Sent: Mon 6/20/2005 10:36 AM

Stogner, Michael, EMNRD

From:

April McKay [april@mckayoil.com]

To:

Stogner, Michael, EMNRD

Cc:

Jim Schultz

Subject:

McKay Oil Corp

**Attachments:** 

June 20, 2005

Mr. Stogner, I believe that my agent Jim Schultz files an NSL for the Samantha B Federal #1 in Chaves County, NM on May 20th. Do you know the status of this NSL? Please let me know if there is more information required.

Thanks, April D. McKay McKay Oil Corporation P.O. Box 2014 Roswell, NM 88202-2014 Office: 505-623-4735

505-624-2202 Fax: april@mckayoil.com

Sent: Thu 6/23/2005 10:10 AM

Attachments can contain viruses that may harm your computer. Attachments may not display correctly.

## Stogner, Michael, EMNRD

From: To:

Stogner, Michael, EMNRD

**April McKay** 

Cc:

Subject:

RE: McKay Oil Corp

Attachments: McKay.6.doc(19KB)

I have no record of a May 20th application. I did have an April 5th filing for this well from you however. Please see the copy of my e-mail to you on April 22nd attached:

From: April McKay [mailto:april@mckayoil.com]

**Sent:** Mon 6/20/2005 10:36 AM To: Stogner, Michael, EMNRD

Cc: Jim Schultz

Subject: McKay Oil Corp

June 20, 2005

Mr. Stogner, I believe that my agent Jim Schultz files an NSL for the Samantha B Federal #1 in Chaves County, NM on May 20th. Do you know the status of this NSL? Please let me know if there is more information required.

Thanks, April D. McKay McKay Oil Corporation P.O. Box 2014 Roswell, NM 88202-2014 Office: 505-623-4735

Fax: 505-624-2202 april@mckayoil.com

RE: pSEM0-509729980

McKay Oil Corporation's proposed Samantha "B" Federal Well No. to be drilled 660' FSL

& 2080' FEL (O) Sec. 31-T5S-R22E, Chaves County.

DATE: April 22, 2005

I received your letter of application for the Samantha "B" Fed. #1 to be drilled at a "Non Standard Location." From what little information you provided, it would appear this application can be processed administratively; however, as submitted - it is incomplete and is therefore **denied**.

(1) You did not say what formation this well is unorthodox for or its intended spacing unit;

(2) You say that a Texas/NM pipeline ran directly through the original pad for the proposed well being 660' FSL & 1980' FEL and that a move further south would be too close to the Section line; why then couldn't the well be moved north and/or east and not towards the east/west quarter section line?

(3) If you do not choose to move the well to a standard location and plan to reapply, please submit land plats, topographic maps, and a schematic of the pipeline as in traverses through Sec. 31 and any other topographic features precluding McKay from relocating to a standard location.

I will keep your application on file and will supplemental any subsequent re-filing, if you so choose.

e-mailed 4/22/2005