

NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION
SOUTHEAST NEW MEXICO PACKER LEAKAGE TEST

Operator Gulf Oil Corporation			Lease Lea State "CL" (NCT-A)			Well No. 1	
Location of Well	Unit G	Sec 2	Twp 16S	Rge 32E	County Lea		
Name of Reservoir or Pool			Type of Prod (Oil or Gas)	Method of Prod Flow, Art Lift	Prod. Medium (Tbg or Csg)	Choke Size	
Upper Compl	Anderson Ranch Wolfcamp		Oil	Kobe Pump	Tbg.	2" WO	
Lower Compl	Anderson Ranch Devonian		Oil	"	Tbg.	2" WO	

FLOW TEST NO. 1

Both zones shut-in at (hour, date): 10:45 a.m., 5-6-63

Well opened at (hour, date):	Upper Completion	Lower Completion
<u>10:45 a.m., 5-7-63</u>		
Indicate by (X) the zone producing.....		<u>X</u>
Pressure at beginning of test.....	<u>130</u>	<u>6</u>
Stabilized? (Yes or No).....	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Yes</u>
Maximum pressure during test.....	<u>148</u>	<u>64</u>
Minimum pressure during test.....	<u>130</u>	<u>16</u>
Pressure at conclusion of test.....	<u>148</u>	<u>16</u>
Pressure change during test (Maximum minus Minimum).....	<u>18</u>	<u>49</u>
Was pressure change an increase or a decrease?.....	<u>Incr.</u>	<u>Decr.</u>
Well closed at (hour, date): <u>10:45 a.m., 5-8-63</u>	Total Time On Production <u>24 hrs</u>	
Oil Production	Gas Production	
During Test: <u>3</u> bbls; Grav. <u>50.8</u> ; During Test <u>48.0</u> MCF; GOR <u>16,000</u>		
Remarks _____		

FLOW TEST NO. 2

Well opened at (hour, date):	Upper Completion	Lower Completion
<u>10:45 a.m., 5-9-63</u>		
Indicate by (X) the zone producing.....	<u>X</u>	
Pressure at beginning of test.....	<u>151</u>	<u>6</u>
Stabilized? (Yes or No).....	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Yes</u>
Maximum pressure during test.....	<u>175</u>	<u>6</u>
Minimum pressure during test.....	<u>31</u>	<u>6</u>
Pressure at conclusion of test.....	<u>31</u>	<u>6</u>
Pressure change during test (Maximum minus Minimum).....	<u>144</u>	<u>0</u>
Was pressure change an increase or a decrease?.....	<u>Decr.</u>	<u>-</u>
Well closed at (hour, date) <u>10:45 a.m., 5-10-63</u>	Total time on Production <u>24 hrs</u>	
Oil Production	Gas Production	
During Test: <u>68</u> bbls; Grav. <u>38.8</u> ; During Test <u>70.0</u> MCF; GOR <u>1029</u>		
Remarks _____		

I hereby certify that the information herein contained is true and complete to the best of my knowledge.

Approved _____ 19
New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission

Operator GULF OIL CORPORATION

By RAYMOND WATSON

By _____
Title _____

Title WELL TESTER

Date 5-13-63

[illegible][illegible][illegible]

$\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) = \frac{1}{4}$

[illegible]

SECRET

2. *How many people are in the room?*
 3. *How many people are in the room?*
 4. *How many people are in the room?*
 5. *How many people are in the room?*

[illegible][illegible]

1. *Chlorophyll a* and *Chlorophyll b* content of the leaves was determined by the method of Arar and Johnson (1999).

[illegible]

Figure 1. The proposed model for the development of the self-regulation of learning. The model illustrates the relationship between various factors influencing the development of self-regulation of learning. The central concept is 'Self-regulation of learning', which is influenced by 'Metacognitive skills' and 'Metacognitive strategies'. 'Metacognitive skills' are further influenced by 'Metacognitive knowledge' and 'Metacognitive strategies'. 'Metacognitive knowledge' is influenced by 'Metacognitive strategies' and 'Metacognitive skills'. 'Metacognitive strategies' are influenced by 'Metacognitive skills' and 'Metacognitive knowledge'. The model also shows the influence of 'Metacognitive skills' on 'Metacognitive strategies' and 'Metacognitive knowledge' on 'Metacognitive strategies'. The model is based on the work of Flavell (1976) and Metcalfe and Shimamura (1994).

[Home](#)
[About Us](#)
[Contact Us](#)
[Privacy Policy](#)
[Terms of Service](#)
[FAQ](#)
[Blog](#)
[Partners](#)
[Press](#)
[Careers](#)

© 2024 All rights reserved.

Figure 1. The effect of the concentration of the H_2O_2 solution on the amount of the released H_2O from the H_2O_2 -loaded hydrogel. The amount of the released H_2O was measured by the weight difference of the hydrogel before and after the release. The concentration of the H_2O_2 solution was 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5, 0.6, 0.7, 0.8, 0.9, and 1.0 wt. %.

Figure 1. The effect of the concentration of the *Agrobacterium* suspension on the transformation efficiency of *Agrobacterium* strains. The concentration of the *Agrobacterium* suspension was 10⁶ cells/ml (a), 10⁷ cells/ml (b), 10⁸ cells/ml (c), and 10⁹ cells/ml (d). The concentration of the *Agrobacterium* suspension was 10⁶ cells/ml (a), 10⁷ cells/ml (b), 10⁸ cells/ml (c), and 10⁹ cells/ml (d). The concentration of the *Agrobacterium* suspension was 10⁶ cells/ml (a), 10⁷ cells/ml (b), 10⁸ cells/ml (c), and 10⁹ cells/ml (d). The concentration of the *Agrobacterium* suspension was 10⁶ cells/ml (a), 10⁷ cells/ml (b), 10⁸ cells/ml (c), and 10⁹ cells/ml (d).

Figure 1. The effect of the concentration of the *Agrobacterium* suspension on the transformation efficiency of *Agrobacterium* strains. The *Agrobacterium* strains were grown in YEA medium for 24 h at 28 °C. The cell concentration was adjusted to 10⁸ cells/ml. The cells were then mixed with the plant tissue and incubated for 24 h at 28 °C. The plant tissue was then cultured on the selective medium. The transformation efficiency was determined as the number of transformants per 10⁶ cells. The data are the mean ± SD of three independent experiments.

[illegible]