

KELLAHIN AND KELLAHIN

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

EL PATIO BUILDING

117 NORTH GUADALUPE

POST OFFICE BOX 2265

SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO 87504-2265

W. THOMAS KELLAHIN*

*NEW MEXICO BOARD OF LEGAL SPECIALIZATION
RECOGNIZED SPECIALIST IN THE AREA OF
NATURAL RESOURCES-OIL AND GAS LAW

JASON KELLAHIN (RETIRED 1991)

TELEPHONE (505) 982-4285
TELEFAX (505) 982-2047

June 20, 2001

VIA HAND DELIVERY AND FACSIMILE

Ms. Lori Wrotenbery, Director
Oil Conservation Division
1220 South Saint Francis Drive
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504

Re: Request of Richardson Production Company
for Extension of Date for Commencement of Well
Pursuant to Compulsory Pooling Order R-11549
Case 12598 (Ropco Well No. 9-2)
SE/4 Section 9, T29N, R14W, NMPM
San Juan County, New Mexico

Dear Ms. Wrotenbery:

On behalf of Richardson Production Company ("Richardson") and in accordance with the provisions of the referenced order (copy enclosed), I am requesting a 90-day extension to the commencement date for subject well and in support state:

- (1) the order was entered effective March 15, 2001 and provided that this well shall be commenced on or before July 1, 2001;
- (2) this a well in which the BLM shares in a royalty;
- (3) The Ropco No. 9-2 well will be located on BLM surface next to existing surface disturbance (Conoco and Western Gas Resources products pipelines). The most logical way to access the wellsite is across BLM surface. However, during the BLM on site inspection, Richardson's route was denied because, in part, it was more than 300 feet from existing surface disturbance;

Oil Conservation Division

June 20, 2001

Page 2.

(4) Richardson is still negotiating a surface right of way for this well across private lands (see attached documentation);

(5) a 90-day extension to October 1, 2001 will afford Richardson with a reasonable opportunity to complete its negotiations for an alternate access to the location.

Should you grant this extension, I have enclosed for your consideration a proposed letter which will authorize the requested extension. Should you decide to deny this request, I would appreciate being advised immediately so that Richardson can timely file to re-instate this pooling order which will otherwise expire.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'W. Thomas Kellahin', is written over a horizontal line.

W. Thomas Kellahin

cc: David R. Catanach (NMOCD Hearing Examiner)

cc: Richardson Production Company

Attn: Cathy Colby

June __, 2001

W. Thomas Kellahin
Kellahin & Kellahin
P. O. Box 2265
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

Re: Approval of Request for Extension of Date to Commence
Operations on the Ropco Well No. 9-2
Order R-11549 Case 12598

Dear Mr. Kellahin:

Based upon good cause shown in your written request dated June 20, 2001, and in accordance with the provisions of Division Order R-11549 and the authority retained by the Division therein, Richardson Production Company is hereby granted an extension of time until October 1, 2001 in which to commence the drilling of the Ropco Well No. 9-2 located in the SE/4 of Section 9, T29N, R14W, NMPM, San Juan County, New Mexico.

Sincerely,

Lori Wortenberg
Director

PERMITS WEST INC.
PROVIDING PERMITS for LAND USERS
27 Merano Lodge, Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505 (505) 466-8120

Page 1 of 2
April 2, 2001

To: Cathy Colby

Fr: Brian Wood

RoPco 9-2

Re: 9-2 & 16-2

Kuecks will not grant any type of right-of-way under any circumstances. He says "no hard feelings", but he feels he has done his share. This blocks the easiest way to tie the 9-2 road and pipeline into the 9-3 or 9-4.

Singleton will grant a road and pipeline right-of-way, provided we provide a second access road to his land. His land is currently accessed by the road shown in the map which crosses state land in NWNE Sec. 16.

It appears we could best provide a second road by starting near the NW corner of Section 16. This road would cross state land, cross an irrigation canal, and pass some domestic gas line valves. There is a road right-of-way across the state land and canal at this point, but it appears to be too small for well traffic. We would probably need to build a second parallel crossing. The road could also serve a possible 16-2 well. The well would be perched on the bluff overlooking US 64.

Thus, the proposed (dashed line) 9-2 road and pipeline would go NW along an existing pipeline road, enter Singleton land, follow Singleton's property line SW to the state section, enter the state section, connect with the 16-2, and then proceed west to the canal crossing and existing US 64 driveway. Pipeline route from there westward would need to be determined. We would need a state right-of-way from 16-2 to Singleton's line.

