

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

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested	Specific Rule (optional)	Explanation:	Referenced
COMPLETENESS REVIEW				

Not required

Issue identified by staff:		Suggested		Specific Rule	Explanation:	Referenced in	SME reviewer	403233613	403233636
COMPLETENESS REVIEW									
Lesser Impact Area Exemption was requested.									
Please refer to the LIA Exemption Tab - request is granted							MMH	x	x

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule	Explanation:	Reference
COMPLETENESS REVIEW				

Lesser Impact Area Exemption was requested.
Please refer to the LIA Exemption Tab - request is granted

304.c.(4). Odor Mitigation Plan

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule	Explanation:	Referenced in
COMPLETENESS REVIEW				
Not required				

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Explanation:	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer		
COMPLETENESS REVIEW							
Truck trips differ from the Form 2B.							
					MMH	x	x

T
M
h
re
u

304.c.(6). Transportation Plan

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested	Specific Rule	Explanation:	Referenced in	SME reviewer	403233613	403233636
COMPLETENESS REVIEW							
Not required					MMH	X	X

304.c.(7). Operations Safety Management Program

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested	Specific Rule	Explanation:	Referenced in	SME reviewer	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW						403233636
Meets the requirements					MMH	x
					x	

Issue identified by staff:		Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Explanation:	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	403233613	403233636	C m
COMPLETENESS REVIEW									
Site description states "1 helium well." However, the well is being perforated to develop helium, natural gas, and potentially oil and the production is equipped for these fluids.			Use the term "conventional well" or "vertical well."			MMH	x		x

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

Issue identified by staff:		Suggested		Specific Rule	Explanation:	Referenced in	SME reviewer	403233613	403233636
COMPLETENESS REVIEW									
Not required							MMH	x	x

304.c.(10). Hydrogen Sulfide Drilling Operations Plan

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested	Specific Rule	Explanation:	Referenced in	SME reviewer	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW						403233636
Not required					MMH	x
					x	x

304.c.(11). Waste Management Plan

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested	Specific Rule	Explanation:	Referenced in	SME reviewer	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW						
Meets the requirements of the Rule.					MMH	x
						x
						403233613
						403233636

304.c.(12). Gas Capture Plan

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested	Specific Rule	Explanation:	Referenced in	SME reviewer	403233613	403233636
COMPLETENESS REVIEW							
Not required					MMH	x	x

304.c.(13). Fluid Leak Detection Plan

Issue identified by staff:		Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Explanation:	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer		
The wrong legal description is reported in the second paragraph under Plan.		Correct the legal description.				MMH		
							x	
								403233636
								403233613
								403233636
								C
								P

Issue identified by staff:**COMPLETENESS REVIEW**

Topsoil Plan states that there will be a diversion ditch around all sides of the pad and flow into a sediment trap located on the east side of the pad. The Stormwater Plan states "ditches surrounding the north, west, and south sides of the pad will direct stormwater to a sediment trap on the southwest corner."

The Stormwater Plan Site Specific Drawing shows the sediment trap in the southwest corner of the pad.

The Stormwater Plan Site Specific Drawing shows a cuttings trench that is not planned on the Form 2A.

The plan states the sediment trap will be located in the eastern side; however, the Stormwater Management Plan reports that the sediment trap will be located on the southwestern corner of the location. Also, the sediment trap is not depicted on the drawing.

The plan discusses the use of diversion ditches; however, the ditches are not depicted on the drawings.

The Stormwater Plan Site Specific Drawing shows a cuttings trench that is not planned on the Form 2A.

The narrative BMPs are not consistent with the BMPs on the Drawing.

Verify the location of the sediment trap.

Verify the location of the sediment trap.

Include the cuttings trench on the Form 2A under the Drilling Waster Management Program or remove it from the Drawing if not actually being planned.

Verify the use and location of the sediment trap.

Verify the use of the ditches and include the on the drawing if being used.

Include the cuttings trench on the Form 2A under the Drilling Waster Management Program or remove it from the Drawing if not actually being planned.

Provide consistency.

Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Explanation:	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer
-----------------------	--------------------------	--------------	----------------------------------	--------------

MMH

x

MMH

x

MMH

x

MMH

x

MMH

x

MMH

x

MMH

x

304.c.(15). Stormwater Management Plan

Issue identified by staff:		Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Explanation:	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW							403233613
Topsoil Stockpile locations do not match between the Site-Specific Diagram and the Stormwater Erosion Control Drawing. The plan states the topsoil stockpiles will be located along the southern boundary; however, the Drawing shows them along the southwestern and northwestern boundaries.		Verify the location of the topsoil stockpiles.				MMH	x
The Stormwater Plan states the drainage is to the northeast while the Form 2A states that it is to the east.		Verify the bearing of the drainage.				MMH	x
The plan states the sediment trap will be located in the southwestern corner; however, the Topsoil Protection Plan reports that the sediment trap will be located on the eastern side of the location. Also, the sediment trap is not depicted on the drawing. The plan discusses the use of diversion ditches; however, the ditches are not depicted on the drawings.		Verify the use and location of the sediment trap. Verify the use of the ditches and include the on the drawing if being used. Include the cuttings trench on the Form 2A under the Drilling Waster Management Program or remove it from the Drawing if not actually being planned.				MMH	x
The Stormwater Plan Site Specific Drawing shows a cuttings trench that is not planned on the Form 2A.						MMH	x
The plan narrative states that the diversion ditches will be located along the northwest and southwest sides; however, the drawing depicts the ditches along the northeast, southeast, and eastern perimeter.		Verify the location of the diversion ditches.				MMH	x

The plan states the sediment trap will be located in the southwestern corner; however, the Topsoil Protection Plan reports that the sediment trap will be located on the eastern side of the location. Also, the sediment trap is not depicted on the drawing. The plan discusses the use of diversion ditches; however, the ditches are not depicted on the drawings.

Verify the use and location of the sediment trap.
Verify the use of the ditches and include the on the drawing if being used.
Include the cuttings trench on the Form 2A under the Drilling Waster Management Program or remove it from the Drawing if not actually being planned.

Verify the location of the diversion ditches.

Issue identified by staff:		Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Explanation:	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	403233613	403233636
COMPLETENESS REVIEW								
The BMP narrative of the plan states that the berms will be located on the northeastern and southeastern perimeters of the location; however, the diagram shows the berms along the northwestern and southeastern perimeters.		Verify the location of the berms.						
		Include the cuttings trench on the Form 2A under the Drilling Waster Management Program or remove it from the Drawing if not actually being planned.				MMH	x	
The Stormwater Plan Site Specific Drawing shows a cuttings trench that is not planned on the Form 2A.						MMH	x	

304.c.(17). Wildlife Plan

Issue identified by staff:		Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Explanation:	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	403233613	403233636	C m
COMPLETENESS REVIEW									
Project Description reports 3.5 acres of disturbance as opposed to the 3.7 acres of disturbance throughout the plans and Form 2A.						MMH	x		P re a E ct 4 g e e p P at F
Project Description reports the elevation as 4120 feet as opposed to 4119 feet throughout the plans and Form 2A.						MMH	x		
The Wildlife Plan was not submitted.						MMH		x	

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested	Specific Rule	Explanation:	Referenced in	SME reviewer	403233613	403233636
COMPLETENESS REVIEW							
Meets the requirements					MMH	X	X

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Explanation:	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	403233613
COMPLETENESS REVIEW The CI Plan reports the area after interim reclamation at 2.1 acres and the Form 2A reports the area at 1.2 acres. Furthermore, the Interim Reclamation Drawing reports a surface disturbance of 3.7 acres, with 2.5 acres being reclaimed, leaving a total of 1.2 acres of disturbance after interim reclamation. This equates with the acreage reported in other plans as well as on the Form 2A. However, this plan states that 1.2 acres of the initial 3.7 acres of total disturbance will be reclaimed during interim reclamation, which differs from acreages reported within the submittal.	Verify the correct acreage after interim reclamation. Provide a description of the amount and source of water needed for the development in the Water Resources Section.				MMH	x
Missing a description of the water amount and water source in the Resources Description. The sentence "Use of an estimated 1,500 bbls of total estimated water volume would cumulatively contribute to other water uses in the area" is unclear.	More specifically, the sentence "Water would be obtained from existing, permitted sources of groundwater, including an estimated 1,500 bbls of groundwater", could be moved to the Description.				MMH	x
Hydrology Map abd the Form 2A report the nearest wetland at 829 feet east of the WPS; however, the CI Plan reports the wetland 970 feet east of the WPS.	Suggest "impacts resulting from additional water usage in the area."				MMH	x
	Verify the correct distance between the wetland and the WPS.				MMH	x

304.c.(20). Community Outreach Plan

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested	Specific Rule	Explanation:	Referenced in	SME reviewer	403233613	403233636
Not required					MMH	X	X

304.c.(21). Geologic Hazard Plan

Issue identified by staff:		Suggested correction:		Specific Rule	Explanation:	Referenced in	SME reviewer	403233613	403233613
COMPLETENESS REVIEW									
Not required							MMH	x	x

ALA DATASHEET

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Explanation:	Referenced document:
COMPLETENESS REVIEW				

The preferred Location coordinates do not match. Verify the coordinates.
Meets the requirements of the Rule.

