

304.c.(1). Emergency Spill Response Program

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW		304.c.(1)					403549787
Plan not required. The Emergency Response Plan was incorrectly uploaded to this plan.	Remove from this plan on the Form 2A. Nothing required for this plan.			AP	Removed	yes	X

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW		304.c.(2)					403549787
The plan speaks to CPW coordination and noise limits, but this is not supported with documentation. Discussing with CPW, the ECMC MPNLs as defined in Rule 423, Table 423-1, are adequate.	Update plan to indicate accordingly.			AP	Updated	no, but not rule bust	
Table 6-3 Unmitigated Noise Modeling Results (dBC) incorrectly lists ECMCs MPNL. Sentence on page 33 requests a higher MPNL but does not provide an explanation why. Additionally, as presented, the plan shows compliance with the proposed mitigation; therefore, the request for higher levels does not appear to be needed.	Update to 60. Additional information is required prior to ECMC and CPW further discussing. Update to ensure alignment between the two plans.			AP	Updated	yes	X
				AP	Updated	yes	X
Table 1-2 of the Dust Plan does not align with the listed duration of days in the Noise Plan.				AP	Corrected Dust Plan	yes	X

304.c.(3). Light Mitigation Plan

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW		304.c.(3)		AP			403549787
No issues.							X

304.c.(4). Odor Mitigation Plan						
Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW Not required.	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.c.(4)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer AP	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed? 403549787 X

304.c.(5). Dust Mitigation Plan

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.c.(5)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403549787
The Lat coordinate listed does not align with the Form 2A.	Update to read 40.143220 for alignment with the 2A.			AP	Corrected 2A (which had the error)	yes	X
The listed distance of 38.36 from Meeker does not align with the miles listed on the Access Road Map.	Update to ensure alignment between both.			AP	It does, see access road plat now that includes driving directions	yes	X
The introduction second paragraph states that, "The location will be accessed via CR 77 in the NWNW of Section 4..." but the access road shows NWSW.	Update for accuracy. Update plan to include the referenced table or remove the language.			AP	Thanks for catching, corrected.	yes	X
Table 4-2 is not included in the plan. The first sentence of the Surface of Access Road paragraph states that, "The proposed lease access road will be installed in the NWNW of Section 4..." which is actually Section 17.	Update for accuracy.			AP	Thanks for catching, corrected.	yes	X
The last two sentences of the Surface of Access Road paragraph are a great BMP and should be added to the list of BMPs.	Include these two sentences as part of the BMP list. Ensure alignment between both plans.			AP	Added	yes	X
Table 1-2 does not align with the listed duration of days in the Noise Plan.				AP	These two plans align as to duration of days.	yes	X

304.c.(6). Transportation Plan

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW Not required.		304.c.(6)		AP			403549787
							X

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW		304.c.(7)					403549787
The change review documentation should also include in the listed elements, whether or not the change is permanent or temporary, and also include detail as to how long temporary will be if applicable.	Update the plan to include the added detail.		yes	AP	Updated	yes	X
The change review documentation should also include in the listed elements, an evaluation of impacts that identifies what impacts would occur if the change is not made and what impacts could occur if the change is made.	Update the plan to include the added detail. Update the plan to include the added detail.		yes	AP	Updated	yes	X
The Records Keeping section should also indicate how often records are updated.	Update the plan to include the added detail.		yes	AP	Updated	yes	X

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.c.(8)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403549787
Last paragraph of section 4 indicates that Meeker is 38.3 miles away which contradicts what the access road map says.	Ensure alignment between the plans.			AP	This has been corrected	yes	X
The Location Layout section lists acres for the permanent access road and the total long-term disturbance which do not align with the 2A and the Layout Drawings.	Update to ensure alignment with all.			AP	Updated	yes	X
The equipment counts (oil tanks and compressors) listed in Table 5 do not align with the counts on the Form 2A.	Update for alignment.			AP	Updated to match 2A	yes	X
	Replace the Location Drawing with a detailed layout of the location.						
The guidance list a requirement for, "A detailed layout of the Oil and Gas Location."			yes	AP	This has been added to the plan	yes	X

304.c.(9). Flood Shut-In Plan

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW Not required.		304.c.(9)		AP			403549787
							X

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW Not required.	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.c.(10)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403549787
				AP			X

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW		304.c.(11)					403549787
The lat coordinate listed does not align with the Form 2A.	Update for consistency. Update to include the required information.				Updated to match 2A (corrected lat/long)	yes	X
The haul routes to the disposal facilities and the list of BMPs are not included.			yes	AP	Added	yes	X

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW Not required.		304.c.(12)		AP			403549787
							X

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.c.(13)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403549787
	Update to ensure alignment between all OGD components.			AP	It matches the access road plat now that has been added to the 2A	yes	X
Miles from Meeker does not align with Access Road Map. In the site description section it states that, "The location will be accessed via CR 77 in the NWNW of Section 4..." but it is actually the NWSW.	Update for accuracy.			AP	Updated, now just explains lease access road that exists heads to the new road that will be built in Sec 17	yes	X
In the site description section the widths of the ROW for access road and pipeline corridor and the acres do not align with the Dust Plan.	Update for alignment with the Dust Plan. Either remove if it is not applicable to this location or remove the "where applicable" language.			AP	Updated	yes	X
Site specific BMPs lists, "Double-walled storage tanks will be used where applicable." This is not specific. Is it applicable? The plan indicates that, "...liners will be installed underneath any hydraulic fracturing equipment and manifolds used during completion operations," but this is not listed in the BMPs.	"where applicable" language.			AP	I don't see this in the plan, but I may be working from a different version, regardless it is no longer in the plan	yes	X
	Include this in the BMP section.			AP	Added to BMPs	yes	X

