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Unitization of Haynesville Shale

Richard W. Revels, Jr.

Liskow & Lewis
Lafayette, Louisiana

I. Background

This article attempts to give the reader an overview of unitization developments in Louisiana relating to the Haynesville Zone which have occurred in the last three or so years. That we would even be discussing development of a shale interval is surprising in itself. Historically, geologists have considered shale as a source rock, but not a reservoir rock capable of producing oil and gas in commercial quantities. That shale can be commercially drilled and produced has been amply demonstrated in other shale plays, particularly the Barnett Shale around Fort Worth, Texas. With new drilling and completing technologies, resource plays focused on development of shale intervals are ongoing throughout the United States, including the Barnett Shale (Texas), Woodford Shale (Oklahoma), Fayetteville Shale (Arkansas), Bakken Shale (Montana and North Dakota) and Marcellus Shale (New York, Pennsylvania, West Virginia), just to name some of the most prominent.

Our focus today is the Haynesville Shale play currently going on in the northeastern part of Texas and the northwestern portion of Louisiana, including Bossier, Caddo, DeSoto, Red River, Webster, Bienville, Sabine and Natchitoches Parishes (See maps attached at Exhibits 1 & 1A). First, you may be interested in why Louisiana’s shale play is named for the Town of Haynesville. Some of you may know that Haynesville is a small town of about 2,700 people in Claiborne Parish, not far from the Arkansas state line, which began in a much earlier oil boom at the turn of the 20th Century. The Haynesville Formation was identified roughly 60 years ago in nearby Haynesville Field. The Haynesville Formation in this northern area is primarily composed of sandstones rather than shales according to the information on the Office of Conservation’s website (dnr.louisiana.gov/haynesvilleshale/default.asp). The first order issued for the Haynesville Sand, in Haynesville Field, is Office of Conservation Order No. 35-R, effective February 5, 1986. Over 100 orders in this 35-R Series have subsequently been issued. Haynesville is justly proud of the storied football success of its Golden Tornado high school football team formerly led by its legendary coach, Alton “Red” Franklin, winning 14 state championships, second only to John Curtis High School of River Ridge, Louisiana. Now Haynesville has another source of pride—it has lent its name to the shale play ongoing in northwest Louisiana and northeast Texas, which Aubrey McClendon, Chief Executive Officer of Chesapeake Energy Company, predicts will by 2020 become the largest gas...

At early as 2004, several operators, including EnCana, Chesapeake and Petrohawk, among others, began amassing large lease blocks in northwestern Louisiana with development of the Haynesville and Bossier Shales in mind. Many of these leases were acquired on three (3) to five (5) year paid-up forms for bonuses in the $150 to $200 range, with royalties of 1/6 or 3/16 most common. Some of the areas which are now being the most actively developed in the Haynesville Shale are covered by older leases maintained in effect by shallow production, principally from the Hosston and Cotton Valley Formations. In those areas, Haynesville operators sought farmouts or leasehold acquisitions from the existing leasehold owners, whether structured as complete or partial buy outs of the entire leasehold or purchases of rights below currently producing intervals. These developments at first did not create a great stir with the public or Office of Conservation, and the lease terms negotiated were within the range previously paid and would, from a historical prospective, be deemed fair and reasonable.

II. Early Unitization

Early unitization affecting the Haynesville and Bossier Shales also followed historical precedent. As operators began to propose units that would include the Haynesville Shale in areas in which units already existed for the Cotton Valley or Lower Cotton Valley Formations, they typically asked the Commissioner of Conservation to redefine the unit interval so as to include Bossier and Haynesville Shales by lowering the base of the defined interval rather than seeking to establish new units specifically for the Haynesville Zone. Thus, in attempting to research whether Haynesville units in a particular field exist, one must look at any fairly recent redefinitions of the Cotton Valley or Lower Cotton Valley intervals to determine whether those definitions might extend down to or through the base of the Haynesville Shale. As a result of hearings on August 1, 2006, the Commissioner of Conservation issued Order Nos. 917-J and 917-J-1 for Bracky Branch Field, and Order No. 1137-E for Martin Field, establishing units for the Jurassic Zone, which included the Cotton Valley Formation, Bossier and Haynesville Shales, and perhaps the upper portion of the Smackover Formation. Again, these units followed the same pattern of governmental sectional units of approximately 640 acres in size that has for decades existed for shallower Hosston and Cotton Valley Formations. No special rules or regulations applied to the Haynesville Zone, and its unitization in the early stages proceeded smoothly, well accommodated by the regulatory framework in place.

