

**From:** [Belanger, Paul](#)  
**To:** [Yokley, Bill](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Another question on the HA4 doc. # 400224207  
**Date:** Friday, March 02, 2012 12:19:50 PM  
**Attachments:** [image002.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)

---

Sorry Bill,

I omitted/had some sort of mental block on not seeing the S1/2SW1/4 – my mistake; your map below is correct and thus the nearest distance is that SWSE qtrqtr – and 1228' works for me.

The total lease is 640 ac when you include the other sections. It is 440 ac in S29

Paul

Paul E. Belanger, Geologist 303-249-7966  
Regulatory Contractor @ Kinder Morgan  
[Paul.Belanger@KinderMorgan.com](mailto:Paul.Belanger@KinderMorgan.com)  
Kinder Morgan Cortez Office 970-882-2464

---

**From:** Yokley, Bill [mailto:Bill.Yokley@state.co.us]  
**Sent:** Friday, March 02, 2012 11:55 AM  
**To:** Belanger, Paul  
**Subject:** RE: Another question on the HA4 doc. # 400224207

Hey Paul,

On the Lease that was supplied it states that the lease covers the area that I have outlined in red and cross hatched in red.

Therefore, the nearest lease line would be the Fed. minerals in the SESE of section 29.

It appears that the S1/2 SW1/4 has been left off of the drawing you have provided in this email.

Has the lease description from the original signed lease changed?

I did not mention anything about the 640 acres you mention. My concern is the distance to the nearest lease line.

Please review the following map and see if we agree that the green area (SESE) is the nearest lease not covered by the supplied Etta L. Thomas lease of April 1976.

I measure that distance to be approximately 1228 feet.

Let me know.

Bill




**From:** Belanger, Paul [[mailto:paul\\_belanger@kindermorgan.com](mailto:paul_belanger@kindermorgan.com)]  
**Sent:** Friday, March 02, 2012 11:22 AM  
**To:** Yokley, Bill  
**Subject:** RE: Another question on the HA4 doc. # 400224207

Bill,

I think you were saying that all 640 ac in section 29 are from the same mineral owner? It IS true that the lease IS 640 ac but from various portions of sections 29, 31 and 32. (from the form: 38N18W: **S29:** S1/2N1/2, N1/2S1/2, S1/2SW, SWSE. **S31:** E1/2NE. **S32:**N1/2NW,NWNE)

So the nearest lease line is the NE corner of the SESW qtrqtr; in any event that is closer to 220' vs. the 180' I entered – for both this doc 400224207 and 400224189 (the vertical pilot).

Paul



Paul E. Belanger, Geologist 303-249-7966  
 Regulatory Contractor @ Kinder Morgan  
[Paul\\_Belanger@KinderMorgan.com](mailto:Paul_Belanger@KinderMorgan.com)

**From:** Yokley, Bill [<mailto:Bill.Yokley@state.co.us>]  
**Sent:** Friday, March 02, 2012 6:45 AM  
**To:** Belanger, Paul  
**Subject:** Another question on the HA4 doc. # 400224207

Good morning Paul,  
 The supplied lease shows that 440 acres in section 29 are from the same mineral owner.  
 Issue: so the distance to the nearest lease line would be about 1230'. That would be to the Fed. lease in the SESE of section 29.  
 Please review and clarify.  
 Thanks,  
 Bill