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.c.(14)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403549787
The listed lat coordinate does not align with the Form 2A.	Update for alignment.			AP	Updated	yes	X
The first sentence of project description section incorrectly references SENE when the location is in the SVNE.	Update for accuracy.			AP	Updated	yes	X
The miles listed from Meeker in the project description section does not align with the access road map.	Update to ensure alignment.			AP	It does, access road now has driving directions attached to	yes	X
In the site description section it states that, "The location will be accessed via CR 77 in the NWNW of Section 4..." but it is actually the NWSW.	Update for accuracy.			AP	Updated	yes	X
Section 2.1 states that, "All cut and fill slopes of the pad would be established at a 3:1 slope..." which contradicts the Layout Drawings.	Update to ensure alignment.			AP	Updated	yes	X
Section 2.2 incorrectly states that there are two proposed access roads when the access road map and other OGDG components only indicate one access road.	Update for accuracy.			AP	Updated	yes	X
Section 2.2 states, "The construction of the access road while utilization of the existing BLM two track for 1,985-foot that would be improved. The road disturbance would encompass 2.278 acres and of that 1.731 acres would be new disturbance." The wording of this is very confusing and does not align with the Dust Plan. The Dust Plan does not speak to "new disturbance" and the entire project is considered new disturbance.	Update to ensure alignment with the Dust Plan.			AP	Updated	yes	X
Section 2.3 speaks to 2,541 cubic yards of topsoil from the pipeline construction area being stored but does not say where this will be stored. Will this be stored on location? Is this included in the calcs on the layout drawings?	Update with added detail for clarity of intended plans.			AP	Updated	yes	X
Table 2.1 column of New Disturbance does not make sense. The location and the access road and pipeline are all new and are demonstrated as such on the 2A and the Dust Plan.	Add further explanation or remove the column.			AP	Updated	yes	X
Section 7 indicates 3,780.04 cubic yards of soil stockpile which contradicts the layout drawings, and neither equal 6" of topsoil removal for 9.74 acres.	Update to ensure accuracy and alignment.			AP	Updated	yes	X
Two BMPs reference ACE's Surface Reclamation Plan, what is this? Is this suppose to reference the Interim Reclamation Plan?	Update with added detail or update to the proper plan name.			AP	Updated	yes	X
The plan includes the NRCS Soil Unit Descriptions, which should not be included.	Remove from plan and only include as a separate attachment to the Form 2A.		yes	AP	Updated	yes	X
The plan should include a description of the method and timeline for seeding and stabilizing the soil stockpiles.	Update with required information.		yes	AP	Updated	yes	X

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.c.(15)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403549787	AEC response
The listed distance of 38.36 from Meeker does not align with the miles listed on the Access Road Map.	Update to ensure alignment between both.			AP	This does match the access road plat now as I have included the driving directions	yes	X	
The introduction second paragraph states that, "The location will be accessed via CR 77 in the NWNW of Section 4..." but the access road shows NWSW.	Update for accuracy.			AP	Updated	yes	X	
Site description indicates a 70' ROW for the access road but the Dust Plan indicates 50'.	Update to ensure alignment between both.			AP	Updated	yes	X	
Site description indicates a 30' ROW for the pipeline corridor but the Dust Plan indicates 70'.	Update to ensure alignment between both.			AP	Updated	yes	X	
Plan states that the topsoil will be stockpiled only along the east and north of the pad but the layout drawings shows more.	Update to ensure alignment between both.			AP	Updated	yes	X	
						This is requested because revisions were required on the original drawings. Remove to ensure no discrepancies between the two.		
The layout drawings are included in the plan and should not be.	Remove the layout drawings and only include as a separate attachment to the Form 2A.			AP	This is new, I have always attached these to the plans because the plans often mention the attachment - we would prefer to keep it attached because the plan mentions to see the attachment	Yes.	X	Removed
The first two sentences under the Potential Pollutant Sources are not included on the BMP lists.	Update to include this language as a BMP.			AP	Updated	yes	X	
Two BMPs indicate the use of sediment control logs and a sediment basin, but neither are included in the Layout Drawings.	Update to ensure alignment between the two OGDG components.			AP	Updated	yes	X	
						no - ECMC regulates the interim and final reclamation of the surface and requires pursuant to rule 100s.e.(2) 80%, which is more restrictive than 70% so having met ECMC rules would therefore allow BLM rules to be met also.		
Two times the plan states that the location will be considered having met final reclamation at 70% establishment of pre-disturbance reference vegetation, which is not the rule criteria.	Update to indicate 80% as required by rule.	1003.e.(2).		AP	This is where the ECMC vs. BLM comes into play. The plan was drafted to meet the BLM's reclamation expectations as the surface owner and agency regulating restoration of the surface.	Yes.	X	Updated to 80%
On page 4 a "cuttings trench" is referenced but the 2A and Waste Plan indicate drill cuttings are being transported off-site.	Remove language or revise OGDG to align with cuttings trench being used. If cuttings trench is to be used, then the Waste Plan will also have to be updated.			AP	Removed this was listed in error	yes	X	

