

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]
11/29/2017 9:29:08	80516	I'm concerned about the proposed wells along the hwy 287 corridor. The current plan appears to locate these wells right in the middle of residential neighborhoods and various local governments have requested that the wells be moved to a location closer to 287 where they will have significantly less impact on residents. As a homeowner and resident in the proposed area, I agree that this seems like a far better plan and wonder why it's not being pursued in more depth.	Oil and Gas Development	Health & Safety Concerns	Siting
11/29/2017 10:48:36	Erie, Co 80516	Please move this away from my neighborhood, Kenosha Farm and closer to hwy 52.	Crestone Peak Resources	Health & Safety Concerns	Health & Safety
11/29/2017 11:55:36	80516	I'm a surface owner in your proposed CDP. I live less than 50 yards away from your planned pipeline. The practice of hydraulic fracture drilling is inherently toxic, leaving a poison trail of well-documented infractions and accidents that demonstrate the risks to public safety. In light of these events, I want to go on record to say this drilling activity is not conducted for the benefit of jobs or energy independence; it's conducted for profit. Why else would you continue with this proposal after thousands of protest emails, phone calls, and responses like this one? I can attest to Crestone's track record of public information negligence. The reverse callback meeting in October was a sham. 39 of 700 invitees responded? [expletive]. I registered and never got the call, and my two phone calls to Crestone to report that were never returned. Crestone answers to their investors and no one else, certainly not to the people who have to live near their toxic activities. DO NOT DRILL IN COMMUNITIES!	Hydraulic Fracturing (Fracking)	Health & Safety Concerns	Health & Safety
11/29/2017 15:31:03	Boulder, CO 80301	This is to state for the record the Sierra Club's opposition to this plan for all of the reasons described in our November 8, 2017 comments and attachments.	Crestone Peak Resources	Health & Safety Concerns	Health & Safety

<p>12/3/2017 11:24</p>	<p>Longmont, CO 80504</p>	<p>I would like to commend Crestone for undertaking a review and analysis of the oil and gas locations in light of the feedback from the first CDP preliminary draft. As a resident in the Oxford Road area where we are facing the potential of 3 large oil and gas locations, 2 from Crestone, and 1 from 8 North, I would like to reiterate my firm request that Crestone and the COGCC do everything possible to relocate the proposed locations to Hwy 52. The total impact to Boulder County residents will be reduced due primarily to the greatly reduced number of occupied buildings along the Hwy 52 corridor as compared to both the Oxford Rd. area in the northern sections and the Kenosha Rd./119th St. area in the southern end.</p> <p>With reference to the 2nd draft I am very dismayed that the COGCC proceeded with the publication of this document and is conducting the comment period before Crestone's location review has been completed and published. It appears that we will not see the results of the review prior to the closing of the comment period on December 8th which means that all stakeholders have been deprived of an opportunity to comment on those results during this review cycle. This does not "facilitate discussions" as stated in the purpose for Rule 216.</p> <p>COGCC's own document, CDP Plan Elements, states that oil and gas locations are to be defined in the preliminary draft. Given that this is the last version of the preliminary draft, and that the proposed locations are essentially unknown to the stakeholders due to the ongoing review, this COGCC requirement will not be satisfied.</p> <p>I request that the CDP timeline be extended to allow for the re-opening of the 2nd preliminary draft comment period for 7 days after Crestone has completed and published its oil and gas location review.</p>	<p>COGCC Rules & Processes</p>	<p>CDP Process</p>	<p>Siting</p>
<p>12/3/2017 13:09</p>	<p>Longmont CO 80504</p>	<p>I support moving the proposed drilling operations outlined by Crestone Peak to the Hwy 52 corriador. Containing noise, odors, artificial light sources, and potential health risks to areas along the highway will protect the health and we'll being of residents in the CDP area. Our area has been used as an agricultural stronghold in Boulder County and is not an appropriate location for industrial oil and gas development.</p>	<p>Oil and Gas Development</p>	<p>Property Values and Land Use</p>	<p>Siting</p>

<p>12/3/2017 18:50</p>	<p>Longmont CO 80504</p>	<p>CRESTONE PEAK RESOURCES SECOND DRAFT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE DRILLING PLAN: BOULDER COUNTY COLORADO; COMMENTS</p> <p>COMPREHENSIVE: adj. of large scope; covering or involving much; inclusive; Random House Dictionary of the English Language</p> <p>This is a poorly prepared, unprofessional and incomplete plan that should be totally rejected. The COGCC should require Crestone Peak to start over. This report is so poorly done it makes me very nervous that 72 wells could be drilled and fracked on either side of my neighborhood by people who cannot even prepare a report. Crestone has generated more complaints than any other driller in Colorado partially due to poor practices and trying to force an industrial use within close proximity of residential neighborhoods. Almost all of these issues would be avoided if Crestone puts all their pads on Highway 52 where they belong. With higher ambient noise levels, easy truck access, fewer residences the COGCC and Crestone will not have to be subject to angry neighbors whose lives have been completely disrupted and their homes invaded by noise, smells and dust. The Highway 52 alternative will consolidate the recovery of the CDP oil and gas resources and the attendant pipelines and ongoing monitoring and maintenance. The majority of my concerns and comments below would be alleviated with the Highway 52 Alternative.</p> <p>PROPOSED PAD SITES: There has been no geologic, scientific or locational reasons given for the proposed pad sites. Other sites within the CDP area are available with similar conditions but were not evaluated in the plan. There are no alternative plans given for the pad site locations. Crestone acknowledges, in several places, that the majority of comments on the first draft request that all the pads be located along Highway 52 which runs through the center of the CDP area. The Kenosha Road Property Owners submitted, within the last comment period, two alternative pad siting maps. Why aren't they listed as alternative sites that Crestone will look at? All Crestone says is that they did not have time to review the use of Highway 52 and they would look into the matter. How do we know they will look into this if they do not show any alternate plan? Or give a thorough alternative site plan analysis? Why is the proposed pad in Section 26 located on land that Crestone does not have a leasehold on? I may be reading their leasehold map wrong; the maps provided with this report are very unclear and of poor quality. They show leasehold lands along Highway 287, put the pad there. Crestone identifies the agricultural land under the proposed pad in Section 26 as Lands of National Significance and the agricultural land under the proposed pad in Section 25 as agricultural land of State Wide Significance. There will be significant land lost to agricultural purposes. Crestone has never responded to the numerous requests for their reasoning of placing three major pads within residential areas when there are suitable places outside residential zones. As we have all seen in Erie and Greely this use is not compatible with residential uses.</p> <p>TRAFFIC: How are those of us affected by this plan supposed to comment on the traffic impact if Crestone will not provide a traffic study? We have no idea of the magnitude of what could be a very significant impact. Are there going to be 50 truck trips per day? 100? 150? All the time? Twenty-four hours a day? What route are they taking along Oxford Road? Will we be able to even get out of our neighborhood? Will 10 trucks be backed up at the intersection of 287 and Oxford because they cannot turn left or cross the Highway? What will these trucks be carrying? What will happen if something spills that is toxic? Who will clean it up and remediate if necessary? Several years ago there was a silica spill on Niwot Road within the CDP and NO ONE took responsibility for it. What are the emergency plans if this occurs?</p> <p>EMERGENCY PLANS: Where is the plan? What happens if something blows up? We have lightning strikes out here, my house was hit before the trees grew tall, and the house across the street (to the East) removed a tree this past spring that was killed by a strike from last year. Can anything explode if the Pads are hit? If this CDP report was complete we would have answers to these very important questions. It is not your house or neighborhood that will be impacted it is ours.</p> <p>MINERAL RIGHTS: Boulder County has requested proof and location of Crestone's mineral rights for months now. This should be a very easy piece of data to provide if Crestone has the right to drill within the CDP area. I still do not see any indication of their right to drill and mineral owners within Sections 26 and 25 have not even been contacted by Crestone. Is this</p>	<p>Crestone Peak Resources</p>	<p>Health & Safety Concerns</p>	<p>Siting</p>
----------------------------	------------------------------	---	--------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------

