

7 Dec 81 ①

as no expln. prog.

^{MAIN}
2. [?] from a geol. point of view

1. will predicted Ts be encountered
 2. will fract zone be ~~not~~ capable of production (of suitable quality H₂O?)
- other ?'s follow these - all influence negotiations (suitable quality, etc.)

injection into 2
who gets well
20 ac centers - lease land ok
drill on base infert (??)

Temp. #1 196°C (79) from Group Seven rept
earlier T - 178°C

if T (79) is true, temp should be no problem

#2 if 178°C @ 10.454 is correct, then may not increase quite as much

{ ε - seems reasonable, but may be a tad short of 425°F

{ see logs of 6-7, run new logs

{ dependant on section not going isothermal or decreasing in gradient -

{ what rx will be encountered

{ they imply in proposal that volcs. will continue

{ Eberly + Stanley imply basement (pE?)

Fract. ability for prod is major ?

fracture w/ skin damage vs no prod. fracs. argument

#1 mil will buy better completion (no drilling plan submitted)

prob again of what rx @ 12k ft - old volcs - may ^{or may} not have many open fractures

pE - as @ RHS, could prob., depending on lithology, be attractive

proposal doesn't discuss any changes in drilling plans that might be reqd
by diff lithologies

major gamble in program

7 Dec 81 (2)

H₂O qual. (>40k tds)

injection into #2 - USAF should be assured that will work for long term test
why no T grad meas recently - will it have to be worked
over 1st? who pays?

20 ac centers - adaq. - hydrol. aspects

leasing

who gets well & resource if failure (?)

- USAF negot. -
- 0. handle cost share? maybe $\frac{2}{3}$, $\frac{1}{3}$ to max of 1 mil, as GKI proposed to spend $> \frac{1}{3}$ of \$ on total
 - 1. what are conditions of wells now
 - 2. what are new T logs (?)
 - 3. details of drilling plans, & contingency arrangements
 - 4. contractor estims. to back up costs