

**From:** [Campbell, Patricia](#)  
**To:** [Yokley, Bill](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Request on the Parry GU E 4 doc. # 400193354  
**Date:** Tuesday, October 18, 2011 4:07:10 PM

---

Hi Bill,

I apologize for the miscalculation. You are right. Thank you very much for picking this up.

*Patti Campbell*  
*Regulatory Analyst*  
*(970) 335-3828 (Office)*  
*(970) 335-3738 (Fax)*  
*[patricia.campbell@bp.com](mailto:patricia.campbell@bp.com)*

---

**From:** Yokley, Bill [mailto:Bill.Yokley@state.co.us]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 18, 2011 8:16 AM  
**To:** Campbell, Patricia  
**Subject:** Request on the Parry GU E 4 doc. # 400193354

Hey Patti,

I have finally gotten back to the Parry GU E 4.

Using the "new" lease map and the submitted plat there still appears to be a discrepancy.

Issue: line # 24 Distance to nearest mineral lease line state 707'.

The "new" lease map shows the NWNE to be under lease and the NENE not leased.

Therefore the nearest lease line would be at that point, from the plat for the BHL  $1835.4 - 1326.2 = 509.2$ .

So, I come up with 509'.

Please review and clarify.

Spacing order 112-190 has a >660' from unit boundary but no restriction on the interior lease line distances, but the form should reflect the "nearest" lease line distance.

Thanks,

Bill