

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?	403444016
<b>COMPLETENESS REVIEW</b> Attachment not required.		304.c.(1)		KF			

304.c.(2). Noise Mitigation Plan

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.c.(2)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444016
LIA Exemption request approval pending confirmation of status for the building located to the north of the site.				KF	See attached email from Surface Owner, Aurora Highlands. RBU will be completely demolished prior to construction.	Yes	X
LIA Exemption request was approved. Attachment not required.				KF			

304.c.(3). Light Mitigation Plan

Issue identified by staff: <b>COMPLETENESS REVIEW</b>	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.c.(3)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444016
LIA Exemption request approval pending confirmation of status for the building located to the north of the site.				KF	See attached email from Surface Owner, Aurora Highlands. RBU will be completely demolished prior to construction.	Yes	X
LIA Exemption request was approved. Attachment not required.				KF			

304.c.(4). Odor Mitigation Plan

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.c.(4)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444016
Attachment not required if RBU will be demolished by the time construction begins. If the RBU will still be present it an odor plan will be required. Attachment not required.	Include Odor Plan if RBU/buildings will not be demolished prior to the start of construction. If the RBU/buildings will be demolished by the start of construction update other plans to describe in detail the plan to demolish the RBU/buildings.			KF KF	See attached email from Surface Owner, Aurora Highlands. RBU will be completely demolished prior to construction.	Yes	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?	403444016
No issues identified.				KF		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 No issues identified.		304.c.(6)		KF			403444016  X

304.c.(7). Operations Safety Management 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 No issues identified.		304.c.(7)		KF			403444016  X

304.c.(8). Emergency Response Plan

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?	403444016
Plan does not include staffing information for local and mutual aid agencies (Full time, part volunteer, all volunteer, etc.).	Include staffing information for local and mutual aid agencies (Full time, part volunteer, all volunteer, etc.).		<a href="#">Yes, Plan Elements</a>	KF	Updated ERP has been attached to the filing.	Yes	X
Plan does not include a detailed layout of the oil and gas location.	Include a detailed layout of the oil and gas location.		<a href="#">Yes, Plan Elements</a>	KF	Updated ERP has been attached to the filing.	Yes	X
Plan does not include a detailed description of the equipment, typical quantities of hydrocarbon liquids and other hazardous, reactive and flammable materials stored.	Include a detailed description of the equipment, typical quantities of hydrocarbon liquids and other hazardous, reactive and flammable materials stored.		<a href="#">Yes, Plan Elements</a>	KF	Updated ERP has been attached to the filing.	Yes	X
Plan does not include a description of the response equipment, instruments and materials that are staged at the location and how they can be accessed.	Include a description of the response equipment, instruments and materials that are staged at the location and how they can be accessed.		<a href="#">Yes, Plan Elements</a>	KF	Updated ERP has been attached to the filing.	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 Attachment not required.		304.c.(9)		KF		

403444016

304.c.(10). Hydrogen Sulfide Drilling Operations 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?	403444016
<b>COMPLETENESS REVIEW</b> Attachment not required.		304.c.(10)		KF			

304.c.(11). Waste Management Plan

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.c.(11)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444016
The plan does not include a description or map showing planned haul routes for E&P Waste disposal.	Include a description or map showing planned haul routes for E&P Waste disposal.		<a href="#">Yes. Section 2.c.iii.</a>	KF	Haul Route Map has been included in the Plan	Yes	X
References are made to COGCC, however the COGCC was renamed to ECMC.	Update to use new ECMC name.			KF	Revised in the Plan.	Yes	X
Household and Human Waste are referenced in this plan however the tables do not include details on how these waste types will be handled.	Update tables to include details on Household and Human Waste disposal.			KF	Added to Table	Yes	X

304.c.(12). Gas Capture 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 Attachment not required.		304.c.(12)		KF		

403444016

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

Issue identified by staff: <b>COMPLETENESS REVIEW</b>	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444016
No issues identified.		304.c.(13)		KF		X	

