

Public Comments

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

<u>No.</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Comment Date</u>
1	<p>I am writing to you in regards to County Road 18, and the 12 wells proposed by Encana on the Regnier property: Section 19, T2N, R68 W.</p> <p>Having the kind of traffic associated with this magnitude of drilling on our one lane road will directly impact all of the residents. It is entirely inappropriate for this area. The foundation of the road will not be able to withstand the weight demands placed on it. In the past, when we have had heavy traffic from the oil companies combined with heavy snow or rain, the road is nearly impassable. Over the past 27 years, the maintenance of the road by the oil companies has been inconsistent and mostly unacceptable. The cost of maintaining the road has always been put on the people who live here.</p> <p>Pleasant View Ridge Cemetery will also be disturbed/destroyed; mail boxes and utility poles will need to be moved; utility lines elevated, and a new culvert placed. The most recent of the 22 graves in the cemetery is 1916, with the earliest being 1893. It is neither respectful or acceptable to damage this historical site.</p> <p>If the decision is made to widen the road and disregard the cemetery, the issue of safety needs to be taken into consideration. Turning onto Road 18 from County Line Road can be extremely hazardous from both north and south directions when waiting for access to the road. Numerous gravel trucks travel County Line, which has no shoulder. They have heavy loads and are usually exceeding the speed limit. It is a harrowing experience to sit on County Line waiting for a big truck to exit Road 18 so we can get out of the flow of traffic. Also, can you guarantee first responders will have immediate access to one of the neighbors if needed? It should not be our responsibility to schedule when we can safely travel Road 18 to get to our jobs.</p> <p>I am requesting the following:</p> <p>Move the entire Regnier Operation over to the already existing site. Using Road 18 as access should not be an option for the Regnier wells or facility sites.</p> <p>Reduce the Site to 4 wells. We are a Low Volume Hydrofracturing Area not a High Volume Hydrofracturing Area.</p> <p>Use an Electric Rig to keep noise levels in our neighborhood down.</p> <p>Conduct a traffic study for County Line and Road 18.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration</p>	04/24/2015
2	<p>I am writing to you in regards to County Road 18, and the 12 wells proposed by Encana on the Regnier property: Section 19, T2N, R68 W.</p> <p>Having the kind of traffic associated with this magnitude of drilling on our one lane road will directly impact all of the residents. It is entirely inappropriate for this area. The foundation of the road will not be able to withstand the weight demands placed on it. In the past, when we have had heavy traffic from the oil companies combined with heavy snow or rain, the road is nearly impassable. Over the past 27 years, the maintenance of the road by the oil companies has been inconsistent and mostly unacceptable. The cost of maintaining the road has always been put on the people who live here.</p> <p>Pleasant View Ridge Cemetery will also be disturbed/destroyed; mail boxes and utility poles will need to be moved; utility lines elevated, and a new culvert placed. The most recent of the 22 graves in the cemetery is 1916, with the earliest being 1893. It is neither respectful or acceptable to damage this historical site.</p> <p>If the decision is made to widen the road and disregard the cemetery, the issue of safety needs to be taken into consideration. Turning onto Road 18 from County Line Road can be extremely hazardous from both north and south directions when waiting for access to the road. Numerous gravel trucks</p>	04/24/2015