By the spring of 2008, things began to change dramatically. Chesapeake Energy, in particular, started to very publicly tout the tremendous potential of the Haynesville Shale in terms of both reserves and value.
Bonus payments skyrocketed, with some lucky lessors receiving as much as $30,000 per acre bonus. Numerous operators aggressively competed to acquire additional acreage in areas of perceived Haynesville Shale potential. With all the media attention and unprecedented bonus payments, landowners and mineral owners who had leased for more customary terms were understandably disappointed not to have participated in the financial windfall to the same degree as other owners enjoyed who leased somewhat later. And many other landowners and mineral owners were quite upset to realize that their existing leases were maintained in effect by shallow production as to all depths; and thus, they would not be receiving any additional bonus monies from operators seeking to develop the deeper Haynesville Zone although their lessees might be in a position to negotiate lucrative deals with Haynesville operators. The impact and influence of the internet cannot be overstated. For perhaps the first time, Louisiana lessors actively investigated developments and communicated with other owners in an effort to educate themselves as to Haynesville developments and shale plays in general. Websites and blogs proliferated (e.g., www.gohaynesvilleshale.com). There was a fairly widespread and growing sentiment that Haynesville operators used superior knowledge to acquire large lease blocks to the detriment of the individual landowners. So, although the regulatory framework of the Office of Conservation for the formation of compulsory units easily accommodated creation of units for the Haynesville Zone, the greatly increased public interest and publicity the Haynesville Zone received prompted several responses from the Office of Conservation.

III. Regulatory Responses

At the height of the leasing frenzy and publicity, the Commissioner of Conservation issued a Memo dated July 28, 2008 (attached as Exhibit 2), requiring that the Haynesville Zone be unitized separately from the intervals primarily composed of sandstones both above and below the Bossier Shale and Haynesville Shale intervals. Thus, the traditional Cotton Valley Formation and Smackover Formation had to be excluded from the definition of the Haynesville Zone. As mentioned above, the Haynesville interval in the very northern part of the state tends to be composed more of sandstones, but shales predominate as one moves to the south. So the Haynesville Zone is now referred to as the subsurface interval consisting primarily of shale situated below the base of the deepest Cotton Valley sands and above the Smackover Formation.

Why was this a sensitive issue given that the same size and shape units were typically being formed whether the Cotton Valley Formation was unitized with the Haynesville Shale or identical Haynesville Shale units were separately created? Well, the Haynesville Shale was new and different in the sense of bonuses being paid and potential reserves being estimated by Haynesville operators. Although any production in paying
quantities will maintain a standard lease in effect as to all depths, there
was a concern on the part of many lessors that the early leases they had
granted for relatively low bonus payments might be maintained in effect
as to the Haynesville Zone by drilling and producing of shallower inter-
vals. Also, many leases were negotiated with “deep right” termination
provisions, and again, there was a concern that despite these provisions,
the leases might be maintained to the base of the Haynesville Zone by
establishment of Cotton Valley production. How these provisions might
operate in a particular situation to the disadvantage of the lessor may be
discussed by our other panelists. The Office of Conservation was bom-
barded with questions and complaints from unhappy Haynesville lessors.
The memo then was one result of the outcry.

The Commissioner of Conservation also at this time established an
advisory committee chaired by Randy Songy and composed additionally
of Todd Keating, Director of the Engineering Division of the Office of
Conservation, Louis Gilbert, a panelist today, Bill Fleming, Warren
Fleet, David Smelley and myself. The first item recommended
by the Committee and adopted by the Commissioner in Memorandum dated
August 19, 2008, (Exhibit 3 attached) is a blanket exemption of Haynes-
ville Zone units from the production test in the field requirement. As a
general policy, the Commissioner of Conservation does not establish pre-
drilling units without a production test in the field or a specific waiver
issued after it is demonstrated that a well on trend or in the general area,
although not in the same field, has produced from this interval. This
blanket waiver facilitated formation of Haynesville Zone units in fields
which had no Haynesville production test without the delay attendant to
obtaining a specific waiver from the Office of Conservation.