		<p>plan even legal?</p> <p>WATER SOURCE: Who and where is the water source for this proposal? What depth are the wells that Crestone will be drawing water from? Will this huge rapid draw down effect my irrigation well? Will my well dry up? If it does who is going to compensate me? How do I prove it was Crestone’s excessive use of water that caused the loss of my well? We can only run our sprinkles for 1 hour 15 minutes twice a day since the cistern requires 12 hours to refill. Not very good flow.</p> <p>WILDLIFE: Who prepared this study? If Crestone does not list the author how do we know a qualified consultant prepared this information? They state they came out and did field studies (no description of methods or duration thereof) in the areas of the proposed pad locations yet they show on their map that they do not know what is in Sections 26 and 25. If they do not know what is there how can Crestone and the COGCC conclude that there is not an impact to wildlife? At the eastern edge of Oxford Farms HOA, which is between the Section 26 and Section 25 pads, we have, at the least, 1 red-tail hawk nest, 1 great horned owl nest, 1 screech owl nest, at least 1 barn owl nest, we see bald eagles regularly fly over our house. There are 2 red-tail hawks who sit on the power poles across Oxford Road everyday adjacent to the proposed pad 26 location as well as a kestrel. I personally have seen Ferruginous Hawks in the area just north of the Section 26 pad yet your wildlife study says they are not here. I have also seen Swanson’s hawks north of Section 26. (Yes I am qualified to recognize these birds). My suspicion is that the red fox is trying to move back in after the coyotes displaced them several years ago. The rabbit population is declining and I saw what could have been fox tracks this last winter. Again lack of credible information.</p> <p>PAD LOCATIONS IN THE FUTURE: There is no information on what these pads will look like for the next 30 to 50 years. They will be quite large as I understand. Will they landscaped so they fit in to the landscape since the agricultural use will be lost? What I have seen in Weld County looks just like an industrial site, which it is, not like the open space it is now. Who will maintain these eyesores? Do they just become weedy abandoned looking industrial sites? Is Crestone being required to post a bond that will insure future maintenance? How does Crestone and the COGCC insure that these sites will not be tampered with? If hit by lightning will anything blow up? Crestone does not even mention possible future re-fracking of these well pads. What will that look and sound like? How long will it take? How will the noise, traffic, smells be handled then?</p> <p>COMMENTS ON FIRST DRAFT: I attended the only public hearing held on October 18 and made comments. I registered for the so-called phone hearing on November 2. I was not called and since Crestone never sent information on how to call in on that night I had to go to my neighbor and get a phone number to call. I missed a significant portion of this whatever it was supposed to be. I know of many people who registered and were not called and many who received notice the day after the event. I made comments during the Nov 2 call in and have never been invited to a one on one with Mr. Oates and Ms. Jost. Maybe if Crestone and Ms. Jost offered true public face to face hearings for everyone within the CDP they would hear from a significant number of people.</p> <p>SUMMARY: Crestone and the COGCC cannot expect a valid review of such an incomplete plan as Crestone has submitted. Crestone keeps saying they want a transparent process and to be a good neighbor. Transparency means showing all the information needed to make constructive criticism’s, it means giving all the information available to make informed decisions as to impacts and possible mitigation measures. Being a good neighbor means sharing what we can expect and being willing to hear our concerns. This not just a temporary process. Along Oxford Road what Crestone alone is proposing will mean at least 4 years of very significant disruption of our lives and long lasting loss of the environmental factors that made us choose to live in this area of Boulder County. Every time we drive down Oxford Road for the next 30 to 50 years we will see industrial sites instead of agricultural open space. For the COGCC to view this as just a temporary disruption is unconscionable.</p> <p>The CDP process was supposed to allow for a Comprehensive Plan of drilling large areas. It was supposed to involve the public and help reduce the complaints and impacts of landowners in the drilling area. Crestone has not</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

		<p>met any of the criteria of the CDP process and the COGCC should deny this plan and demand that it be done right. As I have said before, I recognize that in the current political reality of Colorado oil and gas has all the rights and I have very few. I recognize Crestone's right to drill and extract but I also expect the COGCC to uphold the State's mandate which is: "COGCC is charged with fostering the responsible development of Colorado's oil and gas natural resources in a manner consistent with the protection of public health, safety and welfare, including the environment and wildlife resources."</p> <p>Respectfully submitted by: Jan L Wilson 7557 Rodeo Drive Longmont CO 80504</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

<p>12/5/2017 9:37</p>	<p>Longmont, CO 80504</p>	<p>I would like to commend Crestone for undertaking a review and analysis of the oil and gas locations in light of the feedback from the first CDP preliminary draft. As a resident in the Oxford Road area where we are facing the potential of 3 large oil and gas locations, 2 from Crestone, and 1 from 8 North, I would like to reiterate my firm request that Crestone and the COGCC do everything possible to relocate the proposed locations to Hwy 52. The total impact to Boulder County residents will be reduced due primarily to the greatly reduced number of occupied buildings along the Hwy 52 corridor as compared to both the Oxford Rd. area in the northern sections and the Kenosha Rd./119th St. area in the southern end.</p> <p>With reference to the 2nd draft I am very dismayed that the COGCC proceeded with the publication of this document and is conducting the comment period before Crestone's location review has been completed and published. It appears that we will not see the results of the review prior to the closing of the comment period on December 8th which means that all stakeholders have been deprived of an opportunity to comment on those results during this review cycle. This does not "facilitate discussions" as stated in the purpose for Rule 216.</p> <p>COGCC's own document, CDP Plan Elements, states that oil and gas locations are to be defined in the preliminary draft. Given that this is the last version of the preliminary draft, and that the proposed locations are essentially unknown to the stakeholders due to the ongoing review, this COGCC requirement will not be satisfied.</p> <p>I request that the CDP timeline be extended to allow for the re-opening of the 2nd preliminary draft comment period for 7 days after Crestone has completed and published its oil and gas location review.</p>	<p>Crestone Peak Resources</p>	<p>CDP Process</p>	<p>Health & Safety</p>
---------------------------	-------------------------------	--	--------------------------------	--------------------	----------------------------