304.c.(14). Topsoil Protection Plan

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?	403444016
<p>The plan states, "Test pits for topsoil determination will be hand dug to a depth of one foot or less. Topsoil in this area is not expected to exceed 12 inches", however the rule states "When separating soil horizons, the operator shall segregate horizons based upon noted changes in physical characteristics such as organic content, color, texture, density, or consistency. Segregation will be performed to the extent practicable to a depth of six (6) feet or bedrock, whichever is shallower"</p>	<p>Update plan to describe what will be done if topsoil depth is greater than the proposed "one foot or less".</p>	<p>1002.b.(1).</p>		<p>KF</p>	<p>Added verbage from Rule to the Topsoil Plan.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>X</p>
<p>The plan states, "A Sundry Notice will be submitted at a later date with the test pit photos showing topsoil determination as agreed to by COGCC". This does not describe when this will be done.</p>	<p>Update to include details about submittal of the sundry with the results of the topsoil test pit information. This sundry should be submitted at least 30 days prior to the start of construction.</p>			<p>KF</p>	<p>Revised in Plan.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>X</p>
<p>Proposed test pits and their planned locations are not shown on the included map.</p>	<p>Update map to include proposed test pit locations.</p>			<p>KF</p>	<p>Map included with test pit planned locations.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>X</p>

Issue identified by staff: <b>COMPLETENESS REVIEW</b>	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.c.(15)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444016
<p>Per the referenced rule, "Documentation shall include a description of the BMPs selected to ensure proper implementation, operation, and maintenance". The Plan only references "Installing Construction BMPs" and "Installing stormwater BMPs".</p>	<p>Add a section that includes a description of the planned BMPs, structural and nonstructural. BMPs should describe all structural BMPs such as drainage structures, diversion ditches, berms, etc. as well as all nonstructural BMPs that GMT agrees to adhere to from this plan such as types and timing of inspections, storage of records, etc. These BMPs should be included as a list and formatted to allow for ease of copying into the Form 2A upon final completeness determination.</p>	<p>1002.f.(3).B.</p>		<p>KF</p>	<p>The BMP's are listed on Page 31/32 of the SWMP. The BMP list has been updated to include non-structural BMPs</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>X</p>
<p>Section C. states that GMT has an approved "Administrative Oil &amp; Gas use by special review permit Report Stormwater Management Plan for Well Pads and Access Road with Adams County", however there is no statement about Aurora requirements in this plan. Since this location is located inside the City of Aurora additional details related to this should be included.</p>	<p>Clarify whether Aurora has their own Stormwater requirements. If they do add details describing what has been done to coordinate with them. If not state that they do not.</p>			<p>KF</p>	<p>The Plan has been revised to meet all state requirements.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>X</p>

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?	403444016
<p>"Reference Area Vegetation" section is extremely limited and does not include enough information. This section should describe not only the predominant plant species, but also the percent of vegetative cover, any known weed infestations or lack thereof, and any other relevant information related to the native vegetation.</p>	<p>Update to add additional detail regarding vegetative cover, weed infestations, and any other relevant information related to native vegetation at this location.</p>			KF	Revised Interim Rec Plan has been uploaded	Yes	X
<p>Section III on Page 5 states that, "The following procedures detail site-specific Interim Reclamation BMPs that will be implemented following construction and drilling operations, and within six months of the date of first production". The referenced rule states, "interim reclamation shall occur no later than three (3) months on crop land or six (6) months on non-crop land after such operations unless the Director extends the time period because of conditions outside the control of the operator". The Form 2A states that this location is within cropland.</p>	<p>Update to meet rule requirements.</p>	1003.b		KF	Revised in the Interim Reclamation Plan.	Yes	X
<p>Section 5. in Appendix A - Seeding Method - is not descript.</p>	<p>Update this section to describe how the soil will be prepared for reseeded. Describe in detail what will be done as part of the "range-type drill methods".</p>			KF	Description of "range-type drill methods" were added to the Interim Reclamation Plan.	Yes	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?	403444016
Section 5.a.(4) mentions a cuttings pit, however section 5.a.(9). states "No pits will be on this Location".	Update to accurately reflect whether a cuttings pit will be used at this location.			KF	Added statement: There are no pits planned on this location.	Yes	X
Section 5.a.(5) mentions trenches, however no trenches are included in other plans or maps. Section 5.a.(11). states that "No flowline or other underground utility associated with the Project will cross either a perennial stream or an aquatic HPH" however Section 5.b. says "Operator will comply". If no flowline or utilities will cross any aquatic HPH then both sections should state such.	Update to accurately reflect whether trenches will be present at this location.			KF	Added statement: There are no trenches planned for this location.	Yes	X
	Update to match.			KF	Revised in plan.	Yes	X