Another development relates to the manner in which the Office of
Conservation will determine whether a horizontal or directional well
complies with applicable spacing requirements. In the Memorandum is-
sued by the Commissioner of Conservation on November 24, 2008 (Ex-
hibit 4 attached), he states that in cased holes, the nearest perforation ra-
ther than the penetration point or terminus will be used to determine
compliance with applicable spacing. Because the Haynesville Zone is
predominately being developed by use of horizontal laterals, it was es-
sential for the Haynesville operators to know whether they had to design
a well path so as not to penetrate the top of the Haynesville Zone closer
than 330 feet from any unit line, or instead, whether the closest perfora-
tion would be used to determine compliance with spacing requirements.
Because the Haynesville Zone, as defined in some fields, is in excess of
1,000 feet thick, using the penetration point and terminus could signifi-
cantly reduce the effective length of lateral.

The Committee has been working on a proposed Statewide Order
for the Haynesville Zone which the Commissioner of Conservation is
presently considering. Some variation of that proposed rule may be is-
issued by the Commissioner in the relatively near future. From a regula-
tory standpoint, treatment of the Haynesville Zone in a separate state-
wide order is perhaps most akin to the treatment which the Austin Chalk
Formation received. Statewide Order 29-S, effective September 15,
1997, adopted rules and regulations specifically addressing the Austin
Chalk Formation. Hundreds of Austin Chalk units were formed in about
17 different fields. Over 200 horizontal wells were drilled to the Austin
Chalk. Unfortunately, many of these wells did not pay out, and after sev-
eral years of active development, most operators abandoned further plans
and few Austin Chalk wells have been drilled in the last several years.
We all hope that the Haynesville Shale development will be much more
profitable and long-lived.

The Commissioner also appointed members to a committee chaired
by David Smelley to consider more strict control and regulation of drill-
ing Haynesville wells in urban areas within 750 feet of a residence, reli-
gious institution, public building or public park. A statewide rule may be
promulgated in the near future resulting from the work of this committee.
Any such rule will likely include requirements that operators take steps
to minimize noise, dust, and vibrations resulting from their operations,
particularly at night.

IV. Current Developments

A. Activity

Because of the high profile the Haynesville Zone enjoys, the Office
of Conservation has constructed a separate area on its website containing
information with respect to the Haynesville Shale, including a listing of
Haynesville wells and an interactive map of Haynesville units. Louis
Gilbert has also included in his seminar materials a map showing exist-
ing or proposed Haynesville units that you may find helpful. According
to Conservation’s website, as of March 3, 2009, some 260 Haynesville
wells have been permitted, including 44 producing wells and 40 wells
currently drilling. The Office of Conservation estimates the number of
existing Haynesville units at 302 as of March 3, 2009. The number of
wells and number of units are increasing at a fairly rapid pace, which is
somewhat surprising given the dramatic drop in natural gas prices from
the $13-$14 range in the summer of 2008 to the $4 to $5 per MCF which
is more typical at present. Based upon the listing of wells, some of the
active operators include Chesapeake Operating, Inc., Petrohawk Operat-
ing Company, EnCana Oil & Gas (USA) Inc., SWEPI LP, EXCO Pro-
duction Company, LP, Questar Exploration & Production Company,
Comstock Oil & Gas-Louisiana, LLC, Camterra Resources, Inc., J-W
Operating Company, El Paso Production Company, EOG Resources,
Star Operating, Inc.
B. Regulatory Input by Local Political Subdivisions and Federal Agencies

