

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?	403444544	403444545
COMPLETENESS REVIEW		304.c.(1)		DT, KF			x	x

304.c.(2). Noise Mitigation 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?	403444544
COMPLETENESS REVIEW			304.c.(2)					403444545
OGLA Supervisor John Noto approved Noise Plan LIA request.					DT, KF		x	x

304.c.(3). Light Mitigation 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?	403444544	403444545
COMPLETENESS REVIEW OGLA Supervisor John Noto approved Light Plan LIA request.		304.c.(3)		DT, KF			x	x

304.c.(4). Odor Mitigation 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?	403444544	403444545
COMPLETENESS REVIEW Location 3391' and 2401' feet away from nearest BU, Odor plan not required.		304.c.(4)		DT, KF			x	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?	403444544	403444545	
BMPs are non-specific and do not describe in detail what will be done and/or when they will be done.	Update BMPs to be specific. What speed limit will there be? What conditions will trigger fresh water applications?			DT, KF	Revised	Yes	x	x	
The Table that shows the number of Truck Trips lists "Re-entry Operations", however the 2A lists this location as a "New Location".	Update to accurately reflect the number of Truck Trips and Phases.			DT, KF	Revised	Yes	x		
The Table that shows the number of Truck Trips lists 299 Truck Trips under the "Monthly Truck Trips" column. This does not seem to accurately reflect either "Monthly Truck Trips" or "Total Truck Trips". Is this the Total Truck Trips from construction through the beginning of production?	Update to clarify what this number means.			DT, KF	Revised	Yes	x	x	

304.c.(6). Transportation Plan

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.c.(6)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444544	403444545
Transportation plan not required				DT, KF			x	x

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

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.c.(7)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444544	403444545
No issues identified				DT, KF			x	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?	403444544	403444545
No issues identified				DT, KF			x	x

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

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.c.(9)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444544	403444545
Neither location is within floodplain.				DT, KF			x	x

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444544	403444545
COMPLETENESS REVIEW Operator states H2S gas not reasonably expected to be encountered during drilling operations.		304.c.(10)		DT, KF			x	x

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?	403444544	403444545
No issues identified				DT, KF			x	x

304.c.(12). Gas Capture Plan

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.c.(12)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444544	403444545
All gas going to Ladder Creek Plant via an existing pipeline gathering system.				DT, KF			x	x

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

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.c.(13)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444544	403444545
No issues identified				DT, KF			x	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?	403444544	403444545
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 six-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."	Update plan to describe what will be done if topsoil depth is greater than the proposed "one foot or less". Update the plan to include what you will do to submit the test pit data once the test pits have been completed.	1002.b.(1).		DT, KF	Revised. Will include changes in sundry with test pit data if needed.	Yes	x	x
No description of what will be done to submit the test pit data is included.				DT, KF	Revised. Will submit via sundry.	Yes	x	x
The "Best Management Practices" section states that 1,756 CY of topsoil material will be stockpiled on the eastern portions of the cleared pad for 1 Wavetech Wulff Trust 43-5 and 1,701 CY of topsoil material will be stockpiled on the western portions of the cleared pad for 1 Wavetech Furst 12-33. A minimum of 6 inches of topsoil is required to be stored for use in final reclamation, however for the total disturbance area of the pads (3.5 acres for 1 Wavetech Wulff Trust 43-5 and 3.4 acres for 1 Wavetech Furst 12-33) and for their associated access roads (1.1 acres for 1 Wavetech Wulff Trust 43-5 and 1.6 acres for 1 Wavetech Furst 12-33), the volumes of topsoil provided are not sufficient to reclaim the pads and access roads with the minimum 6 inches of topsoil.	Update the proposed cubic yardage of topsoil that will be stored for the oil and gas location in order to allow for at least 6 inches of topsoil to be available for use in site reclamation. For the 3.5 acres of pad disturbance at the 1 Wavetech Wulff Trust 43-5 pad location, a minimum of 2823 CY of topsoil would be required. The 1.1 acres of access road disturbance would require an additional 887 CY of topsoil to be stockpiled. Update map to include proposed test pit locations.			DT, KF	Revised drawings and updated plan.	Yes	x	x
Proposed test pits and their planned locations are not shown on the included map.				DT, KF	Test Pit location map included.	Yes	x	x
Add COA: After topsoil sample results have been returned Operator will submit soil test pit data to ECMC via Form 4 Sundry not less than 30 days prior to the start of construction.								