<p>12/6/2017 16:31</p>	<p>Longmont, CO, 80504</p>	<p>I have stated before, in the stakeholders meeting on October 18, 2017 and in written comment to the first draft of Crestone’s CDP, that I believe locating wells near State Highway 52 (Mineral Road) is the most appropriate way to extract oils from the area. I wish to reiterate that alternative.</p> <p>I have prepared annotated satellite photos available from Google to investigate the Highway 52 alternate. These show the number of residences within 2/3 mile from Crestone’s proposed well pads in sections 25 and 26. I prepared other figures which show the number of residences within 2/3 mile from alternative well pad locations along Highway 52. My intent was to include these annotated satellite photos with this comment, but I was unable to find a way to do this on the public comment portal. I have forwarded copies of the photos to the following COGCC emails: john.noto@state.co.us and rebecca.treitz@state.co.us</p> <p>I found there are 43 residences within 2/3 mile of the well pad location proposed by Crestone for Section 26. My suggested alternative location in Section 35 near Highway 52, at roughly the same longitude, has 7 residences within 2/3 mile. For Section 25, there are 19 residences within 2/3 mile of Crestone’s proposed well pad. My suggested alternative location in Section 36 has 9 residences within 2/3 mile. Clearly, these proposed alternate locations pose less impact than the well locations shown in Crestone’s second draft.</p> <p>I live in the northern part of the CDP area, and only prepared figures for the northern half of the area. However, similar observations may be made for the southern portion of the CDP area; these have already been addressed by attorney Matt Sura in a letter prepared on behalf of some Kenosha Road stakeholders.</p> <p>I also point out some other reasons favoring well locations along Highway 52:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Highway 52 is a relatively busy state highway. Residents near Highway 52 are already subject to traffic and its associated noise --- more so than the areas near the northern edge of the CDP where Crestone is proposing wells. Using a downloaded noise monitor for a tablet, I found that noise levels during daylight hours outside our home in the northern part of the CDP range typically between about 42 to 55 decibels (dBa), and during night time hours are generally below 30 dBa. 2. Highway 52 is a structurally robust highway, much more so than the rural roads that would need to be used to construct and service wells in the northern part of the CDP. 3. Oil pipelines already run along Highway 52 in Weld County to the east. These pipelines could be extended westward to access wells drilled near Highway 52, rather than having to add north and south lateral pipelines as shown in Crestone’s second draft. More efficient ! 4. I believe there are other advantages to consolidating oil facilities along Highway 52, including easing access for inspections and maintenance, and minimizing traffic through other semi-rural and residential portions in the CDP area during construction, maintenance and inspection. <p>Since Crestone already indicates well bores running southward from the proposed northern well sites, and northward from their proposed southern well sites, I see no geologic reason why the wells should not be consolidated in the Highway 52 corridor.</p> <p>I noted in the second draft for Crestone’s Plan that they say they will consider locating wells along Highway 52. This is a positive indication from my viewpoint. However, they unfortunately state they have not had time to investigate this alternative yet --- disappointing. This points to the fact that the timeline for the CDP process is too compressed, and should be extended. I have noticed from the satellite photos and from driving along Highway 52 that there are already oil or gas wells near the locations I suggest as alternate well sites. This suggests that Crestone should be able to obtain surface agreements to locate wells along highway 52, although I understand such negotiations could require some time. Again, the CDP process seems too compressed.</p> <p>I request that the COGCC fulfill its mandate to protect public health and welfare, and to maximize efficiency in extracting oil. Respectfully submitted, Brian Wilson 7557 Rodeo Drive</p>	<p>Oil and Gas Development</p>	<p>Health & Safety Concerns</p>	<p>Siting</p>
----------------------------	--------------------------------	--	--------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------

<p>12/6/2017 22:37</p>	<p>Erie, CO 80516</p>	<p>My comments on the CDP second draft are basically the same as my comments on the first, as I can see very little change between the two document packages. I implore Crestone to consider consolidating and relocating the pad sites along the Mineral Road (Hwy 52) corridor between County Line Rd. and Hwy 287, in the interest of mitigating disruption to several neighborhoods near the planned pad sites. The current configuration would negatively impact established residential areas both in the northern and southern parts of the CDP area. If this cannot be accomplished, I feel that the company owes the public a thorough explanation of its siting constraints and decisions.</p> <p>Furthermore, as a surface owner who lives a scant 3/4 mile from the planned pad site in Section 11, I do NOT feel as if I've been able to effectively participate in the CDP planning process, as required per Rule 216. I was invited to only one of the three so-called "public" meetings, the last telephone meeting--and I did participate. I just don't feel that Crestone has seriously tried to solicit and act upon stakeholder considerations. This whole CDP process looks like a way to "rubber stamp" whatever Crestone decides it wants, and to streamline the permitting for the individual pads/wells when the time comes.</p> <p>And ... I understand that the company is only now conducting a comprehensive location review. Shouldn't that study have been completed before the second draft was published? Seems like Crestone is putting the cart before the horse, in that regard. Believe me, residents are extremely interested in why there are pad sites in and near flood plains--and also adjacent to our nice, quiet neighborhoods. We will be awaiting more information!</p>	<p>Crestone Peak Resources</p>	<p>CDP Process</p>	<p>Siting</p>
----------------------------	-----------------------	--	--------------------------------	--------------------	---------------