One regulatory development that bears watching is the extent to which local political subdivisions will attempt to regulate various aspects of development by Haynesville operators. It is the writer’s understanding that city and parish officials in Bossier and Caddo are currently discussing how they might ensure that development is done in a prudent, safe manner and that additional costs and burdens to the localities’ roads, water systems and infrastructure are shouldered, at least in part, by the operators. The Commissioner included representatives of local governments on the committee formulating additional requirements for urban Haynesville drilling. It is understandable that local public officials believe they have an important role to play in overseeing Haynesville development to the end that such development results in the maximum long-term benefit to the affected communities. The City of Shreveport, in particular, is no doubt aware that direct regulation of drilling is under the exclusive authority of the Commissioner of Conservation. See, La. R.S. 30:28. In 1990, it enacted Ordinance 221 forbidding any new drilling within 1,000 feet of Cross Lake, Shreveport’s main source of drinking water. This ordinance was ruled to be preempted by state law in litigation that subsequently ensued. Energy Management Corp. v. City of Shreveport, 397 F.3d 297 (5th Cir. 2005), and 467 F.3d 471 (5th Cir. 2006). Louisiana has wisely avoided the proliferation of overlapping and inconsistent rules and regulations which would no doubt result if every local political subdivision were free to issue its own rules regulating drilling and development. It is likely, however, as we go forward that some accommodations are made to give local political subdivisions some input in matters that are of great concern to them. There is no dispute that the Federal Emergency Management Agency has some jurisdiction with respect to structures constructed in floodplains and floodways. Some operators have already encountered difficulties and delays in conducting drilling operations in these areas. Obviously, the Federal Aviation Agency has jurisdiction to regulate obstructions to air traffic within areas proximate to airports, including Barksdale Air Force Base. So, operators must be prepared to deal with local, state and federal agencies as they seek to develop their leasehold positions.

C. Groundwater Use

One of the areas of greatest concern to some landowners and governmental entities is that of groundwater use by Haynesville drillers. The wells being drilled will not produce at desired rates without hydraulic fracturing (“fracing”). Large quantities of water are required for this process. In certain areas of active Haynesville development, groundwater aquifers are more taxed, bringing their sustainability into question. The Commissioner of Conservation has jurisdiction over groundwater. The
Office of Conservation has certain notification and permitting requirements for wells used for fracking. The Commissioner has issued an advisory cautioning wise water use planning in development of the Haynesville Shale. (See Exhibits 5 and 6 attached).

V. Future Developments

Operators with large, undrilled lease blocks will likely focus primarily on drilling unit wells to hold leases included within units established for these wells. Several alternate unit wells have been sought by operators, and it is expected that more alternate unit wells to serve existing producing units will be requested in the future as operators gain additional experience and the better productive areas are identified. The pace and extent of future development is obviously dependent upon reserves, well performance, costs of drilling and development, and product prices. The writer is not sufficiently foolhardy to attempt any predictions other than to suggest that prices and costs are likely to continue to be quite volatile and unpredictable. As Louisianans, we can be grateful for the billions of dollars of investment the Haynesville Shale play has brought to our state and for the professional and competent manner in which the Commissioner of Conservation and his staff have and continue to regulate the oil and gas industry here.
CORE HAYNESVILLE AREA
TO: All Concerned  
FROM: James H. Welsh  
Commissioner of Conservation  
SUBJECT: Units for the Haynesville Shale and other shale formations—Defined Interval

Effective immediately, it will be the policy of the Office of Conservation that the defined interval in any order issued after the date of this Memorandum creating one or more units for the exploration for and production of gas and condensate from primarily shale formations, such as the Haynesville and Bossier Shales, shall not include any sandstone, limestone or other primarily non-shale intervals, such as the Cotton Valley or Smackover Formations, absent proof of exceptional circumstances.

This policy shall apply to pending unit proceedings, but in such pending proceedings, some consideration will be given for granting an exception based on undue prejudice to the applicant or other interested owners, represented parties or interested parties. With regard to pending unit proceedings, if the application and the correlative Legal Notice for that docket references a single definition which combines intervals containing primarily shale with other primarily non-shale intervals, the Office of Conservation shall consider that the creation of separate units for the primarily shale interval as well as the creation of separate units for (or a redefinition affecting) the primarily non-shale intervals included within the applicant’s proposed definition, shall be within the call of the hearing for that docket, without the necessity of the filing of an amended application or the publication of a revised Legal Notice.