	<p>travel County Line, which has no shoulder. They have heavy loads and are usually exceeding the speed limit. It is a harrowing experience to sit on County Line waiting for a big truck to exit Road 18 so we can get out of the flow of traffic. Also, can you guarantee first responders will have immediate access to one of the neighbors if needed? It should not be our responsibility to schedule when we can safely travel Road 18 to get to our jobs.</p> <p>I am requesting the following:</p> <p>Move the entire Regnier Operation over to the already existing site. Using Road 18 as access should not be an option for the Regnier wells or facility sites.</p> <p>Reduce the Site to 4 wells. We are a Low Volume Hydrofracturing Area not a High Volume Hydrofracturing Area.</p> <p>Use an Electric Rig to keep noise levels in our neighborhood down.</p> <p>Conduct a traffic study for County Line and Road 18.</p>	
3	<p>This Form 2 Drilling permit application is deficient and should be rejected or denied for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) Pursuant to Rule 604.c.(2)E.i. requiring an operator proposing a multi-well production facility within 1000 feet of a building unit to locate the facility as "far as possible" from homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Absence of supporting documentation from operator as to siting "as far as possible" from homes. -No "alternative location analysis" or "siting rationale" submitted <p>Recommended/Requested Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -At least one additional 20-day comment period extension -The COGCC hold a public hearing on the requested Form 2A permit, providing local community citizens their only opportunity for due process under current law. -If permit(s) approved, COGCC require mitigation to reduce impacts. Such mitigation should include: <p>Limitations on the daily time periods during which operations vehicles and traffic are allowed, from 7:00AM to 7:00PM only.</p> <p>The utilization of remote fracking operations technology, as developed by Anadarko, to the extent possible, but at a minimum to include piped-in water.</p> <p>All operations be subject to an instrument-based leak detection and repair inspection. Employ VOC destruction or control technologies with at least 95% efficiency on all tanks capable of emitting over 2 tons of VOCs annually. Any un-repaired leak over 10,000 ppm of hydrocarbons after 24 hours results in a shut down until repaired.</p> <p>Automated ground water monitoring systems with data available to non-operator personnel in real time.</p> <p>Required use of electric-powered engines for all motors, compressors, pumps, and production systems to minimize noise levels.</p> <p>2) Pursuant to COGCC Mission Statement: "exploration and production... in a manner consistent with the protection of public health, safety and welfare</p> <p>Pursuant to COGCC Strategic Plan/Goals: "Prevent and mitigate adverse impacts to public health, safety, welfare and the environment."</p> <p>COGCC has not adequately assessed the risks to public health and welfare and, as such, issuance of this permit is contrary to the COGCC's duty to act in accordance with its stated Mission and Goals to protect public health and environment. Therefore, this permit should be denied.</p>	04/24/2015

Toxic risks to the community's health and well-being include the following*:

Benzene poisoning

Diesel fumes from app. 10,000 total truck trips (carcinogen)

Formaldehyde exposure

Hydrogen Sulfide exposure

24/7 Noise Light

Particulate exposure

The appropriation and partial removal from community use of the semi-private Rd 18

Contamination of local well-water supplies

Respiratory problems, rashes, lesions, dizziness, headaches.

Birth defects, lowered APGAR scores and newborn birth weights

Newborn livestock deformities

*Supporting documentation on public health and environmental risks:

Diesel exhaust and many individual substances contained in it (including arsenic, benzene, formaldehyde and nickel) have the potential to contribute to mutations in cells that can lead to cancer. In fact, long-term exposure to diesel exhaust particles poses the highest cancer risk of any toxic air contaminant evaluated by OEHHA. ARB estimates that about 70 percent of the cancer risk that the average Californian faces from breathing toxic air pollutants stems from diesel exhaust particles.

In its comprehensive assessment of diesel exhaust, OEHHA analyzed more than 30 studies of people who worked around diesel equipment, including truck drivers, railroad workers and equipment operators. The studies showed these workers were more likely to develop lung cancer than workers who were not exposed to diesel emissions. These studies provide strong evidence that long-term occupational exposure to diesel exhaust increases the risk of lung cancer. Using information from OEHHA's assessment, ARB estimates that diesel-particle levels measured in California's air in 2000 could cause 540 excess cancers (beyond what would occur if there were no diesel particles in the air) in a population of 1 million people over a 70-year lifetime. Other researchers and scientific organizations, including the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, have calculated cancer risks from diesel exhaust that are similar to those developed by OEHHA and ARB.

Exposure to diesel exhaust can have immediate health effects. Diesel exhaust can irritate the eyes, nose, throat and lungs, and it can cause coughs, headaches, lightheadedness and nausea. In studies with human volunteers, diesel exhaust particles made people with allergies more susceptible to the materials to which they are allergic, such as dust and pollen. Exposure to diesel exhaust also causes inflammation in the lungs, which may aggravate chronic respiratory symptoms and increase the frequency or intensity of asthma attacks.

Diesel engines are a major source of fine-particle pollution. The elderly and people with emphysema, asthma, and chronic heart and lung disease are especially sensitive to fine-particle pollution. Numerous studies have linked elevated particle levels in the air to increased hospital admissions, emergency room visits, asthma attacks and premature deaths among those suffering from respiratory problems. Because children's lungs and respiratory systems are still developing, they are also more susceptible than healthy adults to fine particles. Exposure to fine particles is associated with increased frequency of childhood illnesses and can also reduce lung function in children.

