

From: Bodek, Robert
Sent: Mon Mar 29 16:18:01 2010
To: Albertin, Martin L.; Paine, Kate (QuaDril Energy LT)
Cc: Bellow, Jonathan M; Wagner, Bruce E; Morel, Brian P; Haffle, Mark E
Subject: RE: Macondo bp1 Mar 29 model
Importance: Normal

If we really believe that sand PP at 17,200' could be as high as 14.4ppg, then we need to start having some serious discussions about pulling the plug early. To cover a 14.4 PP at 17,200', we'll need a 14.2ppg surface, giving us a 14.4 ESD, at this point, from an ECD standpoint, we'll be at, or over our surface LOT value (14.67). We're taking a wait-and-see approach, but we can't cover a 14.4 sand pp at TD should a sand show up at 17,200ish.

B

From: Albertin, Martin L.
Sent: Monday, March 29, 2010 10:47 AM
To: Bodek, Robert; Paine, Kate (QuaDril Energy LT)
Cc: Bellow, Jonathan M; Wagner, Bruce E; Morel, Brian P; Haffle, Mark E
Subject: RE: Macondo bp1 Mar 29 model

At the current build rate, it looks like shale PP will be ~14.1 at 17200'. Sand Pp will be higher. Hope to see a break in the build rate soon!

Marty

From: Bodek, Robert
Sent: Monday, March 29, 2010 10:19 AM
To: Albertin, Martin L.; Paine, Kate (QuaDril Energy LT)
Cc: Bellow, Jonathan M; Wagner, Bruce E; Morel, Brian P; Haffle, Mark E
Subject: RE: Macondo bp1 Mar 29 model

Marty,

We're RMW to 14.0ppg surface on the next connection ~16,750' (TVD) probably have the 14.0ppg mud around 1 connection later (~16,900'). That'll give us about a 14.0 surf./14.25 ESD/14.5ECD at ~16,900' (TVD). On your PP trend, what is our estimated PP @ target depth (17,200')?? After RWM 0.1ppg on the next hook, we don't plan on RMW until TD, unless you project PP to be higher than the ~14.25 static we'll have at the 17,200' TD. We've planned to manage to a 14.5 ECD. I believe this to be conservative, but intentionally so. We could bump another point if necessary, but obviously would prefer not too if you believe we're sufficiently overbalanced.

Bobby

From: Albertin, Martin L.
Sent: Monday, March 29, 2010 10:07 AM
To: Paine, Kate (QuaDril Energy LT)
Cc: Bodek, Robert; Bellow, Jonathan M; Wagner, Bruce E
Subject: RE: Macondo bp1 Mar 29 model

Kate,

I've been wrestling with the misfit between the sonic and resistivity. I went back and repicked just shales on sonic and resistivity, being more picky than normal (fewer picks, and just in the slowest/lowest resistivity stuff). It looks like, the way I picked it at least, that I've got sonic showing higher pressure, touching 13.9 at current TD. The very deepest deep resistivity is still a bit higher than that, but I've



got sonic running a few tenths higher than you do. I'm using the well overburden from the spreadsheet, with OBC=4200 just to make sure, and CEC=1.25.

I'll recheck what I've done since I'm always missing something. Have a look at attached .BMP and try and poke some holes in it. Attached is a .SAV file also (generated using the latest release of Presgraf, which I think you have...)

Marty

<< File: 29mar_MLA.BMP >> << File: 29mar_MLA.SAV >>

From: Paine, Kate (QuaDril Energy LT)

Sent: Monday, March 29, 2010 5:13 AM

To: Albertin, Martin L.

Subject: Macondo bp1 Mar 29 model

<< File: MC 252 BP01 Mar 29 16460MD.SAV >>

Cordially,

Kate Paine

Wellsite Pore Pressure

Kate.Paine@bp.com