

Timestamp	City, State, Zip	Comment text	Comments pertaining to general issues relating to oil and gas development and regulation. [General Topics]	Comments related to the proposed CDP generally. [CDP Topics]	Comments relating to specific proposed oil and gas locations as part of the proposed CDP. [Location Topics]
10/13/2017 16:08:42	Erie	<p>I am very disheartened to learn that Crestone has selected to invite only a subset of landowners in the area covered by the Crestone Comprehensive Drilling Plan application. In the email that was sent out, Crestone specifically invited only those residents who are surface owners within ½ mile of a proposed oil and gas location within the Boulder County CDP.</p> <p>This is reprehensible behavior. These large multi-well pads, whose locations remain unknown, to date, to the citizens of Boulder County, will have impacts far beyond 2,640 feet. These wells and their associated pipelines and traffic will have impacts on all surface owners of the CDP area, and throughout Eastern Boulder County and Western Weld County.</p> <p>In your September 14, 2017 letter to landowners in the CDP area (unfortunately Crestone also failed to send me a copy of this letter), Crestone stated that they are “committed to open, transparent communication with you throughout this process.” This is simply not the case if you cannot manage to communicate with ALL residents within the CDP boundaries. Additionally, I have signed up through the Crestone Boulder County CDP webpage requesting that I be informed. My name and address are listed as an interested party within the CDP boundary area in the “Crestone Comprehensive Drilling Plan application.”</p> <p>I have learned that the public meeting is scheduled on October 18, 2017 and a public telephone town hall is scheduled on October 19, 2017. Both meetings are scheduled one day apart. This demonstrates that Crestone has no real intension of any public communication on siting, nor does Crestone seek any effectiveness of these meetings.</p> <p>Why have I not been informed? Why have I not been invited to this Stakeholder’s Meeting? As a surface owner within the CDP boundaries, I do have a stake in these operations. I am demanding an invitation to these meetings, and future meetings, for not only myself, but for ALL residents living within, or nearby the Boulder County CDP area.</p> <p>Respectfully, Eileen S.K. Rojas, Ph.D.</p>	Crestone Peak Resources	CDP Process	Siting

10/13/2017 16:11:32	erie, co 80516	I am against the CDP. My home will be directly impacted. The noise, smells, and pollutants will lower my home value and jeopardize the health of my infants, pets, and family. The setbacks required are not far enough to protect us from the effects of drilling. This will also create increased traffic and break down infrastructure. The drilling often takes place at night and disturbs sleep, which is vital to the health of my family. Fracking has been shown to also disturb wildlife as well as human development. These pads are located too close to developments that are already in existence. They should NOT be allowed.	Hydraulic Fracturing (Fracking)	Health & Safety Concerns	Health & Safety
10/13/2017 17:51:25	80516	With Crestone's drilling record, they should not place any high density well pads anywhere near a residential area. They have failed at the WBS, Waste Connections, and Pratt sites with excessive odors that emanates more than a mile from the source, then they are unable to contain any sounds(both dbA and dbC). This is just a horrible idea, and should never have been allowed. Their track record should be sufficient to show they are not concerned with the health, safety, or welfare of residents. It also shows that the COGCC has repeatedly failed in this area too.	Oil and Gas Development	Health & Safety Concerns	Odors
10/13/2017 20:32:12	Boulder, CO 80302	Concerns about Health & Safety including air and water pollution, impacts on property values, noise, odors, and wildlife. Other nuisance Issues including traffic.	Hydraulic Fracturing (Fracking)	Health & Safety Concerns	Health & Safety
10/13/2017 22:09:35	Longmont CO 80501	Hydraulic fracturing is not the answer to this country's energy consumption problem. Fracking uses too much water and pollutes the atmosphere. The people have spoken. Citizens have the right to control what happens in their communities. The COGCC must protect the health and safety of people. No new wells in Boulder County. No drills. No pipelines. No fracking.	Boulder County Rules & Processes	Health & Safety Concerns	Health & Safety
10/13/2017 22:42:39	Erie, CO 80516	I urge you to solicit information from ALL persons residing in the CDP area during your planning process--not only those living within 1/2 mile of a proposed fracking site! Today the draft plan was published, and I just discovered that our house is a scant 3/4 mile from the Section 11 pad, where 36 wells are planned to be drilled. Thanks to Crestone's Woolley Becky Sosa operation near County Line Road, which is approximately the same distance from my house, I have a good idea that the peace of our neighborhood will be assaulted with this operation--especially during its 9-month completions phase. I would appreciate the opportunity to attend the meetings, provide input, and ask questions. Crestone's reply to the County's concerns was absolutely inadequate. Please consider providing additional vehicles for planning input by CDP residents. We care deeply about this process, and our opinions need to be heard and considered.	COGCC Rules & Processes	CDP Process	Noise
10/13/2017 23:22:30	Erie, Colorado 80516	Inhumane to live in a neighborhood with this level of noise coming from the crestone drilling site. This should be illegal! We can't sleep, my dog is afraid to go outside. Wrong..... on so many levels			Noise
10/14/2017 3:35:04	Boulder	Stay away from Boulder County. You are not allowed here!	Boulder County Rules & Processes	Health & Safety Concerns	Siting
10/14/2017 6:48:14	Erie, co 80516	This form is way too limiting. This cannot and will not happen in Boulder county, Specifically Kenosha farms. What on earth - you know the place that supports your life, the one you're trying to rape of its gaseous liquids - would make you have the human right to do that to people who have established lives here. Who enjoy the quiet, healthy, beautiful escape of living here. You will not take that away. You do not have the right to put 100+ wells, drill for years, creating horrendous noise pollution, filling children's lungs with VOCs, creating eye-sores all over the front range, killing our home resale values (the towns and cities will suffer greatly, too), creating anger and hysteria among neighborhoods, putting pressure on town officials, further destroying wildlife habitats... NO MORE! NO DRILLING! NO MORE SLOW MURDER! NO MORE INVADING! TAKE HEED! WE ARE PREPARED!	Oil and Gas Development	Property Values and Land Use	Health & Safety
10/14/2017 7:04:46	80504	Please no oil/gas activity in Boulder County. No drilling, no fracking, no pipelines, no wells in Boulder County. I hate the noise, the smell, the pollution that is evident in Weld County which is just across the street from me. I hear the trucks all night. Sometimes I can smell the chemicals. I'm afraid of the contamination and pollution. It used to be relatively clean here before fracking. We are destroying Colorado. I am heartbroken by what dirty energy is doing to our community.	Boulder County Rules & Processes	Health & Safety Concerns	Health & Safety
10/14/2017 8:54:47	Boulder, CO 80302	We are opposed to drilling in Boulder County and all of Colorado. You should abide by the Martinez ruling and take the health and safety of citizens into account. If you were following the law you would not dare propose to drill in populated areas. We do not need the oil/gas and we do not want the pollution, environmental destruction and health effects of your evil industry. YOU have no business destroying the open space land that Boulder County	Boulder County Rules & Processes	Health & Safety Concerns	Wildlife

		citizens have paid for and conserved for the last 50 years. This is outrageous! You know what you are doing to people is morally wrong and yet you continue. Is it worth a quick buck at the expense of so much? You should be ashamed.			
10/14/2017 10:30:49	Erie, CO, 80516	These plans are disturbing, concerning, insane, and a downright intrusion of our town and the community. The fear you are causing residents is downright inhumane. Living next to a current Crestone operation (pratt & waste connections) we know how this will continue to effect us and our neighbors. There are noxious smells making us sick, there is continuous loud noise and bright lights at night, here is construction traffic tearing up our roads and leaving debris, and not to mention the potential for silica dust clouds forming above the fracking sites. You are too close for comfort and have no business drilling and laying pipelines filled with explosive gas and putting in wells that omit VOCs 24/7 - next to our homes or anywhere in our community. You are not welcome. I completely and full object to any and all of your current operations as well as future plans here in Erie, Weld & Boulder Counties	Hydraulic Fracturing (Fracking)	Health & Safety Concerns	Health & Safety
10/14/2017 15:23:11	Longmont, Co 80501	We own agricultural property in section 13, where we have installed the first 126 trees in an apple orchard, with 440 specialty and heritage varieties ordered for planting in spring of 2018. We also own a home kitty-corner from our orchard site abutting section 18. We are firmly against the proposed development on or below our property, and the proposed other areas need to be protected as well. The site map is vague, it's impossible for laypeople to understand exactly what is proposed--how many or where a well/wells would be drilled. The vagueness seems designed to confuse and discourage property owners with undecipherable documents. We, and our neighboring farmers utilize Dry Creek and Rice irrigation ditches to grow crops. There is plenty of evidence that ground water can be contaminated by fracking. There are also disturbing factors of air quality, odors, noise when drilling, traffic and light pollution. Public relations materials claim the impact while drilling is minimal, yet several years ago, a drilling operation more than two miles away thrummed all night and the light was blinding for months. This beautiful area we live and work in is blessed with significant wildlife populations as well, and they would be severely impacted. We also have concerns about 8 N being a subsidiary of Extraction Oil & Gas, known to have unresolved pollution violations on their sites near Greeley and Windsor. These are violations about venting issues on condensate tanks, according to the Colorado Department of Health and Environment. (Longmont Times Call, 10/07/17) They have been identified as being in noncompliance since 2014. Based on their dangerous and long-lived track record, it seems unsafe to grant them further drilling permits, especially when it takes years for resolution after violations. It seems likely, based on the record of disregarding rules and regulations that permitting would be a risky venture, with consequences to public health and safety. This is a beautiful, shrinking agricultural area that was deemed by Boulder County to be perpetual agricultural open space. It is clearly a quality of life issue. It is also an economic one. If crops are spoiled or contaminated, it threatens property owners economic status. It also scars a beautiful vista. We stand firmly against this proposed development.	Hydraulic Fracturing (Fracking)	Health & Safety Concerns	Other Nuisance Issues
10/14/2017 18:14:33	Erie, Co., 80516	I am next to the Woolly-Becky-Sosa sight, it was pure hell via noise and odors for eight or nine months. Summer was awful, had to keep windows closed during at night the heat of the summer due to both noise and odor. COGCC was absolutely worthless when complaints were brought to their attention -- no issues found. Noises always got louder at night, I assume due to the COGCC inspectors not working at those hours. Please, no more oil & gas operations near residential areas!	Other	Health & Safety Concerns	Noise
10/14/2017 19:42:38	Lafayette CO 80026	Oil and gas companies have no right to destroy our land destroy our water pollute our air and cause sickness and death in the citizens who live here. Ban all fracking in Boulder County Do not let oil and gas ruin our lives.	COGCC Rules & Processes		Siting
10/14/2017 20:30:23	Colorado	Horrible	COGCC Rules & Processes	Health & Safety Concerns	Health & Safety
10/14/2017 23:11:22	Erie, CO 80516	As a valid stakeholder, I wish to be invited to the meeting to be held on 10/18/17 for the review of Crestone's draft CDP for eastern Boulder County, where I reside. I live approximately 3/4 mile east of the proposed site for the Section 11 pad. However, sections of the proposed pipeline from the Section 11 pad to the central hub in Weld County, if built as planned, will be located closer to my parcel than 1/2 mile. According to the definitions in COGCC Rule 100, oil & gas operations include the installation of flowlines and gathering systems. Therefore, my property falls within the 1/2 mile "buffer zone" Crestone is using as a basis for selecting surface owners for participation in	Crestone Peak Resources	CDP Process	Operation Duration & Timing

		the CDP. I cannot attend the telephone meeting, and I have some questions that need to be addressed. Please contact me at your earliest opportunity concerning an invitation to Wednesday's meeting.			
10/15/2017 16:43:09	Boulder	PLEASE do not allow fracking in Boulder County. Enough is enough. I'm amazed that fracking is enemy still in consideration after the house in Firestone exploded. There comes a point where we need to stop being the Guinea pigs in this experiment.	Hydraulic Fracturing (Fracking)	Health & Safety Concerns	Health & Safety
10/16/2017 21:25:05	Longmont CO 80504	The proposed well pad will negatively impact our lives in so many ways. Our safe, quiet environment will be impacted by traffic, noise, air pollution and light pollution. A sense of impending danger accompanies the oil and gas installations. Our views of the mountains will be obstructed and the value of our home will be diminished. The Boulder County open space area was not meant for this kind of development. I specifically am concerned that our neighborhood may become filled with truck traffic since the only routes from the proposed well pad to County Line Road are Oxford Road and 115th Street.		Property Values and Land Use	Health & Safety
10/16/2017 22:33:17	Erie, CO 80516	<p>Concerns about Rules and Processes: First off... the "First Draft Preliminary CDP Package" does not load correctly in the web browser Chrome. Secondly, the "Public Comment Portal" does not work well in Safari. Serious technical issues that you need to work out.</p> <p>Your lack of interest in notifying all residents within ½ mile of the oil and gas operations is appalling. I am within ½ mile of your some of your proposed pipelines, specifically, the pipelines connecting the pad site in Section 11 to Weld County. You have refused to even acknowledge my requests for an invitation to the meetings. There are existing Anadarko gas gathering lines in the same area as your pipeline proposal. How does this work? Will you be sharing lines with Anadarko? Will there will any upgrades or modifications to the existing lines? Who will be responsible for inspections, maintenance and upkeep in the future?</p> <p>Concerns about Siting: Fracking on Boulder County Open Space? Clearly you think that is permissible. As a Boulder County resident, I do not feel like I gave my permission for part of my tax money to be used to purchase land for oil and gas development. I do not feel that it is permissible.</p> <p>Concerns about Siting and Floodplains: I take grave concern over your proposal to put a 36 well pad (Section 1) in a floodplain. This is hazardous, foolish and an unsound practice. Is their intuitional memory at Crestone? Across Kenosha Rd, at Lomardi St, is site Bailey 43-12 (336480). During the floods of 2013, this floodplain flooded. During that time, one of the storage tanks at this site was knocked over due to the raging floodwaters (luckily this tank was mostly empty and a spill was not reported). Do you really want to a potential widespread oil and gas contamination, or expensive equipment failure and damage to a large multi-well pad site? This is a very, very dangerous location for a multi well pad site. Additionally, I have similar concerns regarding the pad site in Section 11. It is located merely feet from the floodplain. Yet another horrible pad site placement suggestion.</p> <p>There are a lot of permitted wells and streams in the area. Plus, you are proposing to drill in a floodplain. A recipe for disaster.</p> <p>Concerns about Siting and Wildlife: The bald eagle nesting grounds. I am very concerned about your location of the bald eagle winter roosting grounds. I believe that it is incorrect. According to the Colorado Parks and Wildlife KMZ maps, the winter roosting grounds are to the east of the Panama Reserve, not to the west, in Sections 35 and 36. In fact, I believe that your location for the multi well pad site in Section 35 is in the zone for the winter roosting grounds. According to CO Parks and Wildlife, bald eagles prefer to be further than 500 yards from human activity. There are also seasonal restrictions that need to be addressed: "No human encroachment from November 15 through March 15 within 1/4 mile radius of an active winter night roost</p>	COGCC Rules & Processes	Health & Safety Concerns	Siting