Like all fuel-burning equipment, diesel engines produce nitrogen oxides, a common air pollutant in California. Nitrogen oxides can damage lung tissue, lower the body's resistance to respiratory infection and worsen chronic lung diseases, such as asthma. They also react with other pollutants in the atmosphere to form ozone, a major component of smog.

http://oehha.ca.gov/public_info/facts/dieselfacts.html

Benzene causes problems in the blood. People who breathe benzene for long periods may experience harmful effects in the tissues that form blood cells, especially the bone marrow. These

effects can disrupt normal blood production and cause a decrease in important blood components. A decrease in red blood cells can lead to anemia. Reduction in other components in the blood can cause excessive bleeding. Blood production may return to normal after exposure to benzene stops. Excessive exposure to benzene can be harmful to the immune system, increasing the chance for infection and perhaps lowering the body's defense against cancer.

Long-term exposure to benzene can cause cancer of the blood-forming organs. This condition is called leukemia. Exposure to benzene has been associated with development of a particular type of leukemia called acute myeloid leukemia (AML). The Department of Health and Human Services has determined that benzene is a known carcinogen (can cause cancer). Both the International Agency for Cancer Research and the EPA have determined that benzene is carcinogenic to humans.

Exposure to benzene may be harmful to the reproductive organs. Some women workers who breathed high levels of benzene for many months had irregular menstrual periods. When examined, these women showed a decrease in the size of their ovaries. However, exact exposure levels were unknown, and the studies of these women did not prove that benzene caused these effects. It is not known what effects exposure to benzene might have on the developing fetus in pregnant women or on fertility in men. Studies with pregnant animals show that breathing benzene has harmful effects on the developing fetus. These effects include low birth weight, delayed bone formation, and bone marrow damage.

We do not know what human health effects might occur after long-term exposure to food and water contaminated with benzene. In animals, exposure to food or water contaminated with benzene can damage the blood and the immune system and can cause cancer.

<http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/phs/phs.asp?id=37&tid=14>

Air concentrations of volatile compounds near oil and gas production: a community-based exploratory study: Results: Levels of eight volatile chemicals exceeded federal guidelines under several operational circumstances. Benzene, formaldehyde, and hydrogen sulfide were the most common compounds to exceed acute and other health-based risk levels. Conclusions: Air concentrations of potentially dangerous compounds and chemical mixtures are frequently present near oil and gas production sites. Community-based research can provide an important supplement to state air quality monitoring programs.

<http://www.ehjournal.net/content/13/1/82>

From the COMPENDIUM OF SCIENTIFIC, MEDICAL, AND MEDIA FINDINGS DEMONSTRATING RISKS AND HARMS OF FRACKING (UNCONVENTIONAL GAS AND OIL EXTRACTION) (Concerned Health Professionals of NY)

<http://concernedhealthny.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/CHPNY-Fracking-Compendium.pdf>

First: A new study on fracking-related air pollution in northeastern Colorado: even though the volume of toxic emissions per well might be decreasing, overall air quality in the shale field continues to deteriorate as the rapid, continuing increase in the number of wells cancels out improvements to air quality brought about by more stringent regulations. (See footnote 4.) Similarly, the results of a new study from Texas raises the possibility that methane can migrate into aquifers through unseen cracks and fissures in the rock surrounding the wellbore in ways that no cementing and casing protocols, however strictly applied, can prevent. (See

footnotes 55 and 56.)

New findings from West Virginia show how unmapped, long-abandoned wells—including those drilled generations ago—can become re-pressurized during nearby fracking operations and serve as conduits for the contamination of drinking water. (See footnote 57.) A new study by Princeton researchers working in Pennsylvania found that, many decades after their abandonment, plugged and unplugged wells alike leaked significant amounts of methane into the atmosphere. There are an estimated three million abandoned oil and gas wells in the United States; the locations of many are unmapped and unknown. (See footnotes 265 and 266.) No set of regulations can obviate these problems.