<p>12/7/2017 14:51</p>	<p>longmont, Co, 80504</p>	<p>There has NOT been adequate information sharing, and although i talked to someone about it when i heard some gossip about CDP plans for a large area last year. I called and provided all my contact info and phone number. When I last talked with your phone rep last year (there was a suggested coverage area) " and the proposed wells would not be anywhere within 2miles of my property. Then I last minute found out through another landowner that they were having a meeting but nobody could go that wasn't within some extremely short distance of not only the proposed CDP enclosure but also limited to within an extremely dangerous distance of a proposed well site or operations proposal. Your whole communication requirement and notification obligation is in violation as it seems you sent a post card to "require" me to go online and set up my contact information (contact information previously volunteered and provided to Crestone) giving me a requirement of a unreasonably short period of time that i must provide information again to be eligible to receive information, which i believe is a complete illegal violation of your requirements of notification. I called and left many messages to which your folks ignored to date. I believe this "flawed system" of Crestone's has been designed to deceive and avoid legal requirements of notification, and to create a method that leaves the requirement of full disclosure and notification to my obligation which is illegal and completely against commission rules. Further I was traveling at the time and a random post card or the hey lets be friends registered letter does not meet any sort of perceived notification requirement and basically said nothing about any specifics happening just making a requirement on me to provide Crestone something else to possibly give them a out and make it my fault and keep me in the DARK. I call "UNFAIR" on this. Further your public meeting that you limited folks that might be closer than your imposed requirement for being welcome at the meeting was skewed if they were like across the street from the proposed site but actually physically closer than my property which is eligible to attend the meetings (has there actually been a full public meeting take place ?) as i'm within the toxicity circle you require. Further my attempt to listen on phone was cut off and public meeting if you can call it that abruptly came to an end at the direction of Crestone. If you want to try to meet legal requirements better START OVER , but i assure you with the lack of compliance on Crestone methods of providing information you most likely will be busy dealing with lawsuits from that alone much less the ridiculous idea that proposing on putting 18 wells spaced on the surface at 10' from each other in a row would protect or be reasonably expected to be safe or environmentally acceptable from noise, air standards, odor, flammability, or general health and safety regulations. Every site you propose has no information provided or plan suggested to protect from the known common hazards of these sites, which to me its unacceptable and effects the safety of having a safe proposed organic/biodynamic produce facility, and complete Horse training and health facility, on my property and lets not forget about the humans who need to live there, like myself..... I officially protest this proposed and requested by Crestone action and herein provide notice thereof . When Crestone and /or the commission receives this you HAVE BEEN PUT ON NOTICE OF My Objection and protest to all Colorado Oil & Gas Commission and regulators tendered Actions and requests regarding my property and proximity thereof. Further the proposal says Crestone is trying to come up with better air quality safety methods , they don't get to experiment on us!!!! and hope for better!!!! NO WAY! Crestone Never once offered how they actually propose to get to the proposed target zone just some first grade level map with horizontal lines running one after another. What depth are you planning on crossing properties and side kick outs, so landowners know what depth you will be mining across the properties. More information and facts missing from your proposal than provided. Totally Unacceptable application and proposal. Remember Your not asking for permission to grow and harvest food (like the proposed site directly South and east of hwy's 52 /287 has been for decades) and this is on open space land. Oil, Gas, Gas condensate is not safe materials, infact Gas condensate/liquids is fully known to be horribly toxic and dangerous to human life. This So Far is just a horrifically dangerous and bad idea.</p> <p>Respectfully tendered Loren Frederick</p>	<p>COGCC Rules & Processes</p>	<p>Health & Safety Concerns</p>	<p>Health & Safety</p>
----------------------------	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	----------------------------

<p>12/7/2017 14:51</p>	<p>longmont, Co, 80504</p>	<p>There has NOT been adequate information sharing, and although i talked to someone about it when i heard some gossip about CDP plans for a large area last year. I called and provided all my contact info and phone number. When I last talked with your phone rep last year (there was a suggested coverage area) " and the proposed wells would not be anywhere within 2miles of my property. Then I last minute found out through another landowner that they were having a meeting but nobody could go that wasn't within some extremely short distance of not only the proposed CDP enclosure but also limited to within an extremely dangerous distance of a proposed well site or operations proposal. Your whole communication requirement and notification obligation is in violation as it seems you sent a post card to "require" me to go online and set up my contact information (contact information previously volunteered and provided to Crestone) giving me a requirement of a unreasonably short period of time that i must provide information again to be eligible to receive information, which i believe is a complete illegal violation of your requirements of notification. I called and left many messages to which your folks ignored to date. I believe this "flawed system" of Crestone's has been designed to deceive and avoid legal requirements of notification, and to create a method that leaves the requirement of full disclosure and notification to my obligation which is illegal and completely against commission rules. Further I was traveling at the time and a random post card or the hey lets be friends registered letter does not meet any sort of perceived notification requirement and basically said nothing about any specifics happening just making a requirement on me to provide Crestone something else to possibly give them a out and make it my fault and keep me in the DARK. I call "UNFAIR" on this. Further your public meeting that you limited folks that might be closer than your imposed requirement for being welcome at the meeting was skewed if they were like across the street from the proposed site but actually physically closer than my property which is eligible to attend the meetings (has there actually been a full public meeting take place ?) as i'm within the toxicity circle you require. Further my attempt to listen on phone was cut off and public meeting if you can call it that abruptly came to an end at the direction of Crestone. If you want to try to meet legal requirements better START OVER , but i assure you with the lack of compliance on Crestone methods of providing information you most likely will be busy dealing with lawsuits from that alone much less the ridiculous idea that proposing on putting 18 wells spaced on the surface at 10' from each other in a row would protect or be reasonably expected to be safe or environmentally acceptable from noise, air standards, odor, flammability, or general health and safety regulations. Every site you propose has no information provided or plan suggested to protect from the known common hazards of these sites, which to me its unacceptable and effects the safety of having a safe proposed organic/biodynamic produce facility, and complete Horse training and health facility, on my property and lets not forget about the humans who need to live there, like myself..... I officially protest this proposed and requested by Crestone action and herein provide notice thereof . When Crestone and /or the commission receives this you HAVE BEEN PUT ON NOTICE OF My Objection and protest to all Colorado Oil & Gas Commission and regulators tendered Actions and requests regarding my property and proximity thereof. Further the proposal says Crestone is trying to come up with better air quality safety methods , they don't get to experiment on us!!!! and hope for better!!!! NO WAY! Crestone Never once offered how they actually propose to get to the proposed target zone just some first grade level map with horizontal lines running one after another. What depth are you planning on crossing properties and side kick outs, so landowners know what depth you will be mining across the properties. More information and facts missing from your proposal than provided. Totally Unacceptable application and proposal. Remember Your not asking for permission to grow and harvest food (like the proposed site directly South and east of hwy's 52 /287 has been for decades) and this is on open space land. Oil, Gas, Gas condensate is not safe materials, infact Gas condensate/liquids is fully known to be horribly toxic and dangerous to human life. This So Far is just a horrifically dangerous and bad idea.</p> <p>Respectfully tendered Loren Frederick</p>	<p>COGCC Rules & Processes</p>	<p>Health & Safety Concerns</p>	<p>Health & Safety</p>
----------------------------	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	----------------------------