304.c.(16). Interim Reclamation Plan

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.c.(16)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403549787
<p>The listed lat coordinate does not align with the Form 2A.</p> <p>The miles listed from Meeker in the project description section does not align with the access road map.</p> <p>In the site description section it states that, "The location will be accessed via CR 77 in the NWNW of Section 4..." but it is actually the NWSW.</p> <p>The first sentence of project description section incorrectly references SENE when the location is in the SWNE.</p> <p>The last sentence in the project description section references a Table 1.1, which is not part of the plan.</p> <p>Section 2.1 includes, "...which 13.679 acres would be considered new disturbance..." but the entire proposal is new disturbance.</p> <p>Section 2.1.1 states that the cut and fill slopes will be established at 3:1 slope which contradicts the Layout Drawings.</p> <p>Section 2.1.2 states there will be two access roads but the access road map and dust plan only speak to one.</p> <p>Section 2.1.2 states, "The construction of the access road while utilization of the existing BLM two track for 1,985-foot that would be improved. The road disturbance would encompass 2,278 acres and of that 1,731 acres would be new disturbance." The wording of this is very confusing and does not align with the Dust Plan.</p> <p>Table 2.1 column of New Disturbance does not make sense. The location and the access road and pipeline are all new and are demonstrated as such on the 2A and the Dust Plan.</p> <p>Section 4 Interim Reclamation sentence only speaks to compliance with BLM.</p> <p>Section 4.3 states that the upper 6" of topsoil (if available) would be stripped, but rule requires the topsoil horizon or the top six inches, whichever is deeper.</p> <p>Section 4.5 does not speak to the timing requirement of interim reclamation being required to commence no later than 6 months after drilling operations.</p> <p>Two BMPs indicate the use of sediment control logs and a sediment basin, but neither are included in the Layout Drawings.</p>	Update for alignment.			AP	They no wmatch	yes	X
	Update to ensure alignment.			AP	This should now match driving directions attached to the access road plat	yes	X
	Update for accuracy.			AP	Updated	yes	X
	Update for accuracy.			AP	Updated	yes	X
	Remove language or update plan with the referenced table.			AP	Updated	yes	X
	Remove the language.			AP	Updated	yes	X
	Update to ensure alignment.			AP	Updated	yes	X
	Update to ensure alignment.			AP	Updated	yes	X
	Update to ensure alignment with the Dust Plan.			AP	Updated	yes	X
	Add further explanation or remove the column.			AP	Updated	yes	X
	Update to include compliance with ECMC.			AP	Updated	yes	X
	Remove the "if available" language to be compliant with rule.	1002.b.(2).		AP	Updated	no - not rule bust	X
	Update to include language showing intentions of beginning reclamation operations timely by rule.			AP	Updated	yes	X
	Update to ensure alignment between the two OGDG components.			AP	Updated	yes	X
	Remove the layout drawings and only include as a separate attachment to the Form 2A.			AP	Updated	This is requested because revisions were required on the original drawings. Remove to ensure no discrepancies between the two.	X

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.c.(17)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403549787	Operator response
The listed lat coordinate does not align with the Form 2A.	Update for alignment.			AP	2A was updated as it had an error	yes	X	
The first sentence of project description section incorrectly references SENE when the location is in the SWNE.	Update for accuracy.			AP	Updated - paying direct impact mitigation fees b/c of an existing location that was P&Ad - indirect costs would be applied if the other well pad was P&Ad	no- this change is not reflected in the plan re: indirect costs.	X	
The miles listed from Meeker in the project description section does not align with the access road map.	Update to ensure alignment.			AP	Updated	yes	X	
In the site description section it states that, "The location will be accessed via CR 77 in the NWNW of Section 4..." but it is actually the NWSW.	Update for accuracy.			AP	Updated	yes	X	
Section 2.1 includes, "...which 13.679 acres would be considered new disturbance..." but the entire proposal is new disturbance.	Remove the language.			AP	Updated	yes	X	
Section 2.1.1 states that the cut and fill slopes will be established at 3:1 slope which contradicts the Layout Drawings.	Update to ensure alignment.			AP	Updated	yes no - still reads two access roads.	X	
Section 2.1.2 states there will be two access roads but the access road map and dust plan only speak to one.	Update to ensure alignment.			AP	Updated	Yes	X	updated
Section 2.1.2 states, "The construction of the access road while utilization of the existing BLM two track for 1,985-foot that would be improved. The road disturbance would encompass 2.278 acres and of that 1.731 acres would be new disturbance." The wording of this is very confusing and does not align with the Dust Plan.	Update to ensure alignment with the Dust Plan.			AP	Updated	yes	X	
Table 2.1 column of New Disturbance does not make sense. The location and the access road and pipeline are all new and are demonstrated as such on the 2A and the Dust Plan.	Add further explanation or remove the column.			AP	Updated	yes	X	
Number 8 of Section 4 states, "AEC is planning on removing vegetation after 4/30 and before 5/1..." which does not make sense.	Update timeframe.			AP	checking with TP	yes	X	
Section 6.3 lists a BMP that states, "If construction is to be conducted between May 1st and August 15th..." but the noise plan indicates it will be constructed during this time.	Update language to be site specific.			AP	Updated	yes	X	
Section 7 and Table 7-1 indicates that AEC has committed to Indirect and Direct mitigation fees, but the Form 2A does not align with this.	Update to ensure alignment.			AP	Language updated - only Direct Impact Fees are required for now. Indirect Impact Fee is further explained as to why or why not it will be required. A comment was added to the submit tab to reflect this.	no- 2A is still not aligning. Direct amount is not correct.	X	Updated 2A
The Wildlife Habitat Map should not be included in the plan.	Remove from the plan and only attach to the Form 2A as a separate attachment.			AP	Removed	yes	X	

