

State of Colorado
Energy & Carbon Management Commission1120 Lincoln Street, Suite 801, Denver, Colorado 80203
Phone: (303) 894-2100 Fax: (303) 894-2109

Document Number:

403570482

Receive Date:

10/24/2023

Report taken by:

BOB CHESSON

Site Investigation and Remediation Workplan (Supplemental Form)

This form shall be submitted to the Director for approval prior to the initiation of site investigation and remediation activities. However, this shall not preclude the Operator from taking immediate action to protect public health or safety, the environment, wildlife, or livestock.

This Form 27 describes site conditions as currently understood by the Operator; approval of this Form 27 by COGCC is based on the site conditions accurately described herein; any changes in site conditions identified during or subsequent to the performance of the approved workplan may necessitate additional investigation or remediation which shall be described on a supplemental Form 27. This Form 27 is intended to provide basic information regarding the proposed site investigation and remediation actions, but the workplan may be more fully described in attached documentation.

Closure request is not available for an Initial Site Investigation and Remediation Workplan.

OPERATOR INFORMATION

Name of Operator: NOBLE ENERGY INC	Operator No: 100322	Phone Numbers
Address: 2001 16TH STREET SUITE 900		Phone: (715) 562-0251
City: DENVER	State: CO	Zip: 80202
Contact Person: Dan Peterson	Email: rbueuf27@chevron.com	Mobile: ()

PROJECT, PURPOSE & SITE INFORMATION

PROJECT INFORMATION

Remediation Project #: 27922 Initial Form 27 Document #: 403335886

PURPOSE INFORMATION

- ☐ Rule 913.c.(1): Pit or Cuttings Trench closure.
- ☐ Rule 913.c.(2): Buried or partially buried vessel closure, which will be by removal.
- ☒ Rule 913.c.(3): Remediation of Spill and Releases pursuant to Rule 912.
- ☐ Rule 913.c.(4): Land treatment of Oily Waste pursuant to Rule 905.e.
- ☐ Rule 913.c.(5): Closure of Centralized E&P Waste Management Facilities pursuant to Rule 907.h.
- ☐ Rule 913.c.(6): Remediation of impacted Groundwater pursuant to Rule 915.e.(3).D, and the contaminant concentrations in Table 915-1.
- ☐ Rule 913.c.(7): Investigation and remediation of natural gas in soil or Groundwater.
- ☐ Rule 913.c.(8): When requested by the Director due to any potential risk to soil, Groundwater, or surface water.
- ☒ Rule 913.c.(9): Decommissioning of Oil and Gas Facilities.
- ☐ Rule 913.g: Changes of Operator.
- ☐ Rule 915.b: Request to leave elevated inorganics in situ.
- ☐ Other: _____

SITE INFORMATION

Yes Multiple Facilities

Facility Type: WELL	Facility ID: _____	API #: 123-27157	County Name: WELD
Facility Name: BOOTH C 35-01	Latitude: 40.274701	Longitude: -104.511087	
** correct Lat/Long if needed: Latitude: _____		Longitude: _____	
QtrQtr: NENE	Sec: 35	Twp: 4N	Range: 64W
Meridian: 6	Sensitive Area? Yes		

Facility Type: SPILL OR RELEASE	Facility ID: 484838	API #: _____	County Name: WELD
Facility Name: Booth C35-01	Latitude: 40.275162	Longitude: -104.512419	
** correct Lat/Long if needed: Latitude: _____		Longitude: _____	
QtrQtr: NENE	Sec: 35	Twp: 4N	Range: 64W
Meridian: 6	Sensitive Area? Yes		

SITE CONDITIONS

General soil type - USCS Classifications SW

Most Sensitive Adjacent Land Use Grassland

Is domestic water well within 1/4 mile? No

Is surface water within 1/4 mile? No

Is groundwater less than 20 feet below ground surface? No

Other Potential Receptors within 1/4 mile

NA

DENIED

SITE INVESTIGATION PLAN

TYPE OF WASTE:

- ☒ E&P Waste ☐ Other E&P Waste ☐ Non-E&P Waste
- ☒ Produced Water ☐ Workover Fluids
- ☒ Oil ☐ Tank Bottoms
- ☒ Condensate ☐ Pigging Waste
- ☐ Drilling Fluids ☐ Rig Wash
- ☐ Drill Cuttings ☐ Spent Filters
- ☐ Pit Bottoms
- ☐ Other (as described by EPA)

DESCRIPTION OF IMPACT

Impacted?	Impacted Media	Extent of Impact	How Determined
No	GROUNDWATER	NA	Lab analysis if encountered
Yes	SOILS	10' x 10' x 4' BGS	Lab analysis

INITIAL ACTION SUMMARY

Description of initial action or emergency response measures take to abate, investigate, and/or remediate impacts associated with E&P Waste.

Pursuant to ECMC Rule 911 a site investigation was conducted pertaining to the Booth C35-01 wellhead cut and cap and flowline removal. Approximately 713' of flowline was removed. The wellhead was cut and capped per ECMC rules. Additionally, soil samples were field screened at the N-E-S-W sides of the wellhead. Soil samples were taken along the flowline at points of material change and/or hammer unions, directional changes, as well as at the bell holes on either side of a waterway. The Flowline Pre-Abandonment Notice Document number was included under Related Forms.

PROPOSED SAMPLING PLAN

Proposed Soil Sampling

- ☒ Will soil samples be collected as part of this investigation? (Number, type (grab/composite), analyses, and locations of samples):

A grab soil sample was collected at the base of the excavation or the area showing the highest degree of impact during field screening activities at the wellhead excavation. Additionally, soil samples were field screened at the N-E-S-W sides of the wellhead. Soil samples were taken along the flowline at any points of material change and/or hammer unions, directional changes, as well as at the bell holes on either side of a waterway. Soil samples were analyzed by a certified laboratory for TPH (total volatile [C6-C10] and extractable [C10-C36] hydrocarbons) organic compounds in soil per ECMC Table 915-1, and EC, SAR, pH, and boron. Additionally, one soil sample was submitted for laboratory analysis of ECMC Table 915-1 Metals in soil. All samples collected were analyzed by a certified laboratory using approved ECMC laboratory analysis methods.

Proposed Groundwater Sampling

- ☒ Will groundwater samples be collected as part of this investigation? (Number, analyses, and locations of samples):

If groundwater is encountered during the site investigation a grab groundwater will be collected and analyzed for all organic compounds per ECMC Table 915-1.

Proposed Surface Water Sampling

- ☐ Will surface water samples be collected as part of this investigation? (Number, analyses, and locations of samples):

Additional Investigative Actions

- ☐ Additional alternative investigative actions described in attached Site Investigation Plan (summary):

Visual inspection of the wellhead and flowline areas occurred during abandonment activities. Field personnel field screened all disturbed areas using visual and olfactory senses to determine if laboratory confirmation sampling is required. The ECMC Flowline Closure and Wellhead Closure Checklists were utilized and filled out during the abandonment process. A photolog was submitted on the Subsequent Form 27.

SITE INVESTIGATION REPORT

SAMPLE SUMMARY

Soil

NA / ND

Number of soil samples collected 24

Number of soil samples exceeding 915-1 21

Was the areal and vertical extent of soil contamination delineated? Yes

Approximate areal extent (square feet) 100

ND Highest concentration of TPH (mg/kg)

-- Highest concentration of SAR 2.57

BTEX > 915-1 No

Vertical Extent > 915-1 (in feet) 4

Groundwater

Number of groundwater samples collected 0

Was extent of groundwater contaminated delineated? No

Depth to groundwater (below ground surface, in feet)

Number of groundwater monitoring wells installed

Number of groundwater samples exceeding 915-1

Highest concentration of Benzene (µg/l)

Highest concentration of Toluene (µg/l)

Highest concentration of Ethylbenzene (µg/l)

Highest concentration of Xylene (µg/l)

Highest concentration of Methane (mg/l)

Surface Water

0 Number of surface water samples collected

Number of surface water samples exceeding 915-1

If surface water is impacted, other agency notification may be required.