12/7/2017 14:51	longmont, Co, 80504	<p>There has NOT been adequate information sharing, and although I talked to someone about it when I heard some gossip about CDP plans for a large area last year. I called and provided all my contact info and phone number. When I last talked with your phone rep last year (there was a suggested coverage area) " and the proposed wells would not be anywhere within 2miles of my property. Then I last minute found out through another landowner that they were having a meeting but nobody could go that wasn't within some extremely short distance of not only the proposed CDP enclosure but also limited to within an extremely dangerous distance of a proposed well site or operations proposal. Your whole communication requirement and notification obligation is in violation as it seems you sent a post card to "require" me to go online and set up my contact information (contact information previously volunteered and provided to Crestone) giving me a requirement of a unreasonably short period of time that I must provide information again to be eligible to receive information, which I believe is a complete illegal violation of your requirements of notification. I called and left many messages to which your folks ignored to date. I believe this "flawed system" of Crestone's has been designed to deceive and avoid legal requirements of notification, and to create a method that leaves the requirement of full disclosure and notification to my obligation which is illegal and completely against commission rules. Further I was traveling at the time and a random post card or the hey lets be friends registered letter does not meet any sort of perceived notification requirement and basically said nothing about any specifics happening just making a requirement on me to provide Crestone something else to possibly give them a out and make it my fault and keep me in the DARK. I call "UNFAIR" on this. Further your public meeting that you limited folks that might be closer than your imposed requirement for being welcome at the meeting was skewed if they were like across the street from the proposed site but actually physically closer than my property which is eligible to attend the meetings (has there actually been a full public meeting take place ?) as I'm within the toxicity circle you require. Further my attempt to listen on phone was cut off and public meeting if you can call it that abruptly came to an end at the direction of Crestone. If you want to try to meet legal requirements better START OVER , but I assure you with the lack of compliance on Crestone methods of providing information you most likely will be busy dealing with lawsuits from that alone much less the ridiculous idea that proposing on putting 18 wells spaced on the surface at 10' from each other in a row would protect or be reasonably expected to be safe or environmentally acceptable from noise, air standards, odor, flammability, or general health and safety regulations. Every site you propose has no information provided or plan suggested to protect from the known common hazards of these sites, which to me its unacceptable and effects the safety of having a safe proposed organic/biodynamic produce facility, and complete Horse training and health facility, on my property and lets not forget about the humans who need to live there, like myself..... I officially protest this proposed and requested by Crestone action and herein provide notice thereof . When Crestone and /or the commission receives this you HAVE BEEN PUT ON NOTICE OF My Objection and protest to all Colorado Oil & Gas Commission and regulators tendered Actions and requests regarding my property and proximity thereof. Further the proposal says Crestone is trying to come up with better air quality safety methods , they don't get to experiment on us!!!! and hope for better!!!! NO WAY! Crestone Never once offered how they actually propose to get to the proposed target zone just some first grade level map with horizontal lines running one after another. What depth are you planning on crossing properties and side kick outs, so landowners know what depth you will be mining across the properties. More information and facts missing from your proposal than provided. Totally Unacceptable application and proposal.</p> <p>Remember Your not asking for permission to grow and harvest food (like the proposed site directly South and east of hwy's 52 /287 has been for decades) and this is on open space land. Oil, Gas, Gas condensate is not safe materials, infact Gas condensate/liquids is fully known to be horribly toxic and dangerous to human life. This So Far is just a horrifically dangerous and bad idea.</p> <p>Respectfully tendered Loren Frederick</p>	COGCC Rules & Processes	Health & Safety Concerns	Health & Safety
12/7/2017 16:19	Longmont, CO 80504	<p>There is a factual error on p. 13 of the CDP.</p> <p>Under the heading HOA's it is stated that Oxford Farms HOA has acquired legal counsel. This is false. A group called Oxford Road Property Owners has acquired legal counsel, and they have no association with the Oxford Farms HOA.</p> <p>Crestone has been notified of this error and assures us it will be corrected.</p>			

<p>12/7/2017 19:10</p>	<p>Erie, CO 80516</p>	<p>I am very disappointed that Crestone has (in the 2nd draft CDP) ignored input from Erie residents, other residents living close to the proposed well pads & pipelines, Eire neighborhood groups, the Colorado Department of Public Health, and the Town of Erie ... whom have all requested that well pads and pipelines be relocated to the Co 52 corridor.</p> <p>I live in the north side of Kenosha Farm (Section 12 of the Crestone map) ... adjacent to the proposed location of flowlines from the well pad in Section 11. These flow lines would be less than 100 feet from my property ... TOO CLOSE for safety. There are approximately 54 other residential properties in Kenosha Farm, and 13 in Kenosha Estates, that would also be approximately 100 feet from the proposed flow lines. Again, TOO CLOSE for safety. Relocating all well pads and flow lines to the Rt 52 corridor would be a safer choice.</p> <p>CRESTONE, stop using this EXCUSE, repeated several times in the 2nd draft of the CDP proposal, as to why all well pads cannot be relocated to the Rt 52 corridor: "Boulder County's position that it will not discuss or consult with Crestone for potential use of Boulder County Open Space adjacent to Highway 52 until Crestone consents to utilizing Boulder County's permitting process prior to the Commission's CDP process".</p> <p>Crestone is using the residents of Boulder County as hostages in order to avoid having to use the Boulder County permitting process!!!!</p>	<p>Oil and Gas Development</p>	<p>Health & Safety Concerns</p>	<p>Health & Safety</p>
<p>12/8/2017 0:08</p>	<p>80303</p>	<p>I would like to request that Creststone have another public hearing to listen to the concerns that residents of Boulder County have over their proposed production pad locations. I have seen how the location of some production pads have ruined the rural settings that many residents have worked hard to get. Fracking is a business and production pads need to stay on Industrial and business zoned highways. Stay along highway 52. Boulder County does not need to allow Crestone's greed for bigger profits to devalue rural property and ruin the quite rural lifestyle that many folks have sought. keep the fracking business in areas zone for business and industry.</p>			<p>Siting</p>

<p>12/8/2017 11:52</p>	<p>Erie, CO 80516</p>	<p>Sorry if you get two copies on my comments (after submitting the first version, nothing happened) ... My comments:</p> <p>I am very disappointed that Crestone has (in the 2nd draft CDP) ignored input from Erie residents, other residents living close to the proposed well pads & pipelines, Eire neighborhood groups, the Colorado Department of Public Health, and the Town of Erie ... whom have all requested that well pads and pipelines be relocated to the Co 52 corridor.</p> <p>I live in the north side of Kenosha Farm (Section 12 of the Crestone map) ... adjacent to the proposed location of flowlines from the well pad in Section 11. These flow lines would be less than 100 feet from my property ... TOO CLOSE for safety. There are approximately 54 other residential properties in Kenosha Farm, and 13 in Kenosha Estates, that would also be approximately 100 feet from the proposed flow lines. Again, TOO CLOSE for safety. Relocating all well pads and flow lines to the Rt 52 corridor would be a safer choice.</p> <p>CRESTONE, stop using this EXCUSE, repeated several times in the 2nd draft of the CDP proposal, as to why all well pads cannot be relocated to the Rt 52 corridor: "Boulder County's position that it will not discuss or consult with Crestone for potential use of Boulder County Open Space adjacent to Highway 52 until Crestone consents to utilizing Boulder County's permitting process prior to the Commission's CDP process".</p> <p>Crestone is using the residents of Boulder County as hostages in order to avoid having to use the Boulder County permitting process!!!!</p>	<p>Oil and Gas Development</p>	<p>Health & Safety Concerns</p>	<p>Health & Safety</p>
----------------------------	-----------------------	--	--------------------------------	-------------------------------------	----------------------------