304.c.(18). Water Plan

Issue identified by staff: <b>COMPLETENESS REVIEW</b>	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.c.(18)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444016
Plan does not describe the volume of the planned MLVT.	Update to include volume of planned MLVT in this plan.			KF	Revised in the Plan.	Yes	X
Aurora Water and Pure Cycle Corporation are named as sources of water, however their addresses and the GPS of the source location are not included as part of this plan.	Update plan to include the name, address, and GPS for all sources of water that will be used during operations.			KF	Revised in the Plan.	Yes	X
All water sources need to state whether they are surface water, groundwater, or mixed sources.	Update to describe the source water.			KF	Revised in the Plan.	Yes	X
The quantity of water used should be described not only in the total volume, but also broken down into usage for each phast of operations.	Update to show water usage by phase of operations.			KF	Revised in the Plan.	Yes	X

Issue identified by staff: <b>COMPLETENESS REVIEW</b>	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.c.(19)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444016
<p>All buildings, RBUs, HOBUs, etc. need to be described in the "4.6 Public Welfare" section of this plan. It is stated in the Emergency Response Plan that the building to the north is "Slated for demolition" but does not give a timeline.</p>	<p>If any buildings will still be present at the time construction begins they should be included on the Form 2A as well as all relevant plans and attachments. If they have been or will be demolished prior to construction a statement describing the process and timing of the demolition should be included in the "Public Welfare" section of this plan.</p>			KF	<p>See attached email from Surface Owner, Aurora Highlands. RBU will be completely demolished prior to construction.</p> <p>The Schuh 3-65 has already been constructed and has four (4) producing wells. These wells were drilled in 2021.</p> <p>The King 3-65 location has also constructed and has four (4) producing wells. Crestone has an approved OGDG to enlarge the location. Public information on the ECDC website indicates that drilling is anticipated in Q1/2024.</p>	Yes	X
<p>This location is between 2 locations operated by Crestone. This plan should state the status of these adjacent locations and their associated timelines. If there is overlap in drilling operations between those locations and this location this should be described as part of this plan as there could be additional considerations including traffic, emissions, ozone, etc.</p> <p>Section 5.1 AIR QUALITY does not describe the type of engines (Tier IV, etc.), drilling mud, closed top tanks, etc. that will be used at this location.</p>	<p>Update to describe neighboring locations, their timelines, and any additional considerations that relate to cumulative impacts.</p> <p>Update to describe in detail the types of equipment that will be used on site that may impact air quality at this site.</p>			KF	<p>GMT has no information regarding another Operator's plan of operations. Regarding traffic, all of these projects are in the city of Aurora. A Road Maintenance Agreement will be required by the City of Aurora.</p> <p>Plan Updated.</p>	Yes	X
<p>The Table of Contents lists section 6 - Mitigation Measures, however section 6 is listed as References and the entire Mitigation Measures section is missing from this version.</p>	<p>Update to include the Mitigation Measures section.</p>			KF	<p>Plan Updated.</p>		X

304.c.(20). Community Outreach 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?	403444016
COMPLETENESS REVIEW Attachment not required.		304.c.(20)		KF			

304.c.(21). Geologic Hazard 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 No issues identified.		304.c.(21)		KF			403444016  X

**ACCESS ROAD MAP**

<b>Issue identified by staff:</b>	<b>Suggested correction:</b>	<b>Specific Rule (optional)</b>	<b>Referenced in guidance document?</b>	<b>SME reviewer</b>	<b>Applicant Response:</b>	<b>Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?</b>	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW No issues identified.		304.b.(7).F		KF			403444016  X

ALA DATASHEET

<b>Issue identified by staff:</b> <b>COMPLETENESS REVIEW</b> Attachment not required.	<b>Suggested correction:</b>	<b>Specific Rule (optional)</b> 304.b.(2)	<b>Referenced in guidance document?</b>	<b>SME reviewer</b>  KF	<b>Applicant Response:</b>	<b>Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?</b>	403444016
---	------------------------------	--	---	-------------------------------	----------------------------	--	-----------