Without limitation, this policy shall apply to additional units created in fields for which existing units for any reservoir have a definition more expansive than that allowed by this policy. Applications for the revision of the defined interval of existing units to comply with this policy will be considered; however, due regard will be given for undue prejudice to the operator and other interested owners, particularly where a well or wells have previously been drilled sufficiently deep to test the primarily shale interval, and
further consideration will also be given to the general rule applicable to any request for a unit revision, that is, that the proposed revision must be supported by new data obtained after the hearing upon which the unit order is based.
MEMORANDUM

August 19, 2008

TO: All Concerned

FROM: James H. Welsh
Commissioner of Conservation

SUBJECT: Exemption of Haynesville Zone units from production test requirement

The policy of the Office of Conservation has been to require a production test in the field prior to creating an undrilled unit for a particular interval unless a waiver of that requirement is obtained from this Office pursuant to Memorandum dated March 16, 1998. Effective immediately, the “Production Test in the Field” policy shall not apply to filings for units relating to the Haynesville Zone, and undrilled units may be proposed and created without a production test in the field or a waiver of that requirement from this office. For purposes of this exemption, the Haynesville Zone refers to that interval consisting primarily of shale situated below the deepest Cotton Valley sands and above the top of the Smackover Formation. The Haynesville Zone has been shown to be both laterally continuous and productive over an extensive area making this exemption appropriate and justified. In addition, granting this exemption will facilitate orderly development of this important natural resource.
MEMORANDUM

TO: All Concerned

FROM: James H. Welsh
Commissioner of Conservation

DATE: November 12, 2008

SUBJECT: Well spacing.

In order to provide for uniformity in the application of the well spacing requirements provided in Statewide Order No. 29-E or in special field rules, effectively immediately the following shall be the policy of the Office of Conservation:

(1) With respect to any well in which production casing is run and cemented across the pool in which the well is perforated for production, the distance to any property line and offset well shall be calculated based on the distance to the nearest perforation in the pool, and not based on the distance from the point at which the wellbore penetrates or exits the pool.

(2) With respect to any well in which production casing is not run and cemented across the pool (including, without limitation, open hole completions or completions using a slotted liner), the distance to any property line and offset well will be calculated based on the closest point open to the wellbore.
MEMORANDUM

To: Oil and Gas Exploration and Production Well Operators / Ground Water Well Owners

From: James H. Welsh
Commissioner of Conservation

Date: August 21, 2008

Subject: Ground Water Use Other than Drilling Rig Supply
Office of Conservation Water Well Notification and Evaluation Requirements

This memorandum is provided to inform oil and gas exploration and production well operators and water well owners of the water well notification requirements for all drilling rig supply wells and ground water well use for purposes other than drilling rig supply.

Louisiana Revised Statute 38:3097.3 and LAC 43:VI.701 require that 60 days prior to the drilling of a water well, Notice of Intent to Drill must be submitted by the well owner to the Office of Conservation (Conservation). There are four well types that are not required to provide notice to Conservation sixty days prior to drilling. These include drilling rig supply wells, domestic wells, replacement wells and drought relief wells.

As the law states, drilling rig supply wells are “used only for the duration of the oil and gas drilling operation at the drilling location where sited for the immediate needs of rig operations.” La. R.S. 38:3097.3.C(4)(x)(iii). In other words, a drilling rig supply well is to be used only temporarily for as long as the associated oil or gas well is being drilled. When the oil or gas well drilling operation is complete, this office must be notified of any change in well use or well type. For this reason all post installation notifications claiming to notify this office of a drilling rig supply well, shall be required to identify the serial number of the oil or gas well it has been drilled to supply.

Notification of change in information is required by LAC 43:VI.701.B. This includes any transfers of ownership and/or changes of well use or type. All notifications of change in information to a well use or well type, which is not exempt from the sixty (60) day prior notification requirement of LAC 43:VI.701.B, must be submitted to Conservation at least sixty (60) days prior to the change in well use or well type. (See NOTE).

All water well notifications or change of information amendments must be submitted with a properly completed Ground Water Resources Form. To obtain a copy of the form, contact Ground Water Resources Program staff at 225-342-8244 or download the form at http://dtr.louisiana.gov/CONS/gwater/GWR-01R1.pdf. Submit completed forms by mail, e-mail or fax to the contact information provided below.