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403549787
COMPLETENESS REVIEW		304.c.(18)					X
The listed lat coordinate in the header and the location section do not align with the 2A. Last sentence in the introduction discusses possibility for change prior to or during operations. This change would require prior approval.	Update for alignment. Update with added language to indicate operator's understanding of prior approval being needed.			AP	Corrected 2A (which had the error)	yes	X
Miles listed to Meeker contradicts the Access road map.	Ensure alignment.			AP	Updated Matches directions now updated and included in the Topo B attachment	yes yes	X X
The location section indicates that the parcel's distance from Meeker is further than the distance the well pad is from Meeker. This does not make sense.	Update with added detail.			AP	Corrected	yes	X
The Water Take Point is illustrated on the Overview map as being in the NWNW of S12, 2N97W which contradicts what is listed in this plan.	Update for accuracy and alignment.			AP	Corrected, map was the correct source	yes	X
A BMP listed states there will be no on-site storage of water due to lack of space but then right below it states freshwater will be retained in temp tanks.	Update to ensure consistency of plans for the water.			AP	Detailed a bit more at the end - the water recycling space needed is substantial vs. a small footprint for temporary water storage during completions	yes	X

304.c.(19). Cumulative Impacts Plan

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.c.(19)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403549787
The listed lat coordinate does not align with the Form 2A.	Update for alignment.			AP	It does, 2A fixed.	yes	X
The first sentence of project description section incorrectly references SENE when the location is in the SWNE.	Update for accuracy.			AP	Updated	yes	X
The miles listed from Meeker in the project description section does not align with the access road map.	Update to ensure alignment.			AP	updated	yes	X
In the site description section it states that, "The location will be accessed via CR 77 in the NWNW of Section 4..." but it is actually the NWSW.	Update for accuracy.			AP	Updated	yes no - still referring to "new disturbance" when all 15.173 is new disturbance. All other plans have been update properly but not this one.	X
Section 2.1 includes, "...which 12.023 acres would be considered new disturbance..." but the entire proposal is new disturbance.	Remove the language.			AP	Updated	Yes	X Updated
Section 2.1.1 states that the cut and fill slopes will be established at 3:1 slope which contradicts the Layout Drawings.	Update to ensure alignment.			AP	Updated	yes	X
Section 2.1.2 states there will be two access roads but the access road map and dust plan only speak to one.	Update to ensure alignment.			AP	Updated	yes	X
Section 2.1.2 states, "The construction of the access road while utilization of the existing BLM two track for 1,985-foot that would be improved. The road disturbance would encompass 2,278 acres and of that 1,731 acres would be new disturbance." The wording of this is very confusing and does not align with the Dust Plan.	Update to ensure alignment with the Dust Plan.			AP	Updated	yes no, not rule bust - still not updated anywhere in the plan	X
Section 3 and then continuing throughout refers to WRFO but no where is this defined.	Update to include defining terms of the acronym.			AP	Updated	Yes	X Updated to define
Section 3 incorrectly references reclamation requirements as being 75-100 percent.	Update to indicate 80-100%.	1004.d.		AP	Updated	yes	X
Many of the sections refer to associated plans instead of specifically providing measures taken to avoid or minimize and measures to mitigate or offset cumulative adverse impacts.	This plan should meet the rule criteria and serve as a stand alone component of the OGDG. Update to include specified rule requirements.	304.c.(19).		AP	Updated	yes	X
Section 3.3 incorrectly references the water take point in the SWNE of S34, T2N - R97W, when the overview map shows NWNW S12, T2N-R97W, with a lat/long that does not align with the water plan either.	Update for accuracy and alignment.			AP	Updated	yes	X
Section 3.4 lists interim acreage that does not align with the Form 2A.	Update for accuracy and alignment.			AP	Updated - total project acreage used and not just well pad location acreage	yes	X
Section 3.5 references a "Surface Reclamation Plan" which should refer to the Interim Reclamation Plan.	Update for accuracy and alignment.			AP	Updated	yes	X
The plan speaks to CPW noise limits, but this is not supported with documentation. Discussing with CPW, the ECOMC MPNLs as defined in Rule 423, Table 423-1, are adequate.	Update plan to indicate accordingly.			AP	Updated	yes	X
Remove the following Appendices: Cultural Features Map, Hydrology Map, and Soil Types Map.	These maps are required as separate attachments to the Form 2A and should not be included as part of this plan. Provide details regarding the electrified equipment and whether or not the production facility will be electrified.			AP	Updated	yes	X
The 2A lists several electric equipment but the CI Plan does not indicate that the production facility will be electrified.				AP	No updates on CIP as no electrification of location and equipment explained on 2A Tab	yes	X

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW Not required.		304.c.(20)		AP			403549787 X

