

Public Comments

The following comments were provided by members of the public and were considered during the technical review of this application.

No. Comment

Comment Date

1

11/24/2015

On Wednesday, November 18, 2015, our second West Greeley Neighborhood Meeting was held with Extraction Oil Gas, the Operator for the Triple Creek Directional Project. As expected, there were new changes stated by the Operator, both from the original Neighborhood Meeting of September 2014 and from the Reply to Comments and the Traffic Impact Study that had more recently been submitted to the City of Greeley Planning Department.

There were two commitments made by the Operator at the 2014 meeting: the first was that the project would go tankless and instead use a pipe to transport the oil to the nearest transload facility. We knew that they had reneged on that commitment prior to the second meeting but, as justification, we were told during the current meeting that the pipe would have to be about 30 miles long and that it would require hundreds of easements. That is understandable, but why didn't they know that 14 months earlier, instead of waiting to change it two months prior to beginning operations.

(Possibly to ease the acceptance of the Form 2A site approval?)

The second commitment made in the 2014 meeting was for high-line power from Xcel to power the electric rig. This would make the drilling operation quieter and cause less air quality concerns as well. Instead, at the more recent

meeting, we were told that the high-line power may not be ready in time for the drilling phase to begin. Of course, we are all now wondering at what point in the drilling process electric power will be made available, if at all.

Another commitment was made to the City of Greeley. In the City's Comments to the Operator, the City asked why the project was not going tankless, and after citing the current price of oil and economies of scale, Extraction said in the effort to continue to reduce and mitigate the impacts of installing tanks... Extraction is committed to using Lease

Automatic Custody Transfer (LACT) meters to load trucks. Then they explained the advantages over traditional truck loading including:

less likelihood of spills,

electrically driven and enclosed pumps, reducing noise,

truck loading times are at least two times faster, reducing truck time on site,

95% efficient destruction of VOCs due to vent lines being sent to the Emission Control Device, and

elimination of emissions and improved safety for the driver, who now doesn't have to open thief hatches to gauge tanks.

At the meeting, however, we were told that the LACT system would not be available at the start of the Production Phase. We don't know whether it is a limitation of the system, availability of equipment, expense or some other

concern. All we know is that this is the time in the project when pressure and hydrocarbon flows are at a maximum. So we are concerned that air quality and other negative effects should occur as a result of the Operator not using

another BMP. This will be especially distressing to my wife and I who suffer from asthma and Parkinson's Disease. In fact, half of the Mountain Vista East development consists primarily of retired families, who tend to be affected more by

air quality concerns. This is yet another example of the Operator telling us how clean the project will be, only to leave us wondering what adverse change will be next.

Many of our concerns could be alleviated by Extraction adhering to the original commitment to a