ALA NARRATIVE SUMMARY

Issue identified by staff:		Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Explanation:	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	403233613	403233636
COMPLETENESS REVIEW								
The Legal Description for the Alternative Location is incorrect.		Verify the correct Legal Description.						
Hydrology Map reports the nearest wetland at 829 feet east; however, the ALA Narrative reports the wetland at 941 feet east.						MMH	x	
Hydrology Map reports the nearest wetland at 460 feet east; however, the ALA Narrative reports the wetland at 411 feet east.						MMH	x	
						MMH		x

CPW CONSULTATION

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested	Specific Rule	Explanation:	Referenced in	SME reviewer	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW						403233636
Meets the requirements of he Rule.					MMH	x

CULTURAL FEATURES MAP

Issue identified by staff:		Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Explanation:	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	403233613	403233636	C
COMPLETENESS REVIEW									m
The Cultural Features Map reports the nearest building is 3579 feet to the southwest; however, the Form 2A reported the distance as 3578 feet to the southwest.		Verify the correct distance.				MMH	x		2
Meets the requirements of the Rule.						MMH	x		cc

DIRECTIONAL WELL PLAT

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested	Specific Rule	Explanation:	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	403
COMPLETENESS REVIEW						
Not required as this is a verticle well.					MMH	x

**DISPROPORTIONATELY IMPACTED
COMMUNITY MAP**

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested	Specific Rule	Explanation:	Referenced in	SME reviewer	403233613	403233636
COMPLETENESS REVIEW							

Does not lie within a DIC.

MMH

x

x

GEOLOGIC HAZARD MAP

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested	Specific Rule	Explanation:	Referenced in	SME reviewer	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW						403233636
Meets the requirements of the Rule.					MMH	x
					x	

GIS data

Issue identified by staff:

COMPLETENESS REVIEW

Location and WPS appear.

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested	Specific Rule	Explanation:	Referenced in	SME reviewer	403233613	403233636
COMPLETENESS REVIEW							
Location and WPS appear.					MMH	X	X

HYDROLOGY MAP

Issue identified by staff:		Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Explanation:	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	403233613	403233636	C
COMPLETENESS REVIEW							Harker	Hillman	
Hydrology Map and the Form 2A report the nearest wetland at 829 feet east of the WPS; however, the CI Plan reports the wetland 970 feet east of the WPS.		Verify the correct distance between the wetland and the WPS.				MMH	x		C
Hydrology Map reports the nearest wetland at 829 feet east; however, the ALA Narrative reports the wetland at 941 feet east.						MMH	x		b fr 8 A b cc A b cc T b to w W S
Hydrology Map reports the nearest wetland at 460 feet east; however, the ALA Narrative reports the wetland at 411 feet east.						MMH		x	
Hydrology Map defines the mapped wetland located 460 feet to the east of the location as a WUS mapped drainage; however, the NWI map and the Form 2A define the drainage as a Palustrine Emergent wetland.						MMH		x	

INFORMED CONSENT LETTER

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested ..	Specific Rule ..	Explanation: ..	Referenced in ..	SME reviewer 403233613	403233636

Not required

MMH

x

x

LAYOUT DRAWING

Issue identified by staff:		Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Explanation:	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	403233613	403233636	C
COMPLETENESS REVIEW							Harker		m
Facility Layout Drawing shows a combustor which is not listed on the Equipment and Flowlines Tab.						MMH	x		R
		Meets the requirements of the Rule.				MMH		x	D b

LESSER IMPACT AREA EXEMPTION REQUEST

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Explanation:	Referenced in guidance document?
COMPLETENESS REVIEW				
Requires a statement regarding CPW consultation and recommendation for the LIA Exemption requests as the location lies within mapped HPH.	Provide a statement regarding CPW consultation and recommendation for the LIA Exemption requests.		Operator discussion with CPW is necessary to determine if potential noise impacts to Lesser Praire Chicken habitat is a concern. LIA request dated 5/19 provides an adequate description of the wildlife concerns and likelihood of impacts. LIA exemption request is granted -	
Request for LIA exemption from Rule 304.c.(2) Noise Mitigation Plan			potential noise impacts can be addressed with BMPs on the Form 2A (JN 8/31/23)	
Request for LIA exemption from Rule 304.c.(3) Light Mitigation Plan			Operator discussion with CPW is necessary to determine if potential light impacts to Lesser Praire Chicken habitat is a concern.. LIA request dated 5/19 provides an adequate description of the wildlife concerns and likelihood of impacts. LIA exemption request is granted - potential light impacts can be addressed with BMPs on the Form 2A (JN 8/31/23)	