OTHER INVESTIGATION INFORMATION

☐ Were impacts to adjacent property or offsite impacts identified?

☒ Were background samples collected as part of this site investigation?

A total of twenty background samples were collected from ten discrete locations and analyzed for arsenic. One background sample was collected and analyzed for pH.

☐ Was investigation derived waste (IDW) generated as part of this investigation?

Volume of solid waste (cubic yards)

Volume of liquid waste (barrels)

☐ Is further site investigation required?

REMEDIAL ACTION PLAN

Does this Supplemental Form 27A include changes to a previously approved Remedial Action Plan? No

SOURCE REMOVAL SUMMARY

Describe how source is to be removed.

The source was delineated through an environmental site assessment and will be left in place, pending ECMC approval to close the remediation number and apply ECMC Table 915-1 Residential Soil Screening Levels (RSSLs) to the site. Refer to the operator comments section for a detailed justification for the application of ECMC Table 915-1 RSSLs.

REMEDIATION SUMMARY

Describe how remediation of existing impacts to soil and groundwater is to be accomplished (i.e. summarize remedial action plan). Provide a brief narrative description including: technical justification, schedule for implementation, estimated time to attain NFA status, plus plans and specifications for the selected remedial action technology.

A Site Assessment was conducted on 9/5/2023 and 9/12/2023 to delineate impacted media. Ten soil borings were advanced in the area of impacts. BH01 was advanced at the same location as the waste characterization sample FL01-B@3.5' to vertically delineate impacts at that location. BH02-BH05 were advanced surrounding BH01 to vertically and laterally delineate impacts identified at FL01-B@3.5'. BH06 was advanced at the same location as the waste characterization sample FL01-G@4' to vertically delineate impacts at that location. BH07-BH10 were advanced surrounding BH06 to vertically and laterally delineate impacts identified at FL01-G@4'. Soil samples were collected and analyzed for TPH (total volatile [C6-C10] and extractable [C10-C36] hydrocarbons), organic compounds in soil, metals in soil per COGCC Table 915-1, and EC, SAR, pH, and boron. Groundwater was not encountered during this assessment.

Soil Remediation Summary

☐ In Situ

☐ Ex Situ

Bioremediation (or enhanced bioremediation)

Excavate and offsite disposal

_____ Chemical oxidation
_____ Air sparge / Soil vapor extraction
_____ Natural Attenuation
_____ Other _____

If Yes: Estimated Volume (Cubic Yards) _____
Name of Licensed Disposal Facility or COGCC Facility ID # _____
_____ Excavate and onsite remediation
_____ Land Treatment
_____ Bioremediation (or enhanced bioremediation)
_____ Chemical oxidation
_____ Other _____

Groundwater Remediation Summary

_____ Bioremediation (or enhanced bioremediation)
_____ Chemical oxidation
_____ Air sparge / Soil vapor extraction
_____ Natural Attenuation
_____ Other _____

GROUNDWATER MONITORING

If groundwater has been impacted, describe proposed monitoring plan, including # of wells or sample points, monitoring schedule, analytical methods, points of compliance. Attach a groundwater monitoring location diagram.

REMEDIATION PROGRESS UPDATE

PERIODIC REPORTING

Approved Reporting Schedule:

☒ Quarterly☐ Semi-Annually☐ Annually☐ Other

☐ Request Alternative Reporting Schedule:

☐ Semi-Annually☐ Annually☐ Other

Rule 913.e:

After initial approval of a Form 27, the Operator will provide quarterly update reports in a Supplemental Form 27 to document progress of site investigation and remediation, unless an alternative reporting schedule has been requested by the Operator and approved by the Director. The Director may request a more frequent reporting schedule based on site-specific conditions.