**ALA NARRATIVE SUMMARY**

<b>Issue identified by staff:</b>	<b>Suggested correction:</b>	<b>Specific Rule (optional)</b>	<b>Referenced in guidance document?</b>	<b>SME reviewer</b>	<b>Applicant Response:</b>	<b>Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?</b>	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW Attachment not required.		304.b.(2)		KF			403444016

**CONSULTATION SUMMARY**

Issue identified by staff: <b>COMPLETENESS REVIEW</b>	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444016
The Form 2A states that GMT has had a consultation with the Relevant Local Government. No Consultation Summary with the Relevant Local Government was submitted with this Form 2A.	Include summary of discussion with the Relevant Local Government from 7/13/23.			KF	City of Aurora Pre-App Notes have been attached.	Yes	X

**CPW CONSULTATION**

<b>Issue identified by staff:</b>	<b>Suggested correction:</b>	<b>Specific Rule (optional)</b>	<b>Referenced in guidance document?</b>	<b>SME reviewer</b>	<b>Applicant Response:</b>	<b>Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?</b>
COMPLETENESS REVIEW Attachment not required.				KF		

403444016

**CULTURAL FEATURES MAP**

Issue identified by staff: <b>COMPLETENESS REVIEW</b>	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.b.(3)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444016
<p>All buildings, RBUs, HOBUs, etc. need to be shown on this map. It is stated in the Emergency Response Plan that the building to the north is "Slated for demolition" but does not give a timeline. Attachment not required.</p>	<p>If the building will still be present at the time construction begins the RBU should be included in this map. If it has been or will be demolished prior to construction a statement describing this should be included as part of the Cumulative Impacts Plan and this comment can be ignored.</p>			<p>KF KF</p>	<p>See attached email from Surface Owner, Aurora Highlands. RBU will be completely demolished prior to construction.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>X</p>

**DIRECTIONAL WELL PLAT**

Issue identified by staff: <b>COMPLETENESS REVIEW</b>	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444016
No issues identified.		304.b.(7).H		KF		X	

**DISPROPORTIONATELY IMPACTED  
COMMUNITY MAP**

Issue identified by staff: <b>COMPLETENESS REVIEW</b>	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.b.(7).J	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444016
Attachment not required if RBU/buildings will be demolished by the time construction begins. If the RBU will still be present it is inside of a DIC and a DIC map will be required. Attachment not required.	Include Odor Plan if RBU/buildings will not be demolished prior to the start of construction. If the RBU/buildings will be demolished by the start of construction update other plans to describe in detail the plan to demolish the RBU/buildings.			KF KF	See attached email from Surface Owner, Aurora Highlands. RBU will be completely demolished prior to construction.	Yes	X

**GEOLOGIC HAZARD MAP**

<b>Issue identified by staff:</b>	<b>Suggested correction:</b>	<b>Specific Rule (optional)</b>	<b>Referenced in guidance document?</b>	<b>SME reviewer</b>	<b>Applicant Response:</b>	<b>Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?</b>	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW No issues identified.		304.b.(7).I		KF			403444016  X

GIS data

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444016
No GIS data was attached.	Attach GIS data as required.	304.b.(8)	<a href="#">Yes.</a>	KF	Uploaded to the 2A.	Yes	X

**HYDROLOGY MAP**

<b>Issue identified by staff:</b>	<b>Suggested correction:</b>	<b>Specific Rule (optional)</b>	<b>Referenced in guidance document?</b>	<b>SME reviewer</b>	<b>Applicant Response:</b>	<b>Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?</b>	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW No issues identified.		304.b.(7).E		KF			403444016  X

**INFORMED CONSENT LETTER**

<b>Issue identified by staff:</b>	<b>Suggested correction:</b>	<b>Specific Rule (optional)</b>	<b>Referenced in guidance document?</b>	<b>SME reviewer</b>	<b>Applicant Response:</b>	<b>Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?</b>
COMPLETENESS REVIEW Attachment not required.		604.b.(1)		KF		