<p>12/8/2017 12:30</p>	<p>Longmont CO 80504</p>	<p>With respect to the general process, I have received an invite to one meeting when I was out of town. I tried to call in for a telephonic meeting but I was cut off and when I called back in the system would not accept my call. I also left messages for both Crestone and Mr. Lepore at the COGCC but did not receive a return call. As a result, we have not had any real opportunity to provide comments or input. I am not necessarily opposed to oil and gas development, however, this process has not allowed for adequate landowner input.</p> <p>With regard to Crestone's second preliminary submission, (i) we do not agree with comments from others to move locations adjacent to Highway 52 (especially any location along Hwy 52 in Section 36, T. 2N., R69W), (ii) we prefer the original locations proposed by Crestone which take into account the layering of surface constraints, (iii) the submission completely fails to take into account the water body and stream that is located in the N1/2 NE1/4 of Section 36, T. 2 N., R 69 W. of the 6th PM. The Huffman Waste Water Ditch Reservoir and Huffman Waste Water Ditch are decreed by state water court decree in Case No. W-3575 and include as their source surface runoff and seepage, tributary to Boulder Creek. The reservoir and the drainage coming out of the reservoir do not appear on your maps and there must be buffers/setbacks from these resources. The natural drainage which runs most of the year crosses our property in the S1/2 SE1/4 of the NE1/4 NE1/4 of Section 36, T. 2. N. R 69 W. This natural drainage (with significant wetlands located west of our property) should be identified and buffers implemented to protect this riparian area. Finally, (iv) there is a bald eagle nest or winter roost site located west of our property in Section 36 which we did not see identified in your materials.</p> <p>If you choose to reconfigure your locations, we are adamantly opposed to any site in Section 36 given its proximity to Boulder Creek, FEMA identified floodways, local reservoir/water rights and the drainage that runs through our property (see above). In this regard, the letter from Mr. Sura on behalf of the Kenosha Road Property Owners proposing 72 wells in the SW1/4 of Section 36 is misplaced and poorly informed.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I can be reached at my law firm office (Johnson & Repucci LLP 303-442-1900 or by cell 303-589-7471).</p>	<p>Other</p>	<p>CDP Process</p>	<p>Siting</p>
----------------------------	------------------------------	--	--------------	--------------------	---------------

<p>12/8/2017 13:57</p>	<p>80302</p>	<p>The following comments are submitted on behalf of the City of Boulder (the “City”) by city staff who have reviewed the Second Draft Preliminary Comprehensive Drilling Plan (“CDP”) application documents (“Application”) submitted by Crestone Resources Operating, LLC (“Crestone”) to identify potential impacts to city interests and resources and deficiencies in the Application. These comments are not the result of any kind of official review under land use code or by any advisory board or other authority which may be required if/when the CDP is approved by the COGCC, and the City anticipates further review and comment as the CDP process progresses and during Boulder County’s Special Use Review process. The City’s comments are provided as a land, mineral, and water rights owner, a stakeholder and a local government with public interests in the CDP area.</p> <p>The intent of a Rule 216 CDP is for the applicant to provide the most detailed information practicable so that the public and stakeholders can provide comment and shape proposals over a broader geographic area than typically allowed in COGCC development and planning processes. This Application is the first time Rule 216 is being used in the developed areas of the Front Range and therefore should be carefully evaluated in the context of residential development and properties purchased and managed with public funds, and held to the highest standard so it can be used as an effective and useful tool. The process to-date and Crestone’s preliminary submissions and public processes fail to realize these potential benefits of comprehensive planning for the reasons set out below.</p> <p>Crestone did not acknowledge or respond to the City’s comments provided during the first preliminary submission of the CDP, so they are restated and supplemented during this second comment opportunity. The City owns Boulder County parcel number 146501000014 at 11910 Mineral Road, 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 and use of oil based drilling mud under the property. The City is also concerned about potential groundwater, surface water and air quality, and hydrologic 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, the City’s surface diversions into the ponds and Boulder Creek (all of which are “Waters of the State,” as defined by COGCC). Any impacts to water quality would be detrimental to the City’s ability to use the water stored on the property as intended. 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>This City’s property is within Section 1, which as stated in the Application is within an environmentally sensitive area. The City believes Crestone has not adequately addressed potential impacts or mitigation measures related to the nearby heron rookeries, bald eagle nesting sites, wetlands or operations within the floodplain, nor has Crestone consulted with the US Army Corp of Engineers on jurisdictional determination of the wetlands within Section 1 or the CDP area (the wetlands in Section 1 are likely watered by the extensive reclaimed gravel ponds and proximity to Boulder Creek and not due to irrigation as “agricultural wetlands” as Crestone describes). Because of the natural resources and potential impacts to surface and groundwater, the City believes a Sensitive Area Determination should be made by the COGCC Director within Section 1.</p> <p>The Application shows the potential for numerous wells drilled beneath the City’s property that is owned and maintained for its important water resources and storage uses, where Crestone fails to show any rights to do so. Crestone has not provided proof that it owns any mineral rights in the CDP despite referencing Attachment I on page 13 of the Application to fulfill this requirement. Its cursory statement of its percentage of partial undivided leasehold interests in the DSU’s is insufficient to demonstrate that it has the right to drill throughout the CDP and what the scope and parameters of those rights are. Moreover, even if Crestone can prove its right to use a given surface to extract the minerals underneath it, it must demonstrate its right to use that surface to install enough wells to drill minerals from hundreds or thousands of additional acres, including from the acreage owned by the City where records indicate City ownership of most of the mineral interest. These land, water and mineral rights were purchased by the City with restricted funding for water utility purposes and are subject to a Boulder County-held Conservation Easement. These interests were purchased to meet the goals of the City’s municipal water plans, and the large-</p>			
----------------------------	--------------	--	--	--	--

	<p>scale drilling operations proposed by Crestone as currently proposed in the Application represents significant risks to these goals. Crestone provides no detail on how it proposes to carry out its operations to develop its mineral interests without depleting the mineral estate and impacting the water resources where it has no right/interest. Crestone also has presented no proof of negotiation or documentation of its intent to [force] pool.</p> <p>The City 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 and irrigation infrastructure in the CDP area, water rights or the local water resources that will be used in the drilling operations. The Application also proposes a large number of wellbores passing through this area of historic gravel mining and fails to address this risk or justify the placement.</p> <p>Of additional note from City review of the Application, Crestone has not provided the contents of its consultation with and responses received from Colorado Parks and Wildlife – stating in the CDP only that CPW’s biological concerns have been “addressed.” Also, portions of the CDP area were heavily damaged and eroded during the 2013 flood when the Boulder Creek channel changed course and Crestone is not using maps reflecting the new alignment nor considering the potential changes to the groundwater hydrology. The City is would also like confirmation that the ponds located on the City property were considered as such, with associated buffer requirements, and not as wetlands as some of the mapping suggests. The City has received feedback that Crestone also has not yet provided a further direct response to Boulder County as indicated on page 29.</p> <p>The Application proposes large-scale and intensive oil and gas development inappropriately located close to residences, valuable agricultural lands, hazard areas, sensitive wildlife and plant habitat, riparian habitat corridors, water bodies, wetlands, and recreational areas. Such sizeable industrial activity is generally not compatible with residential development and those resources and given the significant deficiencies in the information provided and continued concerns with the second draft of the Application outlined above, the City does not believe Crestone has effectively addressed air, water, seismic, environmental, agricultural, and public health impacts from the proposed large-scale industrial operations or ways to effectively mitigate or avoid impacts. The COGCC should consider the Application inadequate and require the issues identified in these and other comments to be fully addressed in the final draft or deny the CDP.</p> <p>The City welcomes a meeting with Crestone and/or COGCC staff to discuss these comments and also respectfully requests to be notified at cityofboulderlgd@bouldercolorado.gov of any surveying (including via drone) or seismic testing involving the City’s property.</p> <p>Submitted by:</p> <p>City of Boulder 1777 Broadway Boulder, CO 80302 cityofboulderlgd@bouldercolorado.gov</p> <p>with copy to: Colorado Oil and Gas Conservation Commission – c/o matt.lepore@state.co.us Crestone Peak Resources Operating LLC – c/o jjost@jostenergyllc.com</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

