STATE OF NEW MEXICO

ENERGY, MINERALS AND NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION

IN THE MATTER OF THE HEARING CALLED BY THE OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONSIDERING:

CASE NO. 12,961 (Reopened)

APPLICATION OF DEVON ENERGY PRODUCTION)
COMPANY, L.P., TO REOPEN CASE NO. 12,961)
FOR AN EXCEPTION TO DIVISION ORDER)
NUMBER R-111-P, EDDY COUNTY, NEW MEXICO)

ORIGINAL

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDING RECEIVED

EXAMINER HEARING

JUL 24 2003

BEFORE: DAVID R. CATANACH, Hearing Examiner Oil Conservation Division

July 10th, 2003

Santa Fe, New Mexico

This matter came on for hearing before the New Mexico Oil Conservation Division, DAVID R. CATANACH,
Hearing Examiner, on Thursday, July 10th, 2003, at the New Mexico Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources Department,
1220 South Saint Francis Drive, Room 102, Santa Fe, New Mexico, Steven T. Brenner, Certified Court Reporter No. 7
for the State of New Mexico.

* * *

I N D E X

July 10th, 2003 Examiner Hearing CASE NO. 12,961

	PAGE
EXHIBITS	3
APPEARANCES	3
APPLICANT'S WITNESSES:	
RICHARD C. WINCHESTER (Landman)	
Direct Examination by Mr. Bruce	4
Examination by Examiner Catanach	11
JAMES BLOUNT (Engineer)	
Direct Examination by Mr. Bruce	15
Examination by Examiner Catanach	18
REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE	21

EXHIBITS

Applicant's		Identified	Admitted
Exhibit	2	5	11
Exhibit		7	11
Exhibit		11	11
Exhibit		16	18
Exhibit		17	18

* * *

APPEARANCES

FOR THE DIVISION:

DAVID K. BROOKS, JR.
Attorney at Law
Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources Department
Assistant General Counsel
1220 South St. Francis Drive
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505

FOR THE APPLICANT:

JAMES G. BRUCE
Attorney at Law
P.O. Box 1056
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504

* * *

1	WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were had at
2	8:22 a.m.:
3	EXAMINER CATANACH: And at this time I will call
4	Case 12,961, which is the Application of Devon Energy
5	Production Company, L.P., to reopen Case Number 12,961 for
6	an exception to Division Order Number R-111-P, Eddy County,
7	New Mexico.
8	Call for appearances in this case.
9	MR. BRUCE: Mr. Examiner, Jim Bruce of Santa Fe,
10	representing the Applicant. I have two witnesses.
11	EXAMINER CATANACH: Call for additional
12	appearances?
13	Okay, will the witnesses please stand to be sworn
14	in?
15	(Thereupon, the witnesses were sworn.)
16	RICHARD C. WINCHESTER,
17	the witness herein, after having been first duly sworn upon
18	his oath, was examined and testified as follows:
19	DIRECT EXAMINATION
20	BY MR. BRUCE:
21	Q. Would you please state your name for the record?
22	A. Richard Winchester.
23	Q. And where do you reside?
24	A. In Norman, Oklahoma.
25	Q. Who do you work for and in what capacity?

1 I work for Devon Energy Corporation as a 2 petroleum landman. Have you previously testified before the 3 Q. Division? 4 5 A. Yes, I have. And were your credentials as an expert petroleum Q. 6 7 landman accepted as a matter of record? 8 A. Yes, they were. And are you familiar with the land matters 9 Q. involved in this Application? 10 11 A. Yes, I am. Does your area of responsibility at Devon include 12 13 this portion of New Mexico? Yes, it does. 14 Α. MR. BRUCE: Mr. Examiner, I'd tender Mr. 15 Winchester as an expert petroleum landman. 16 EXAMINER CATANACH: Mr. Winchester is so 17 qualified. 18 19 (By Mr. Bruce) Mr. Winchester, let's open up 20 your Exhibit 1. And before we begin, this is a reopened case, isn't it, Mr. Winchester? 21 22 Yes, it is. Α. And Devon is asking for certain -- oh, how shall 23 Q. I put it? -- certain relaxation of the Division Rule 24

R-111-P with respect to how the wells are drilled and

completed?

