

Stogner, Michael

From: Perrin, Charlie
Sent: Wednesday, April 19, 2000 11:18 AM
To: Stogner, Michael; Chavez, Frank
Subject: NSL

Mike

Howdy,

Phillips will restake the following wells to standard locations.

San Juan 29-6 # 81M

"	"	85M
"	"	86M
"	"	91M
"	"	94M
"	"	97M
"	"	100M
"	"	101M

San Juan 30-5 # 48M

And they are checking the three in the forest to make sure where we picked is standard.

If I can be of more help let me know
Thanks and have a great week!!
Charlie



Stogner, Michael

From: Perrin, Charlie
Sent: Tuesday, April 25, 2000 10:50 AM
To: Chavez, Frank; Stogner, Michael; Wrotenbery, Lori
Subject: Non-Standard location meeting

Good Morning

On Tuesday April 19, 2000. I met with Camela Hooley, Natural Resource Specialist with the Carson National Forest and R. A. (Richard) Alred the Development Superintendent for Phillips Petroleum Company, Farmington area.

The meeting was to visually verify the necessity for locations staked Non Standard in the Carson National Forest,

I went to Camela's office early so we could discuss Non Standard locations.

Camela explained the importance of the archeology sites and her concerns about the disturbance to the natural resources. Her concerns included the effect roads, locations, and pipelines have on wildlife in the forest.

I agreed with her concern, indicating our concern was also for the natural resources and with us working together we accomplish what is best for the long term. I explained reservoir drainage and how important proper drainage is to preventing waste, I pointed out to Camela that if a well did not drain the reservoir properly, the company would probably want to drill another well to recover the rest of the resource. This would require a second road and location. She did not seem to accept this. I said to minimize the surface damage it is better to place the location in the best place the first time.

Richard called and was running late and asked that we meet at the location, Richard explained that some locations were staked for geologic reasons and some were due to topographic reasons. He also indicated some of the wells were staked expecting a rule change for the Dakota footage to match the Mesa Verde. Locations that were staked for geologic reasons will be scheduled for hearing.

During our field discussion, I reiterated the importance for the locations to be staked for the best possible reservoir drainage. Reminding them surface remediation can be done at the end of the well life, there is no remediation for the reservoir. If the reservoir is not drained properly, resources may be wasted, a result we all want to prevent. Drilling a well on a non-standard location only to limit surface damage is a short-term solution. This solution may cause more disturbances in the long run. I asked Richard if the well did not drain the reservoir properly what would be their procedure. Richard indicated a second well would certainly be a consideration. This seemed to get Camela's attention, as if she now understood what we discussed at her office. I said that to limit the disturbance to the forest it is best to place the well in the best location the first time. We discussed non-standard locations due to geology, how this issue is not decided in the field, and how a hearing is required.

I offered to go with Camela and/or Richard when they need to look at possible non-standard locations. We all agree it is better to do it right the first time.

Phillips will restake the following wells to standard locations.

San Juan 29-6 # 81M

" " 85M

" " 86M

" " 91M

" " 94M

" " 97M

" " 100M I received the standard location plat 4/25/00

" " 101M I received the standard location plat 4/25/00

San Juan 30-5 # 48M

Of the three wells staked non-standard in the Carson National Forest two will be moved for sure and they are verifying the third.

Stogner, Michael

From: Perrin, Charlie
Sent: Thursday, May 04, 2000 1:15 PM
To: Stogner, Michael; Chavez, Frank
Cc: 'RAALLRE@PPCO.COM'
Subject: Non-standard locations

Hello Mike:

I went to the field with R. A. Allread this morning and looked at two NSL requests.

San Juan 29-6 # 94M	2370 FNL	1845 FWL	API # 30-039-26339
San Juan 29-6 # 35M	215 FSL	820 FEL	API # 30-039-26423

There appeared to be a standard location available looking at the topo map. After walking the area it is easy to see there is not a place to put either location that would be standard,

I recommend approval of the NSL for these two locations

Thanks
Have a great week
Charlie

From: Stogner, Michael
Sent: Friday, May 05, 2000 1:24 PM
To: Perrin, Charlie
Subject: RE: Non-standard locations

I issued an NSL order for the 29-6 Un. #35-M a minute ago.

Per you two previous e-mail messages of April 19 and April 25, I withdrew and returned to Phillips its application for the San Juan "29-6" Unit #94-M (see my letter of 4-24-00).

From: Perrin, Charlie
Sent: Thursday, May 04, 2000 1:15 PM
To: Stogner, Michael; Chavez, Frank
Cc: 'RAALLRE@PPCO.COM'
Subject: Non-standard locations

Hello Mike:

I went to the field with R. A. Allread this morning and looked at two NSL requests.

San Juan 29-6 # 94M	2370 FNL	1845 FWL	API # 30-039-26339
San Juan 29-6 # 35M	215 FSL	820 FEL	API # 30-039-26423

There appeared to be a standard location available looking at the topo map. After walking the area it is easy to see there is not a place to put either location that would be standard,

I recommend approval of the NSL for these two locations

Thanks
Have a great week
Charlie