		<p>(see 'Definitions' below) if there is no direct line of sight between the roost and the encroachment activities. No human encroachment from November 15 through March 15 within 1/2 mile radius of an active winter night roost if there is a direct line of sight between the roost and the encroachment activities. If periodic visits (such as oil well maintenance work) are required within the buffer zone after development, activity should be restricted to the period between 1000 and 1400 hours from November 15 to March 15." I believe your current location proposal to be in violation of these regulations.</p> <p>Concerns about Health and Safety: Do you have an estimate for the amount of VOC and methane emissions from the 180 proposed wells? I suspect that the emissions from that many wells in such a small area will be very high, and unhealthy to those of us 'lucky' enough to live within the CDP boundaries. Have you conducted studies specific to the CDP area to assess the damage that you will be causing to our air quality with this increase in emissions from fracking in the immediate region?</p> <p>What about the stress to the animals in the area? I am concerned about the farm animals, but specifically I am referring to the horses at the Colorado Therapeutic Riding Center. They are within ½ of two multi well pad sites. This could be potentially hazardous to those animals, as well as to the amazing services that this riding center provides to the region. The attempts made to shelter odor and noise from the pad sites are not enough. I lived through the Woolley Becky Sosa drilling, with a buffer distance of 1400ft. The veiled attempts to shield the community were a farce. I do not expect any better from you in the future.</p> <p>Concerns about Current Wells: Are you planning on P&A all of the existing wells in the area? All 95 of them? And then adding 85 more wells? Doesn't seem like a good deal.</p>			
10/17/2017 12:11:59	80516	<p>I am commenting about the proposed pipeline from the Crestone CDP Section 11 site. This pipeline runs through Sections 11 and 12.</p> <p>I live in the Kenosha Farm development; adjacent to the planned pipeline route through Section 12. I strongly object to having a pipeline run so close to the Kenosha Farm development (and so close to my house). My concerns are related to ongoing safety issues, noise and odor issues (during construction), and the long-term negative impact on the value of my property and dwelling.</p> <p>Safety is my primary concern. First, after the Firestone incident, I am very concerned about the proximity of flow pipelines to my home (my home is adjacent to the proposed route). Second, there is an existing pipeline already in the exact route proposed for the Crestone pipeline. I am concerned that the excavation of the Crestone CDP pipeline could accidentally disturb/damage the existing pipeline leading to disastrous results.</p> <p>I am requesting that Crestone find an alternate route for this pipeline that is not adjacent to the Kenosha Farm development (or any other housing development).</p>		Health & Safety Concerns	Health & Safety
10/18/2017 13:23:40	Longmont, CO 80501	Drill, baby, drill!	Oil and Gas Development	Support for CDP	Siting
10/19/2017 10:08:46	Erie, CO 80516	Mineral rights to the proposed new well.	Boulder County Rules & Processes	Property Values and Land Use	Siting
10/20/2017 7:51	Longmont, CO 80504	<p>I appeared at Crestone's first meeting on October 18, 2017, but did not have time to provide verbal comments, because the meeting was abruptly ended by Crestone. The meeting did not provide sufficient opportunity for stakeholder participation. As such, I am submitting my comments in writing. My family and I lost our home and everything we owned in the 2013 flood, and were just able to move back into our home in February 2017. Since moving from the City of Boulder in 2008, we have always understood that oil and gas development will occur. Moreover, we support Crestone's use of the CDP process. The well sites along Highway 52 make sense, because those wells are accessible by state highways sufficient to accommodate the truck traffic during construction, and</p>	Crestone Peak Resources	CDP Process	Traffic/Access

		<p>also because there are far fewer residents that will be impacted by those well sites. However, we strenuously object to the Section 11 well site. The Section 11 well site is located only a few yards from the floodplain and wetlands, in a densely populated area. The Section 11 well site can only be accessed using local streets (Kenosha Road, 119th Street) that were never intended to accommodate truck traffic like that traffic that will occur during construction of the wells. The proposed access road for the Section 11 site is on 119th, sandwiched between two residences. The road then meanders through a pasture, directly impacting at least 10 more residences – because the access road is so far from the actual well site, the Section 11 location impacts twice the number of residents than it would if the access road was closer to the well site. In addition, the access road is shared with the irrigation ditch, and we own irrigation rights in that ditch. We irrigate our pastures for livestock grazing and hay production. Our irrigation water will be adversely impacted if the access road is used for construction activities. 36 wells at the Section 11 site is far too many, and will substantially increase construction time and the negative impacts to surrounding residents. I would like to see the justification for locating 36 wells there – it would appear that more wells could be located at the Highway 52 sites and less at the Section 11 site, if the Section 11 site is to be used at all. Finally, there are heron nesting areas just north of the Section 11 well site that will be destroyed by the construction activities.</p>			
10/20/2017 9:53	Erie, CO 80516	<p>I appeared at Crestone's first meeting on October 18, 2017, but was unable to provide verbal comments, because the meeting was abruptly ended by Crestone. There was insufficient opportunity for stakeholder participation so, I am submitting my comments in writing. My husband and I have lived at this address since 1978. We have always understood that oil and gas development will occur. Moreover, we support Crestone's use of the CDP process. The well sites along Highway 52 make sense, because those wells are accessible by state highways sufficient to accommodate the truck traffic during construction, and also because there are far fewer residents that will be impacted by those well sites. However, we strenuously object to the Section 11 well site. The Section 11 well site is located only a few yards from the floodplain and wetlands, in a densely populated area. The Section 11 well site can only be accessed using local streets (Kenosha Road, 119th Street) that were never intended to accommodate truck traffic like the traffic that will occur during construction of the wells. Our house, along with others on 119th St and Kenosha, was built over 60 years ago They are far closer to the road than would be appropriate if built today. When built, our road was a quite dirt country road that saw very little traffic. It is now chip sealed, not paved. Trucks would be rumbling past our house less than 100 feet from our front door, 24 hours a day. The proposed access road for the Section 11 site is on 119th. This is a meandering dirt road that runs directly next to the irrigation ditch. It starts right next to a house that is the same age as mine and so is just as close. The road then meanders through a pasture, directly impacting at least 10 more residences – because the access road is so far from the actual well site, the Section 11 location impacts twice the number of residents than it would if the access road was closer to the well site. This ditch irrigates pastures for livestock grazing and hay production. Irrigation water will be adversely impacted if the access road is used for construction activities. 36 wells at the Section 11 site is far too many, and will substantially increase construction time and the negative impacts to surrounding residents. I would like to see the justification for locating 36 wells there – it would appear that more wells could be located at the Highway 52 sites and less at the Section 11 site, if the Section 11 site is to be used at all. Directly next to the access road is a tree where bald eagles roost on a regular basis, (yes, I watch them with my binoculars) they would be driven away by the construction and traffic.</p>	Other	Property Values and Land Use	Siting
10/20/2017 15:52	Longmont, CO 80504	<p>I am strongly opposed to the proposed oil and gas locations submitted to COGCC by Crestone Peak in the CDP Preliminary Draft. The proposed sites are in the areas with the highest impact to property owners with in the CDP Area. Considering Crestone's alarming high complaint rate from Weld County residents near drilling sites in</p>	Hydraulic Fracturing (Fracking)	Schedule	Health & Safety

		<p>particular about noise and odor complaints, I urge you to move the current proposed sites from an agricultural/residential area to an industrial area, such as Highway 52. This area is mostly highway and not as populated, yet it is clearly located within the CDP Area and this location is not restricted from potential oil and gas locations. For reasons that should be rather obvious, we bought property in Unincorporated Boulder County, the entire area is very quaint, VERY QUITE, peaceful, filled with wild life, lots of local farmers selling their products, surrounded by Boulder County Open Space, and great views. We picked this location to ensure our family's continued health and high quality of life away from industrial, LOUD, polluted, health hazardous areas, such as the one Crestone is trying to create. I am not only opposed to the proposed site locations, I am also very scared and concerned for our physical health, whether it might be oil and gas spills, leaks, fugitive methane and other gas emissions, or any serious emergency due to equipment failure, ruptured flow lines, lack of maintenance, abandonment activities, or for many other reasons. I am furthermore very concerned for our mental health regarding the noise and odor pollution coming from drilling rigs. After having read hundreds of disturbing and alarming Crestone complaints filed with the COGCC, and having listened to Crestone's explanation at a Public Meeting on October 18, 2017, that none of any complaints filed with the COGCC were any violations, I do not consider Crestone a good "neighbor" who is willing to possibly go above and beyond COCGG standards to ensure the least impact on property owners located near any of their oil and gas operations. The CDP timeline projects a completion time frame of approximately 6 years. It is more than inhumane and absurd to even entertain the idea to expose people to the above mentioned physical and mental health risks for more than 6 years. Since our property values will suffer due to the drilling operations (if none of the houses explode in the meantime) yet overall Colorado property values are still on the rise, many property owners will not be able to financially afford to sell their property and relocate elsewhere.</p>			
10/20/2017 21:58	Erie, CO 80516	<p>I was unable to attend your in-person meeting because I 'only' live 1 mile away from two different multi-well pad sites. The following day, a mere seconds after connecting to the phone meeting, you disconnected me. There was no way for me to reconnect. As far as I am concerned, you have not help ANY PUBLIC MEETINGS regarding your plans for the Boulder County CDP.</p>	Crestone Peak Resources	CDP Process	
10/23/2017 14:13	Longmont, CO 80504	<p>I would like to make several comments concerning the Crestone CDP preliminary draft, and the public meetings held the 10/18 and 19.</p> <p>Concerning the Crestone CDP preliminary draft –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The primary issue I wish to raise is that the oil and gas locations have been proposed without any input from surface owners, no justification for the sites chosen, and no alternative site analysis. This does not provide enough information for surface owners, Crestone, and the COGCC to carry on discussions. Discussions that are assured in Rule 216(a), and 216(d)(2). <p>o We believe that if at all possible well pad locations should be situated along Hwy. 52 where –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are fewer occupied buildings. • The baseline noise level is higher. • Existing road infrastructure is greater able to handle the substantial increase in truck traffic. • Closer to existing oil and gas pipelines requiring less development. • Pad locations situated here can be located on either the north or south side of Hwy. 52 and well bores can be drilled north or south from any such location to cover the spacing units. • If Crestone will not consider this option for each of the 3 proposed pads outside this central development area we need to have a full justification and discussion as to why. • We need to see the composite constraints map displayed at the public meeting, and justifications on current proposal to make more substantive suggestions. 	Crestone Peak Resources	CDP Process	Siting