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.c.(15)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444544	403444545
Plan says on page 8 that diversion ditches will be NW and SW sides, but from on page 7 and on the map it appears the diversion ditches will be all the way around the location.	Make consistent and/or clarify.			DT, KF	Revised	Yes	x	x

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?	403444544	403444545
No issues identified				DT, KF			x	x

304.c.(17). Wildlife Plan

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?	403444544	403444545
No issues identified				DT, KF			x	x

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.c.(18)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444544	403444545
The Water Plan states that the fresh water will be trucked in and stored in the one water tank on site. However, the Preliminary Process Flow Diagram shows that produced water will be stored in the water tank as well. If freshwater is stored in a tank where produced water has been stored, then it will no longer be considered fresh water.	Provide a way for fresh water to be onsite while not sharing a tank with produced water.			DT, KF	This is temporary water tank used during drilling operations. The permanent tank used for produced water is a separate tank that will be part of the facility. Updated 2A for temporary fresh water tank.	Yes	x	x
Plan does not describe why recycled water cannot be used at these locations. Is it not feasible due to the low volume of water that will be used at this location? I'm not sure what relevance the industrial water well permit has in relation to recycled water usage.	Describe the reasons why recycled water will not be used for these locations.			DT, KF	Low volume per well and number currently drilled at the same time. If changes in the future will put together plan to recycle. Updated plan.	Yes	x	x

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.c.(19)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444544	403444545
No issues identified				DT, KF			x	x

304.c.(20). Community Outreach Plan

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.c.(20)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444544	403444545
A mile or more away from DIC.				DT, KF			x	x

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				304.c.(21)					403444544
Neither location are within one mile of a geologic hazard.						DT, KF		x	403444545
									x

ACCESS ROAD MAP

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.b.(7).F	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444544	403444545
No issues identified				DT, KF			x	x

ALA DATASHEET

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444544	403444545
COMPLETENESS REVIEW		304.b.(2)		DT, KF			x	x
ALA not required								

ALA NARRATIVE SUMMARY

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.b.(2)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444544	403444545
ALA not required				DT, KF			x	x

CONSULTATION SUMMARY

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?	403444544	403444545
No consultation				DT, KF			x	x

CPW CONSULTATION

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?	403444544	403444545
No summary required				DT, KF			x	x

CULTURAL FEATURES MAP

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.b.(3)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444544	403444545
The cultural items table doesn't list directions when the setback is 5280' or greater.	Add the directions to all items in the table.			DT, KF	Revised.	Yes	x	

DIRECTIONAL WELL PLAT

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.b.(7).H	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444544	403444545
Directional well plat not required for vertical wells.				DT, KF			x	x

DISPROPORTIONATELY IMPACTED
COMMUNITY MAP

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444544	403444545
COMPLETENESS REVIEW No required, locations mile plus from DIC		304.b.(7).J		DT, KF			x	x

GEOLOGIC HAZARD MAP

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.b.(7).I	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444544	403444545
No issues identified				DT, KF			x	x

GIS data

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.b.(8)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444544	403444545
No issues identified				DT, KF			x	x

HYDROLOGY MAP

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.b.(7).E	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444544	403444545
Map doesn't indicate radius of the buffer.	Indicate on the map what distance is used as the radius around the WPS.			DT, KF	Revised.	Yes	x	

INFORMED CONSENT LETTER

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 604.b.(1)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444544	403444545
Not required, both locations a mile plus away from RBUs or HOBUs.				DT, KF			x	x