- A. That's correct.
- Q. In the middle of this map there's an area that has a black outline. Is that the area that was originally sought or applied for in Case 12,961?
 - A. That's correct, last November.
- Q. And what area or what lease are we here for today?
- A. We're talking about the north half of Section 14, and this is 23 South, Range 31 East in Eddy County.
- Q. Okay. With that, could you go through this map?

 And this is just a revision of the map that was originally presented.
- A. That's correct. Mr. Examiner, if you'll take a look at the legend on the right-hand side, of course the yellow is Devon leasehold. The red outline indicates the area that's subject to Order R-111-P.

The hached area is the area that we just discussed that was the subject of the hearing last November in which an order came out in February where the OCD granted us an exception to the R-111-P.

The blue line indicates the potash enclave, and then the stippled area are existing federal potash leases. And then down at the bottom with the green outline, again, is the north half of Section 14, which is Federal Lease

533177-A.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

14

15

23

24

- Q. Okay. Now today, this map also has production data on it, does it not, Mr. Winchester?
 - A. That's correct, it does.
- Q. And there is an engineer who can testify about that if necessary?
 - A. Yes, Mr. Blount will testify.
- Q. We do not have a geologist today to testify; is that correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Has there been any change in the geology that you are aware of since the prior hearing?
- 13 A. No, sir.
 - Q. Okay. Now, the lease we're here for today is a federal lease; is that correct?
- 16 A. That's correct.
- 17 Q. And is that marked as Exhibit 2?
- A. Yes, it is. Yes, this Exhibit 2, it's actually
 Lease 533177, and then A was segregated out effective May
 1st, 1964, and it now covers the north half of Section 14,
 over to the east, the southeast quarter of Section 13, and
 then the east half of Section 24.
 - Q. Now, going back to the original case, the original black-outlined area, except for the north half of Section 14, was the subject of a settlement agreement

between the federal government and Devon Energy with respect to drilling in the potash area, was it not?

A. That's correct.

Q. And so the first go-around only concerned the

area that was the subject of that settlement agreement?

A. That's correct.

- Q. And today we're here for the north half of 14.

 This lease was not the subject of that settlement

 agreement?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. Does this lease contain a potash stipulation?
- A. Yes, it does. If you will take a look on page 3 in the addendum under paragraph 1, of course it states that drilling for oil and gas will not interfere with the mining or recovery of potash. So it is subject to the potash stipulation.
- Q. Okay. In looking at Exhibit 1 again, there are already two wells marked in the north half of Section 14; is that correct?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. And Devon does have wells planned to the west and to the south of the north half of Section -- well, actually surrounding the north half of Section 14?
- A. That's correct. If you'll take a look, Mr. Examiner, in -- actually it's in proration unit B, the

northwest of the northeast quarter, we have actually drilled the Todd 14 B Federal Number 3 well. It is currently being completed. And then we have applied for a permit for the A location, being the northeast of the northeast of 14.

- Q. Now, with respect to the casing program that

 Devon is requesting, the BLM has indicated it will approve

 the casing program that Devon is requesting here today?
 - A. That is correct.

- Q. Now, when you look at this, even though it is subject to the potash stipulations, Devon will be able to drill and will drill Delaware wells surrounding the north half of Section 14, will it not?
- A. That is correct. If you'll take a look, Mr. Examiner, at the location that's the northwest of the southwest of 14, and then moving west to that next location that's the northeast of the southeast of Section 15, and then the two locations north of there, the BLM has indicated to us on numerous occasions that once development of that area takes place, then they will grant us the locations in the remainder of the north half of Section 14.
- Q. And the potash companies have consistently maintained that when areas are developed like this, they won't mine it anyway; is that correct?
 - A. That's correct.