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document quality and structure. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The document refers to attachments by a capital letter yet the attachments on the COGCC web site are not labeled as such. o The document appears to be a scanned image only! Therefore - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • text is not searchable making it unnecessarily difficult for readers to find content. • text cannot be copied for reference elsewhere. • text cannot be highlighted in downloaded versions. o Sections are labeled poorly, e.g. “Rule 216.c.(1)-(12) – Informational Requirements”, making referencing from other documents more difficult than necessary. Though this reference to the rule 216 requirement is useful, add a more concise heading for this document. o Please have Crestone convert this document to a searchable pdf. It’s not hard. • The statement in Rule 216.c.(1)-(12) (5), referring to hazardous waste containers, “Where practical, containers will be covered to limit odors and wildlife activity”, is very concerning. Odors from hazardous materials are likely to be hazardous as well. • The list of emergency responders in (12) does not include Mountain View Fire Rescue which serves much of the CDP area. • In Rule 216.d.(1)-(3) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o (3) A. Noise. Estimates of actual dB(A) and dB(C) levels should be provided in the CDP. If this is not possible than maximum values as stated in Rule 802(b)(1) are assumed; 80/75 dB(A), 65 dB(C). Distance to nearest occupied structure should be provided for each proposed pad for purposes of assessing dB(C) levels. Understanding noise levels are critical to understanding impact of siting proposals. • The maximum levels are distressing. 75 dB(A) at 350 ft. attenuates to 57.5 dB(A) at ½ mile. This is 25.5 dB louder than the recently measured nighttime 33 dB(A) (yes, it’s a cheap iPhone meter but it compares with other rural studies). That is 220 times the noise level we’ve enjoyed for 25 years! • I’ll further comment that these industrial noise levels may have been fine for one vertical well that was completed in 2 weeks. For a 36 well site that will take nearly 2 years to build, drill, and complete that level is not tolerable in a residential or rural environment. And in our case we’re talking about 2, 36 well pads (and a possible 3rd pad north of Oxford Rd.) and 4 years of excessive and disruptive noise. o (3) D. Traffic Plan. It is stated that a traffic impact study will be completed as part of the well pad permitting process. It is not clear from COGCC but it appears that this will take place late in the CDP approval process. That restricts time for review and response. Traffic impacts are critical to stakeholders understanding of the impacts of the siting proposals. <p>Concerning the public meetings held 10/18 at Vine Life Church</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The meeting at Vine Life Church on 10/18 was informative but limited. • The information provided as to how the proposed well pad locations were derived was useful. o This information should have been provided in the preliminary draft CDP to allow us to review, analyze and develop questions before the meeting. o It is still incomplete - 			
--	---	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The individual layers showing buffer constraints were made available on the COGCC web site. The composite map was not, and needs to be made available to stakeholders for further analysis. • There was no justification as to why the proposed sites are “optimal” as opposed to other possible sites. • The lead time of 5 days to review the draft in preparation for the meeting was quite inadequate. • Attendance was restricted to those residing ½ mile from a proposed pad. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o This is not acceptable and contradicts Rule 216(d)(2) that states “The operator shall invite...all surface owners to participate in the development of the Comprehensive Drilling Plan.” • The hour and a half duration was not sufficient. • What occurred that evening was a reasonable comment and Q&A session but it was not a discussion, dialogue was limited. Discussion cannot really occur in 3 minutes. Comments were supposedly recorded by Crestone representatives and will be considered for the next draft. There was no back and forth discussion to allow for further explanation from either Crestone reps or stakeholders, or to ensure that comments are understood and will be answered fully. • Again, Rule 216 provides for the opportunity for surface owners to participate in discussions! <p>Concerning phone-in meeting on 10/19</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phone-in and web based meetings are very impersonal and limit interaction. • I see the advantage of a call-in that provides surface owners who simply cannot attend an in-person meeting an opportunity to ask questions. I believe more in-person meetings are needed. • Highly problematic. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Calls were dropped and people could not reconnect. o Web site questions were sometimes lost or truncated. • In-person meeting are highly preferable to phone-in meetings and more should be scheduled. 			
<p>10/24/2017 12:54</p>	<p>Longmont, CO 80504</p>	<p>The CDP process is failing, but can be improved if changes are made.</p> <p>Referring to Rule 216(a), 216(d)(2), and 216(d)(3).</p> <p>I think you are by now well aware that Crestone failed to abide by (d)(2) that states “all surface owners” were to be invited to participate. This error cannot be repeated.</p> <p>More fundamentally is the reference in each of these Rule 216 paragraphs to have “discussions”. 216(a) identifies one purpose is to “facilitate discussions.” 216(d)(2) notes, “the operator shall invite...all surface owners to “participate” in the development of the Comprehensive Drilling Plan.” 216(d)(3) states, “The operator(s), the Director, and participants involved in the Comprehensive Drilling Plan process shall review the proposal, identify information needs, discuss operations and potential impacts, and establish measures to minimize adverse impacts resulting from oil and gas development activities covered by the Plan.”</p> <p>Discussions are not being held nor or any planned. A discussion is a dialogue between parties to exchange ideas, present arguments, justify arguments. It is an informal debate. A dialogue allows for repeated back and forth conversation to achieve those objectives. That is simply not happening in this CDP.</p> <p>The meetings and written comment periods scheduled in the timeline do not constitute a discussion. These are highly constrained sessions, providing 3 mins. for stakeholders to make a comment or ask a question. Or they simply provide the opportunity to submit remarks in writing. There is very limited opportunity for dialogue, no assurance that comments are understood completely or will be responded to fully. Will there be responses from</p>	<p>COGCC Rules & Processes</p>	<p>CDP Process</p>	

		<p>Crestone and the COGCC in writing to each and every comment and suggestion? Will all comments, questions, suggestions be responded to and published for all stakeholders to review? Will there be complete justifications accompanying the responses to allow further substantive comments and questions? Will time be allocated to allow for some iteration here to provide or gather further clarification? Or do we just wait to see what's included in the next draft of the plan to see the result? In summary, are real participatory, substantive discussions as provided for in Rule 216 going to be implemented? If they are not, the CDP will fail. It will provide nothing more than a somewhat extended version of the procedures that were already in place.</p> <p>I believe that discussions should take place in at least 2 more in-person meetings with Crestone, COGCC, and stakeholders. Meetings that provide substantially more time and fewer constraints to have a real dialogue.</p> <p>Another issue related to the CDP process is making its presence known. During the 10/18 meeting Crestone reps indicated that many details, including a traffic impact study and noise abatement plans, would not be provided until Form 2A's are filed. When does this happen? Indications are, that at best, it is very late in the CDP process leaving very little time for review and discussion about them. Impacts like these are critical to evaluating the suitability of proposed or candidate oil and gas locations.</p>			
10/24/2017 21:21	Longmont, Co, 80504	<p>Thank you for providing a place for comments. My family and I were significantly affected by the flood in 2013 and are concerned that while your section 11 proposal is technically out of the flood plain, that it is not the safest of choices in placement based on our experience with this location. We support oil and gas development but would prefer that it is located on Highway 52 to accommodate the traffic. We own irrigation rights in the ditch that runs along the proposed access road to section 11 and are concerned about that impact of our agricultural operations as well. Please also consider taking section 11 out of your plans due to the impact on our wildlife. I personally enjoy spotting deer and eagles from my own property and would be greatly disappointed if that went away with development of oil and gas. Thank you for your consideration of removing section 11 and locating your sites to highway 52.</p>	Oil and Gas Development	Property Values and Land Use	Site Specific Sensitivities
10/25/2017 7:46	Erie, Co 80516	<p>My comments are concerning the proposed Section 11 well site in Erie, Colorado. Many factors play into my stringent opposition to placing the well pad on Section 11.</p> <p>First, my family and I live directly across the street from the proposed access road to the Section 11 well site, which access the Boulder County Lands set between 2 long existing homes. The dirt road accesses pasture land, drives along Boulder Creek and would have serious impact on the wetlands, water quality, wildlife and the quality of life of those that live along N. 119th Street and Kenosha Road. These roads were not designed for the heavy truck traffic that would come with the proposed well site. The long road would create massive amounts of dust and dirt in the air as trucks would drive to the pad. While I accept that the drilling will not be completing abandoned, locating the sites along Highway 52, where there is good highway access and less population would be a far better impact on the community.</p> <p>My second concern about the location of the site is the impact on the wildlife in the area. As the community has grown, this Boulder County Open Space area has become a haven for deer, water fowl, hawks, coyotes, foxes, raccoons and even several pair of American Bald Eagles. I have the pleasure of seeing the eagles occasionally and they next in the trees in the area. The disruption to this eco system, would have far reaching affects on the wildlife.</p> <p>Lastly my concern is in regards to water quality, a serious issue for my family. While I understand that the drilling process does underground deeply it can still affect the quality of water. Unlike many people in areas that Crestone drills, our homes drinking water is supplied to us by an underground well. Occasionally testing the well would never be sufficient because what happens when the water is affected between tests and my family has ingested tainted water? You can not assume that the quality of the water is good "until" it's not, I am not willing to put my family at risk. Also, Boulder Creek runs through Section 11 and that water supplies irrigation water and livestock water to ditch owners, if that quality is affected, it could have far reaching affects.</p>	Crestone Peak Resources	Health & Safety Concerns	Health & Safety

		While I would prefer no drilling, I understand that this may not be reasonable, but the location of the well site should be considered for location and practicality and that would be to situation the site along Highway 52.			
10/26/2017 13:26	Longmont, CO 80504	<p>My name is Jan Wilson and I live at 7557 Rodeo Dr, Longmont. I am in the supposed impact zone for the most Western pad in Section 26. When we received notice of Crestone’s application under Rule 216 for a Comprehensive Drilling Plan we had no idea what that was. I went to the COGCC web site and talked to some people at the COGCC. We invited one of the people who helped write the CDP process guidelines to come to our HOA and give a presentation on the CDP process. We talked with Boulder County as to what they thought the process would look like. What Crestone is doing now is nowhere close to what we were told this would look like. When Crestone did not have any public input meeting by June some of us decided to hold an informative meeting for those landowners in the entire CDP. Again we were told that we as landowners would have input as to the location of pads. This meeting, on October 18 is not input. This meeting is reactionary to Crestone telling us this is where the pads are going. If you truly were trying to follow the intent of the CDP process Crestone would have held meetings in the spring before developing plans or drawing lines. You would have asked us, the people whose lives you will be disrupting, in some cases for 24 hours a day, 7 days a week for close to 4 years, where we find it acceptable to locate these pads. You would have sought the placement of pads partially based on the areas of lowest impact.</p> <p>Mister Oates you stated in our notice of this meeting that Crestone’s policy is to be good neighbors. Good neighbors do not invite a small minority of the players to the party, they invite all the players. When we held our informative meeting for the CDP we sent out 830 invitations, you sent out 140. You did not even invite the major landowner to this meeting until you were caught and forced to invite them. Your statement to the Times-Call, Thursday October 12, 2017 edition “If you’re a half mile away from where we operate, it’s likely you won’t even know we’re operating” That is the most ludicrous statement I have ever heard. Even the director of the COGCC has said, August 20, 2017 Denver Post, “It’s intrusive: it really is. You feel like your house is being violated in some kind of way.” Earlier this year I drove over to Union Reservoir where there was a fracking rig drilling, I could hear what I consider significant noise from 1 mile away, and that was with the background noise of I 25. I can also at night see your rigs lights from my house for pads on Highway 52 east of Rodeo Dr. One half mile? What makes you think the smells of the toxic chemicals, which may carry carcinogens, are not going to make it impossible to be in our houses? West winds sometimes carry odors from the prairie pothole called Little Gaynor Lake 3 miles away, so we are certainly going to be negatively impacted by your operations much further than a ½ mile radius from your rig. Do you think your lights are not traveling at least ½ mile, the noise from your 100 plus truck trips a day (again 24/7) is not going to carry? Does the dust you generate only blow ½ mile? Everyone who lives within this CDP is negatively affected by your operation in some way and is supposed to have a voice if you were truly meeting the intent of the CDP process.</p> <p>I have talked to people in Erie who were 1500 feet from your pads and have been told how bad it is in real life. COGCC records show you have had, from all 2016 to August of this year the following total complaints: NOISE 124, ODOR 365, LIGHTING 18, ACCESS 18, LANDUSE CONFLICTS 2, NOTIFICATION 12, WATER WELLS 3, AIR QUALITY 6, FLARING 1 and TREPASS 1. Crestone has had a total of 540 complaints on only 3 pads. This represents 48% of all the complaints recorded by the COGCC FOR THE ENTIRE STATE for this time period. Just because you have not been fined for these complaints does not mean they are not valid. It means your methods of operations are so bad that you are causing SIGNIFICANT disruption to residents around your pads. These complaints are from more urban areas that have more background noise. During the day we have ambient noise from Highway 287, but at night it there is very little background noise. There is no way you can say that your operations will not be a significant noise pollutant at night. Your pad by my house is on Boulder County Open Space Ag land. This land provides those us on Rodeo Drive with an uninterrupted view of the Front Range. Your huge walls around your rigs will block my view of a very beautiful portion of the Front Range and remind me 24 hours a day of your blatant</p>	Crestone Peak Resources	CDP Process	Siting