<p>12/8/2017 15:15</p>	<p>Longmont CO 80504</p>	<p>I live on the north end of the CDP area, just south of Oxford Road. We will be right in the middle of two proposed pads - one on section 26, 1/2 mile to the west and another in section 25, 3/4 mile to the east.</p> <p>I continue to press on re-siting these two pads along the Hwy 52 corridor where there less residences and with a wider, sturdier road that can handle potentially 100 truck trips a day.</p> <p>The proposed oil & gas location in section 26 is currently agricultural, typically planted with corn - most likely to be used for animal feed. Every 5 - 7 years, it is planted with sunflowers and the nearby residents (and photographers) are treated with a beautiful landscape of sunflowers. Section 25 is surrounded by agricultural land that is farmed every year with wheat, corn, and sugar beets.</p> <p>In the Crestone CDP, they state that a pad would require 18 - 20 acres during the initial phases with a subsequent reclamation of 13 - 15 acres. In researching the impact of fracking on soil and agricultural land, I came across a study done in 2015 by two Colorado scientists who performed a detailed analysis of vegetative patterns over a group of well pads in land managed by the US Bureau of Land Management along with two undisturbed pads. They found that none of the land with oil and gas well pads returned to pre-drilling condition even after 20 years. Minnick, T. J. & Alward, R. D. (2015). Plant–soil feedbacks and the partial recovery of soil spatial patterns on abandoned well pads in a sagebrush shrubland. Ecological Applications, 25(1), 3-10.</p> <p>The risk of spills and leakages, air and water contamination can impact soil quality and eventually the crop consumed by humans or animals. The results can be widespread and devastating. We cannot knowingly introduce these risks into these agricultural areas.</p> <p>We all know that agriculture is a huge consumer of water. Water is already a scarce resource in Colorado. A study by the US Geological Survey published in July, 2015 found that “between 2000 and 2014, the average water used to drill a horizontal natural gas well increased from 177,000 gallons to 5.1 million gallons per well—enough water to fill more than seven Olympic-sized swimming pools”. Today, farmers are already having to change the way they work the land to make up for the scarcity of water. If one had to choose between using water for agriculture vs. oil & gas drilling and with this winter promising to be a dry winter, my vote goes to agriculture. https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/water-use-rises-as-fracking-expands/</p> <p>In yesterday’s Denver Post, Bruce Finley wrote this chilling report “At least a dozen explosions and fires have occurred along Colorado oil and gas industry pipelines in the eight months since two men were killed when a home blew up in Firestone, a Denver Post review of state records found. Two of those explosions killed workers.” http://www.denverpost.com/2017/12/06/colorado-oil-gas-explosions-since-firestone-explosion/</p> <p>Although Crestone was not involved in any of these, spills/release reports have been issued at two plug and abandon sites that Crestone was working at. One report resulted in a Notice of Alleged Violation report. http://ogccweblink.state.co.us/DownloadDocument.aspx?DocumentId=4310698 http://ogccweblink.state.co.us/DownloadDocument.aspx?DocumentId=4283663</p> <p>These reports do not give the public, especially the people who live nearby these wells, any confidence in so-called compliance with protective measures and regulations. The work on volatile material is done by people and people can make errors which can have devastating results. Siting these oil & gas locations in denser residential areas increase the levels of risk to public health, safety and welfare.</p> <p>COGCC needs to review oil and gas drilling before approving more permits. Asking companies to pay fines as it is being suggested by state representatives today is not the answer. It does not pay for the lives that already have been lost, the injuries and as-of-yet unknown risks to public health, safety and welfare.</p> <p>Please re-site these locations to an area in low population density areas. Move them to Hwy 52.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	<p>Hydraulic Fracturing (Fracking)</p>	<p>Health & Safety Concerns</p>	<p>Siting</p>
----------------------------	------------------------------	---	--	-------------------------------------	---------------

<p>12/8/2017 15:45</p>	<p>Eroe, CO 80516</p>	<p>I submitted a citizens response to the first draft. I have modified that response, and it is the paragraphs below. Additionally, I feel it is imperative to comment about the absurdly inadequate reaction by Crestone to the responses to the first draft by the private stakeholders, the Town of Erie, Boulder County, and the Colorado Department of Public Health & Environment. Incredibly, the second draft is identical to the first draft, with a few technical details added. A direct quote from Crestone: “there are variables which could stop us from moving our potential well pads. We are diligently working to make this work by the final submission in December.” My personal reactions to Crestone’s response are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Crestone effectively did not release a second draft so that all stakeholders could make further informed responses; 2. Crestone is intentionally corrupting the entire process; they are effectively stifling the public response until the final package is released; 3. Undefined “variables” is obfuscation; 4. Crestone does not intend to make any substantive changes to their initial proposal; 5. Crestone thinks that the COGCC will “rubber stamp” whatever they submit as the final package. <p>I hope I’m wrong. To date, Crestone has done nothing to change my reactions.</p> <p>Most of the comments to the first draft recommended moving the well sites from residential/agricultural neighborhoods on narrow local roads to CO 52, between US 287 and County Line Road. That certainly is totally rational. I do not have the technical knowledge to provide additional reasons for that to occur. Furthermore, Crestone’s undefined “variables” provides zero additional information. However, there is another aspect of this application that is equally important – the location of new pipelines from the proposed well sites to connections to existing pipeline infrastructure. It appears that all new pipelines are design to ultimately connect to the intersection of County Line Rd. and Weld County Rd 10 ½, the location of the new Wooley Becky Sosa battery and pipelines.</p> <p>I reside between that intersection and the proposed Section 11 battery (36 wells), which will be west of N. 119th St, and north of Jasper Road. The proposed pipeline route is as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. East across agricultural land, under N 119th St. then slightly further east on other agricultural land; 2. North through Town of Erie dedicated open space on the western side of the Kenosha Farms subdivision (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. It also contains a popular soft-surfaced trail; 3. East through additional Town of Erie open space on the north side of Kenosha Farms (north of Banner Circle). Similarly, that area has native grasses and a soft surfaced trail; 4. North on the east side of Lombardi Drive to Kenosha Rd. That area is primarily a very large detention basin that is mowed on a regular basis. <p>I have multiple concerns about the portion that is within the Kenosha Farms subdivision and Town of Erie dedicated open space:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Impact of homeowners and recreationists during the construction: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. There are 29 homes on the west side of Cooke Ct and Banner Circle. The lots are typically no larger than 7,500 sq. ft., so homes are roughly 25’ or less from the rear lot line. The open space to the west of those lots is very narrow, roughly 125’. The map in the proposal does not indicated exactly where within that open space the pipeline would be located. A rough guess places the pipeline within 100’ of those structures. b. There are 26 homes on the north side of Banner Circle. The map in the proposal appears to place the new pipeline directly north of the rear of those lots. A rough guess places the pipeline within 50’ of those structures; c. Closure of the trail during construction. That trail is heavily used, since there are about 500 homes in Erie Village and Kenosha Farms, and there are no other nearby trails within open space. 2. Destruction of native grasslands in dedicated open space: Constructing that pipeline will annihilate those grasses, which are virtually impossible to reestablish without irrigation. Witness the existing weed patch at the south end of Lombard St., which Crestone has been unable to rehabilitate. That is the location of Crestone’s Allen 23 & 24-12 battery. 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>Given the above problems, the rational solution is to find an alternative route. Fortunately, I believe there 2 options. To me, the best option is to continue east to County Line Rd, then north along County Line Rd. to the Wooley Becky Sosa site. My proposed location is also Town of Erie land; there are multiple well sites, multiple gas pipelines, Erie</p>	<p>Crestone Peak Resources</p>	<p>Property Values and Land Use</p>	<p>Siting</p>
----------------------------	-----------------------	--	--------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------