Report Type:

☐ Groundwater Monitoring☐ Land Treatment Progress Report☐ O&M Report☒ Other Laboratory analytical, photos, figures, and checklists

Adequacy of Operator's General Liability Insurance and Financial Assurance

Describe the adequacy of the Operator's general liability insurance and Financial Assurance to fully address the anticipated costs of Remediation, including the estimated remaining cost for this project (below).

If this information has been provided on a Form 27 within the last 12 months, provide the Document Number of that form.

Noble intends to directly address the costs of remediation at the locations as part of our asset retirement obligation process and operations. Noble has general liability insurance (policy MWZZ 316714) and financial assurance in compliance with COGCC rules. Records are available on the COGCC's website.

Operator anticipates the remaining cost for this project to be: \$ 0

WASTE DISPOSAL INFORMATION

Was E&P waste generated as part of this remediation? No

Describe beneficial use, if any, of E&P Waste derived from this remediation project:

Volume of E&P Waste (solid) in cubic yards

E&P waste (solid) description

COGCC Disposal Facility ID #, if applicable:

Non-COGCC Disposal Facility:

Volume of E&P Waste (liquid) in barrels

E&P waste (liquid) description

COGCC Disposal Facility ID #, if applicable:

Non-COGCC Disposal Facility:

REMEDIATION COMPLETION REPORT

REMEDIATION COMPLETION SUMMARY

Is this a Final Closure Request for this Remediation Project? Yes

If YES:

☒ Compliant with Rule 913.h.(1).☐ Compliant with Rule 913.h.(2).☐ Compliant with Rule 913.h.(3).

Do all soils meet Table 915-1 standards? Yes

Does the previous reply indicate consideration of background concentrations? Yes

Does Groundwater meet Table 915-1 standards? Yes

Is additional groundwater monitoring to be conducted? _____

Operator shall comply with the COGCC 1000-Series Reclamation Requirements for all impacted and disturbed areas.

RECLAMATION PLAN

RECLAMATION PLANNING

Describe reclamation plan. Discuss existing and new grade recontouring; method and testing of compaction alleviation; and reseeding program, including location of new seed, seed mix and noxious weed prevention. Attach diagram or drawing.

Reclamation will be in accordance with COGCC 1000 Series Rules.

Is the described reclamation complete? No

Does the reclamation described herein constitute interim or final reclamation of the Oil and Gas Location?

☐ Interim

☐ Final

Did the Surface Owner provide the seed mix? _____

If YES, does the seed mix comply with local soil conservation district recommendations? _____

Did the local soil conservation district provide the seed mix? _____

SITE RECLAMATION DATES

Proposed date of commencement of Reclamation. 04/24/2024

Proposed date of completion of Reclamation. 10/24/2024

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

Per Rule 913.d.(2): Any change from the approved implementation schedule will be requested at least 14 days in advance, and the Operator may not make the change without the Director's approval.

PRIOR DATES

Date of Surface Owner notification/consultation, if required. 01/25/2023

Actual Spill or Release date, or date of discovery. 07/21/2023

SITE INVESTIGATION DATES

Date of Initial Actions described in Site Investigation Plan (start date). 06/29/2023

Proposed site investigation commencement. 04/01/2023

Proposed completion of site investigation. 09/12/2023

REMEDIAL ACTION DATES

Proposed start date of Remediation. 09/12/2023

Proposed date of completion of Remediation. 10/24/2023

Per Rule 913.d.(2): Any change from the approved implementation schedule will be requested at least 14 days in advance, and the Operator may not make the change without the Director's approval.

☐ Change from approved implementation schedule per Rule 913.d.(2).

Basis for change in implementation schedule:

OPERATOR COMMENT

Laboratory analytical results for soil samples indicate elevated pH above ECMC Table 915-1 Soil Suitability for Reclamation (SSR) standards in six of the 20 site assessment soil samples. The background sample analyzed for pH yielded a value of 8.69, which is higher than all decommissioning and site assessment pH values. As such, pH should not be considered a contaminant of concern at the site.

Laboratory analytical results for one soil sample (BH09@4') indicated elevated EC above ECMC Table 915-1 SSR standards at 61.7 millimhos per centimeter (mmhos/cm). However, the average concentration for the remaining 23 soil samples analyzed for EC was 0.472 mmhos/cm. Additionally, this elevated EC does not correlate with other inorganic, metals, or organic impacts. Since there are no other indications of impacts at this sample location, and since the remaining site assessment, decommissioning, and waste characterization sampling results do not have elevated EC, the 61.7 mmhos/cm EC concentration identified at BH09@4' should be considered anomalous and related to background conditions at the site.

A total of 20 background samples were collected from ten discrete locations and analyzed for arsenic. The average background concentrations of arsenic with a 1.25 multiplier applied was calculated to be 0.816 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg) whereas the average soil boring and decommissioning concentration of arsenic was calculated to be 0.792 mg/kg. Since the average background concentration of arsenic was calculated to be higher than its average concentration in the soil boring and decommissioning samples, arsenic should not be considered a contaminant of concern at the Site.

Groundwater was not encountered during decommissioning or site assessment activities at the Site. As such, a desktop review of Colorado's Division of Water Resources (DWR) Well Permit Research Mapper was performed to determine the depth to water below ground surface in permitted water wells within a 0.5-mile radius of the Site. For a visual representation of the results of this inquiry refer to Figure 5 on the attached site investigation report. Three permitted water wells were identified within the 0.5-mile radius at roughly the same ground surface elevation as the Site. According to the permit records, the average static groundwater level in the region is 28.5-ft bgs. Since groundwater is recorded to be 28.5 ft bgs in the region of the Site, and since soil impacts at the Site are limited to less than 8 ft bgs, there is no pathway for contaminant migration to the groundwater table. As such, Noble proposes to utilize ECMC Table 915-1 Residential Soil Screening Levels (RSSL) when evaluating soil sample analytical results. The application of ECMC Table 915-1 RSSLs to the decommissioning and site assessment analytical results eliminates the benzo(a)anthracene detections as contaminants of concern. While arsenic was detected at concentrations above ECMC Table 915-1 RSSLs, the average background concentration of arsenic was calculated to be higher than its average concentration in the soil boring and decommissioning samples, arsenic should not be considered a contaminant of concern at the Site.

I hereby certify all statements made in this form are to the best of my knowledge true, correct, and complete.

Signed: Allan Engelhardt

Title: Environmental Consultant

Submit Date: 10/24/2023

Email: chevroneform@tasman-geo.com

Based on the information provided herein, this Application for Site Investigation and Remediation Workplan complies with COGCC Rules and applicable orders and is hereby approved.

COGCC Approved: _____

Date: _____

Remediation Project Number: 27922

COA Type

Description

0 COA	
-------	--

Attachment Check List

Upon approval, the approved Form 27 and all listed attachments will be indexed to the Remediation Project file. Only the approved Form 27 will also be indexed to the related Facilities.

Att Doc Num

Name

403570482	FORM 27 DENIED
403570654	OTHER
403570682	SITE INVESTIGATION REPORT
403571503	OTHER
403572760	FORM 27-SUPPLEMENTAL-SUBMITTED

Total Attach: 5 Files

General Comments

User Group

Comment

Comment Date

Environmental	The elevated EC observed in BH09 @ 4 feet depth is not evaluated. The result may be in error but no evidence has been presented to verify that it is in error. Further evaluation is required for an NFA determination.	10/25/2023
---------------	---	------------

Total: 1 comment(s)