403444016

**LAYOUT DRAWING**

<b>Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW</b>	<b>Suggested correction:</b>	<b>Specific Rule (optional)</b> 304.b.(7).B	<b>Referenced in guidance document?</b>	<b>SME reviewer</b>	<b>Applicant Response:</b>	<b>Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?</b>	403444016
The "Preliminary Drill Rig Layout" drawing has alphabetic labeling however there is no Legend describing what each letter represents.	Update to include Legend			KF	Legend is at the top of the drawing.	Yes	X
The "Preliminary Well Completion & Stimulation Layout" drawing has alphabetic labeling however there is no Legend describing what each letter represents.	Update to include Legend			KF	Legend is at the top of the drawing.	Yes	X

**LESSER IMPACT AREA EXEMPTION  
REQUEST**

Issue identified by staff: <b>COMPLETENESS REVIEW</b>	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.d	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444016
<p>Operator requested a Rule 304.d Lesser Impact Area exemption from the Rule 304.c.(2) Noise Mitigation Plan. The exemption is requested based on the the plan being unnecessary because impacts to the resource will be so minimal as to cause no concern. The decision whether to grant the exemption will be based on the distance to the closest RBU. and whether the building approx 2000 feet to the north is an RBU. Operator provided follow up information with evidence that the RBU is demolished. Staff recommends approval of the request.</p>				JN	See attached email from Surface Owner, Aurora Highlands. RBU will be completely demolished prior to construction.	X	
<p>Operator requested a Rule 304.d Lesser Impact Area exemption from the Rule 304.c.(3) Light Mitigation Plan. The exemption is requested based on the the plan being unnecessary because impacts to the resource will be so minimal as to cause no concern. The decision whether to grant the exemption will be based on the distance to the closest RBU. and whether the building approx 2000 feet to the north is an RBU. Operator provided follow up information with evidence that the RBU is demolished. Staff recommends approval of the request.</p>				JN	See attached email from Surface Owner, Aurora Highlands. RBU will be completely demolished prior to construction.	X	

**LOCAL/FED FINAL PERMIT DECISION**

Issue identified by staff: <b>COMPLETENESS REVIEW</b>	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444016
No Siting Permit attached.	If a Siting Permit has been submitted and approved by the Relevant Local Government attach it to the Form 2A.	303.a.(6).B		KF	The City of Aurora Permit was submitted on October 5, 2023 and is in Process. Comment added to 2A Local Permit.	Yes	X

**LOCATION DRAWING**

Issue identified by staff: <b>COMPLETENESS REVIEW</b>	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.b.(7).A	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444016
All buildings, RBUs, HOBUs, etc. need to be shown on this map. It is stated in the Emergency Response Plan that the building to the north is "Slated for demolition" but does not give a timeline.	If any of the buildings will still be present at the time construction begins they should be included in this map. If they have been or will be demolished prior to construction a statement describing this should be included as part of the Cumulative Impacts Plan and this comment can be ignored.			KF	See attached email from Surface Owner, Aurora Highlands. RBU will be completely demolished prior to construction.	Yes	X

**LOCATION PICTURES**

<b>Issue identified by staff:</b>	<b>Suggested correction:</b>	<b>Specific Rule (optional)</b>	<b>Referenced in guidance document?</b>	<b>SME reviewer</b>	<b>Applicant Response:</b>	<b>Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?</b>	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW No issues identified.		304.b.(4)		KF			403444016  X

**NRCS MAP UNIT DESC**

<b>Issue identified by staff:</b>	<b>Suggested correction:</b>	<b>Specific Rule (optional)</b>	<b>Referenced in guidance document?</b>	<b>SME reviewer</b>	<b>Applicant Response:</b>	<b>Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?</b>	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW No issues identified.		304.b.(10)		KF			403444016  X

**OTHER**

<b>Issue identified by staff:</b>	<b>Suggested correction:</b>	<b>Specific Rule (optional)</b>	<b>Referenced in guidance document?</b>	<b>SME reviewer</b>	<b>Applicant Response:</b>	<b>Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?</b>	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW Attachment not required.				KF			403444016

**PRELIMINARY PROCESS FLOW  
DIAGRAMS**

Issue identified by staff: <b>COMPLETENESS REVIEW</b>	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444016
No issues identified.		304.b.(7).D		KF		X	

**REFERENCE AREA MAP**

<b>Issue identified by staff:</b>	<b>Suggested correction:</b>	<b>Specific Rule (optional)</b>	<b>Referenced in guidance document?</b>	<b>SME reviewer</b>	<b>Applicant Response:</b>	<b>Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?</b>
COMPLETENESS REVIEW Attachment not required.		304.b.(9).B.i		KF		

403444016

**REFERENCE AREA PICTURES**

<b>Issue identified by staff:</b>	<b>Suggested correction:</b>	<b>Specific Rule (optional)</b>	<b>Referenced in guidance document?</b>	<b>SME reviewer</b>	<b>Applicant Response:</b>	<b>Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?</b>
COMPLETENESS REVIEW Attachment not required.		304.b.(9).B.ii		KF		

403444016

**RELATED LOCATION AND FLOWLINE MAP**

Issue identified by staff: <b>COMPLETENESS REVIEW</b>	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.b.(7).G	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444016
<p>OGDP Hearing Application lands &amp; Exhibit A Map lands: the Hearing application indicates the Surface location will only encompass parts of SW¼NE¼ &amp; SE¼NW¼ of section 28 3S65W, but the Form 2C Map and the Form 2A RELATED LOCATION AND FLOWLINE MAP attachment indicate the surface lands will encompass more lands (W/2NE &amp; E/2NW of section 28 3S65W). Which is the correct description of the QtrQtr's the surface lands will be impacting?</p>	<p>Either the Hearing Application lands require updating or the webforms maps require revision.</p>			<p>SS</p>	<p>The Hearing Application has been updated with the additional surface lands. The Related Location and Flowline Map is correct.</p>	<p>YES - SS 3/20</p>	<p>X</p>

**SURFACE AGRMT/SURETY**

<b>Issue identified by staff:</b>	<b>Suggested correction:</b>	<b>Specific Rule (optional)</b>	<b>Referenced in guidance document?</b>	<b>SME reviewer</b>	<b>Applicant Response:</b>	<b>Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?</b>	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW No issues identified.		304.b.(12).B		KF			403444016  X

**WAIVERS**

<b>Issue identified by staff:</b>	<b>Suggested correction:</b>	<b>Specific Rule (optional)</b>	<b>Referenced in guidance document?</b>	<b>SME reviewer</b>	<b>Applicant Response:</b>	<b>Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?</b>	
COMPLETENESS REVIEW Attachment not required.		604.a.(4)		KF			403444016

WILDLIFE HABITAT DRAWING

Issue identified by staff: <b>COMPLETENESS REVIEW</b>	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444016
No issues identified.		304.b.(7).C		KF		X	

COMPLETENESS REVIEW (Form 2A topic)		(topic/subtopic)	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444016
Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:					
All buildings, RBUs, HOBUs, etc. need to be included on the Form 2A. It is stated in the Emergency Response Plan that the building to the north is "Slated for demolition" but does not give a timeline.	If the building will still be present at the time construction begins the RBU should be included on the Form 2A. If it has been or will be demolished prior to construction a statement describing this should be included as part of the Cumulative Impacts Plan and this comment can be ignored.		KF	See attached email from Surface Owner, Aurora Highlands. RBU will be completely demolished prior to construction.	Yes	X
"Other Permininant Equipment" and "Other Temporary Equipment" should only include equipment that will be present during production.	Ensure that all equipment listed is equipment that will be present during the production phase. If the equipment listed will exclusively be used for drilling and completion operations then that equipment should be removed from the Form 2A. The only exception to this is MLVTs which should always be included under the Site Equipment List even if they will be used during drilling or completions operations due to their associated risk factor.		KF	The only temporary equipment listed is a genset which will be onsite until grid power can be brought on location.	Yes	X
"Other Permininant Equipment" and "Other Temporary Equipment" should only include equipment that are not present under the "Site Equipment List" section.	Move any equipment that is listed in "Other Permininant Equipment" and "Other Temporary Equipment" to their relevant sections in the "Site Equipment List" if there is a section for them (ECD, MLVT, Treater, etc.).		KF	The MLVT was moved to permanent equipment.	Yes	X
Form 2A states that no siting permit has been submitted to the Relevant Local Government for this location.	If a siting permit has been submitted since the initial submission of this form, update this section to accurately represent the current status of the Relevant Local Government's siting permit.		KF	The City of Aurora permit was submitted on October 5, 2023. Updated on the form 2A.	Yes	X
The description of MLVT usage on the Submit tab does not include the vendor or duration of it's usage at this location.	Update the MLVT comment on the Submit tab to include the MLVT vendor as well as the duration that it will be used at this location.		KF	MLVT vendor is Select Water and will be onsite approximately 100 days. This comment has been added to the Form 2A Submit Tab.	Yes	X
There is no description of the planned demolition of the RBU/buildings to the north of this location on the Submit tab.	Add a comment detailing the timing and demolition of the RBU/buildings to the north of this location on the Submit tab as well as in the Cumulative Impacts Plan.		KF	See attached email from Surface Owner, Aurora Highlands. RBU will be completely demolished prior to construction. Comment has been added to the 2A.	Yes	X