1	Q. And so even though this particular half section
2	of land is not subject to the potash stipulations, because
3	it will be surrounded by Delaware wells it is essentially
4	the same status as the area outlined in black?
5	A. That's correct.
6	Q. Okay. Now, I think it came up in the last
7	hearing, Mr. Winchester. Where are the nearest mine
8	workings that you're aware of?
9	A. The nearest mine workings are in Section 11 of 23
10	South, 31 East, so they're approximately five miles to the
11	west.
12	Q. Okay. And those are the mines in this area
13	are IMC?
14	A. That's correct.
15	Q. And again, the minerals are federal?
16	A. Yes.
17	Q. And both IMC and the BLM were notified of this
18	Application?
19	A. Yes, they were, on June 19th a letter was
20	forwarded to both parties.
21	Q. Have you heard anything from either entity?
22	A. No, we have not.
23	Q. Okay. Were Exhibits 1, 2 and 3 prepared by you
24	or under your supervision or compiled from company business
25	records?

1 Yes, they were. Α. And in your opinion, is the granting of Devon's 2 Q. Application in the interests of conservation and the 3 prevention of waste? 4 5 Α. Yes, it is. MR. BRUCE: Mr. Examiner, I'd move the admission 6 7 of Devon's Exhibits 1 through 3. EXAMINER CATANACH: Exhibits 1 through 3 will be 8 admitted. 9 10 EXAMINATION BY EXAMINER CATANACH: 11 Mr. Winchester, according to your map the closest 12 13 federal potash lease is to the west --Yes, that's --14 Α. -- in that tier of Sections 8, 17, 20 and 29? 15 Q. That's correct. 16 Α. And then there's some -- I believe up in Sections 17 Q. 3 and 4, were those state potash leases? 18 No, sir, those are federal potash leases. 19 Α. 20 Actually, the state potash leases are in Sections 2 to the 21 north, 16 to the west, and then in Section 32 to the south. 22 And that was on the original map that was prepared, that was inadvertently omitted from this. And that was because 23 the lease was to expire -- I believe our last hearing was 24

on November 15th. The lease was to expire on November

16th. And when Mr. Bruce checked the records, IMC is still paying the rental, and so I believe they still consider that lease in effect.

- Q. So IMC does have those state potash leases, as well as all of the federal potash leases in this unit?
 - A. That's correct.

- Q. Okay. Now, the first time around when you guys came in, we did the area outlined in black?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. And we excluded the north half of 14 at that time?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. And the reason for that was what?
- A. Well, the area that's hached, again, that would show us the settlement area, that was the leases that did not -- that were granted by the BLM, that did not contain potash stipulations. And under the settlement, there was some conflict, we believe, between Devon and the OCD on exactly what we were able to -- or how we were able to conduct our operations out here.

A. That's correct.

- Q. Now, it's my understanding you have already drilled a well in the north half of Section 14?
 - A. Yes, we have.
 - Q. And that was approved by the BLM?
- A. That's correct.
 - Q. And that was approved -- I presume that that well was not drilled with the extra string of casing in it; is that correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Have you had any occasion, Mr. Winchester, to look at any maps that show any LMRs, life of mine reserves, in this area?
 - A. I have, but I can't recall to mind how all of that fits within this, Mr. Examiner.
- Q. Do you recall whether or not there were any LMRs in this area, in the area that you're seeking today?
 - A. No, not in the area that we're seeking today. In fact, I think in the last testimony Mr. Gray testified that this area had not been under potash lease for at least 15 years.
 - Q. You don't anticipate that this will be mined by the potash company?
- A. That's correct, certainly after we develop the east half of Section 15 and then the remainder of the south