		<p>disregard of my property rights. The point is, you are now trying to force a very disruptive industrial use into a suburban/agricultural setting. I do not understand why, when you have 12 square miles of ag and open space land with 2 State Highways and really only 2 densely populated areas you are choosing to put your industrial use right smack up to the two residential uses. Your application states that your wildlife consultants approved of the pad locations as being the least disruptive to wildlife. I have been an Environmental Consultant since 1971. There is no way a reputable wildlife/environmental consultant would locate a drilling/fracking pad in a flood plain next to a heron rookery. Are these the only consultants you used to site your pads? You are showing truck routes on dirt roads behind residences and pipelines going north and south from Highway 52. You will be fracking to our west and driving trucks to our east, then fracking to our east with the trucks still there. MOVE ALL YOUR PADS TO HIGHWAY 52 with the exception of the pad located in a flood zone. I don't care if the COGCC says you can drill and frack in a flood plain. That is just too short sighted and stupid for thought. Ask the people who used to live in Houston how well that idea works. Putting all your pads along Highway 52 is the only logical plan. You are in the middle of the Niobara formation, not near the edge so the geology allows you to frack just about anywhere within this 12 square mile area. Highway 52 can handle all the trucks, you have a straight shot to County Rd 7 with a straight shot to your existing hub. There are very few residences along Highway 52, the noise level is already high and there have been drilling pads on there in recent months. PLACE YOUR PADS IN THE AREA OF LEAST IMPACT. NOT THE AREAS OF HIGHEST IMPACT. By placing your pads on Highway 52 you can consolidate your truck routes and pipelines to be an efficient design. Mr. Oates you stated to the Times-Call, Thursday October 12, 2017 "As we work through this, we want to address the issues that they take exception to immediately and make sure that at least we're trying to meet in the middle on some of these things instead of picking sides and having conflict. That does not add to the dialogue or finding solutions." You are not following the intent of the CDP process, placing your pads in the areas of highest conflict with existing uses has created the conflict and choosing of sides. YOU are not adding to the dialogue and you are sending the message you are not interested in finding solutions, you just want your way. When one of my neighbors and I canvassed the area of 115th Street, Nebraska and Colorado Street it was so very discouraging to hear almost all the people we talked to say " why try, it won't do any good. The drillers just do what they want, the state just does what they say." That is a very sad commentary on the state of the oil and gas industry and community relations. Crestone has a very wonderful opportunity here to set a precedent in Colorado. They can demonstrate to the State how to work with the Community and County, in a cooperative manor, placing pads in a pattern that is acceptable to the community. You can work in harmony with the wishes of surrounding landowners instead of in opposition. I encourage you to set a positive precedent and not continue the existing negative path that has been used in the past.</p> <p>Thank you</p>			
<p>10/27/2017 12:54</p>	<p>Longmont, CO 80504</p>	<p>I would like to make several comments concerning the Crestone CDP preliminary draft, and the public meetings held the 10/18 and 19.</p> <p>Concerning the Crestone CDP preliminary draft –</p> <p>The primary issue I wish to raise is that the oil and gas locations have been proposed without any input from surface owners, no justification for the sites chosen, and no alternative site analysis. This does not provide enough information for surface owners, Crestone, and the COGCC to carry on discussions. Discussions that are assured in Rule 216(a), and 216(d)(2).</p> <p>We believe that if at all possible, well pad locations should be situated along Hwy. 52 where –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are fewer occupied buildings. • The baseline noise level is higher. • Existing road infrastructure is greater able to handle the substantial increase in truck traffic. 	<p>Crestone Peak Resources</p>	<p>CDP Process</p>	<p>Siting</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closer to existing oil and gas pipelines requiring less development. • Pad locations situated here can be located on either the north or south side of Hwy. 52 and well bores can be drilled north or south from any such location to cover the spacing units. • If Crestone will not consider this option for each of the 3 proposed pads outside this central development area we need to have a full justification and discussion as to why. • We need to see the composite constraints map displayed at the public meeting, and justifications on current proposal to make more substantive suggestions. <p>Document quality and structure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The document refers to attachments by a capital letter yet the attachments on the COGCC web site are not labeled as such. - The document appears to be a scanned image only! Therefore, the text is not searchable making it unnecessarily difficult for readers to find content, cannot be copied for reference elsewhere, and cannot be highlighted in downloaded versions. - Sections are labeled poorly, e.g. “Rule 216.c.(1)-(12) – Informational Requirements”, making referencing from other documents more difficult than necessary. Though this reference to the rule 216 requirement is useful, add a more concise heading for this document. <p>* Please have Crestone convert this document to a searchable pdf. It’s not hard.</p> <p>The statement in Rule 216.c.(1)-(12) (5), referring to hazardous waste containers, “Where practical, containers will be covered to limit odors and wildlife activity”, is very concerning. Odors from hazardous materials are likely to be hazardous as well.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The list of emergency responders in (12) does not include Mountain View Fire Rescue which serves much of the CDP area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Rule 216.d.(1)-(3) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o (3) A. Noise. Estimates of actual dB(A) and dB(C) levels should be provided in the CDP. If this is not possible than maximum values as stated in Rule 802(b)(1) are assumed; 80/75 dB(A), 65 dB(C). Distance to nearest occupied structure should be provided for each proposed pad for purposes of assessing dB(C) levels. Understanding noise levels are critical to understanding impact of siting proposals. • The maximum levels are distressing. 75 dB(A) at 350 ft. attenuates to 57.5 dB(A) at ½ mile. This is 25.5 dB louder than the recently measured nighttime 33 dB(A) (yes, it’s a cheap iPhone meter but it compares with other rural studies). That is 220 times the noise level! • I’ll further comment that these industrial noise levels may have been fine for one vertical well that was completed in 2 weeks. For a 36 well site that will take nearly 2 years to build, drill, and complete that level is not tolerable in a residential or rural environment. And in our case we’re talking about 2, 36-well pads (and a possible 3rd pad north of Oxford Rd.) and 4 years of excessive and disruptive noise. o (3) D. Traffic Plan. It is stated that a traffic impact study will be completed as part of the well pad permitting process. It is not clear from COGCC but it appears that this will take place late in the CDP approval process. That restricts time for review and response. Traffic impacts are critical to stakeholders understanding of the impacts of the siting proposals. <p>Concerning the public meetings held 10/18 at Vine Life Church</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The meeting at Vine Life Church on 10/18 was informative but limited. • The information provided as to how the proposed well pad locations were derived was useful. This information 			
--	---	--	--	--

		<p>should have been provided in the preliminary draft CDP to allow us to review, analyze and develop questions before the meeting.</p> <p>It is still incomplete -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The individual layers showing buffer constraints were made available on the COGCC web site. The composite map was not, and needs to be made available to stakeholders for further analysis. • There was no justification as to why the proposed sites are “optimal” as opposed to other possible sites. • The lead time of 5 days to review the draft in preparation for the meeting was quite inadequate. • Attendance was restricted to those residing ½ mile from a proposed pad. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o This is not acceptable and contradicts Rule 216(d)(2) that states “The operator shall invite...all surface owners to participate in the development of the Comprehensive Drilling Plan.” • The hour and a half duration was not sufficient. • What occurred that evening was a reasonable comment and Q&A session but it was not a discussion, dialogue was limited. Discussion cannot really occur in 3 minutes. Comments were supposedly recorded by Crestone representatives and will be considered for the next draft. There was no back and forth discussion to allow for further explanation from either Crestone reps or stakeholders, or to ensure that comments are understood and will be answered fully. • Again, Rule 216 provides for the opportunity for surface owners to participate in discussions! <p>Concerning phone-in meeting on 10/19</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phone-in and web based meetings are very impersonal and limit interaction. • I see the advantage of a call-in that provides surface owners who simply cannot attend an in-person meeting an opportunity to ask questions. I believe more in-person meetings are needed. • Highly problematic. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Calls were dropped and people could not reconnect. o Web site questions were sometimes lost or truncated. • In-person meeting are highly preferable to phone-in meetings and more should be scheduled. 			
10/29/2017 17:15	Denver, CO 80439	<p>In looking over Rule 216, d2, I note that it says in part “The operator(s) shall invite ..., all surface owners to participate in the development of the Comprehensive Drilling Plan.” (This is separate from the public meetings requirement.) By “all surface owners”, this would reasonably be all the official "application area" surface owners. In surveying some of these surface owners, none were involved in the development of the CDP. This is a blatant violation of this rule, and one that must necessitate the rejection of the current CDP and the start of a new process in which all application area surface owners have the opportunity to participate in the development of the CDP. Otherwise, the COGCC may be opening itself up to legal action.</p>	Other	CDP Process	
10/30/2017 13:24	Erie, CO 80516	<p>I am resident of Boulder County, Erie approximately 1400 ft from a 15 well pad site in Weld County and approximately 25 feet from an Anadarko gas gathering line.</p> <p>Since mid-December of last year, my family and our neighbors suffered through increasingly stench filled days and nights. As the drilling neared its end, the stench became stronger and nearly constantly permeated throughout the eastern side of our neighborhood.</p> <p>The next phase of well production brought on intense noise pollution. The noise immediately caused us to suffer from sleepless nights, I lived 3300 feet from the joint completions site. I cannot fathom how intense this noise pollution is for those that live closer.</p> <p>These experiences are not okay. It is not okay for an industrial site to move in across the street from my house, disrupt our lives, and put our health and safety at risk. In my mind, Oil and gas operations do not make good</p>	Oil and Gas Development	Health & Safety Concerns	Siting

		<p>neighbors. They are noisy, smelly and non-communicative. I cannot believe that the COGCC, the state and our local municipalities sit idly by while Oil and Gas fills multiple neighborhoods with noise, air, and light pollution, endangering our communities health, our investments in our homes, our schools, and is but one of the major factors ruining the peaceful nature of our town.</p> <p>I have researched the health impacts of fracking. I even read the very few articles stating the overall benefits of fracking. The research that has shown no negative health impacts of living in such close proximity to fracking sites has not held up. It is unequivocal in my mind, as a Ph.D. level biomedical scientist, that living this close to unconventional hydraulic fracturing and the numerous other wells in Boulder and Weld counties is detrimental to my health, your health, and the health of my family and neighbors.</p> <p>Now, both Crestone and Extraction are looking to expand into Boulder County. Crestone wants to place 2, 36 well pad sites within a mile of my home. BTW, I was not allowed in to their “public meeting,” despite this fact. One of these pad sites is in a floodplain. The other is a mere feet from the floodplain. With the 2013 floods, one of the storage tanks from a well site 1000 ft from my home was knocked over. Do not allow these future wells to be placed in or near the floodplain. We do not need any community disasters from illogical placement of pad sites in or near floodplains.</p> <p>The Extraction proposal for drilling in Lafayette, is potentially going to be placed across the street from my 3 year old and 6 month old nieces. Or, potentially next door to an Elementary school. A Title 1 Elementary school, with 64% minority students and nearly 47% of the students living in poverty. It is not okay to prey upon the young and the poor, upon people who are different from the majority, and upon these young children and families just so more oil and gas, that we do not need, is extracted at the expense of these vulnerable people’s health and safety.</p> <p>Now is the time to start denying more drilling permits. No drills, no wells, no pipelines.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>			
10/31/2017 15:28	Erie CO. 80516	<p>we moved here in november of 1991.Our 9 acre ranch was separated from a 350 acre deal with boulder county who purchased it from a member of my family for open space.Boulder county continues to keep it as open space and always working hard to maintain water levels,bugs and weeds.but they’re largest has been to increase wildlife in this valley. We have a lakes, ponds,Boulder creek,all for our geese ducks ,deer, bald eagles and coyotes.We as property owners paid a huge amount of money to buy propertys along these open space boundaries.We are also reminded in property tax statements.My point is I wonder if Crestone see’s the damage they would be doing by putting a location right in the middle of this valley. I farm the land directly across the street from this possible site and th this valley with the snow peak mountain views are spectacular.I also drive semi’s part time for a living and I cannot bring my truck home because all of our streets are 13 ton weight limits,but yet the trucking route would be hwy. 52 to county line south (13 ton) to kenosha west(13 ton) to 119th south(13 ton). Why not just put the site at a easier and more cost affective spot where drilling riggs have easier access ,bigger and better built roads.That location would be at hwy. 52 and county line rd.. The town of Erie 6 months ago approved a 116 custom home site directly across the street from jasper rd. site also.To conclude,dispite I am a mineral rights owner, I highly doubt my mineral royaltys are going to outweigh my property value dispite you know our taxes,noise traffic and ozone levels will rise.I strongly urge that you reconsider your site proposal and move elsewhere so you won't interrupt this wonderful valley.</p>	Oil and Gas Development	Property Values and Land Use	Traffic/Access
10/31/2017 22:41	Erie, CO 80516	<p>Why can't the Section 11 drilling location be moved directly north to the north edge of Section 2 on the Vicklund parcel, with directional drilling towards the south to cover the same area? This Section 2 location would be close to existing commercial land use (The Tree Farm) along heavily-trafficked and noisy Highway 52, instead of in scenic open space near historic residences as proposed in Section 11. Furthermore, it could utilize the proposed pipeline that runs along 52 and through vacant land, instead of requiring the proposed pipeline segment through Section 12 that will pass within 100-150 feet of more than 75 homes in Kenosha Farms, Kenosha Estates, and Erie Village.</p>	Crestone Peak Resources	Health & Safety Concerns	Siting
10/31/2017 23:13	Longmont, CO 80504	<p>I object to the Section 11 well site, but support the well sites along Highway 52. The Highway 52 sites available are better suited for construction access, operations truck traffic, perpetual traffic, noise, light pollution, and dust. I would</p>	Crestone Peak Resources	Health & Safety Concerns	Siting

