

NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

MISCELLANEOUS REPORTS ON WELLS

(Submit to appropriate District Office as per Commission Rule 1106)

HOBBS OFFICE OCC
1956 MAR 29 AM 9:11

COMPANY Humble Oil & Refining Company, Box 2347, Hobbs, New Mexico
(Address)

LEASE N. M. State AP WELL NO. 1 UNIT E S 36 T 15S R 36E

DATE WORK PERFORMED 3-26-56 POOL Dean Strawn

This is a Report of: (Check appropriate block) ☒ Results of Test of Casing Shut-off
☒ Beginning Drilling Operations ☐ Remedial Work
☐ Plugging ☐ Other

Detailed account of work done, nature and quantity of materials used and results obtained.

Spudded 17-1/2" hole at 11:00 A. M., 3-26-56.

Ran and set 11 joints 13-3/8" casing, 323.58', set at 339.88'. Cemented with 350 ex.
common regular 4 1/2 gal cement. Plug in place 2:50 A. M. 3-27-56.

Tested with 1000# for 30 minutes. No drop in pressure. Started drilling plug at
2:45 A. M. 3-28-56.

FILL IN BELOW FOR REMEDIAL WORK REPORTS ONLY

Original Well Data:

DF Elev. _____ TD _____ PBD _____ Prod. Int. _____ Compl Date _____

Tbng. Dia _____ Tbng Depth _____ Oil String Dia _____ Oil String Depth _____

Perf Interval (s) _____

Open Hole Interval _____ Producing Formation (s) _____

RESULTS OF WORKOVER:

	BEFORE	AFTER
Date of Test	_____	_____
Oil Production, bbls. per day	_____	_____
Gas Production, Mcf per day	_____	_____
Water Production, bbls. per day	_____	_____
Gas-Oil Ratio, cu. ft. per bbl.	_____	_____
Gas Well Potential, Mcf per day	_____	_____

Witnessed by L B Moore Humble Oil & Refining Company
(Company)

OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Name C. M. Lueder I hereby certify that the information given
Title _____ above is true and complete to the best of
Date _____ my knowledge.
Name M M Rogers Position Agent
Company Humble Oil & Refining Company

MAR 29 1956 mob

1. $\frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{4}$

•

•

* χ^2 test for independence. \dagger χ^2 test for trend. \ddagger χ^2 test for independence. \S χ^2 test for trend. \parallel χ^2 test for independence. ∇ χ^2 test for trend.

Figure 1. The effect of the number of trials on the number of correct responses. The number of correct responses was significantly higher than the number of incorrect responses in the 10-trial condition. The number of correct responses was significantly higher than the number of incorrect responses in the 20-trial condition. The number of correct responses was significantly higher than the number of incorrect responses in the 30-trial condition. The number of correct responses was significantly higher than the number of incorrect responses in the 40-trial condition. The number of correct responses was significantly higher than the number of incorrect responses in the 50-trial condition. The number of correct responses was significantly higher than the number of incorrect responses in the 60-trial condition. The number of correct responses was significantly higher than the number of incorrect responses in the 70-trial condition. The number of correct responses was significantly higher than the number of incorrect responses in the 80-trial condition. The number of correct responses was significantly higher than the number of incorrect responses in the 90-trial condition. The number of correct responses was significantly higher than the number of incorrect responses in the 100-trial condition.

• **Prevalence:** 10% of the population

^a Values are means ± SD.

22