Second, drinking water is at risk from drilling and fracking activities and associated waste disposal practices. As documented by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection in a review of its records, 234 private drinking water wells in Pennsylvania have been contaminated by drilling and fracking operations during the past seven years. These do not include drinking water wells contaminated by spills of fracking wastewater or wells that went dry as a result of nearby drilling and

fracking activities. (See footnotes 68 and 69.) In California, the injection of liquid fracking waste directly into groundwater aquifers threatens contamination of large numbers of public drinking water supplies. (See footnote 78.)

Third, drilling and fracking emissions often contain strikingly high levels of benzene. A potent human carcinogen, benzene has been detected in the urine of wellpad workers (at levels known to raise risks for leukemia), in private drinking water wells contaminated by fracking operations, and in ambient air at nearby residences. In some cases, concentrations have far exceeded federal safety standards. Such exposures represent significant public health risks. (See footnotes 3–8, 12, 57, 174.)

Fourth, public health problems associated with drilling and fracking are becoming increasingly apparent. Documented indicators variously include increased rates of hospitalization, ambulance calls, emergency room visits, self-reported respiratory and skin problems, motor vehicle fatalities, trauma, drug abuse, infant mortality, congenital heart defects, and low birth weight. (See footnotes 192–205.)

Fifth, natural gas is a bigger threat to the climate than previously supposed. Methane is not only a more potent greenhouse gas than formerly appreciated, real-world leakage rates are higher than predicted. Within the last five months, multiple teams of independent scientists have published data on fugitive emissions that, all together, call into question earlier presumed climate benefits from replacing coal with natural gas. Further, evidence increasingly suggests that the natural gas abundance brought by fracking is slowing the transition to renewable energy and is thus exacerbating, rather than mitigating, the climate change crisis. (See footnotes 313–318.)

4

04/29/2015

This Public Comment is for all of the 12 wells in the Regnier Application. All 12 wells and their associated Location Assessment should be denied by the COGCC due to errors, incomplete items, inconsistencies and behind-the-scenes assumptions covertly placed in the Location Assessment application Form 2A for the Regnier Wells. These problems are cited below:

A) On the front page of the Location Assessment application it states 'Approval of this Oil and Gas Location Assessment will allow for the construction of the below specified location; however, it does not supersede any land use rules applied by the local land use authority'. The Land Use Authority is the written document found on the Weld County Government Website in the Planning section of the Weld County Code, it states:

Planning Department Mission Statement

3. A. Policy 2.3. Encourage development of agriculture and agriculturally related businesses and industries in underdeveloped areas where existing resources can support a higher level of economic activity. Agricultural businesses and industries include those related to ranching, confined animal production, farming, greenhouse industries, landscape production and agritainment or agritourism uses.

1. A. Policy 7.1. County land use regulations should support commercial and industrial uses that are directly related to, or dependent upon, agriculture, to locate within the agricultural areas, when the impact to surrounding properties is minimal, or can be mitigated, and where adequate services are currently available or reasonably obtainable.

E. I. Goal 5. New industrial uses or expansion of existing industrial uses should meet existing federal, state and local policies and legislation. 1. I. Policy 5.1. Industrial uses should be evaluated using criteria, including but not limited to the effect the industry would have on air and water quality, natural drainage ways, soil properties and natural patterns and suitability of the land. a. Recommended Strategy I.5.1.a. Review the zoning regulations to ensure that they are consistent with this Policy. 2. I. Policy 5.2. Development improvements should minimize permanent visual scarring from grading, road cuts and other site disturbances. Require stabilization and landscaping of final land forms, and that runoff be controlled at historic levels. F. I. Goal 6.

Minimize the incompatibilities that occur between industrial uses and surrounding properties. 1. I. Policy 6.1. Consider the compatibility with surrounding land uses and natural site features. a. Recommended Strategy I.6.1.a. Establish development standards for such issues as use, building height, scale, density, traffic, dust and noise. b. Recommended Strategy I.6.1.b. Consider identifying industrial sub-areas and corresponding design guidelines after notification to the relevant landowners. 2. I. Policy 6.2. Support the use of visual and sound barrier landscaping to screen open storage areas

from residential uses or public roads. 3. I.Policy 6.3. Encourage informational neighborhood meetings for proposed industrial uses that do not require a public hearing. a. Recommended Strategy I.6.3.a. Develop options for neighborhood meeting processes. 4. I.Policy 6.4. Ensure that industrial properties are free of derelict vehicles, refuse, litter and other unsightly materials.