		like to see in the CDP plans for water quality monitoring and air quality monitoring for the life of the wells, not just for one year. I would like Crestone to discuss with private land owners who are willing to negotiate the wells on their land. If the well are on County Open Space, then it would be fair for Crestone to compensate the taxpayers, including my family for the taxes we have paid to purchase that land, just as you would compensate a private surface owner.			
11/1/2017 7:33	Erie, CO 80516	I respectfully condemn the practice of fracking near my community and river habitat. The infrastructure required for drilling and extraction creates noise and pollution hazards that haven't been adequately mitigated or addressed. The amount of proposed new wells will tank property values for years to come. Traffic is also impacted for both motorists and cyclists (especially cyclists). The long-term risk to the environment is my primary concern. Until you tell us specifically what chemicals are being injected into the earth, we can't even begin to have a conversation. The land and water is not yours to exploit.	Crestone Peak Resources	Health & Safety Concerns	Health & Safety
11/1/2017 10:04	Erie, CO 80516	As nearby property owners (north of your proposed site), we vehemently oppose the Section 11 well site proposal, for just about every possible reason: nesting herons and eagles in the nearby cottonwoods, general wildlife concerns, construction / well truck traffic concerns, not to mention the myriad negative effects on local properties / residences and, of course, people...the list goes on, and on. Put your wells off of 52 where they can be easily accessed, where the effects on the wildlife, our lives, and our property values won't be as extreme. Please know that we are sending this Section 11 proposed well plan to every wildlife conservation organization we can find. Bad, bad idea. Think. Please think. This is out of control.	Oil and Gas Development	Property Values and Land Use	Wildlife
11/1/2017 15:52	Longmont CO 80504	<p>Crestone has proposed 2 pads on the south side of Oxford Road that are 1 1/4 miles of each other and we will be in the middle of those two pads. There is the strong likelihood of more pads just on the north side of Oxford Road with the recent application from 8 North. Three pads, all within 1/4 - 1 mile from the numerous residences turns our once quiet, rural area, supposedly protected by preserved open space to a noisy, smelly, busy, potentially unhealthy highly industrialized zone. This is a frightening prospect.</p> <p>The 3 proposed Crestone well pad locations at the northern and southern extremes of the CDP area should be moved to the more suitable Hwy 52 corridor where there are fewer occupied buildings; better road infrastructure; and the baseline noise level is higher. Crestone needs to fully justify why such locations are not feasible.</p> <p>In the October 18 meeting, we were shown a composite constraints map which Crestone "used" to determine areas where development could take place. At a request from an attendee, we were told that this would be made available on the COGCC website. To-date, we have not seen the map.</p> <p>Additionally, when asked about truck traffic, we were told that traffic analysis would take place just before Form 2A application. At that point mitigation measures would be considered. It would seem to me that impacts due to truck traffic would be part of the criteria for siting pads.</p> <p>Even at 1/2 mile distance from these pads, the max noise levels allowed by commission rules, will result in a substantial increase in our noise level. These noise levels may have been fine for one well that is completed in 2 weeks. For a 36 well site that will take nearly 2 years to drill and complete in a residential or rural area, this level is not tolerable.</p> <p>In our case in sections 25 and 26, we are talking about 2, 36 well pads (and a possible 3rd pad north of Oxford Rd.) for four years. This will be unbearable for people who normally have their windows open at night.</p> <p>The residences east of the proposed pad site on section 26 are downwind. There are enough complaints from these kinds of developments pertaining to noise, odors, and not to mention the risk from gaseous fumes. As one stakeholder at the meeting said: noise does not stop at 1/2 mile, odors and fumes do not stop at 1/2 mile.</p> <p>The residents of the northern and south/south eastern boundaries have not been invited to discuss pad siting — Crestone had 6 months to sit down with us. Instead, out of the 800 plus property owners in the CDP area, only 140 were invited on October 18 and 19 - that is only 18%. These number only represent the property owners - not the entire population in these areas.</p> <p>If we're not going to be able to stop this train, re-siting of the pads on Hwy 52 is a better mitigation measure to the negative impacts of this development on people, their quality of life, the environment and the flora and fauna that live</p>	Crestone Peak Resources	Health & Safety Concerns	Siting

		in it. Thank you.			
11/2/2017 22:17	Lafayette, Colorado 80026	Thanks for letting us speak at Crestone's first meeting on October 18, 2017 and do appreciate the CDP process. We are impacted by the site at the southern end (section 11) and live directly south approximately 1000ft from this site. We are strongly opposed to having a drill site so close to housing/people. What we would like to see is that 36 wells site in section 11 be moved closer to Highway 52 with access to the site via Highway 52 where there would be much less housing/people, noise, lighting, air pollution, land, water, wetlands, nature and wildlife impacts. This would also cause much less truck traffic on Kenosha/119th/Jasper/etc. and lessen the truck road damage/noise impacts to the surrounding areas. Since this section 11 is located in the floodplain, I find it difficult to understand how this well site can exist in a floodplain which flooded 4 years ago. Also note that the noise/pollution from this site will affect the new housing development on Jasper Road (have the developers been notified?). Also, since this is Boulder county open space, which is paid for by the Boulder County citizens, should they all not be alerted to what is happening to the land they own? Please consider moving as many sites as possible towards Highway 52 since the current locations are in a natural area which will be greatly impacted by all the industrial impacts of fracking.	Hydraulic Fracturing (Fracking)	Health & Safety Concerns	Site Specific Sensitivities
11/3/2017 7:26	Longmont	We feel this project will greatly impact our area in a negative way , invading our infrastructure, wildlife , land use , most importantly the surrounding area we house our animals , have our home and enjoy the views we purchased this property for . This area is in a highly designated flood plane and the risks are exponentially dangerous in the unlikely event of another natural disaster like 2013. We equivocally deny the approval of these structures as land owners and will voice our concerns and be present to fight this going forward. Tom and Stacie Holbel	Oil and Gas Development	Infrastructure	Health & Safety
11/3/2017 16:50	Longmont, CO 80503	Crestone Peak Resources c/o Jamie Jost RE: Comments on pad locations 11/02/2017 Dear Crestone Peak Resources ("Crestone"), Kenosha Road Property Owners ("Kenosha RPO") thank you for the opportunity to comment on this CDP proposal. To be clear, the Kenosha RPO would prefer that no additional oil and gas development occur in Boulder County. Boulder County is a great place to live and work, in part, because of our tremendous quality of place. Industrial oil and gas development is not an asset to that quality of place but a liability. Oil and gas development is also inconsistent with residential land uses. However, if additional oil and gas development must occur in Boulder County, Kenosha RPO believe that the locations must be chosen using objective criteria. The "exclusion areas analysis" you used was very helpful, but did not take into account additional factors that would help limit the impacts of your proposed development on the environment and the residents living within the CDP area. The following is the criteria that Kenosha Road proposes as most important in your siting decision. The locations should: 1) be at least 1,500 feet from homes, 2) be located along a main transportation route, 3) be outside of the floodplain, 4) utilize existing well pads when possible, 5) consolidate wells when possible and 6) result in a net decrease in surface disturbance. 1) At least 1,500 feet from homes: Crestone has already applied a 1,000-foot setback criteria in its "Exclusion Area Analysis." Kenosha RPO believe that the 1,000 foot setback is too close to even a single home given the highly-industrialized nature of these facilities. The well pads in the alternative proposals we have developed are no closer than 1,500 feet from the closest home.	Other	Health & Safety Concerns	Siting

	<p>2) Located along a main transportation route: The tremendous number of truck trips that will be required for all the well pads should dictate that each location have easy access to a main road. Smaller roads such as Kenosha Road and 119th Street are not equipped to handle this type of truck traffic; the roads are narrow, with no shoulders, and a particularly tight turning radii. Instead, we have proposed all well pads to be located along Mineral Road (State Highway 52). The state highway is wide, with substantial shoulders, and built to withstand heavy truck traffic. It is also a road that has very few homes. The alternative proposals we have developed would allow trucks to enter directly from and exit directly onto Highway 52. This would presumably minimize road construction costs for Crestone as well.</p> <p>3) Outside of the floodplain: The current proposal sites one location just outside the floodplain and sites another well pad within the floodplain – both of these areas are not just in the floodplain, but they both actually flooded in 2013. This is contrary to Boulder County regulations and completely unnecessary. The floodplain and associated stream corridor are also important wildlife habitat. The alternative locations we have chosen pull all the wells out of the floodplain.</p> <p>4) Utilize existing well pads when possible: There are currently 95 oil and gas locations within the 12-square mile CDP area. If additional oil and gas development is going to occur, it makes more economic and environmental sense to use existing locations rather than developing new locations. It also minimizes construction impacts to residents.</p> <p>5) Consolidate wells when possible: Using the same reasoning as #4, it is better for the environment to use fewer pads than to have scattered development, and more surface disturbance, throughout the CDP area. COGCC 1002.e requires that wells are consolidated:</p> <p>(3) Where practicable, operators shall consolidate facilities and pipeline rights-of-way in order to minimize adverse impacts to wildlife resources, including fragmentation of wildlife habitat, as well as cumulative impacts.</p> <p>One of our alternative proposals reduces the number of well locations from seven to four. (See Map B). #1 and #2 locations could also be consolidated in a larger 72-well pad location which would reduce the number of well pads to three. (See Map B).</p> <p>6) Net decrease in surface disturbance: Kenosha RPO would like Crestone to attempt to use its new oil and gas development to eliminate as many old oil and gas locations as possible. We challenge Crestone to reclaim two acres for every acre disturbed. If there are four well pads at seven acres each there will be 28 acres of surface disturbance. To reclaim two acres for every acre disturbed, Crestone would need to reclaim 56 acres. If we estimate each existing well site disturbs 1.5 acres (including pads, equipment and roads) Crestone would need to plug, abandon, and reclaim at least 37 existing well locations. Since there are 95 existing wells in production within the CDP, we believe plugging, abandoning and reclaiming 37 well locations is a very achievable goal.</p> <p>Applying this criteria, Kenosha RPO has prepared a two alternative proposals. Both proposals would locate the well pads along State Hwy 52. The first proposal (Map A) would allow for four locations and Map B would limit the locations to three. The proposed drilling and spacing units are marked in red.</p> <p>In its alternative proposals, Kenosha RPO was able to limit the well pads from seven to three or four without limiting the number of wells. That being said, Kenosha RPO objects to Crestone's proposal for 36 well-bores in every section. As we understand it, Crestone is proposing more wells per section than has been approved anywhere else in the state. Kenosha RPO requests to see Crestone's geologic reports that would justify such a dense drilling pattern.</p> <p>In sum, we believe that our alternative proposals would benefit not only the residents of the entire CDP area, but Crestone as well. The alternatives stay out of the floodplain, are farther from homes, are closer to a main road, and consolidate wells in fewer locations. They will also greatly reduce the need for as much access road and pipeline right of ways – reducing Crestone's costs and damage to the environment.</p> <p>While Kenosha RPO are adamantly opposed to oil and gas development in Boulder County, we do appreciate that Crestone voluntarily agreed to do a Comprehensive Drilling Plan. We are all hopeful that our comments will be</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>seriously considered, and that this will be a model process for future oil and gas development.</p> <p>Kenosha RPO appreciate the opportunity to give feedback on the proposal and would be willing to meet with you to discuss our alternative.</p> <p>Please feel free to call or email if you would be interested in meeting to discuss these comments.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Matt Sura For Kenosha Road Property Owners.</p>			
11/3/2017 21:04	Ere, CO 80516	I strongly object to the Section 11 well site, but do support well sites along highway 52. The 52 sites available are much better suited for truck traffic, construction access, as well as noise and odor and light and dust pollution. Also, the wild life and agriculture that would be affected with the Section 11 site is far greater than that of the Hwy 52 site. I would also appreciate water and air quality monitoring for the life of the wells. If the wells are on Boulder County Open Space, then it would be fair for Crestone to compensate taxpayers for the taxes we have paid to purchase the land.	Oil and Gas Development	Property Values and Land Use	Health & Safety
11/7/2017 19:10	Longmont, CO 80504	In reference to the letter to Crestone written by Matt Sura on behalf of the Kenosha Road Property Owners I also request that the drilling pads on Kenosha Rd. and Oxford Rd. are moved to Hwy 52. I think it makes the most sense. This plan would be mutually beneficial to Crestone Peak and many landowners in Boulder County. Thank you for your time and consideration.	Other	Property Values and Land Use	Siting
11/7/2017 19:24	Longmont, CO 80504	I would just like to reiterate my support to the plan proposed in the letter to Crestone written by Matt Sura on behalf of the Kenosha Road Property Owners. While my preference would be to eliminate all oil and gas production in this area, I understand that we have to achieve compromise. The proposed plan to focus pad sites on Highway 52 is incredibly sensible, and I sincerely hope this receives proper consideration.	Crestone Peak Resources	CDP Process	Siting
11/8/2017 10:23	80516	Concerning Crestone's CDP in eastern Boulder County, I fully support the thoughtful proposals made by Matt Sura on behalf of the Kenosha Road Property Owners (Kenosha RPO) in his 11/2/17 letter to Crestone. Consolidating and clustering the operations along Highway 52 makes so much sense for surface owners, and would minimize disruption to the entire area, avoid development in flood plains, and better utilize existing transportation routes. You also should consider reducing the total number of wells to be drilled within this small area. COGCC, please-- PLEASE--listen to the affected surface owners and enable them to have input into the CDP planning process, as envisioned in Rule 216. I fear that Crestone is poised to ride roughshod over our very valid concerns about the noise pollution and noxious fumes of these proposed, nearby HUGE multi-well pad sites. I'm sure you're aware that Boulder County residents, as a group, are opposed to fracking within our community. PLEASE, at the very least, require Crestone to work with the citizenry to minimize disruptions to our neighborhoods!!!	Crestone Peak Resources	CDP Process	Siting
11/8/2017 11:13	Longmont, CO, 80504	As a stakeholder in Section 26 of the CDP proposed by Crestone Peak Resources near State Highway 52 (Mineral Road) in eastern Boulder County, I have recently received a copy of the letter to Crestone written by attorney Matt Sura on behalf of the Kenosha Road Property Owners. I support the suggestions in this letter, and stated similar suggestions to locate the well pads along the Highway 52 corridor during the stakeholder meeting on October 18, 2017. This location makes sense for so many reasons --- less disruption to residents, better access for trucks and pipelines, consolidation of wells to minimize impacts and promote better inspection and maintenance. Thank you, Brian Wilson	Oil and Gas Development	Health & Safety Concerns	Siting
11/8/2017 11:47	Boulder, CO 80301	The Sierra Club submits these comments in opposition to the Crestone Peak CDP. Expanding oil and gas development in Boulder County would endanger public health and welfare. Furthermore, the wells would be on county open space. This space was acquired by the county and paid for by tax payers with the purpose of recreation and preservation—not industrial oil and gas operations via surface wells or production facilities. Please see the following link for our complete comments and relevant attachments: https://app.box.com/s/sy3ji0wczujhivvuxhmfna4riu3gnnvq . We have also sent a copy of these comments and attachments via U.S. Postal Service.	Crestone Peak Resources	Health & Safety Concerns	Health & Safety
11/9/2017 5:17	Longmont, CO. 80504	I implore Crestone to seriously consider the issues raised and suggestions made in the letter to Crestone written by Matt Sura on behalf of the Kenosha Road Property Owners as the company moves forward with its planned drilling. I am fully in agreement with these points.	Crestone Peak Resources	Property Values and Land Use	Siting

