 barrels of oil.
12
                        Was that particular production put in a
13
    pool?
14
             A
                        Yeah, that belongs to the Baum North
15
    Pool, I believe. It may be the Lazy J but I do believe it
16
    is the Baum North.
17
                                 MR. STOGNER: I have no further
18
    questions of this witness.
19
                                      there any other questions
20
                                 Are
    of Mr. Rempe?
21
                                 If not, he may be excused.
22
                                 Mr. Dickerson?
23
```

```
1
                             JIM BALL,
2
    being called as a witness and being duly sworn upon his
3
    oath, testified as follows, to-wit:
5
                         DIRECT EXAMINATION
6
    BY MR. DICKERSON:
7
             0
                       Mr. Ball, will you state your name, your
8
    occupation, and by whom you're employed?
                       My name is Jim Ball and I'm a landman for
             Α
10
    Yates Petroleum Corporation.
11
                       Mr. Ball, you have previously testified
12
    as a landman before this Division, have you not?
13
             Α
                       Yes, I have.
14
             Q
                       And are you familiar with the application
15
    filed by Yates for approval of its Lazy Tree Unit Area?
16
             Α
                       Yes, I am.
17
                                 MR. DICKERSON:
                                                 Tender Mr. Ball
18
    as a landman, Mr. Stogner.
19
                                 MR.
                                      STOGNER:
                                                      Ball is so
                                                 Mr.
20
    qualified.
21
                       Mr. Ball, will you refer to what we have
22
    submitted to the Examiner as Exhibit Number Three and tell
23
    him what that instrument consists of?
24
                        Okay. Exhibit Three is the unit agree-
25
            It's on a state form. It consists of exhibits which
    ment.
```

include the ratifications. A few are signed and some aren't. I'll go into that later. And the land plat is Exhibit A. The Exhibit E is a further detailed description of the land status. You'll note that all the leases are State leases and are all currently leased at this time.

Q Mr. Ball, paragraph 2 of this standard and required unit form provides that all unitized substances in all formations will be pooled by this formation of this unit, does it not?

A Yes, it does.

And again the printed form of agreement in paragraph 11 provides that the production from the unit will be allocated among the various interest owners on a surface acreage basis, as is customary, does it not?

A That's correct.

Q Refer the Examiner to Exhibit A attached to your unit agreement and describe for him in a little bit more detail, Mr. Ball, what that map reflects.

A Okay. The map reflects who the owners are, the expiration dates, the lease serial number, if they're HBP status or not, and, as I said earlier, they're -- they're all leased right now.

Q And Exhibit B to that unit agreement, tell Mr. Stogner what information is shown on that exhibit.

A Okay. It gives the exact lease descrip-

23

24

25

tions. It gives the serial number and expiration dates, the number of acres within the unit boundaries per tract, the royalty of each lease, the burdens on the royalty, and the working interest owner breakdown and lesse of record.

Q What is the current status of your attempts to invite other parties to join the unit area, Mr.

A Well, as of yesterday I received a verbal of S4 percent will be committed to the unit, or 84.47, and I suspect that the others will come in any day.

Q You anticipate approval prior to December 1st of the substantial majority of the interests within the unit area?

A Yes, I do.

Q What is the expiration date of the earliest expiring lease within this unit area, Mr. Ball?

A It is December 1st of this year.

Q And it will be necessary for Yates to obtain final approval and be in the process of actual drilling operations prior to that date, then, will it not?

A That's correct.

Q Refer to Exhibit Number Four, Mr. Ball, and tell the Examiner what that is.

A That's the standard 1977 AAPL model operating agreement form.

Q And Article VI on page 4 of that instrument, because of your lease expiration date provides for Yates to commence the initial unit well on or before December 1st, 1987?

That's correct.

Refer the Examiner to Exhibit A to your operating agreement and describe or point out to him the breakdown of the ownership interest of the parties within this area.

Okay. Of course, the Yates entities are the -- Yates Pet will be the operator. All the Yates entities will be a party to the unit, as well as, I've got a verbal that -- from Bass. They'll farm out to Yates. have a verbal that F. Karsten and Manforth Production will farm out to Yates. All the remaining parties with the exception of Southland have indicated they will -- they're leaning in a favorable attitude to join this unit through ratification or farmout or cutright sell.

And so in your opinion you anticipate joinder of this unit by sufficient number of parties representing a large enough share of the total interest to enable Yates to exercise reasonably effective control over unit operations?

> That's correct. A

Refer to what we've submitted as Exhibit

25

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Number Five, Mr. Ball, and tell us what that is.

A Exhibit Number Five is -- that is the preliminary approval from the Commissioner of Public Lands and which gave us preliminary approval subject to a few conditions. I'd like to point out that conditions four and five have been corrected, are in the corrected form that you have in front of you today.

Q Okay, Mr. Ball, were Exhibits Three, Four, and Five prepared or compiled by you or under your direction and supervision?

A Yes, they were.

MR. DICKERSON: Mr. Examiner, move admission of Yates Exhibits Three, Four, and Five, and I have no further questions of Mr. Ball.

MR. STOGNER: Exhibits Three, Four, and Five will be admitted into evidence at this time.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. STOGNER:

Mr. Ball, now, Southland Royalty Company is now operated and owned by somebody else, is that correct?

A The way it was explained to me by someone at Meridian is that Meridian was sort of a maintenance type of party, that Southland is still an entity that should retain the Southland name.

```
Q
                        Okay.
                               But you have been dealing with
1
    personnel from Meridian --
2
                       Yes, I have.
             Α
3
                       -- who acts for Southland.
             \circ
                       That's correct.
5
                        Whenever I look at Exhibit A, I
6
    that's page two of your -- I'm sorry -- Exhibit Number Four,
7
    that's page two of Exhibit A of that particular example, and
    if I look in here at Yates Petroleum Company, I go over here
    to the right and there's some columns, deep initial test
10
    well, shallow subsequent wells, and deep subsequent wells,
11
    and the percentages are different for Yates Petroleum Com-
12
    pany, Bass Enterprises, and Sabine Production Company.
13
    Could you elaborate on what those different figures mean?
14
                       Yes.
                              Yates Pet, or excuse me,
                                                          Sabine
15
    owns from zero to 5000 feet.
16
                       Yates and Bass share acreage 50/50 below
17
    5000 feet, so that's the reason why it looks different.
18
                       Now what formations, pools, or depths are
19
    being unitized by this proposed unit?
20
                       It will be all.
             A
21
                       Okay. 100 percent State lands?
             Q
22
                       Yes, sir.
             Α
23
                       Okay.
24
             Q
                                 MR. STOGNER: I have no further
25
```

```
15
1
   questions of this witness.
2
                                 Are there any other questions
3
   of Mr. Ball?
                                 MR. DICKERSON: No.
5
                                 MR.
                                       STOGNER:
                                                   Не
                                                        may
                                                              be
6
    excused.
7
                                       Dickerson, do you have
                                 Mr.
8
    anything further in Case Number 9244?
9
                                 MR. DICKERSON: No. sir.
10
                                 MR. STOGNER: Does anybody else
   have anything further in this case?
11
12
                                 Case Number 9244 will
                                                              be
13
    taken under advisement.
14
15
                        (Hearing concluded.)
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

5

-

CERTIFICATE

I, SALLY W. BOYD, C.S.R., DO HEREBY

CENTIFY that 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. 2144 heard by me on 4 foundary 1987

Oil Conservation Division