Issue identified by staff:		Specific Rule	Referenced	SME	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403549787
COMPLETENESS REVIEW		(optional) 304.c.(21)	in guidance document?	reviewer			
<p>Geo Hazard Plan is missing a list of site specific BMPs. The plan states: In the event that a future landslide should occur, Anschutz would enlist the services of an engineering firm, that would suggest Best Management Practices.</p> <p>Geo Hazard Plan is missing a list of site specific BMPs. The plan states: Anschutz would be prudent to monitor any potential visible landslide movement in the area after major rain events and check with the U.S. Landslide Inventory for any future updates to the classification.</p>		<p>This sentence can be rewritten to be a site-specific BMP that is more proactive instead of reactive. BMPs should be in place prior to a future landslide. A BMP section is required for the plan, as stated in guidance. This sentence can be rewritten to be a more committed BMP by stating that Anschutz will monitor....A BMP section is required for the plan, as stated in guidance.</p>					
				AP	Uploaded new plan	yes	X
				AP	Uploaded new plan	yes	X

ACCESS ROAD MAP

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW Several items included in the legend that are not illustrated in the map; therefore, are not applicable.	Remove items included in the legend that are not applicable. Either add the buffer and indicate no RBUs or HOBUs within 2000' of the access road or simply add a statement indicating such. Update to include the HPH layers that are applicable.	304.b.(7).F		AP	Several of the items in the plat are required for BLM, instead of creating two different maps this is the map we use for BLM and ECMC	yes, using a different map	X
Map does not include a 2,000' buffer around the access road indicating RBUs and HOBUs.			yes	AP	Added 2K buffer to plat	yes	X
Map does not illustrate applicable HPHs. The listed distance from Meeker in the Dust Plan, Fluid Leak Plan, Topsoil Plan, Water Plan, SWMP, Interim Rec., Wildlife Plan, CI Plan, and ERP does not align with the miles listed on the Access Road Map.	Update to ensure alignment between all OGD components.		yes	AP	Updated	yes	X

ALA DATASHEET

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW		304.b.(2)					403549787
All indications of NA need to be replaced with 5280'.	Update to indicate at least a mile in distance.			AP	Updated	yes	X

ALA NARRATIVE SUMMARY

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW Remove the ALA datasheet and only include as separate Form 2A attachment.	Remove.	304.b.(2)		AP	Updated	yes	403549787 X

CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW							
Not required.				AP			X

403549787

CPW CONSULTATION

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?		
COMPLETENESS REVIEW							403549787	Operator Response
The listed lat coordinate does not align with the Form 2A.	Update for alignment.			AP	Updated to match 2A (correct lat/long	yes	X	
The miles listed from Meeker in the project description section does not align with the access road map.	Update to ensure alignment.			AP	Updated	yes	X	
In the site description section it states that, "The location will be accessed via CR 77 in the NWNW of Section 4..." but it is actually the NWSW.	Update for accuracy.			AP	Updated	yes	X	
Local description references Table 1.1, which is not included.	Remove non-applicable language.			AP	Updated	yes	X	
Page 3 is a duplicate of page 2 and needs to be removed and replaced with the missing first page of email correspondences with CPW.	Update properly.			AP		yes	X	No page 3 for the consultation summary, deleted duplicative page, added full email correspondence

CULTURAL FEATURES MAP

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.b.(3)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403549787
Several items included in the legend that are not illustrated in the map; therefore, are not applicable.	Remove items included in the legend that are not applicable.			AP	Revised map attached	yes	X

DIRECTIONAL WELL PLAT

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW The submitted plat does not illustrate the full proposed wellbore trajectory for each well, with the surface hole location, top of productive zone, and bottom hole location clearly indicated.	Update to include required illustration details.	304.b.(7).H	yes	AP	Updated and added	yes	X
							403549787

DISPROPORTIONATELY IMPACTED
COMMUNITY MAP

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW Not required.		304.b.(7).J		AP			403549787
							X

GEOLOGIC HAZARD MAP

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW		304.b.(7).l		AP			403549787
No issues.							X

GIS data

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403549787
COMPLETENESS REVIEW		304.b.(8)		AP			
No issues.							

HYDROLOGY MAP

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW		304.b.(7).E		AP			403549787
No issues.							X

INFORMED CONSENT LETTER

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW		604.b.(1)		AP			403549787
Not required.							X

LAYOUT DRAWING

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.b.(7).B	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403549787
Both the "Layout Drawing" and the "Const. Layout Drawings" should be combined as one attachment to the 2A.	Combine both into one attachment to the Form 2A.			AP	Fixed in 2A	no - see 2A tab	X
"Maximum Oil & Gas Surface Disturbance Boundary" language does not align with the defined term of the ECOMC rules.	Revise all language to Oil and Gas Location.			AP	This is different than what I have been told by OGLAs - we have had to change it before to call it this.	no - not rule bust	X
Construction layout does not include the Working Pad Surface (WPS) label.	Update to include the label of the WPS boundary.	yes		AP	Updated	no - not rule bust	X
Finished grade elevation does not align with the Form 2A.	Update to ensure alignment with the Form 2A.			AP	Updated 2A	no - see 2A tab	X
	List only the acreages required by rule/guidance: Oil and Gas Location, WPS, Access Road (temp and perm), and Pipeline (temp and perm), and use the terms as indicated in rules/guidance.	yes		AP	We use these plats for BLM permitting as well. AEC would like to not create additional costs with creating separate plats for different agencies. This lists WPS, so we feel that this should suffice, despite the extra information.	no - not rule bust	X
There are several acreages listed and the terms used do not align with rule terms.	Update the title block from Well Pad to Mohee Fed 0297-17.	yes		AP	Updated	yes	X
The Location name needs to be included on all layout drawings, not "Well Pad" and the well names do not need to be included.	Update the legal description to include SWNE	yes		AP	Updated	yes	X
The legal description should include the QTR/QTR.	Update to include the WPS dimensions.	yes		AP	Updated	yes	X
Rig layout diagram does not include the WPS dimensions.	Update to include flowback layout drawing if applicable.	yes		AP	Updated	yes	X
Flowback layout drawing is not included.	Update to include applicable dimensions.	yes		AP	The dimensions are shown, see the working pad surface on the right hand side of the drawing	yes	X
The interim reclamation layout drawing does not include the WPS and the Production Pad dimensions.	Remove from final reclamation drawing.			AP	Removed	yes	X
The final reclamation layout drawing is not required.	The drawings need to be site specific. Illustrate exactly what BMPs will be installed.			AP	Updated	no - not rule bust	X
The "as needed" language tied to all the stormwater BMPs illustrated needs to be modified.							
Section 7 of the Topsoil Plan indicates 3,780.04 cubic yards of soil stockpile which contradicts the layout drawings, and neither equal 6" of topsoil removal for 9.74 acres.	Update to ensure accuracy and alignment.			AP	Updated	yes	X