11/9/2017 7:54	Longmont, CO 80504	Our property is located in section 26 and I would like to express our fullest support of the outlined alternative proposals in the letter to Crestone written by Matt Sura on behalf of the Kenosha Road Property Owners, dated November 2, 2017. As Mr. Sura pointed out, these alternative proposals "would benefit not only residents in the entire CDP area, but Crestone as well".	Crestone Peak Resources	Health & Safety Concerns	Siting
11/9/2017 11:09	Longmont,Colorado 80504	In reference to the letter to Crestone from Matt Sura on behalf of the Kenosha Road Property Owners; I would like to add my agreement with the recommendation to move well pads along the Hwy 52 corridor. Doing this will minimize traffic, noise, odor, environmental, and visual impacts to the highest density of resident surface owners. Preserving health, safety, and quality of life for the impacted community can only enhance the success of accessing local resources.	Crestone Peak Resources	Health & Safety Concerns	Siting
11/9/2017 12:26	Longmont, CO 80504	I want to express my full support for the proposals put forth by Matt Sura on behalf of Kenosha Road Property Owners. The consolidation of pads along Hwy 52 will result in less overall impact to residents in the area in terms of noise, odor, traffic, environment, and property value reduction. Additionally, the number of wells proposed per section appear to be excessive and result in drilling and completion time that magnify these impacts unnecessarily. This Crestone proposal simply puts the north end of the CDP area under assault. Two 36 well pads a mile apart, with a 3rd pad from another operator a strong possibility, will simply destroy our quality of life in the area for an extended period of time. It nullifies our choice and investment to live in a peaceful, attractive non-industrial area. You must reconsider this proposal and the alternatives from Matt Sura are viable options unless you can PROVE otherwise.	Oil and Gas Development	Property Values and Land Use	
11/9/2017 12:48	Longmont	The Smaller roads such as Oxford Road and 119th Street are not equipped to handle Production Pad truck traffic. These roads have no shoulders, and are insulated and quiet. Instead, we have proposed all well pads to be located along Mineral Road (State Highway 52). The state highway is wide, with substantial shoulders, and built to withstand heavy truck traffic. It is also a road that has very few homes. The alternative proposal would require that moving the pads, would allow trucks to enter directly from and exit directly onto Highway 52. This would presumably minimize road construction costs for Crestone as well. *Additionally, I am in support of the letter to Crestone written by Matt Sura on behalf of the Kenosha Road Property Owners.	COGCC Rules & Processes	Traffic	Traffic/Access
11/9/2017 13:37	Longmont, CO 80504	I agree with the statements in Matthew Sura's letter concerning the impacts on the environment and the residents living within the CDP area. I also felt that the well pads should be along Highway 52 to minimize impact.	COGCC Rules & Processes	Health & Safety Concerns	Traffic/Access
11/9/2017 18:27	Erie Colorado 80516	It appears that Crestone could move their proposed Section 11 drilling pad from just west of the Kenosha neighborhood to the south side of Highway 52, which would eliminate the need for the pipeline segment through our neighborhood, and would move the noise, traffic, and other issues associated with drilling almost 2 miles to the north to a sparsely populated area along an already-busy road. Please consider keeping the pipelines away from neighborhoods whenever possible, considering there is a chance of accident, however slim, caution is preferable.			Site Specific Sensitivities
11/9/2017 18:29	Erie Colorado 80516	Pad 11, putting a pipeline between two neighborhoods seems crazy given the recent house explosion in Frederick. Proposed pipelines goes right next to Kenosha and Kenosha estates and next to Erie Village -- is it that much cheaper to endanger so many homes rather than route the pipeline elsewhere?	Other	Health & Safety Concerns	Health & Safety
11/9/2017 18:46	Erie, CO 80516	PLEASE, PLEASE PLEASE!!!! move to the south side of Highway 52, which would eliminate the need for the pipeline segment through our neighborhood, and would move the noise, traffic, and other issues associated with drilling almost 2 miles to the north to a sparsely populated area along an already-busy road. I have not slept well for many months. I feel the vibration of the machines working. If you move to highway 52 this would be life changing for me. PLEASE.			
11/9/2017 19:05	Erie, CO 80516	Please do not allow Crestone to build the gas pipeline through my neighborhood next to my home. My family cannot afford to have any more potential health risks.	Crestone Peak Resources	Health & Safety Concerns	Health & Safety
11/9/2017 19:47	Longmont, CO, 80504	We recently received a copy of, and would like to comment on the Kenosha RPO (Kenosha Road Property Owners) letter sent to Crestone Peak Resources by Matthew Sura from his law office -- Identical to the Kenosha RPO, we would prefer that no additional oil and gas development occur in Boulder County, and in particular, not along Oxford Rd. We recently moved to Colorado with plans of retiring. We purchased our home at the intersection of Oxford Rd and 119th street last year without any knowledge of the potential for large scale fracking operations in the immediate vicinity. We purchased our place in large part because of the exquisite	Crestone Peak Resources	Traffic	Siting

		<p>scenery and the designation of “open space land” surrounding our property. Similar to the Kenosha RPO position, we don’t see industrial oil and gas development as an asset, but instead as a liability.</p> <p>We are aware of the recent Colorado Supreme Court ruling stipulating that only the state government can regulate the oil and gas industry in the state. Thus, if additional oil and gas development must occur in Boulder County, we strongly believe (like the Kenosha RPO’s) that the locations must be chosen using objective criteria that demonstrate respect for both the environment and the impacted property owners. The “exclusion area analysis” used by Crestone does not take into account additional factors that we feel are critical to limiting the impacts of the proposed development on the environment and the residents living within the CDP area.</p> <p>The following are the two key criteria that we feel are the most important, going forward in the siting decision. The locations should first be located along a main transportation route, not along rural roads such as Oxford Rd., and second, chosen sites should utilize existing well pads.</p> <p>1) Located along a main transportation route: Crestone’s proposed two sites along Oxford Rd are scheduled to be completed sequentially. This means that for 4 years or longer, the residence of Oxford Rd must endure 24/7, the incessant truck noise and pollution from light, dust and odor! Upwards of 100 trucks per day has been acknowledged by Crestone representatives (Jason Oates during the 2nd phone-in on 11/2/17). This level of trucking should dictate that each pad location have easy access to a main thoroughfare. Smaller roads such as Oxford Rd and 119th Street are not equipped nor designed to handle this type of truck traffic; the roads are narrow, without paved shoulders, and a particularly tight turning radii at a blind intersection exists at Oxford Rd & 119th Street. Instead, we strongly support the Kenosha RPO’s request that all well pads be located along Mineral Road (State Highway 52). The state highway is wide, with substantial shoulders, and built to withstand heavy truck traffic. It is also a road that has very few homes. Both alternative siting proposals submitted by the Kenosha RPO would allow trucks to enter directly from and exit directly onto Highway 52. This would presumably minimize road construction costs for Crestone as well.</p> <p>2) Consolidate wells when possible: Crestone is currently drilling at two pads (21+ wells each) along State Hwy 52 at CR 3¼. This demonstrate that Crestone can manage closely spaced, large scale pads. In addition, as pointed out in the Kenosha RPO’s letter, COGCC 1002.e requires that wells are consolidated:</p> <p>(3) Where practicable, operators shall consolidate facilities and pipeline rights-of-way in order to minimize adverse impacts to wildlife resources, including fragmentation of wildlife habitat, as well as cumulative impacts.</p> <p>In addition, in Crestone’s COGCC testimony (10/31/17), Crestone engineers stated that distances up to 3 miles can be drilled horizontal underground. Thus all of the CDP area can be accessed from drilling pads located on State Hwy 52.</p> <p>We also strongly support the other siting criteria put forth by the Kenosha RPO group in their letter (dated Nov 2, 2017); those additional siting criteria being: 1) be at least 1,500 feet from homes, 2) be outside of the floodplain, 3) seek to consolidate wells, and 4) result in a net decrease in surface disturbance.</p> <p>In addition, for the projected 30 year operational life of these wells, there is always the risk of an accident like what happened in Firestone earlier this year, and what happened in San Bruno, CA in 2010. Property values for all residences within and bordering the CDP area will be negatively impacted, with those closest to the well sites, having the highest impact. Placing the well pads on Hwy 52 goes a long way toward improving safety and reducing the negative property value impact to all residences with the proposed CDP area.</p> <p>In sum, we believe that either of Kenosha RPO’s alternative proposals would benefit not only the residents of the entire CDP area, but Crestone as well.</p> <p>Like the Kenosha RPO’s, we are hopeful that our comments will be seriously considered. We appreciate the opportunity to give feedback on the proposal and would be willing to meet with all interested parties to discuss all alternatives. Please feel free to call or email us regarding any comments.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

		Reed & Peggy James			
11/9/2017 20:27	Longmont CO 80504	<p>I agree with the proposals written Matt Sura on behalf of Kenosha Road Property Owners and request that Crestone seriously consider these proposals. Re-siting all the pads along Hwy 52 will result in less impact to people residing in the area.</p> <p>The idea of having to live near the 36-well pads in sections 25 and 26 are frightening especially when another operator is planning a development north of Oxford Road.</p> <p>We moved out here 25 years ago because it was quiet and beautiful. The wildlife - from foxes, great-horned owls, hawks that nest in our trees, and even the rabbits and coyotes - have enjoyed the quiet over the years and we have respected their space as we have watched them. The placement of these two 36-well pad will ruin all of that, not just for the humans but also for the wildlife.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Crestone Peak Resources	Health & Safety Concerns	Wildlife
11/9/2017 20:38	Erie, CO 80516	<p>Some of our major concerns revolve around water. Our farm adjoins the proposed Section 11 site. We have two spring fed lakes on our 35-acre farm. The Boulder Weld ditch runs through our farm. Our domestic water is provided by a 50-foot well on our property. It would be devastating if the springs, water well and/or water table were interrupted or contaminated.</p> <p>I would like to bring to your attention that our two spring fed lakes were shown on the layered map on one of the slides at the CDP meeting but when the next slide showed the bodies of water that were to be avoided when placing the pads (shown on the CDP map as blacked out) our two lakes were not blacked out.</p> <p>The two spring fed lakes on our farm provide water for our cow herd. If the oil and gas activity on Section 11 disrupts or contaminates the springs that feed these lakes, the effects will be far reaching. We provide healthy, natural, free-range, grass fed beef for between 15 and 35 people each year. So when we voice our concerns, not only are we concerned about our livelihood, we are also voicing concerns of contamination for this larger number of people that have come to expect healthy beef.</p> <p>The Boulder Weld ditch that runs beside the proposed site on Section 11 also runs through our farm and provides water for our herd as well. It is spring fed in the winter months so it provides water year round for our herd. We own water rights in the Boulder-Weld ditch and use our north lake for water storage during irrigation. We use the water from the Boulder Weld ditch to irrigate our fields. The hay we grow on the fields then feed our cattle, as well as providing pasture land for the cattle. If the ditch becomes contaminated, once again we are affecting our cattle and the many people that eat our beef.</p> <p>We have a 50-foot deep water well on our farm. Our well is our only source of water for domestic use. Our water table is very high on the farm, especially the area closest to the proposed Section 11 site. Our concerns are that the oil and gas activity on Section 11 may contaminate our springs' aquifers, our shallow domestic water well and the high water table.</p> <p>.Another huge concern about the Section 11 proposed site is flood. When we had the flood of 2013, many of the tanks in the area were tipped over. We had flood water on all the lands in this area, the ditches were full to overflowing. Not all the water was from the creek leaving its banks. Much was from the heavy rains. Our sump pump ran for more than a year afterwards due to this area's high water table that was made even higher by the soaking of the rain into the ground. This area cannot easily absorb water, so every rain storm we have that is significant impacts the water table, the ditches and our lakes. Any chemicals that are used or spilled at a drill site would soak down into this water table during rains, floods or just because the water table is so high and close to the surface. Even the aquifer that feeds our domestic water well could be affected.</p> <p>Contamination of any of our water sources would have a devastating and permanent effect on our livelihood and the safety of our cattle and the meat they provide. In light of this unrecoverable impact from contamination of our lakes, the ditch and our water well, I would request that the drill site on Section 11 be moved to another location, such as Highway 52 or 287.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Oil and Gas Development	Health & Safety Concerns	Siting
11/9/2017 20:48	Erie, CO 80516	<p>Boulder County residents pay high taxes. In return, the county has purchased the Open Space that defines our county's culture. Agricultural lands have been preserved for continued ranching and farming and the County has been encouraging more and more the sustainable and organic farming practices. We live in the midst of some of the most beautiful agricultural Open Space in the state. We were promised when we approved the purchase of these open space lands with our tax dollars, that there would be no development. No commercial development, no</p>	Other	Property Values and Land Use	Siting

