

## Michael Feldewert

---

**From:** Ocean Munds-Dry  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 10, 2011 4:53 PM  
**To:** Michael Feldewert  
**Subject:** FW: Shell/SWEPI

---

**From:** Olivia Ita **On Behalf Of** William Carr  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 10, 2011 4:51 PM  
**To:** Ocean Munds-Dry  
**Subject:** FW: Shell/SWEPI

FYI, Mike took the folder if you want to forward this to him.

---

**From:** Macquesten, Gail, EMNRD [<mailto:gail.macquesten@state.nm.us>]  
**Sent:** Monday, May 09, 2011 10:00 AM  
**To:** [tkellahin@comcast.net](mailto:tkellahin@comcast.net); [jamesbruc@aol.com](mailto:jamesbruc@aol.com); William Carr  
**Subject:** Shell/SWEPI

Tom, Jim and Bill—

I finally took a look at the amended filings for Shell/SWEPI and I had a question. When we spoke about the remaining issues, we found that the source of one of the problems was C-103 sundry notices filed by Shell/SWEPI that indicated multiple completions. That led the other parties to expect additional, separate filings for each completion. But when we discussed the matter, we thought that Shell/SWEPI was probably mistaken in reporting multiple completions—each well appeared to have only one completion. I thought that Shell/SWEPI was going to file amended C-103s to clarify that we weren't talking about multiple completions. I haven't seen any amended C-103s. Bill, is that in the works? Tom and Jim, did I misunderstand this part of the puzzle?

Thanks-Gail