Form 2B

**COMPLETENESS REVIEW (Form 2B topic)**

**(topic/subtopic)**

**SME reviewer**

**Applicant Response:**

**Staff second  
review: Was  
the issue  
addressed?**

403444016

**Issue identified by staff:**

No issues identified.

**Suggested correction:**

KF

X

Form 2C

COMPLETENESS REVIEW (Form 2C topic)	(topic/subtopic)	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444016
Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:				
<p>OGDP Hearing Application lands &amp; Exhibit A Map lands: the Hearing application indicates the Surface location will only encompass parts of SW¼NE¼ &amp; SE¼NW¼ of section 28 3S65W, but the Form 2C Map and the Form 2A RELATED LOCATION AND FLOWLINE MAP attachment indicate the surface lands will encompass more lands (W/2NE &amp; E/2NW of section 28 3S65W). Which is the correct description of the QtrQtr's the surface lands will be impacting?</p>	<p>Either the Hearing Application lands require updating or the webforms maps require revision.</p>	SS	<p>The Hearing Application has been amended and filed with ECMC. Form 2C has been resubmitted.</p>	YES - SS 3/20	X

COMPLETENESS REVIEW		Docket# 230900308	
<b>Attorney Name: KELSEY WASYLENKY; JAMIE JOST</b>		<b>Attorney Email Address: KWASYLENKY@JOSTENERGYLAW.COM; JJOST@JOSTENERGYLAW.COM</b>	
<b>Permitter Name: Eden Espino-Rodriguez</b>		<b>Permitter Email: eden.espino-rodriquez@state.co.us</b>	
<b>Engineer Name: Diana Burn</b>		<b>Engineer Email: Diana.Burn@state.co.us</b>	
<b>Hearing Officer Name: Jon Peskin</b>		<b>Hearing Officer Email: jon.peskin@state.co.us</b>	
Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Explanation:	SME reviewer
<u>OGLA Review Notes</u>			
OGDH Hearing Application lands & Exhibit A Map lands: the Hearing application indicates the Surface location will only encompass parts of SW¼NE¼ & SE¼NW¼ of section 28 3S65W, but the Form 2C Map and the Form 2A RELATED LOCATION AND FLOWLINE MAP attachment indicate the surface lands will encompass more lands (W/2NE & E/2NW of section 28 3S65W). Which is the correct description of the QtrQtr's the surface lands will be impacting?	Either the Hearing Application lands require updating or the webforms maps require revision.		corrected 2/12
<u>Permitting Review Notes</u>			
Concern: The spacing application has the county as Elbert County , should be Adams County		Topic: County	corrected 1/11
Concern, Page 1, paragraph 2: In the spacing application and testimony the county name should be Adams not Elbert		Topic: Typographic and Other Errors	corrected 1/11
<u>Geologic Testimony</u>			
Concern: The testimony has the incorrect county name, should be Adams County		Topic: All Exhibits	corrected 1/11
<u>Engineering Testimony</u>			
Operator should provide information detailing how permission obtained for accessing minerals through sections 29 and W/2 of 28 and would not be considered mineral trespass. The requested spacing is appropriate based on the testimony provided.		CLARIFICATIONS OR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REQUESTED	Engineering reviewer satisfied 3/6/2024

**Applicant Response:**

The Hearing Application has been amended and filed with ECMC.

The Spacing Application has been corrected to read Adams County.

The Spacing Application has been corrected to read Adams County.

The Spacing Application has been corrected to read Adams County.