LESSER IMPACT AREA EXEMPTION
REQUEST

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.d	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403549787
Not applicable.				AP			X

LOCAL/FED FINAL PERMIT DECISION

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW		303.a.(6).B					403549787
Pending confirmation from operator. Other 2As indicate Rio Blanco does have a permit.	Confirm that Rio Blanco does not have a local permit, as other Form 2As have indicated as such. If there is one, update the Form 2A.			AP	See 2A response regarding this - this will be secured after the fed and OGDG is approved. Rio Blanco does not have siting regulations for improvements - which means they do not dictate how oil and gas is sited or planned. Instead they have a per well fee due prior to drilling.	yes	X

LOCATION DRAWING

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403549787	Operator Response
COMPLETENESS REVIEW		304.b.(7).A						
						no - all SI and PA wells within the 2000' need to be illustrated per rule requirements,		
Wells within the 2000' buffer are not illustrated.	Update to include all SI and PA wells.	304.b.(7).A.viii.-xi.		AP	Fixed	Yes	X	This has now been updated.
Both, the Location and the WPS outlines are not illustrated.	Update to include both outlines, the Oil and Gas Location and the WPS.	304.b.(7).A.		AP	Fixed	yes	X	
The buffer does not indicate what it is measuring from.	Update to indicate the 2000' is measured from the WPS.	304.b.(7).A.		AP	Fixed	yes	X	
Title block should include the Location Name.	Update to include Mohee Fed 0297-17.			AP	Fixed	yes	X	

LOCATION PICTURES

Issue identified by staff:		Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW			304.b.(4)		AP			403549787
No issues.								X

NRCS MAP UNIT DESC							
Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW		304.b.(10)					403549787
No issues.				AP			X

OTHER

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403549787
COMPLETENESS REVIEW							
OGDP Overview Map should be titled Waste Management Haul Route Map.	Update to clearly indicate this map is associated with the Waste Management Plan. Update to ensure accuracy and alignment between all OGDG components.		yes	AP	? We updated the name of the map - is that what you need?	yes	X
The OGDG Overview Map legal description does not align with the Water and CI Plans.				AP	Descriptions Align between plan/map	yes	X
Variance Request Letters needs to address each Rule 502.c.(1-5) requirements in the letter.	Update with all applicable rule requirement information. Pursuant to the January 6, 2017 "Notice to Operators: Interim Reclamation Procedures for Delayed Operations", Operator will provide an estimate of the cost for a third-party contractor (i.e. not the site operator) to perform interim reclamation, and an increase in Financial Assurance for the O&G Location; the presumptive amount of the Interim Reclamation Financial Assurance will be the cost for a qualified third party to perform interim reclamation. The "Interim Reclamation Financial Assurance" will be released upon a satisfactory interim reclamation inspection for the Location, pursuant to Rule 1003.e (2). Pursuant to the September 1, 2016 (Rev October 6, 2016) "Notice to Operators: Procedures for Preset Conductors", Operator will provide an additional financial assurance of \$5,000 per conductor for wells that will not be drilled within 6 months after setting the conductor. Financial Assurance will be released once the well has been drilled, or conductor plugged.	502.c.(1-5).		AP	406.e variance letter was missing the attachment from the hearing application that addresses this portion of the rule. It has now been attached to the variance letter.	yes	X
Reclamation Staff has requested this COA be applied to the Form 2A based on the variance requests. Please review and address the COA. Additionally, the Cost Estimate Template will need to be emailed back to me with this spreadsheet at the time of resubmittal.					AEC will be using all or a portion of the bonding secured with the BLM. Per Rule 702.a which applies to all Locations and Facilities in CO - unless the "Operator demonstrates that it has already provided or will provide Financial Assurance for the same Well, Oil and Gas Location, or Oil and Gas Facility to the federal government at the time it files an OGDG" The SBP regarding this rule expresses ECMC's desire to avoid double bonding, therefore this COA should not apply.	Will review with Reclamation Staff once a complete application is received.	
Reclamation Staff has requested this COA be applied to the Form 2A based on the variance requests. Please review and address the COA. Additionally, the Cost Estimate Template will need to be emailed back to me with this spreadsheet at the time of resubmittal.					Will provide spreadsheet. I was told by ECMC staff last year this NTO was no longer valid. Is that true? Beyond this, AEC will be using federal bonding - see above	Will review with Reclamation Staff once a complete application is received and spreadsheet has been reviewed.	