NOTE: water wells used for supplying hydraulic fracturing operations at oil and gas exploration and production sites, also known as Frac Water Supply Wells, do not meet the definition of drilling rig supply wells and shall therefore provide notification to the Office of Conservation sixty (60) days prior to drilling or change of use as set forth above.

Mail: Louisiana Office of Conservation
Environmental Division
Ground Water Resources
P.O. Box 94275
Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9275

E-mail: gwater@la.gov
Fax: (225) 342-5529
EXHIBIT

Web Posting

Ground Water Use Advisory:
Commissioner of Conservation Recommends Wise Water Use Planning in the Haynesville Shale

Commissioner of Conservation Jim Welsh recommends that oil and gas operators with interest in developing the Haynesville Shale in Northwest Louisiana choose their water sources for use in drilling or hydraulic fracture stimulation operations wisely. Of particular interest are areas in the lower Caddo and Bossier Parishes and DeSoto Parish where the Carrizo - Wilcox aquifer is used as the main source of drinking water supply for domestic and public water supplies. Data reported by the USGS indicates that the Carrizo - Wilcox aquifer system is a low yield aquifer system that generally produces water suitable for drinking water purposes which has been and is currently being used predominately for domestic and public water supply in mostly rural areas of Northwest Louisiana. However, water production from the aquifer system is reported to be physically restricted due to the aquifer's discontinuous nature and typically thin, lenticular and fine textured sand beds.

Based on USGS and other published information on ground water resources in Northwest Louisiana, the Red River Alluvial aquifer system is a high yield system comprised of coarse gravel and sand formations continuously recharged by the surface waters of the Red River. It is further documented that the Red River Alluvial aquifer system, due to its hardness and high dissolved solids, is seldom used for domestic and public supply purposes, and is predominately used for industrial purposes.

Therefore, if ground water must be used for drilling or hydraulic fracture stimulation purposes, it is recommended that the Red River Alluvial aquifer be utilized for these purposes, where feasible, as the source of ground water supply in lieu of the Carrizo - Wilcox aquifer. However, agency staff will continue to evaluate water usage from the Carrizo - Wilcox aquifer for hydraulic fracture stimulation operations according to state law.

The Commissioner further encourages oil and gas operators to use the available surface water resources or other acceptable alternative water sources in Northwest Louisiana, where practical and feasible.

Provided below are links to published documents, resources and references available for water quality and use in Northwest Louisiana. If you have any questions or need further clarification, please contact Environmental Division staff at 225-342-8244 or by email at http://dnr.louisiana.gov/qwater.

http://www.deq.louisiana.gov/portal/Portals/0/evaluation/aeps/02Carrizo-WilcoxAquiferSummary06.pdf

Louisiana Ground-water Map No. 8, Potentiometric Surface, 1991, of the Carrizo-Wilcox


1/3/2009
Aquifer in Northwestern Louisiana, USGS Water-Resources Investigations Report, 1995
http://pubs.er.usgs.gov/djvu/WRI/wrr_95_4175_plt.djvu

RED RIVER ALLUVIAL AQUIFER SUMMARY, BASELINE MONITORING PROGRAM, FY 2004,
APPENDIX 3 OF THE TRIENNIAL SUMMARY REPORT, 2006, FOR THE WATER QUALITY
ASSESSMENT DIVISION OF THE LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL
QUALITY
http://www.deq.louisiana.gov/portal/Portals/0/evaluation/aeps/
03RedRiverAlluvialAquiferSummary06.pdf

Water Use in Louisiana, 2005: Louisiana Department of Transportation and
Development Water Resources Special Report No. 16, 133 p., 2007

LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY, Appendix 1, Estimates of
Average Ground Water Velocities in Louisiana Aquifers and Delineation of Source Water
Protection Areas, from RECHARGE POTENTIAL OF LOUISIANA AQUIFERS, prepared by the
Louisiana Geological Society for the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality,
1989.

The Louisiana Regional Restoration Planning Program
FINAL Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, January 2007: See Table 2.1:
Louisiana Aquifers

Editors: For more information, contact the DNR Public Information Office at 225-342-0088.