14 of 14. 1 Q. And is this -- The north half of Section 14, 2 that's going to be operated by Devon? 3 That's correct. Α. So do you know how many wells you guys are 5 0. planning to drill in that area? 6 7 Well, under current plans we would like to see Α. eight wells drilled in the north half of Section 14. 8 mean, certainly everything that you see that has a triangle 9 is a well that we either have a permit on now or we have 10 applied for a permit on. 11 Okay, and you mentioned something about a 12 stipulation by the BLM in that once you drill the wells in 13 Section 15 --14 Α. That's correct. 15 -- then the will authorize the additional wells 16 Q. 17 in Section 14; is that right? Α. That's correct. 18 How were you able to get that one, the existing 19 Q. well in Section 14, permitted? 20 Because they lie outside of the potash enclave, Α. 21 the blue line. 22

I see.

I have nothing further.

Okay, that's all I

EXAMINER CATANACH:

MR. BRUCE:

have, Mr. Bruce.

23

24

1 JAMES BLOUNT, 2 the witness herein, after having been first duly sworn upon 3 his oath, was examined and testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION 4 5 BY MR. BRUCE: Will you please state your name for the record? 6 Q. 7 A. James Blount. Where do you reside? 8 Q. I reside in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. 9 Α. Who do you work for and in what capacity? 10 Q. For Devon Energy, as a production -- or 11 A. operations engineer. 12 Have you previously testified before the Division 13 Q. 14 as an operations engineer? Yes, I have. 15 Α. And were your credentials as an expert accepted 16 17 as a matter of record? Α. Yes, they were. 18 And does this area of New Mexico -- Does your 19 Q. area of responsibility include this part of New Mexico? 20 Yes, it does. Α. 21 MR. BRUCE: Mr. Examiner, I tender Mr. Blount as 22 23 an expert operations engineer. EXAMINER CATANACH: Mr. Blount is so qualified. 24 (By Mr. Bruce) Mr. Blount, what I've handed you 25 Q.

are Exhibits 8 and 9 from the original hearing, which is why there's a gap in the numbering, Mr. Examiner.

What is Exhibit 8, Mr. Blount?

- A. Exhibit 8 is a typical wellbore diagram of the wells that have been drilled in this area. Basically, all wells that were drilled by Devon all through the 1990s were drilled with this program, and the wells that have been drilled since the last hearing that we had, with the exception, are also drilled to this program with basically the cement on the 5-1/2-inch brought up into the intermediate, but not to the surface.
- Q. Yates is another big operator in this township, is it not?
 - A. Yes, they are.

- Q. And to the best of your knowledge, are Yates wells similarly completed?
- A. That's correct, they are.
- 18 Q. Basically all the Delaware wells in this township
 19 are drilled and completed in an equivalent manner?
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. Okay. Now, one well has already been drilled in the north half of Section 14, and I think you testified about this in the prior hearing, but if the Division did not grant Devon's Application you could re-enter that well and recomplete it in the manner specified by Rule 111,

could you not?

- A. That's correct, we could do a squeeze and bring the cement on up. We have the cement currently at the base of the intermediate, right now, and if this Application is denied we can go in there and squeeze that to the surface.
 - Q. Okay. What is Exhibit 9, then, Mr. Blount?
- A. Exhibit 9 is just a visual interpretation of the R-111-P as interpreted by Tim Gum, actually. Basically it shows that these are the different requirements based on, you know, wells that you could drill in the potash. If you drill a well 5000 feet or shallower, they only require a single string across the salt, a single cemented string. But if you drill deeper than 5000 their interpretation is, you have two cemented strings across the salt. And you can achieve that by cementing the long string to the surface or by setting a secondary, intermediate string beyond the salt protection string.
- Q. What is the approximate depth of the Delaware wells in this area?
 - A. These are approximately 8300 foot.
 - Q. Okay, so the two wellbore sketches on the right-hand side would apply if the relief is not granted?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. And were Exhibits 8 and 9 from the prior hearing prepared by you?

STEVEN T. BRENNER, CCR (505) 989-9317

Q. Mr. Blount, I believe you testified the well in

1 A. Yes, they were. And in your opinion is the granting of Devon's 2 Q. Application in the interest of conservation and the 3 prevention of waste? 4 5 A. Yes, it is. One final question, Mr. Blount. I think you 6 0. 7 testified about the approximate cost to complete them in the manner that Devon desires, as opposed to the way the 8 Artesia OCD office requires them to be completed. What is 9 the approximate cost difference per well? 10 It would add a minimum of \$30,000 per well. 11 A. Okay, so over eight wells in this section you're 12 0. talking what, a quarter million dollars or so? 13 A. That's correct. 14 MR. BRUCE: Thank you. That's all I have, Mr. 15 16 Examiner. 17 EXAMINER CATANACH: Let's see, do you want to enter these exhibits? 18 MR. BRUCE: Yes, I'd like to move the admission 19 of Exhibits 8 and 9. 20 EXAMINER CATANACH: Exhibits 8 and 9 will be 21 admitted. 22 23 EXAMINATION

Mr. Blount, I believe you testified the well in

BY EXAMINER CATANACH:

Q.

24

1	Section 14 currently has cement to the base of the
2	intermediate?
3	A. That's correct. I believe 4300 foot was where we
4	found the top of cement.
5	Q. And where's the intermediate set at?
6	A. Intermediates are roughly 4500.
7	Q. So you've got a couple of hundred feet
8	A. Right.
9	Q inside the intermediate?
10	A. Right.
11	Q. I don't recall, in the last order did we have a
12	stipulation on how far up the cement needed to be?
13	A. It requested 500 feet.
14	Q. So this is not in compliance with that?
15	A. That's correct.
16	Q. How many wells were drilled, do you know, since
17	the order was issued in the last case?
18	A. We're currently drilling the fourth.
19	Q. Now, do you know if those wells were in
20	compliance with the minimum cement height?
21	A. Yes, they were. Yeah, for whatever reason they
22	fell back a little bit on this 14 B.
23	Q. I don't think I have anything else.
24	What would be the procedure to bring that well
25	into compliance, Mr. Blount?

1	A. We could perforate the 5-1/2-inch string	
2	approximately 50 feet above the cement top, set a cement	
3	retainer and pump cement in there and circulate it to	
4	surface.	
5	Q. To get into compliance with the terms of the last	
6	order, you'd only need to bring that cement up an	
7	additional 300 feet.	
8	A. That's correct.	
9	Q. Would that I mean, would that be better for	
10	your guys, doing that?	
11	A. Well, it would definitely be a lot less cement.	
12	Q. You'd still have to squeeze, though?	
13	A. That's correct.	
14	EXAMINER CATANACH: Okay, I have nothing further,	
15	Mr. Bruce.	
16	MR. BRUCE: I have nothing further in this	
17	matter, Mr. Examiner.	
18	EXAMINER CATANACH: Okay, Case 12,961 will be	
19	taken under advisement.	
20	(Thereupon, these proceedings were concluded at	
21	8:44 a.m.)	
22	* * * *	क्षित्रहाः विश्वतिकालिकाः - 75 €र 7
23	the section of Committee the section of Committee the	+2003
24	Cil Conservation Division	merice!

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

STATE OF NEW MEXICO)
) ss.
COUNTY OF SANTA FE)

I, Steven T. Brenner, Certified Court Reporter and Notary Public, HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing transcript of proceedings before the Oil Conservation Division was reported by me; that I transcribed my notes; and that the foregoing is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative or employee of any of the parties or attorneys involved in this matter and that I have no personal interest in the final disposition of this matter.

WITNESS MY HAND AND SEAL July 10th, 2003.

STEVEN T. BRENNER

CCR No. 7

My commission expires: October 16th, 2006