OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION STATE OF NEW MEXICO

Transcript of Hearing
CASE NO. 334

January 22, 1952

Henricksen's Reperting Service 2324 - 47th Street Les Alames, New Mexico

BEFORE THE OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

January 22, 1952

Case 334: In the matter of the application of the Worth Drilling Company, Incorporated for approval of the secondary-recovery program (by water flooding) on A. C. Taylor Federal Lease in Sections 1, 12 and 13, Township 18 South, Range 31 East, Eddy County, New Mexico, by injection into its A. C. Taylor No. 3-A well on said lease. There now being twelve (12) producing wells on the lease, all of which are being pumped by individual pumping units.

JOSEPH D. KENNEDY.

having first been duly sworm, testified as follows:

MR. KENNEDY: Our plan is to establish a program of water flood on our A. C. Taylor Lease in the north sugar field. This will be a pilot project. Production from this lease is from the Queen's Section at about thirty-five hundred (3,500) feet, producing from one sand zone only. We plan to inject approximately one hundred fifty (150) barrels of water per day in the A. C. Taylor A No. 3 in an attempt to increase our recovery of oil. We have had our firm engineer prepare a report to be submitted to this Commission as an exhibit which fully covers all our intentions.

MR. GRAHAM: Do you wish to offer it as an exhibit?

MR. KENNEDY: I do wish to offer it as an exhibit.

MR. SPURRIER; Without objection, it will be accepted as an exhibit.

MR. GRAHAM: What pool is that?

MR. KENNEDY: That's in the North Sugar Pool.

MR. GRAHAM: And that is considered to be an auto-drive - - -

MR. KENNEDY: It is a gas solution pool. We have encountered no water. There is no water being produced in any of the wells.

MR. SPURRIER: Are you familiar with the Camp Rock Pool repressuring on secondary recovery?

MR. KENNEDY: Yes. I am.

MR. SPURRIER: That is in the same formation, is it not?

MR. KENNEDY: The Camp Rock? Yes, I believe it's in the same formation, yes, sir.

MR. SPURRIMR: I just wondered. We understand that they felt that "slugging" - they are using air primarily. "Slugging" with water has not worked out very satisfactorily in that pool. However, I don't know if the conditions aren't different in your pool.

MR. KENNEDY: We had considered using air and have studied the re-pressuring of the south lot and believe that the recovery will be much more efficient using water. We do have sufficient amount of water on the lease to go ahead with our water-injection program.

MR. GRAHAM: Would you care to summarize the contents of that?

MR. KENNEDY: There are twelve (12) producing wells all being

pumped by individual pumping units. Recovery as of January 1st, 1952, was 460,203 barrels. It is estimated that an additional 84,000 barrels will be recovered by primary production. The reservoir data is rather meager in this field. However, the information available indicates that there is an excellent chance for water production to be successful.

MR. SPURRIER: Is this considered to be a pilet?

MR. KENNEDY: A Pilot, yes, sir. If it is successful, we will probably convert more wells to the water-injection method.

MR. SPURRIER: I presume that as in many cases where you get ready to put secondary-recovery methods into effect that you don't have near the information from the old well. That is, there is no reservoir data available because there are no cores available.

MR. KENNEDY: We took one core and one well and took samples from them. The main zone showed very poor recovery.

MR. GRAHAM: Would you like to outline to the Commission the Cantil devices or procedures?

MR. KENNEDY: We intend to obtain water from the existing water well on the lease and in addition we intend to go into an eld dry hole on our lease for water-producing sand, and if necessary drill another water well. We believe that with three water wells, we can produce about five or six hundred barrels of water per day which is more than adequate. We intend to inject water by gravity at the

rate of one hundred fifty (150) barrels a day. Not over one hundred fifty (150) barrels a day. This will be increased as the perimeter of the actual flood indicates.

MR. GRAHAM: What will be your criteria? How will you know -

MR. KENNEDY: We probably won't know for some five to six months in view of the fact that we don't know the amount of water that will be injected and also due to the wide spacing in the area. We calculate it will take approximately four months to replace the oil which has been produced in the immediate area by the water injection method. Probably not until that time will we begin to get a ny noticeable change in our production.

MR. GRAHAM: You have a plat or a map there. Is it your intention to introduce that as evidence?

MR. KENNEDY: I have - - there is a map of our lease. If the Commission wishes, it can be submitted as an exhibit.

MR. SPURRIER: Does anyone have any questions or comment.

MR. KENNEDY: I would like to add that we have the approval of the U. S. Geological Survey and also have gained the approval of the off-set operators.

MR. GRAHAM: Do you care to introduce that letter in the record for the information of the Commission or a photostat of it?

MR. KENNEDY: I have had copies made of the letter from the Off-set Operators. If you wish, I will have photostats made as I

do not have any copies of the U.S.G.S.

MR. SPURRIER: The Commission would like to have photostats of that letter and with no objection, they will be accepted as evidence in this case. Are there any further questions or comment?

Mr. Morrell?

MR. MORRELL: No. sir.

MR. SPURRIER: If not, the case will be taken under advisement.

STATE OF NEW MEXICO)

COUNTY OF LOS ALAMOS)

I hereby certify that the foregoing and attached transcript of hearing in Case 334 before the Oil Conservation Commission on January 22, 1952, at Santa Fe is a true record of the same to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.

DATED at Los Alamos, this 23rd day of January, 1952.

Andrey M. Henrickson

My commission expires September 20, 1955.