		<p>industrial development, no housing development. In light of the housing boom in Erie, the Open Space surrounding the Section 11 proposed site has been an oasis of unspoiled lands in the midst of suburbia. We are not the only ones that appreciate this oasis. The open space near the Section 11 site is home to much of the wildlife that has been crowded out of their natural habitat by the housing and commercial development in the area. We are talking about eagles, hawks, great white egrets, blue herons, owls, pelicans, deer, foxes and coyotes. Our area ponds and lakes are home to the birds, provide water for the four-footed wildlife and are filled with bass, catfish, blue gill, crappie, turtles and bull frogs.</p> <p>Please move the Section 11 pad to either Highway 52 or 287 where the impact won't be as great.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>			
11/9/2017 20:58	Erie, CO 80516	<p>We are concerned about the proposed Section 11 site. The entrance to the proposed winding, dirt road that is the access road to the site is directly across from our farm and will create noise, dust and traffic congestion on the two lane N 119th St. Please move to an area where the roads are built for heavy traffic such as Hwy 52.</p>	Crestone Peak Resources	Traffic	Traffic/Access
11/9/2017 21:02	Erie, CO 80516	<p>Some of our major concerns revolve around water. Our farm adjoins the proposed Section 11 site. We have two spring fed lakes on our 35-acre farm. The Boulder Weld ditch runs through our farm. Our domestic water is provided by a 50-foot well on our property. It would be devastating if the springs, water well and/or water table were interrupted or contaminated.</p> <p>I would like to bring to your attention that our two spring fed lakes were shown on the layered map on one of the slides at the CDP meeting but when the next slide showed the bodies of water that were to be avoided when placing the pads (shown on the CDP map as blacked out) our two lakes were not blacked out.</p> <p>The two spring fed lakes on our farm provide water for our cow herd. If the oil and gas activity on Section 11 disrupts or contaminates the springs that feed these lakes, the effects will be far reaching. We provide healthy, natural, free-range, grass fed beef for between 15 and 35 people each year. So when we voice our concerns, not only are we concerned about our livelihood, we are also voicing concerns of contamination for this larger number of people that have come to expect healthy beef.</p> <p>The Boulder Weld ditch that runs beside the proposed site on Section 11 also runs through our farm and provides water for our herd as well. It is spring fed in the winter months so it provides water year round for our herd. We own water rights in the Boulder-Weld ditch and use our north lake for water storage during irrigation. We use the water from the Boulder Weld ditch to irrigate our fields. The hay we grow on the fields then feed our cattle, as well as providing pasture land for the cattle. If the ditch becomes contaminated, once again we are affecting our cattle and the many people that eat our beef.</p> <p>We have a 50-foot deep water well on our farm. Our well is our only source of water for domestic use. Our water table is very high on the farm, especially the area closest to the proposed Section 11 site. Our concerns are that the oil and gas activity on Section 11 may contaminate our springs' aquifers, our shallow domestic water well and the high water table.</p> <p>.Another huge concern about the Section 11 proposed site is flood. When we had the flood of 2013, many of the tanks in the area were tipped over. We had flood water on all the lands in this area, the ditches were full to overflowing. Not all the water was from the creek leaving its banks. Much was from the heavy rains. Our sump pump ran for more than a year afterwards due to this area's high water table that was made even higher by the soaking of the rain into the ground. This area cannot easily absorb water, so every rain storm we have that is significant impacts the water table, the ditches and our lakes. Any chemicals that are used or spilled at a drill site would soak down into this water table during rains, floods or just because the water table is so high and close to the surface. Even the aquifer that feeds our domestic water well could be affected.</p> <p>Contamination of any of our water sources would have a devastating and permanent effect on our livelihood and the safety of our cattle and the meat they provide. In light of this unrecoverable impact from contamination of our lakes, the ditch and our water well, I would request that the drill site on Section 11 be moved to another location, such as Highway 52 or 287.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Crestone Peak Resources	Health & Safety Concerns	Health & Safety
11/9/2017 21:17	Lafayette CO 80026	<p>No fracking anywhere! It is dangerous to our health it poisons the waters it pollutes the air it poisons the land. Other countries ban it entirely And for the same reasons. People are valued much more than profits of the oil and gas industry. We must transition to clean energy.</p>	Boulder County Rules & Processes	Health & Safety Concerns	Siting
11/9/2017 21:55	Erie CO 80516	<p>I would like to support the plan proposed in the letter to Crestone written by Matt Sura on behalf of the Kenosha Road Property Owners. The proposed plan to focus pad sites on Highway 52 solves many problems and would ease all the concerns I have by eliminating the Section 11 site. Highway 52 is more feasible for truck traffic and construction access. The noise, odor and dust pollution would have less of an impact on our neighborhoods and</p>	Crestone Peak Resources		Siting

		farms by placing the sites on Highway 52. The wildlife and agriculture impact is too severe on the Section 11 site. The Highway 52 proposal is a good solution.			
11/9/2017 22:26	Erie, CO 80516	I just wanted to say THANK YOU for providing our community, available, affordable, abundant energy. While others in my community, the NIMBY crowd complains, I am grateful that what you do makes a difference in our community by providing jobs and helping the poor in our community be able to afford energy and not make choices between other necessities. Keep up the great work you do and the silent majority appreciate the women and men of Crestone.	Crestone Peak Resources	Support for CDP	Siting
11/9/2017 22:42	Longmont, CO 80504	As a resident of Boulder County, I pay a premium to live here, and greatly enjoy the beauty of the landscape and sweeping vistas of the Rocky Mountains. The drilling for oil and gas negates what I enjoy and pay dearly for. I will say for the record that I oppose all drilling in the county, but if it must occur, then I ask Crestone to use the Highway 52 corridor for all well pads, as they are industrial sites. This keeps traffic on major transportation routes and reduces disturbance to residential areas and productive farmlands. This will help strike a balance between oil and gas development and the health and safety of the citizens of Boulder County.			Traffic/Access
11/9/2017 23:47	Longmont, CO 80504	My name is Sonya Lewis. I am a mineral rights AND surface rights owner on Oxford Road in Section 25 of the Crestone CDP. I appreciate the commitment of the COGCC to incorporate Citizen input in Gas and Oil development in our neighborhoods and near our homes. Upfront, I must state I am opposed to all new drilling in Boulder County. I do understand there are long standing leases in the County. Crestone's Plan to locate 2 Large Production pads on Oxford Road would, forever destroy the Quiet and Secluded Owl, Hawk and Eagle living, hunting and breeding zone. It is also a major Bird and Bat migration route in Spring and Fall. Oxford Road has several Colorado legacy family farms, new Organic farms and a large majority of the area is Boulder County Open Space. If Crestone is allowed to turn Oxford Road into a Loud and Noisy Industrial complex, with construction which has been estimated to take 6 to 10 years, it will be almost impossible to return the road to its pristine agricultural and natural habitat. Oxford Road is not designed for heavy traffic, there are no shoulders, the road is narrow and many Bicycle Clubs use Oxford as their route for training, fundraising and athletic competition. The Venus de Miles, national bike fundraiser for Breast Cancer is just one example of the recreational use on Oxford Rd. The Heavy Duty truck traffic from Pad Construction will make that use next to impossible. My family and I understand Crestone has committed to fixing all of the problems that have occurred in Erie with the Production Pad construction. But, Crestone has had over a year to make these changes and we have seen no sign of true commitment to these promises. We are, in agreement with the Colorado DPHE, which states that Crestone should consolidate and move the Production Pads to an Industrial zoned area like Highway 52. We know Crestone has the technology to do it. We ask that Pads on Highway 52 be enlarged and consolidated to take the place of the pads on Oxford. If Crestone agrees to these recommendations by Citizens groups, Neighborhood Associations, and State Agencies, I am sure the Crestone will be able to begin Construction and Production faster, cheaper and smoother than if the Plan ignores what appears to be unanimous agreement that ALL Pads should be located on Highway 52. Thank You	COGCC Rules & Processes	Support for CDP	Siting
11/10/2017 7:39	Erie, CO 80516	My property is located equidistant from the proposed well pads in Sections 11 and 1. I also wholly support the Kenosha RPO suggestion, and the CDPHE agreement to move the pad in Section 11 to Hwy 52. Kenosha Rd, 119th and 115th is far too small of roads to handle this type of truck traffic. Additionally, placing new pipelines a mere feet from a largely populated area, and in-between these homes, is an extremely irresponsible business practice. Additionally, I want to express my extreme concern over the placement of the multi-well pad in Section 1. This section is in a floodplain. A floodplain that FLOODED with our recent 2013 floods. During these floods, there are images are floating O&G tanks and storage tanks that were lifted off their base. One of these images is likely even from the drill site at Lombardi, Kenosha and County Line...less than a mile from the proposed site in Section 1. Are you aware that some communities in Texas have decided to not allow drilling in floodplains because it is unsafe and they do not want to cause an environmental disaster, and contamination of downstream water in the event of a flood? Please, do the right thing for the environment. NO DRILLING IN FLOODPLAINS.	Oil and Gas Development	Health & Safety Concerns	Siting
11/10/2017 8:34	Longmont, CO 80504	I wish to record my concerns and objections to some of the comments submitted by Kent Kuster of the Colorado Dept. of Public Health and Environment. In the paragraph headed "Location of well sites" CDPHE recommends moving the section 11 pad up to Hwy 52. I	Hydraulic Fracturing (Fracking)	Property Values and Land Use	Siting

		<p>support that recommendation. However, they omit any reference to the pads in 2N-69W sections 25 & 26. CDPHE may not be aware that there is a population density in the northern part of the CDP as well. CDPHE states the COGCC should become involved with Crestone and Extraction in surface use discussions "...to overcome this issue and locate the MAJORITY of the proposed well sites to the Highway 52 corridor" (emphasis mine). It cannot just be a majority. All pads in the southern (section 11) and northern (sections 25, 26) extremes of the CDP area must be evaluated for relocation along Hwy. 52.</p> <p>The suggestions within the paragraph headed "Remote fracing operations" are absolutely unacceptable to the residents in the northern sections of the CDP area. CDPHE is recommending the use of remote fracking with the fracking operations located at 2 "central" locations; one at Hwy 52 and "one in the northern part of 2N 69W" (I don't know how the latter qualifies as being "central"). Again, CDPHE appears to be unaware that there is significant residential development in the northern part of 2N 69W! The comments further state, "Moving these operations as far as possible from residents will reduce the impacts from noise, odors and truck traffic." There are already 2 pads proposed for the northern part of 2N 69W and CDPHE recommends moving fracking operations, NOT "as far as possible from residents", but actually CLOSER to the residents in 2N 69W sections 25-27! I remind CDPHE that the CDP area consists of 2 areas of population density; one in the southern end and southeastern corner of the 12 sq. mi. rectangle, and the other in the central northern end of the area.</p> <p>Having one of these pads hosting a remote fracking operation will double, maybe triple, either the duration, or level of noise, and traffic impacts in the area. I remind the COGCC that the residents in the northern extreme of the CDP area are already being subjected to the insult of 4 years of construction, drilling, and completions from the 2 proposed pads Crestone has proposed. Additional impacts will occur, in either duration or level, from possible pad(s) on the north side of Oxford Rd. due to 8 North's DSU application. The idea of moving even more fracking operations to the northern CDP area is beyond comprehension, and offensive to all the residents who live here!</p> <p>I do support the other CDPHE recommendations regarding, pipeline installation, use of electrical drilling equipment, odor suppression, infrared cameras for leak detection, and abandoning and plugging of vertical wells.</p>			
11/10/2017 9:48	Erie, CO 80516	<p>I am deeply concerned about the Crestone proposed pipeline route, which borders an existing neighborhood in Erie. The noise, disruption, danger to pedestrians and increased traffic would negatively impact the neighborhoods involved, and create huge problems for residents. This pipeline should be located in a less populated area; the better solution is to place this pipeline along the south side of Hwy 52, a sparsely populated and easily accessible area for Crestone's needs.</p>	Crestone Peak Resources	Health & Safety Concerns	Siting
11/10/2017 11:50	Boulder, CO 80302	<p>The City of Boulder (the City) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the first draft of the Preliminary CDP package and anticipates providing additional comments as the CDP process progresses, as well as during Boulder County's Special Use Review process. The City's comments are provided both as a landowner within the CDP, as well as a local government with public interests within the area. The City also respectfully requests to be notified of any surveying (including via drone) or seismic testing involving the City's property.</p> <p>The City owns Boulder County parcel number 146501000014 at 11910 Mineral Rd, and it is managed by the City's Utilities department as part of the municipal water system (the CDP application mistakenly states that the ponds within the entire CDP are used for crop irrigation). This property is also encumbered by a conservation easement held by Boulder County Parks and Open Space (BCPOS) and the City and BCPOS are currently coordinating on a feasibility study to inform the near-term development of the water storage facilities on the site for municipal purposes. The City anticipates, at a minimum, improvements to the ponds, including possible enlargement and lining, and construction of a surface channel and outlet structure to Boulder Creek, as well as access needs that could be impacted by the current pipeline alignment proposed in the CDP. The City's planned development and use of its property as part of its municipal water system could impact, and be impacted by, Crestone's operations on the adjacent property, as well as the directional drilling under the property. The City is also concerned about potential groundwater, hydrologic and water quality impacts, subsidence and seismic activities and the use of hazardous materials in such close proximity to (and in some cases under) several important water resources, including these ponds and Boulder Creek. Any impacts to water quality would be detrimental to the City's ability to use the water stored on the property as intended.</p> <p>This City's property is within Section 1, which as stated in the application is within an environmentally sensitive area. The City believes the applicant has not adequately addressed potential impacts or mitigation measures related to</p>			