PRELIMINARY PROCESS FLOW
DIAGRAMS

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.b.(7).D	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403549787	Operator Response
Missing a separate diagram for the flowback operation.	Update to include illustration of a flowback diagram. Update to identify which stage of operation the diagram is depicting.		yes	AP	Updated	yes	X	
The title block is missing the operation (i.e. production or flowback). Diagram does not illustrate flow control, shut-off, and shut-down instruments, valves, pumps, and identify any automated, remote controls where applicable.	Update to include applicable items.		yes	AP	Updated	yes no - required per guidance. Link to guidance included.	X	
			yes https://ecmc.state.co.us/documents/reg/Forms/instructions/attachment/guidance/Form_2A_Guidance%20304.b.(7).D%20Preliminary%20Process%20Flow%20Diagram.pdf	AP	Updated	no - not rule bust.	X	This has been updated

REFERENCE AREA MAP

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW		304.b.(9).B.i		AP			403549787
No issues.							X

REFERENCE AREA PICTURES

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.b.(9).B.ii	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403549787
Missing the above view picture and the table of the dominant vegetation.	Update with the required picture and the vegetation info.	304.b.(9).B.ii-iii.		AP	Have this now and updated it.	yes	X

RELATED LOCATION AND FLOWLINE MAP

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.b.(7).G	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403549787
Closed and abandoned locations should not be illustrated.	Remove from the map. Can add a table with the Location ID and well info to ensure all required locations/wells are illustrated and identified.		yes	AP	Updated	no - not rule bust	X
Some active PA or SI wells are not labeled.			yes	AP	Updated	yes	X

SURFACE AGRMT/SURETY

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW SUA not required. Lease map attached to the Form 2A.		304.b.(12).B		AP			403549787
							X

WAIVERS

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW		604.a.(4)		AP			403549787
Not required.							X

WILDLIFE HABITAT DRAWING

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.b.(7).C	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403549787
Mineral development area symbology included in the legend but not depicted on the map.	Remove from the legend. It is not required for the Wildlife Drawing and is not illustrated in the map.			AP	Updated	yes	X

Form 2A

COMPLETENESS REVIEW (Form 2A topic)		(topic/subtopic)			Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	
Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:			
					403549787	Operator Response
The Lat coordinate listed in the Dust Plan, Waste Plan, Water Plan, Wildlife Plan, CI Plan, SWMP, Interim Rec. Plan, and Topsoil Plan does not align with the Form 2A. The equipment counts (oil tanks and compressors) listed in Table 5 of the Emergency Response Plan do not align with the counts on the Form 2A.	Update to ensure alignment between all OGDG components.	AP	2A was updated	yes	X	
	Update to ensure alignment between the two.	AP	HH to check and adjust as needed	yes	X	
			Updated language to reflect that AEC is currently only responsible for the Direct Impact Fees. Indirect Impact fees may be included later if Lloyd Federal #22-X-17 location does not get reclaimed this May amount 2024 but that will be handled later with a Sundry if the location does not get reclaimed.	no - wrong		
The Wildlife Plan, Section 7 and the Table 7-1, indicates that AEC has committed to Indirect and Direct mitigation fees, but the Form 2A does not align with this. Federal Financial Assurance amount is not indicated.	Update to ensure alignment.	AP		Yes	X	Updated to \$38753.83 for "direct impacts" sorry for the error
	Update with applicable amount.		Updated amounts. Please see AEC's response to the Form 3B NTO. Federal financial assurance rulemaking is likely Q1 of 2024 and will be subject to those rules and mounts.	yes	X	
		AP	siting and placement of oil and gas facilities - meaning they do not have rules dictating how an Operator plans and situated infrastructure for oil and gas - they require a permit under their regulations which will require a per well fee and or a permit displaying where a pipeline will be installed. Other operators may represent language on this, see language in the hearing application under the Regulatory Testimony: • Anschutz's planned development is situated in Rio Blanco County, the Relevant Local Government, which does not have oil and gas siting regulations. This means that Rio Blanco County does not have regulations dictating the placement of Improvements related to oil and gas development. Instead, Rio Blanco County requires Special Use/Building Permits ("SU/BP"), which include portions of information stemming from approved state or federal permit applications, pursuant to the Rio Blanco			
The Relevant Local Government section indicates that the RLG does not regulate siting of Oil and Gas Locations, but other 2A's indicate Rio Blanco does. Review and ensure accuracy. If it does, then indicate a current status.	Review and ensure accuracy.	AP		yes	X	
			The ALA dashboard does not allow Operators to update the Alt Loc # - this is an automatic population on ECOMC's end for the form (see greyed out area). Beyond this, AEC's first location required a well pad and a separate facility pad - so the first alternative would have had 2 separate locations. In order to provide clarity I have re-arranged how they are listed.	yes	X	
			no - gas compressor line still shows 2 but the drawing shows 4			
ALA Dashboard needs to have the ALA # associated to the narrative in the first "B" column.	Update table accordingly.	AP		yes	X	Updated to 4 (matches Layout for Facility layout)
Equipment counts (compressors, meter/sales building, vapor recovery towers, ECD) do not align with the Layout Drawings and are listed twice in the site equipment list table and the other permanent equipment table. Estimated post-construction elevation does not align with the layout drawings. The Dominant Vegetation listed does not align with what is listed in the Topsoil and Interim Plans.	Remove the duplicated entries and ensure alignment with the Layout Drawings.	AP	Updated - matches Facility Layout Plat	Yes	X	
	Update to ensure alignment.	AP	Updated to 5990 to match portions of the Final Reclamation Diagram Plat	no - layout drawings shows 5991.2	X	Updated to 5991 (not able to add. 2)
	Update to ensure alignment.	AP	Aligns with plans on 2A now.	yes	X	
Soil types listed do not align with the soil map included in the Topsoil Plan. Soils listed should be the soils specific to the location. The water well referenced does not appear to be constructed, confirm. I think the nearest water well is ~3.8 miles NE and is permit 79500-F, receipt no. 367312 with depth of 100'. If so, updates distance and depth.	Update for accuracy.	AP	The soils listed do match the topsoil plan/map in the topsoil plan, but updated to display the highest percentages for the well pad per the map	no, soil types for the location are 33, 73, 74 and 74 is not listed.	X	Added 74
	Review and ensure accuracy.	AP	Agreed, updated.	yes	X	Updated to 3.8 miles
	Update the field with required date.	AP	It is there on the original submittal - on the Wildlife Resources tab as 9/14/2023	yes	X	Updated with correct amount.
The Compensatory Mitigation fields are not properly filled out. Direct Impacts should indicate yes with yes to the Compensatory Mitigation Fee and the amount of the fee as indicated in the Wildlife Plan and the Consultation Summary.				no, Yes should be indicated for requirement of compensatory mitigation under direct impacts section and the wrong amount was listed.		
	Update and ensure alignment.	AP	Updated	Yes	X	Updated
	Update to ensure accuracy.	AP	Updated	Yes	X	
The Compensatory Mitigation Plan section for indirect impacts should indicate no as the fee is what was agreed upon.				no, No should be indicated for all indirect impacts questions.		