LOCATION DRAWING

Issue identified by staff:		Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Explanation:	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	403233613	403233636	C
COMPLETENESS REVIEW									m
Location Drawing reports the nearest Building at 3579 feet; however, the Form 2A reports the distance as 3578 feet.						MMH	x		2
Meets the requirements of the Rule.						MMH	x		cc

NRCS MAP UNIT DESC

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested	Specific Rule	Explanation:	Referenced in	SME reviewer	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW						403233636
Meet the requirements of the Rule.					MMH	x
Meets the requirements of the Rule.					MMH	x

OTHER

Issue identified by staff:		Referenced in		403233613	403233636
COMPLETENESS REVIEW		SME reviewer			

REFERENCE AREA MAP

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested	Specific Rule	Explanation:	Referenced in	SME reviewer	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW						403233636

Not required.

MMH

x

x

403233613

REFERENCE AREA PICTURES

Issue identified by staff:		Suggested		Specific Rule	Explanation:	Referenced in	SME reviewer	403233613	403233636
COMPLETENESS REVIEW									

Not required.

MMH

x

x

RELATED LOCATION AND FLOWLINE MAP

Issue identified by staff:

COMPLETENESS REVIEW

Meets the requirements of the Rule.

Suggested	Specific Rule	Explanation:	Referenced in	SME reviewer	
					403233636
				MMH	X
					403233613

SECTION 404 PERMIT

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested	Specific Rule	Explanation:	Referenced in	SME reviewer	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW						403233636

Not required.

MMH

x

x

SURFACE AGRMT/SURETY

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?		SME reviewer	403233613	403233636	C m
			Explanation:					
COMPLETENESS REVIEW Meets the requirements of the Rule.					MMH	x		
	SUA is not signed by the Operator.				MMH		x	S h a

WAIVERS

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested	Specific Rule	Explanation:	Referenced in	SME reviewer	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW						403233636

Not requested

MMH x x

WILDLIFE HABITAT DRAWING

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested	Specific Rule	Explanation:	Referenced in	SME reviewer	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW						403233636

Meets the requirements of the Rule.

MMH x x

COMPLETENESS REVIEW (Form 2A topic)		(topic/subtopic)		
Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Explanation:	SME reviewer	403233613
<p>The Stormwater Plan states that the drainage it to the northeast; however, the Form 2A states that it is located to the east.</p> <p>The ALA Datasheet states that the Preferred location is located at Latitude 38.99909; however, the Form 2A has the Preferred Location located at 38.999909.</p> <p>The Cultural Features Map reports the nearest building is 3579 feet to the southwest; however, the Form 2A reported the distance as 3578 feet to the southwest.</p> <p>The post-construction on the Layout Drawing and in the plans is reported as 4127 feet; however, the Form 2A is reporting the post-construction as 4128 feet.</p>	Verify the bearing of the drainage. Verify the correct coordinate.		MMH	x
			MMH	x
			MMH	x
			MMH	
Hydrology Map and the Form 2A report the nearest wetland at 829 feet east of the WPS; however, the CI Plan reports the wetland 970 feet east of the WPS.			MMH	x

COMPLETENESS REVIEW (Form 2B topic)			
Issue identified by staff:	(topic/subtopic)	Suggested correction:	Explanation:
Location Information		Provide a statement as to why noise, light, and odor impacts to wildlife will be minimal.	MMH
Location Information		Truck trips do not match up between the Dust Plan and Form 2B.	MMH
			X
			X

COMPLETENESS REVIEW (Form 2C topic)		(topic/subtopic)		
Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Explanation:	SME reviewer	403233613
Meets the requirements of the Rule.			MMH	x

Hearing Application

COMPLETENESS REVIEW		(topic/subtopic)	Explanation:	SME reviewer	403233613
Issue identified by staff:		Suggested correction:			
Permitting: PASS 2/7					
OGLA: PASS 2/10					
Engineering: PASS 4/5					