And Most Importantly:

'Land use policies should support a high-quality rural character which respects the agricultural heritage and traditional agricultural land uses of the County, as agricultural lands are converted to other uses (excluding urban development). Rural character in the County includes those uses which provide rural lifestyles, rural-based economies and opportunities to both live and work in rural areas. The natural landscape and vegetation predominate over the built environment. Agricultural land uses and development provide the visual landscapes traditionally found in rural areas and communities. (Weld County Code Ordinance 2002-6; Weld County Code Ordinance 2008-13) To protect and enhance the quality of life for County residents through the implementation of the adopted Comprehensive Plan, Weld County Code, and Building Codes while providing professional, friendly and quality customer service to the community.'

As you can logically deduce from the Weld Code, a Major Industrial Site is not appropriate for our high density, historically significant, pristine, historically Low Volume Hydrofracturing area. The nuisances of the 10's of thousands of semitrucks and tankers with the associated diesel emissions, the permanent visual scarring of the Facility Site's infrastructure (30+ years can be considered permanent), the 14 months of 24/7 excessive sound, light, benzene and methane emissions are Industrial scale and do not provide us with 'High Quality Rural Character' or a 'rural lifestyle with rural based economies'. The Regnier 12 well High Volume Hydrofracturing (HVHF) Industrial Site and the 12 well Rasmussen High Volume Hydrofracturing Industrial Sites both proposed to be within a ¾ mile square area in our community in the very near future would dominate 'the visual landscape traditionally found in rural areas and communities' and 'the natural landscape and vegetation' will thus NOT 'predominate over the built environment' if either or both of these sites are approved by the COGCC.

B)The Application Maps.

1. The 19H-B268 PAD BHL Exhibit has 3 major errors on it. It shows the 12 wells abutting Weld County Road 20.5 going 1 mile south to County Road 18:

*The actual placement for the wells is 591 feet east of the Hansen family's home, which is 1 mile south of Weld County Road 20.5. The actual proposed location for the wells is 1 mile south of WCR 20.5, not next to it. Currently there is not a Public or County road that goes from County Road 1 or WCR20.5 directly to the wells.

*The Road they have labeled as County Road 20.5 on the map is not a

Public or County Road at all, it is the Regnier's driveway from County Road 18. It has a 'Private Road' sign and a small sign that says Regnier and is ½ mile north of Rd. 18 and 1 mile south of WCR20.5. This driveway goes as far east as the Hansen's home. The 12 wells are proposed 807 feet east of this Private Road but do not have direct access to it.

*Another error, is that the Road Encana has labeled County Road 18 is not a Public or County Road. In fact there is a question about whether or not Mr. Regnier has rights to use the east/west portion of Rd. 18 at all. He has an Agricultural Easement on a section of unnamed road running north/south on the east end of Road 18 but no 'right of way' for the east/west section of Rd. 18. Mr. Regnier's road is the Regnier Road coming off of CR1. As well, Encana likely does not have a right of way to use the Agricultural Easement running north/south for the exponential increase in truck traffic that would occur for the Facility Pad planned for these 12 wells. Mr. Regnier does not have the legal right to give permission to Encana to use the Agricultural Easement for Major Industrial Truck Traffic, on the north/south section on the east end of Rd. 18, he does not have a legal right to do that, an Agricultural Easement does not include Major Industrial Use of a road and would need permission from the Owner of that north/south section of Rd. 18.

2. The second map of the 19H-B268 Pad Access Exhibit has 1 error:

* It shows the 12 wells being drilled on the south end of Section 18, not in Section 19 which is how the application reads.

NOTE: Encana shows the access to drilling the Wells as being from 'County Road 20.5'. Weld County Road 20.5 is 1 mile north of where the wells are planning on being drilled. This would make the access

to the wells, if Encana was planning on using WCR 20.5, 1 mile.

It would not be economical for Encana to drive all of the rigs and semitrucks 1 mile to drill the 12 wells. Either they made a mistake or I believe the reason they might be willing to drive the 1 mile to drill at this site is that they are planning on putting another 12 wells going north from this site in Section 18 sometime after they put the first set of 12 wells going south in Section 19.

If you look at the map carefully you can see a small Facility site on the Regnier Property in ¼-1/2 mile south of WCR 20.5. This is the legal place that the wells should be placed, an already existing site. It is also the farthest distance from the most amount of homes if you take into consideration the entire Regnier property.

Mr. Regnier is concerned about his Center Point Irrigation and using 5 acres of his precious agricultural land for a Facility Site and the Drilling – so the site is moved 591 feet away from his daughter, son in law and grandchildren's homes and access to the Facility Site is being planned ½ mile from 4 other occupied dwellings.

Legally both the wells and the Facility site should be required to be moved to ½ mile south of Weld County Road 20.5. This is the farthest distance from the most occupied dwellings on the Regnier property. Encana would only have to drive ½ mile or less to drill and reach the Facility pad during the Production Period of these wells. Encana would be able to access this Site from the east, Weld County Road 7, onto Weld County Road 20.5 and then ½ mile to the Site.

The proposal cited above would lessen the driving of trucks dramatically, take all of the traffic off of County Road 1 and away from a Boulder County maintained road and Boulder County citizens who have a right to Low Volume

Hydrofracturing near their homes which are in a moratorium, and it would move all of the nuisances for 10+ neighbors who do not want the visual blight the emissions or the truck traffic much farther away, 1 and ½ miles. Mr. Regnier would need to move the sacrificed 5 acres of his farm land that he has sited for 591 feet east of his family to another part of his farm, but at least 10 families and property owners, and all of the property values in Section 19 would be better off for it. It's 5 acres either way you look at it either for wells or the Production Site. We live in a high density rural neighborhood and we should have protections against Major Industrial sites and the Weld Code, as Land Use Authority, says we do have those protections. Regnier Farms should be required by law to consider the impact their proposal is going to have on the community around them, instead of only considering the impacts on their own farm.

This alternate proposal would have a number of Community Benefits: It would remove all traffic off of County Road 1, it would remove all traffic off of Rd. 18 (6 land owners and neighbors only egress and access to a Public Road), it would move the entire nuisance issue 1 and ½ miles north of our neighborhood which is already at tremendous risk from the 12 proposed Rasmussen Wells and associated Facility Site. It would take this entire operation out of Boulder County.

It would be in the best interest of the property values in the area, particularly in Section 19, if the wells were reduced to 4 (to acknowledge and respect the wishes of Boulder County) and moved to the ACTUAL farthest distance from the largest number of homes, which is ½ mile south of WCR 20.5 at the current site.

C) The Application has an area for completing a 'Comprehensive Drilling Plan' for the Proposed Location. The box is not checked. Encana submitted an application for another Major Industrial Site for this area in December 2014, the Rasmussen Well site. Looking at the maps for the Regnier site, I noticed there is not one map that shows the whole area and all of the wells and proposed now and for the near future. A 2 mile square area map study of the area needs to happen so that neighborhoods like ours do not get lambasted with a site here and a site there without the neighbors and the COGCC ever having a chance to consider the whole picture.

Looking at the Regnier Well and Location maps was like looking at a Picasso painting, a bunch of pieces put together, but not connected. The results of this narrow way of mapping created numerous mistakes in the Application and a lack of actual impact implications for the area. It also prevented Encana from determining the farthest distance from ALL OCCUPIED DWELLINGS when planning the location of the drilling with Mr. Regnier. It's as if, Mr. Regnier picked a site that worked best for him, and then they drew a line around it and made minor adjustments so that the wells and Facility Site would 'seem' to be the 'farthest distance' from that 'chosen spot' but in actuality the wells are not at all the farthest distance from neighbors and occupied dwellings on the Entire Regnier Property.

I am asking for a Comprehensive Drilling Plan and a CDP#, added into the Regnier application for a 2

mile square area and 2 years ahead, around the proposed Regnier Well Site and Facility Site to be reviewed by the COGCC and Community members. If a CDP# existed for this application and accurate maps of the area there could be prudent planning for this area regarding bringing 12- 24-36 wells in addition to the already 13+ wells that are here, to this Low Volume Hydrofracturing area. With this kind of prudent and common sense thinking then the kinds of problems being expressed by community members and other entities would be reduced greatly.

Without a CDP# this application is incomplete.