	Alt Loc #	Latitude	Longitude	
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	40.144070	-108.296470	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	40.143510	-108.298000	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	40.149050	-108.306770	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4	40.142660	-108.300260	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The application consultation
IS Public application consultation with CPW regarding the Oil and Gas Location, occurred on:
CPW Resources and Compliance (link at that apply, and obtain all CPW reviews to this Form 2A)

8/14/2023

The second Wildlife BMP "...restricting well site visitations to no more than once per day..." is not included in the Wildlife Plan : The Variance Request section indicates both 406 E.(4) and 1003.B but the variance request letter does not indicate both rules. Remove the Construction Layout Drawing from the attachments	Update the Wildlife Plan to include to ensure alignment.	AP	Removed to align with WMP	yes	X
	Update to ensure alignment.	AP	There are two variances attached, I have been told in the past to provide 2 letters.	yes	X
	remove - duplicates make the review confusing.	AP		No - not rule bust	X

COMPLETENESS REVIEW (Form 2B topic) (topic/subtopic)

		SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	
Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:				
Water	Listed depth to groundwater does not align with 2A and the well construction data.	AP	Updated	yes	X
Ecosystem&Wildlife	All acreage sections in the Ecosystem & Wildlife section do not align with 2A. Acreages should only include the Location.	AP	I think this should reflect the full project disturbance calculations as that is what is analyzed throughout all the reports and with CPW/other agencies.	yes	X
Public Health	Dust impact truck trip counts do not align with the Dust Plan.	AP	Updated	yes	X

403549787

COMPLETENESS REVIEW (Form 2C topic) (topic/subtopic)

			Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	
Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	
OGDP Map must clearly identify the entire area of the OGD application, including lands and the proposed location(s).	Include an outline showing the full OGD area. SS		<p>no, this is not what we are looking for. It is closer to the Related Location and Flowline map, but does not require a buffer or any existing well and location information. Instead, only the development boundary and the proposed location - basically what is being proposed within this OGD. No this is not published guidance on this but I have added guidance in column B</p> <p>I believe this has been fixed, - is there guidance on this document? It seems to be an evolving document.</p>	<p>This has been updated and added</p>
A map showing the spatial relationships proposed within the OGD will greatly assist staff and the Commission in understanding the spatial extent and layout of the proposed mineral development area and all proposed (new and amended) surface Locations. An overall view of the proposed mineral development area, all new or existing Oil and Gas Locations that are included in the OGD. ***The Exhibit A map from the Hearing Application or the Related Location and Flowline Map from the Form 2A can be used here.			Yes	X

COMPLETENESS REVIEW		Docket# 231000325
Attorney Name: JOSEPH C. PIERZCHALA; ANTHONY M. ROEBER Permitter Name: Fenton Buchanan Engineer Name: Mark Schlagenhauf Hearing Officer Name: Matthew Berman		
Attorney Email Address: JPIERZCHALA@WSMTLAW.COM; AROEBER@WSMTLAW.COM Permitter Email: fenton.buchanan@state.co.us Engineer Email: Mark.schlagenhauf@state.co.us Hearing Officer Email: matthew.berman@state.co.us		
Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Explanation:
SME reviewer		
<u>OGLA Review Notes</u>		
None.	None.	There were no OGLA Review issues identified in the hearing application at this time.
<u>Permitting Review Notes</u>		
None.	None.	There were no Permitting Review issues identified in the hearing application at this time.
<u>Engineering Testimony</u> Developing Federal Exploratory Unit: This Oil & Gas Development Plan (OGDP) Hearing Application seeks to develop the		Engineering

Applicant Response: