

Table No. 3
Jerome P. McHugh
Native Son No. 2

Estimate of Ultimate Recovery

A. Commingled well stream - projected performance:

1. Reference Figure No. 5 and No. 6.
2. Anticipated sustained production performance - 1st month's average = 42% of IP and declining at 40% per year then stabilize at 9%.
3. IP Summary

	<u>BOPD</u>	<u>MCFD</u>	<u>BWPD</u>	<u>GOR</u>
Mancos	233	440	34	1,882
Dakota	58	223	34	3,824
Total	291	663	68	2,278

4. 42% of IP = $291 \text{ BOPD} \times .42 = 122 \text{ BOPD}$
 $= 3,700 \text{ BO/Month.}$
5. Economic Limit - operating expense approx. \$1,350/month.
At end of life GOR will be approx. 10,000;
therefore, approx. revenue per bbl. oil approx.
 $(1 \text{ BO} \times 29.60) + (10 \text{ MCF} \times 2.82 \times 1.20)$
 $= \$63.44 \text{ with gas sales.}$
 $\text{Opex} = 1,350 / 63.44 \times .85 \times .92 \times 30.4 = 0.9 \text{ BOPD}$

Ultimate recovery: $(3,700 - 620) \times 23.5 + (620 - 30) 127.2$
 $= 72,380 + 75,020$
 $= 147,400 \text{ BO}$

B. Split of production between zones:

1. Volumetric calculations do not give realistic results in the Mancos interval, however, are believed to be fairly accurate in the Dakota.
2. Mancos recovery will be greatly influenced by natural fracturing and the natural fractures may, to a lesser degree influence production in the Dakota.
3. Volumetric recovery factors:

	<u>Mancos</u>	<u>Dakota</u>
Mid-perf Datum	7,144'	7,932'
BHP at Datum, ^a psig	1,690	2,674
BH temperature at Datum - °F	166	179
Estimated Solution GOR - SCF/B	500	1,000
Estimated oil FVF - RB/STB	1.33	1.52
Oil Recovery Factor ^b - % OIP		
Primary Pay	?	5%
Secondary Pay	?	0.5%

Notes: a - Mancos BHP determined to be 1,663 psig at 7,200' from build up in Gavilan #1. Dakota BHP was measured to be approximately 2,600 psi at 7,900' on a 132 hr build up in the Gavilan #1.

b - estimated for Solution gas drive.

Dakota Rsrv: $[7,758 \times 320A \times 4' \times .0825 \times (1 - .40) / 1.52] .05 +$
 $[7,758 \times 320A \times 11 \times .061 \times (1 - .40) / 1.52] .005$
 $= 16,170 + 3,290$
 $= 19,460 \text{ STB} \longrightarrow 19,500 \text{ STB}$

Table No. 3 (Continued)

Native Son No. 2

Gas Rsrv: An overall average GOR of 3500 SCF/STB is estimated based upon testing of the Dakota in the Gavilan area.
Therefore, ultimate gas recoveries = $19,500 \times 3.5$
= 68.2 MMCF

Mancos Rsrv: Ultimate recovery - Dakota volumetric Rsrv
: 147,400 - 19,500
= 127,900 STB

Gas Rsrv: An overall average GOR of 10,200 SCF/STB is estimated based upon performance of wells in Gavilan area and in Lindrith Gallup (gas) Field.
Therefore, ultimate gas recoveries = $127,900 \text{ STB} \times 10,200$
= 1,304.6 MMSCF

RESERVE SUMMARY:

	<u>Mancos</u>	<u>Dakota</u>	<u>Total</u>
Oil	127,900 (87%)	19,500 (13%)	147,400
Gas	1,304.6 (95%)	68.2 (5%)	1,372.8

Table No. 2
Open Hole Log Evaluation
Jerome P. McHugh - Native Son #2

DAKOTA

Perforations	Pay ft.	\emptyset %	S_w %	Primary- Secondary	Remarks
7886-88	2	5	?	S	
7919	1	11	"	S	
7930	2	6	"	S	
7938	1	6	"	S	
7955	1	8	"	S	
7963-69	4	5	"	S	
"	2	7½	≤ 48%	P	gas effect on FDC/CNL
7975-77	2	9	≤ 51%	P	
Total	15	$\emptyset = 6.7\%$		4 ft. primary w/ $\emptyset = 8.25\%$ 11 ft. secondary w/ $\emptyset = 6.10\%$	

MANCOS

Perforations	Pay ft.	$\bar{\phi}$ %	Primary Secondary	Remarks
6802	1	16	S	Shaley
6816	1	13	S	
6836	2	13	S	
6844	1	12	S	
6849	1	15	S	
6853	1	14	S	
6869-75	5	?	P	<u>Lost 400 bbl. mud</u> - fractured.
6881	2	?	P	
6898-6904	5	?	P	
6913	2	11	P	
6927-31	2	?	S	
6939-41	2	?	S	
6953	2	21	S	Shaley
6965	1	?	S	
6977	2	11	P)	
6983-91	2	15	P)	<u>Lost 1350 bbl. mud</u> - fractured -
"	2	14	P)	<u>GR indicates to be shaley.</u>
7023	2	10	P	
7029-39	1	17	S	Shaley
"	1	16	S	"
"	1	17	S	"
"	1	15	S	"
7049	1	15	S	"
7053	1	15	S	"
7061	1	15	S	"
7066	2	27?	S	Dolomite? by Log x-plot.
7070	1	15	S	Shaley
7073	1	15	S	"
7080	1	14	S	Dolomite by Log x-plot.
7087	1	9	S	
7326	1	17	P	<u>Lost 1000 bbl. mud</u> - fractured.
7394	1	14	S	
7436	2	?	P	<u>Lost some mud</u> - volume not reported.
7466	2	8?	S	Shaley
7475	1	12?	S	"
7478	1	5?	S	"
7485	1	3?	S	"
Total	58	$\bar{\phi}$ = 14%. (Actually only 39' included in average as 19' had questionable $\bar{\phi}$ due to hole rugosity.)		

Table No. 2 (Continued)

Native Son No. 2

NOTES:

1. The distinction between primary and secondary pay was based upon several factors: sample description, drilling breaks, SP development, sample shows, and shale content based upon the GR curve.

Primary pay is expected to contribute significantly to productivity.

Secondary pay is not expected to significantly contribute to production, but exhibits sufficient potential to perforate.

2. In both Mancos and Dakota intervals, there are no sands thick enough to accurately measure R_t (thin bed effect). This is complicated by a fairly high shale content in most intervals. An average S_w of 40% is believed to be typical to both zones in other fields and where S_w calculations could be approximated, values of 40% were indicated.