D)Per Rule 303.b.(3)C.'Oil and Gas will flow combined to the facilities pad south of the well pad.'And 'Facilities Pad associated with Regnier Farms 19HB268 wells is not within a designated setback location'.And 'well site production facilities #435499, form 2A Doc. #400798141'.

These 3 references to the planned location for the Facility Site for the 12 Regnier Wells are contained within the Form 2A application.Also, we were told by an Encana representative that the proposed location for the 12 wells was dependent a specific location for the associated Facilities Pad which is on an already existent site ½ mile north of Rd. 18 on the north/south section of that road, and south of the proposed 12 wells ¼ mile.

Where is the Form 2A for the Facilities Pad?If the 12 Well Site is dependent on this location for the facilities pad, and Encana is intending on using it, as has been stated in the current application, and we have been told as such by Encana, then approving the permits for the 12 wells in the current location is akin to approving the facility site for the wells in this southern location.

Yet, we have no legal voice in the Facilities Pad because there isn't an application for it.This Facility Site is referred to 3 times in the Form 2A for the wells.

If the wells are approved, the COGCC is sentencing 10+ families to CR1 and Rd 18 being abused by truck traffic for the production of these 12 Regnier wells for 30+ years.And the community never had a say in it!Again an incomplete application.The wells and the facility site should be moved to the WCR 20.5 location.

E) The application states there is a Public Road 807 feet from the Wells.This is not true.The road they are referring to is a Private Road, the Regnier Road as previously described in this document.The closest Public Road is County Road 1, ½ mile to the west, partially owned by Boulder County and maintained by Boulder County.(Please refer to Boulder County's view of the wells and road issues in their Comment Submission) The other road closest to the 12 proposed wells is WCR 20.5 which is 1 mile north of the 12 wells, and currently there is ½ mile of that road made that goes to a current well/facility site on the Regnier property. Encana and their operators would need to drive all of their equipment 1 mile to the site.

This inaccuracy is an error in view.It jumbles the information and then when it comes time to figure out the actual access roads Encana will use, they will have to force issues and force pathways.Planning and permitting 12 wells without the access roads exactly calculated and figured out is putting the cart before the horse (oh and then just get the community to adjust).

F)A CDPHE Study was not conducted. This is an error of judgement by the Weld County Government.A CDPHE study was formally requested of the LGD by a Community member and the Boulder County LGD

Without a CDPHE study completed and shared with the community before the approval of these wells, the application is incomplete.

G)Human Beings and Occupied Dwellings are not contained as an item on the list for Cultural Distance Information.All of the concerned property and surface owners in this area re stakeholders in this decision, therefore all of our comments and concerns should be given as high of priority as the mineral owners.To not do this, to not protect the civil rights of all of the stakeholders is in contrast to the COGCC mission statement and is an error in judgement on behalf of the COGCC.In an agricultural area and humans are stakeholders in the natural environment around them and have equal rights to the protections animals and plants get.

A box is missing from the Cultural Distance part of the application that says 'Occupied Dwellings', therefore this application is incomplete.

H)If Encana is this amazingly careless about submitting their application, I have no confidence in their Drilling and Hydrofracturing ability and neither should the COGCC.There is evidence that these sites are being forced through even though they are not in the best interest of at least 10 families living in

this rural area. Encana's and Regnier Farms profits and 5 acres of land for a Facility Site, are not worth the health, safety and environmental risks associated with this proposed Major Industrial Operation. The devaluing of the neighborhood is not worth the short term profits of Regnier Farms and Encana. This scale of operation does not belong anywhere near Occupied Dwellings. Our area and homes will become a sacrifice zone for the apparent greed of the mineral owners, Encana, COGCC and Weld County Government if the wells are approved as proposed.

Truly a tragedy.

Move the location of the Regnier wells and it's associated Facility site to ½ mile south of WCR20.5 to a current well and facility site on the Regnier Property. Reduce the number of wells to a respectful 4, and keep the area near Boulder County a Low Volume Hydrofracturing area. Protect all of the home owners and surface rights owners in Section 19 from excessive and dangerous truck traffic on CR1 and Rd. 18.

The right thing to do is to protect all citizen's and stakeholders' inalienable rights to safety, health, a clean environment and to peaceful enjoyment of their homes.

Please fully address the issues in this document and directly contact me with your determinations at:

protectpleasantview@gmail.com

Total: 4 comment(s)