	<p>tankless solution.Extraction says that they are still working on this solution.However, after the meeting, my wife and I were told that</p> <p>Extraction has NEVER had a tankless project, further reducing the possibility of its occurrence.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	
2	<p>As a concerned citizen who will be living near the proposed Oil Gas Wells called Triple Creek, I have some strong opinions about allowing this drilling to proceed.</p> <p>1.Extraction Oil Gas has proposed to drill 22 wells with 22 tanks.At the meeting last September, Extraction told the audience that this would be a tankless operation.To date, this has been changed to include 22 tanks, which will be very obvious to anyone looking out over the site.This can lead to a decline in property values as well as to the number of buyers for a particular property that faces the site.</p> <p>2.It seems that Extraction does not have a very solid plan as to the construction of this site and Extraction has not studied the traffic patterns in this area.We have some very busy streets, which were not designed to handle 100 trucks hauling 40,000 lbs of sand and crossing a small bridge that appears to be in need of major repairs or rebuilt. There are school buses that travel on 71st street which is the proposed arterial for transporting the sand, tanker trucks and the drilling rig.The road bed on 71st Street is in constant need of repairs.Imagine 100 trucks making round trips on this already heavily travelled, damaged road.Some individuals residing in special handicapped housing (east of King Soopers) ride their motorized wheel chairs up 71st Avenue.Heavy truck traffic could create a real disaster if they cannot stop for these motorized wheel chairs crossing at the pedestrian crosswalk just east of King Soopers.</p> <p>3.Extraction had to only notify those residents that reside within 500 feet of the well site and those who had signed up last September at the previous meeting.No notice has been given to the residents living to the East of the site, where the 22 horizontal wells are to extend out 2 ½ miles from the site.These lines will be going under residential neighborhoods as well as two schools, Frontier School and University Schools.Also, according to the map, these horizontal wells will pass underneath the City Recreation center known as the Fun Plex.It would seem that all resident who might be potentially impacted by this drilling and fracking site should be notified.</p> <p>4.The site where Extraction plans to drill is considered an area of moderate ecological significance.According to the City's definition this area contains significant natural features which would be moderately and negatively compromised by development.Therefore, it makes no sense to drill in this area based on the impact oil and gas drilling can have.</p> <p>5.There are two emergency centers in this very same area.The ambulances use 71st, 10th Street and 20th Street.Imagine if huge tanker trucks are traveling this road and the ambulances cannot get to their base with an injured person or persons.</p> <p>6.To further exacerbate the traffic patterns, there is a major grocery store at the corner of 71st Avenue and 10th Street which is accessed by many residents in the area who travel 71st Avenue to get to the store.Compound that by the increased number of residents moving into 200 new housing units currently being built in the area as well as 10-15 apartment buildings which has been constructed in the last year on 20th Street and 83rd Avenue.</p> <p>7.Additionally, there is concern about the emission of hazardous air pollutants and other volatile organic compounds which will permeate the air around the site and be spread throughout the neighborhoods.</p> <p>8.It has been noted in the past that fracking has created earthquakes in areas of Greeley.What happens if one of these earthquakes, as a result of the fracking, happens under the schools Extraction proposed to drill beneath?I would say could be a major disaster.</p> <p>9.Unless more consideration is given to studying the impact of this site on the residential neighborhoods close by and studying traffic patterns, I think this drilling operation should be denied.</p>	11/25/2015
3	<p>Comments concerning"Extraction operator application of Oil Gas Permit at Triple Creek at 71St Ave</p>	11/25/2015

in Greeley Co. Between 10th St and 20th St.

1. Notifications: Per City of Greeley permitting: They are required to notify anyone within 500ft.

- There are 2500 – 4000 property owners affected by this proposed site.
- Only a handful i.e. 1- 6-10 were notified
- The meeting time was at 5:30. Most people do not get home that time.
- Meeting was terminated immediately after Operator completed presentation.
- There was no question/answer afterward as promised.

2. Supporting information:

- No traffic studies completed
- No study of roads/Bridges conditions
- No commitment by responsible agencies to correct current deficiencies.
- No current studies to support any public statements

3. Emergency Response

- Only one “applicable Fire unit for all Greeley.
- Consist of one(1) Fire unit housed in a mobile trailer
- Unit is placed at random sites
- Unknown criteria of site selection of where Unit is placed.
- Unknown number of qualified trained personnel on duty per shift
- Unknown response time of unit
- Unknown if Operator has any trained personnel on site

4. Totally untested response of Emergency Personnel including:

- Evacuation routes
- Emergency services sites outside affected areas
- Distance to evacuation sites
- Unknown condition of staging sites.
- Unknown response times of outside support emergency needs.
- How long does it take for your neighbor to respond when needed?

5. No training of Community to help themselves

- Will not be all jamming the same roads
- Going to the same hospitals
- Expecting the same emergency responders to help us all
- Who is responsible for the people who cannot help themselves in an emergency?

6. Location Choice:

- Why locating where no feasible transportation capabilities available.

•No pipe line usage to move “Product” from production.We were told it would be a tank less site (10 of 2014).Now, it will not be tank less due constraints of permitting.

•Nothing was mentioned that the end point of the pipeline was Platteville, Co.Good God – Platteville has been located in the same place sense the “Steam Engine” times.Someone can verify the historical records.

•Misrepresentation of pertinent facts:

i.It is necessary to ask a question 50 ways to get an answer

ii.An answer today is no good tomorrow

iii.Nothing is in writing

iv.Misrepresentation of Operatorcapabilities

v.Operator does not accept responsibility of their actions

vi.No publicly published Liability Insurance

vii. Attempting to discharge responsibility to others.

7.Consideration of Alternative Locations.

•There is a ½ dozen locations with in very reasonable distance for an Industrial Site of this nature that affect a 10th of the properties compared to this location.

•None – has been public stated.

Total: 3 comment(s)