

## Catanach, David

---

**From:** Stogner, Michael  
**Sent:** Monday, July 09, 2001 4:17 PM  
**To:** Hayden, Steven  
**Cc:** Catanach, David  
**Subject:** RE: Merrion's Federal "28" #2-E

Thanks. I'll hold the application pending receipt of an amended C-102.

-----  
**From:** Hayden, Steven  
**Sent:** Monday, July 09, 2001 3:32 PM  
**To:** Stogner, Michael  
**Subject:** RE: Merrion's Federal "28" #2-E

I will take care of it. I will request another C-102 for the Bisti Lower Gallup Oil Pool with an 80 acre dedication.

-----  
**From:** Stogner, Michael  
**Sent:** Monday, July 09, 2001 3:29 PM  
**To:** Hayden, Steven  
**Cc:** Ezeanyim, Richard; Chavez, Frank  
**Subject:** RE: Merrion's Federal "28" #2-E

Is their proposed recompletion restricted just to the limited vertical extent of the **Lower Gallup** interval (whatever that is)?

If so, and since the Bisti Lower Gallup Oil Pool is spaced on 80 acres, would you like me to request an amended C-102 or will the Aztec office be the responsible party?

Thanks again. This information is needed for me to issue an accurate and correct order, otherwise, as you and I are aware, such inaccuracies and wrong information would only act to promulgate problems for the Division later on.

-----  
**From:** Hayden, Steven  
**Sent:** Monday, July 09, 2001 3:09 PM  
**To:** Stogner, Michael  
**Subject:** RE: Merrion's Federal "28" #2-E

Mike,

Going by the rule book, this will be a Bisti Lower Gallup Oil Pool Completion. The fictitious White Wash Gallup-Mancos Oil Pool has no standing and the White Wash Mancos-Dakota Oil Pool is further than the two mile limit for pool extensions. If there were no closer pool, I might stretch things to pick it up, but the Bisti pool will do better.

-----  
**From:** Stogner, Michael  
**Sent:** Monday, July 09, 2001 2:10 PM  
**To:** Hayden, Steven  
**Cc:** Perrin, Charlie; Chavez, Frank; Ezeanyim, Richard  
**Subject:** Merrion's Federal "28" #2-E

I'm reviewing an application for Merrion Oil & Gas that was submitted on June 7, 2001 for the existing Federal "28" Well No. 2-E (**API No. 30-045-26205**) located 1490' FSL & 790' FWL (L) Sec. 28-T25N-R9W, which is to be recompleted into the oil bearing "Mancos/Gallup" interval. Their application is for an oil well in the "White Wash Gallup-Mancos Oil Pool" with 40-acre spacing. There of course is no such pool. However, there is a "White Wash Mancos-Dakota Oil Pool" that is just a little over two miles away that is governed under Rule 104.B (1). Just a little under two miles away is the "Bisti Lower Gallup Oil Pool" with special rules (80-acre spacing - see R-1069, as amended).

You can see my dilemma; I therefore need your advise/assistance/ help/suggestion, which pool will it be, what will the spacing be, what rules will apply?

Thanks.