LAYOUT DRAWING

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.b.(7).B	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444544	403444545
Solid blue line not identified	Describe what it is. Add detail to the descriptions of map features.			DT, KF	Labeled as "Earthen Containment Berm/Trench"	Yes	x	x
Unclear if dashed blue that goes around location is diversion ditch.	Remove the "Facility Layout Drawing" attachment			DT, KF	Yes this is a diversion ditch.	Yes	x	x
The "Facility Layout Drawing" attachment is already included as part of the "Layout Drawing" attachment. It should only be attached once.				DT, KF	Done	Yes		x

LESSER IMPACT AREA EXEMPTION
REQUEST

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.d	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444544	403444545
No issues identified				DT, KF		x		x
Operator requested a Rule 304.d Lesser Impact Area exemption from Rule 304.c.(2) Noise Mitigation Plan. The request is based on the potentially impacted resource concern are not present or impacts will be so minimal as to cause no concern. Based on the nature of the proposed operations, the greater than one mile distance to the nearest RBU and no that mapped HPH are within one mile, staff recommends granting the exemption.				JN		X		X
Operator requested a Rule 304.d Lesser Impact Area exemption from Rule 304.c.(3) Light Mitigation Plan. The request is based on the potentially impacted resource concern are not present or impacts will be so minimal as to cause no concern. Based on the nature of the proposed operations, the greater than one mile distance to the nearest RBU and no that mapped HPH are within one mile, staff recommends granting the exemption.				JN		X		x

LOCAL/FED FINAL PERMIT DECISION

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444544	403444545
COMPLETENESS REVIEW RLG does not regulate siting of these wells. No federal minerals or lands.		303.a.(6).B		DT, KF			x	x

LOCATION DRAWING

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.b.(7).A	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444544	403444545
On the table, the directions aren't added when the distance is 5,280' or more away.	Add the directions.			DT, KF	Revised	Yes	x	

LOCATION PICTURES

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.b.(4)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444544	403444545
No issues identified.				DT, KF			x	x

NRCS MAP UNIT DESC

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.b.(10)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444544	403444545
No issues identified.				DT, KF			x	x

OTHER

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?	403444544	403444545
Optional				DT, KF			x	x
								X

PRELIMINARY PROCESS FLOW
DIAGRAMS

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.b.(7).D	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444544	403444545
The Wulff Trust 43-5 Preliminary Process Flow Diagram is missing fluid flow arrows.	Add the fluid flow arrows back.			DT, KF	Revised	Yes	x	
The symbols 'PR', 'FR', and 'LA' are not in the legend.	Add the symbols for 'PR', 'FR', and 'LA' to the legend.			DT, KF	Revised	Yes	x	x

REFERENCE AREA MAP

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444544	403444545
COMPLETENESS REVIEW Locations are in cropland, so this attachment is not needed.		304.b.(9).B.i		DT, KF			x	x

REFERENCE AREA PICTURES

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444544	403444545
COMPLETENESS REVIEW Locations are in cropland, so this attachment is not needed.		304.b.(9).B.ii		DT, KF			x	x

RELATED LOCATION AND FLOWLINE MAP

Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444544	403444545
COMPLETENESS REVIEW		304.b.(7).G						
The 2000' buffer is only drawn from the locations, but it should be "...within 2,000 feet of the area affected by the proposed Oil and Gas Development Plan". The area affected by the OGD P includes the mineral development area:	Expand the buffer to be 2,000 feet of the area affected by the proposed Oil and Gas Development Plan.			SS	Revised		x	x
Township 14 South, Range 42 West, 6th P.M. Section 33: W½ (320-acres)								
Township 15 South, Range 42 West, 6th P.M. Section 5: S½ (321.10-acres)						Yes		

SURFACE AGRMT/SURETY

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.b.(12).B	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444544	403444545
No identified issues				DT, KF			x	x

WAIVERS

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 604.a.(4)	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444544	403444545
Not within 500' RBU				DT, KF			x	x

WILDLIFE HABITAT DRAWING

Issue identified by staff: COMPLETENESS REVIEW	Suggested correction:	Specific Rule (optional) 304.b.(7).C	Referenced in guidance document?	SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444544	403444545
No issues identified				DT, KF			x	x

Form 2A

COMPLETENESS REVIEW (Form 2A topic) (topic/subtopic)

		SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444544	403444545
Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:					
The estimated shallowest depth to groundwater is estimated at based on water well permit 15490-FP. Looking at the documents these well records the static water level at 230'.	Adjust the 2A to reflect the 230' water table, or explain why the values on the 2A are different.	DT, KF	Revised	Yes	x	x
Under "Consultation", the box is checked for "This Location or its associated new access road, utility, or Pipeline corridor meets Rule 309.e.(2).A, B, or C". Are these locations in some form of High Priority Habit, Federal Critical Habit, or conservation easement? Both locations are in the Northern High Plains Designated Groundwater Basin, making them a sensitive area for Water resources by definition. However the dropdown menu says it is not.	Update to accurately reflect whether these Rule 309.e.(2).A, B, or C apply. Change the dropdown menu to "Yes" on the Form 2A Water Resources Tab to say that this location will be in a Sensitive Area for water resources.	DT, KF	Neither meets rule 309.e(2). Box has been unchecked.	Yes	x	x
		DT, KF	Changed to yes.	Yes	x	x

Form 2B

COMPLETENESS REVIEW (Form 2B topic) (topic/subtopic)

		SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	403444544	403444545
Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:					
The estimated shallowest depth to groundwater is estimated at based on water well permit 15490-FP. Looking at the documents these well records the static water level at 230'.	Adjust the 2A to reflect the 230' water table, or explain why the values on the 2B are different.	DT, KF	Updated the 2As to 230'.	Yes	x	x
The 2B says no additional fluids stored on location besides the oil tank and the produced water tank, but the water plan says that fresh water will be stored in the produced water tank, which isn't allowed.	Figure out where the freshwater will be stored and adjust the forms and plans accordingly.	DT, KF	Added a Temporary Fresh Water Tank to equipment list on the 2A. This will be used during drilling/completions to store fresh water. Fresh water will not be stored in the same tank as the produced water.	Yes	x	x

COMPLETENESS REVIEW (Form 2C topic) (topic/subtopic)		SME reviewer	Applicant Response:	Staff second review: Was the issue addressed?	
Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:				
The attachment OGDG map shows the 1 Wavetech Wulff Trust 43-5 shows the location to include Section 5 S1/2 when the Form 2A and Form 2C shows it to include Section 5 NESE.	Update Map to show proper areas included in this OGDG.	DT, KF		Yes	x
					x

Hearing Application

COMPLETENESS REVIEW		Docket# 231100340	
Attorney Name: KELSEY WASYLENKY; JAMIE JOST	Attorney Email Address: KWASYLENKY@JOSTENERGYLAW.CO M; JJOST@JOSTENERGYLAW.COM		
Permitter Name: Ginger Malasauskas	Permitter Email: ginger.malasauskas@state.co.us		
Engineer Name: Diana Burn	Engineer Email: diana.Burn@state.co.us		
Hearing Officer Name: Matthew Berman	Hearing Officer Email: matthew.berman@state.co.us		
Issue identified by staff:	Suggested correction:	Explanation:	SME reviewer
<u>OGLA Review Notes</u>			Missti Mason
The spacing order that is referenced in this application does not cover the application lands.	This will either need to be corrected to statewide spacing or a new DSU application will need to be established.		
There is a typo in the legal description for the Furst 12-33 Pad.	This should be corrected to SW¼NW¼ and NW¼SW¼ of Section 33, Township 14 South, Range 42 West		
<u>Permitting Review Notes</u>			
None.	None.	There were no Permitting Review issues identified in the hearing application at this time.	
<u>Geologic Testimony</u>			
None.	None.	There were no Review issues identified in the Geologic Testimony at this time.	
<u>Engineering Testimony</u>			Engineering
Developing Existing Drilling and Spacing Unit (no modification): This Oil & Gas Development Plan (OGDP) Hearing			

Applicant Response:

Corrected
6/17

Wavetech Revmoved Order 477-3 from the application and is using state wide spacing (Rule 401.a) for the developement of the proposed locations.

Corrected
6/17

Wavetech updated the legal location description to accurately reflect the surface location for the Furst 12-33 Pad. .