		<p>the nearby heron rookeries, bald eagle nesting sites, or operations within the floodplain. This property was heavily damaged and eroded during the 2013 flood when the Boulder Creek channel changed course. The property also has an active grazing lease (managed by BCPOS) that would likely be impacted by the industrial activities on the adjacent lands.</p> <p>The City also holds and utilizes important water rights in the vicinity of the proposed development activities and notes that there is minimal information related to mitigation of impacts to the ditch infrastructure in the CDP area, water rights or the local water resources that will be used in the drilling operations.</p> <p>Furthermore, considering the scale of this proposed development, the City does not believe the Preliminary CDP package effectively addresses air, water, seismic and public health impacts from the proposed large-scale industrial operations or ways to mitigate or avoid impacts.</p> <p>City of Boulder 1777 Broadway Boulder, CO 80302</p>			
11/10/2017 12:09	Longmont, CO 80501	No Fracking	Hydraulic Fracturing (Fracking)	Health & Safety Concerns	Health & Safety
11/10/2017 13:19	Boulder, CO 80306	Boulder County submitted comments regarding Crestone Peak's First Draft Preliminary CDP via email to COGCC staff on Friday, 11/10. Due to their length, Boulder County's comments (7 pages) were emailed to COGCC staff directly rather than pasted into the public comment portal, but we request that they be posted on COGCC's website, as well. Thank you.			
11/10/2017 13:55	Lafayette CO 80026	I am opposed to the Boulder CDP given the size and impact it will have on the environment and wildlife. In particular Section 11. The proposed access road as well as the site are unnecessary given the fact that the same may be accomplished along hwy 52 with much less impact. Even the COGCC recognizes this and makes that recommendation. Please reconsider in light of this.			
11/10/2017 15:13	Erie, CO 80516	I have great concerns about the proposed drilling at the section 11 pad. The drilling around Kenosha Farm is becoming excessive in our environment and are beginning to impact property values. The opportunity for sink holes and affecting water quality greatly increases with every oil well. Laura	Hydraulic Fracturing (Fracking)	Health & Safety Concerns	Health & Safety
11/10/2017 15:46	Erie, CO 80516	<p>We have been subjected to two fracking operations in the near distance to our home and community in the past years. The most recent operated from Jan - Aug. 2017</p> <p>We were not able to enjoy open windows at night because of the smell and noise. We could not use our porch and deck in the evenings because of the odor. That site was a mile away. I filed multiple complaints about the smell and noise keeping us awake at night.</p> <p>Please find a location further away from us and avoid putting in pipelines around us as well.</p> <p>I am certain that you could locate both the wells and pipelines away from the only subdivision in the 12 square miles you want to locate your wells.</p> <p>My comments relate to health, safety, noise, odor, wildlife and property values affecting my home in the Kenosha Farms subdivision.</p>	Crestone Peak Resources	Health & Safety Concerns	Noise
11/10/2017 15:57	Erie, CO	As a property owner near the proposed Section 11 drilling pad, I'm requesting that Crestone consider an alternative site on the south side of Highway 52. This would eliminate the need for the pipeline segment through a quiet residential neighborhood to a sparsely populated area along the already busy hwy corridor.	Oil and Gas Development	Property Values and Land Use	Siting
11/10/2017 16:03	Erie, CO 80516	<p>Location of Section 11 pipeline. I am very concerned that Crestone is choosing to align their pipeline through several communities out to County Line Road, when they could go west and impact far fewer residents. Also, as usual (unfortunately), Crestone has failed to advise us in writing of this plan, and their map gives no indication of the direction and length of the fracking lines. How can the COGCC allow Crestone to provide limited data and fail to advise the impacted neighborhoods, then expect to receive permission to proceed.</p> <p>Our neighborhood (Kenosha Farms) has already experienced Crestone's cavalier attitude of ignoring the impact on the neighborhood. Over 10 years ago, Crestone (the Encana) drilled adjacent to our community, and even today, they have failed to restore this area as required by the COGCC regulations. In the past 2 years, the COGCC has finally engaged to force them to address this, but I believe they are still far from restoring this area to the 80-90% of adjacent condition.</p> <p>I would ask the COGCC demand Crestone to meet the restoration obligations open, and any other unmet</p>	Other	Infrastructure	Siting

		<p>requirements at other sites before any further drilling requests are considered.</p> <p>I am also very concerned with the traffic coming from these sites. Section 1, 3, and 35 well sites indicate that all the access will be from Hiway 52. This road is already at capacity, especially in the AM going west and the PM going east. There must be specific regulations on time of day and direction of entering and leaving these sites to mitigate the new demands that this drilling will bring to these roads.</p> <p>I am also concerned that the road traffic from the Section 11 site will feed into Road 119 to the north, then east of Kenosha Road to County Line Road. This will also create access issues to our neighborhoods with this increased traffic.</p> <p>Sound mitigation at Section 11 site is also of concern. The recently completed large site near Kenosha Road and County Line Road did not have adequate sound mitigation. It is wrong that these sites, when near residences, are allowed "Industrial sound levels" of 80 DB. This has been disruptive for the whole time this site was drilled, and now, they propose 36 new well sites, perhaps even closer to our house.</p> <p>The design of your questionnaire also resents a biased view. For example, on your second "General Category of Comment" , you offer a "support for CDP", should you not also have a "DO NOT SUPPORT CDP"? I expect the COGCC to equally represent the surface right owners as a state agency and not tilt your surveys to one side or the other. Furthermore, why not allow multiple choice others in General Topic? Again this is biased toward to applicant and incomplete in representing and obtaining feedback from the land owners.</p> <p>The same is true for all the general topic sections to are looking at. In most cases, I am sure, surface right owners would want COGCC to understand there for each topic there are multiple levels of concern.</p> <p>You have failed in developing a survey that will allow the public to adequately respond with the "Optional" section that will then, most likely, provide statistical facts to the COGCC board which will minimize the comments received for each section since only one topic can be selected.</p>			
11/10/2017 17:40	Erie, CO 80516	Please relocate the proposed wellpad in section 11 closer to highway 52. Don't lay a pipeline in my neighborhood. Don't lay a pipeline in a flood zone. Don't drill within a mile of neighborhoods.	Crestone Peak Resources	Health & Safety Concerns	Siting
11/10/2017 19:12	Longmont CO 80504	The Colorado state regulations with respect to oil and gas development are no longer adequate to protect residents. I am referring to the two pads proposed by Crestone on Oxford Road in Boulder County. Residents of Boulder County agreed to have their tax dollars used to acquire lands to be used as open space. The old television ads saying well pads had a small impact of a double car garage may have been correct when they aired. Former governors' comments on TV ads that Colorado has some of the strictest regulations does not mean that those regulations are currently satisfactory. In this new era of oil and gas development, residents will be subjected 24/7 to noise, odor, traffic, light, chemical, sight, and home valuation impacts for years at a time. This is an agricultural, residential, and open space area that should be preserved by moving the proposed well pads to a more appropriate area such as the Highway 52 area.	COGCC Rules & Processes	Property Values and Land Use	Siting
11/10/2017 20:29	Erie, CO 80516	<p>I am very concerned about a portion of the route of the proposed new pipeline serving Section 11 (36 wells). The drilling site is west of N. 119th St, and north of Jasper Road. The proposed pipeline goes east across N 119th St on agricultural land. The proposed route then turns north, through Town of Erie dedicated open space on the western side of the Kenosha Farms subdivision (i.e. west of Banner Circle and Cooke Ct). That area is very narrow (less than 150 feet), contains a robust crop of native grasses, and is non irrigated; there is also a popular soft surfaced trail. The proposed route then turns eastward, directly behind the homes on the north side of Banner Circle, until it reaches Lombardi Drive. The map indicates it would be adjacent to the soft surfaced path, and very close to the rear of the homeowner lots. Lastly, the route turns northward to Kenosha Road, located within more open space and a detention pond</p> <p>I have multiple concerns about the portion that goes through the Town of Erie dedicated open space:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Destruction of native grasslands in dedicated open space:. Constructing that pipeline will annihilate those grasses, which are very difficult to reestablish once destroyed. Witness the existing weed patch at the south end of Lombard, which Crestone has been unable to rehabilitate. I believe that area is their Allen 23-12 and 24-12 well sites. 2. Impact of homeowners and recreationists during the construction: There are 29 homes on the west side of Cooke Ct and Banner Circle. There are 26 additional homes on the north side of Banner Circle. As stated above, that open 	Crestone Peak Resources	Property Values and Land Use	Siting

		<p>space area very narrow. I estimate that the pipeline would be within 50 feet of the property line of those homes, and probably less than 100 feet from the homes themselves, since the lots are small (typically 7,500 square feet). Since that area is so narrow, undoubtedly the trail would be closed during construction.</p> <p>3. Possible safety concerns: I am aware that ruptures and explosions of underground pipelines rarely occur. But “rarely” does not mean “never”. Witness the recent incident in Firestone.</p> <p>Given the above problems, the rational solution is to find an alternative route. Fortunately, I believe there 2 options. To me, the best is east to County Line Rd, then north to the intersection of County Line Road and Weld County Road 10 ½, where there is a new pipeline serving the recently drilled Willy Sosa site. There is a high tension power transmission line that runs due east to County Line Rd. from where the currently proposed pipeline turns north behind Cooke Ct and Banner Circle. South of the transmission line is Lower Boulder Ditch. No homes have been, nor will be, built under that transmission line, nor between the power line and the Ditch. The limited homes north of the power line are much further away than those along the route currently proposed. Also, there are NO homes on the west side, and 1 home on the east side, of County Line Road where I propose rerouting the pipeline. Finally, there are multiple existing Crestone sites that could be connected to the new pipeline if that were preferable and/or necessary in the future. Those sites are Allen23-12 and 24-12, Bailey 33-12, Allen H Unit 1, and Wiggett 13-2. In conclusion, my proposal is infinitely less problematic than the Crestone proposal.</p> <p>The second option is north on N. 119th St., then east on Kenosha Road to County Line Road. I counted the number of homes on those roads as follows: 1. 4 on the west side of N 119th St.; 2. 7 on the west side of N 119th St.; 3. 2 on the south side of Kenosha Rd. Those homes are much further from the road than the homes on Banner Circle and Cooke Ct are to the current proposal. Thus the number of homes impacted is few, and the impact would be substantially less than the current proposal.</p>			
11/10/2017 21:32	Longmont, CO 80504	<p>CDPHE states the COGCC should become involved with Crestone and Extraction in surface use discussions "...to overcome this issue and locate the majority of the proposed well sites to the Highway 52 corridor" In the paragraph headed "Location of well sites" CDPHE recommends moving the section 11 pad up to Hwy 52. I support that recommendation. Additionally I recommend that sections 25 and 26 be moved to Hwy 52 for the same reasons. There is a large population density in the northern part of the CDP as well as the south. All pads in the southern (section 11) and northern (sections 25, 26) extremes of the CDP area must be evaluated for relocation along Hwy 52 due to the density of housing. The suggestions within the paragraph headed "Remote fracing operations" are absolutely unacceptable to the residents in the northern sections of the CDP area. CDPHE is recommending the use of remote fracking with the fracking operations located at 2 "central" locations; one at Hwy 52 and "one in the northern part of 2N 69W". Due to the dense residential population on/near Oxford Rd this is not an acceptable location. The comments further state, "Moving these operations as far as possible from residents will reduce the impacts from noise, odors and truck traffic." I agree, which is why I do not believe locating these operations off of Oxford Rd is an acceptable location. The recommendations do not move these operations farther from residents, but actually CLOSER to families with small children as well as elderly residents with compromised health! Having one of these pads hosting a remote fracking operation will increase the level of noise, and traffic impacts in the area to an unacceptable level for residential living. Additionally, there may be further impacts from possible pad(s) on the north side of Oxford Rd. due to 8 North's DSU application. The idea of moving even more fracking operations to the northern CDP area is beyond comprehension, and offensive to all the residents who live here. I am in support of the other CDPHE recommendations regarding, pipeline installation, use of electrical drilling equipment, odor suppression, infrared cameras for leak detection, and abandoning and plugging of vertical wells.</p>	Hydraulic Fracturing (Fracking)	Health & Safety Concerns	Siting
11/11/2017 10:47	Erie, CO 80516	<p>Instead of impacting our backyards with the proposed pipeline, why can't Crestone go straight south and turn right, going straight west to Section 11 with the 36 wells. There would be many fewer people having to deal with the horrible fumes and noise our neighborhood dealt with for MONTHS from the end of last year until July of this year. Figure out a way to stay away from our neighborhoods.</p>	Oil and Gas Development	Property Values and Land Use	Health & Safety
11/11/2017 10:53	Longmont, CO 80504	<p>Thank you for providing a place for comments. My family and I were significantly affected by the flood in 2013 and are concerned that while your section 11 proposal is technically out of the flood plain, that it is not the safest of choices in placement based on our experience with this location. We support oil and gas development but would prefer that it is located on Highway 52 to accommodate the traffic. We own irrigation rights in the ditch that runs</p>	Oil and Gas Development	Property Values and Land Use	Health & Safety

		along the proposed access road to section 11 and are concerned about that impact of our agricultural operations as well. We also have concerns about the impact of drilling so close to us based upon health reasons. My wife has severe allergies from petroleum products. She is extremely sensitive to odors that can affect her health, sometimes in a severe manner. No matter the precautions taken issues will arise regarding fumes & odors. Please consider taking section 11 out of your plans due to the impact on our health & well being. Thank you for your consideration of removing section 11 and locating your sites to highway 52.			
11/11/2017 17:09	Erie, CO 80516	I strongly object to Section 11 pad location and the pipeline. 36 wells less than 1/2 mile from dense residential areas and schools can and should be avoided. In addition, a new pipeline snaked mere feet from homes through the middle of a residential neighborhood is irresponsible and will be very dangerous and disruptive.	Oil and Gas Development	Health & Safety Concerns	Health & Safety