		<p>water and sewer lines , a high tension power transmission line, and Lower Boulder Ditch. The O&G locations are all owned by Crestone:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bailey 33-12 battery; • Allen 23 & 24-12 battery; • Wiggett 32-13 battery. <p>Mysteriously, the pipelines in that area and along the west side of County Line Rd. all have signage indicating ownership by Kerr McGee or Anadarko. There have to be pipelines that transport the gas output from Crestone wells to the ultimate end users. I therefore conclude that Crestone either owns some of those pipelines, or has rights to use them. No homes have been, nor ever will be, built in this fairly wide area. The limited homes north of that area (roughly 15) are much further away (roughly 250') than those along the route currently proposed. Also, there are NO homes on the west side, and only 1 home on the east side, of County Line Road. Clearly, this route is infinitely superior to 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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>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>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

<p>12/8/2017 15:52</p>	<p>Boulder, CO 80302</p>	<p>Dear Director Lepore, Ms. Jost and Ms. Wasylenky:</p> <p>The Oxford Road Property Owners (“Oxford Road POs”) appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Second Draft Preliminary Comprehensive Drilling Plan (CDP) Elements submitted by Crestone Peak Resources Operating LLC (“Crestone”) and published by the Colorado Oil and Gas Conservation Commission (COGCC) on November 27, 2017.</p> <p>Comments and positions expressed by core stakeholders establish that any development that is ultimately permitted by the Commission must be directed to the Highway 52 Corridor. This approach is consistent with comments received to date from core stakeholders including the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment, the Town of Erie, and the two organized groups of surface owners within the CDP area: the Oxford Road POs and the Kenosha Road POs. The initially proposed Section 25 and Section 26 pads on the north end of the CDP area are unacceptable locations which need to be re-located to the Highway 52 corridor, consistent with the map submitted by the Kenosha Road POs.</p> <p>Crestone rightly stated that it is “currently conducting an in-depth review and analysis of the potential oil and gas locations ... as a result of numerous comments requesting such locations to be located adjacent to Highway 52.” 2nd CDP at page 2. Crestone committed to “update Attachment B accordingly if locations adjacent to Highway 52 are feasible from a surface and operational perspective.” Id.</p> <p>Although Boulder County review will follow the CDP process before COGCC, it appears that the Highway 52 consensus among core stakeholders will be the best approach from the County’s perspective as well, in the event the County process results in permitting of surface operations.</p> <p>The Highway 52 corridor approach appears feasible from technical, engineering, operational, and regulatory perspective. This approach appears to be the best and only feasible solution for core stakeholders, and for meeting the statutory requirements governing state agencies with permitting, review, and consultative authority or jurisdiction over the proposed operations. Thus, it is incumbent on Crestone to apply the Highway 52 Corridor solution for all surface locations in its next draft and final CDP provided to COGCC.</p> <p>The Oxford Road POs appreciate Crestone’s acknowledgement that a CDP is appropriate, and we note that Crestone promptly responded to our request for a meeting to discuss concerns and details, consistent with the statement in the 2nd CDP that Crestone will be meeting with the Kenosha Road POs.</p> <p>1. Interests of the Oxford Road Property Owners</p> <p>[FULL TEXT EMAILED TO COGCC C/O DIRECTOR LEPORE AND OTHER NOTED STAFF, AND CRESTONE C/O ATTORNEYS]</p> <p>8. Conclusion</p> <p>Balancing the operator’s interests with the protection of public health safety, environment, and wildlife resources will be achieved by heeding the core stakeholder and public comment consensus behind the Highway 52 corridor approach. That requires re-locating the currently proposed mega-pads in Sections 25 and 26 to the Highway 52 corridor. We expect the next draft to incorporate that approach.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Mike Chiropolos Attorney for Oxford Road Property Owners</p> <p>Cc: Kent Kuster, CDPHE COGCC Commissioners John Noto and Rebecca Treitz, COGCC c/o john.noto@state.co.us & rebecca.treitz@state.co.us</p>	<p>Crestone Peak Resources</p>	<p>Health & Safety Concerns</p>	<p>Siting</p>
----------------------------	--------------------------	---	--------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------

<p>12/8/2017 16:19</p>	<p>Longmont, CO 80504</p>	<p>We live in the Oxford Farms development on Rodeo Drive. With regards to the second preliminary draft of the CDP I would like to reinforce our position that two, 36 well pads within ½ mile of our development is an unacceptable encroachment on the environment we have chosen to live in. We currently enjoy a beautiful, quiet and clean agricultural and residential environment that would be severely disrupted for 4 years by the proposed industrial operations for our area. And this could be made worse by the potential development of a third or fourth well pad on the north side of Oxford Rd. due to the DSU application from 8 North for that area.</p> <p>We understand that Crestone is reviewing its proposed oil and gas locations for possible re-location to the Hwy 52 corridor and we are glad to see that they appear to taking our concerns and suggestions seriously. Though we'd rather not see these operations anywhere in Boulder County, if we're given no choice the Hwy 52 corridor is the best place for them. We have been presented no substantive reason why these pads cannot be situated along Hwy 52. The occupied building density is far lower in this corridor compared to the areas surrounding the currently proposed pad locations and the resulting impact of noise, odor, traffic, safety hazards, and property values are reduced accordingly.</p> <p>If the proposed pads are retained the impacts we face are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our current nighttime noise levels are ~30 db(A). A 75 db(A) noise allowed by rule 802 would attenuate at ½ mile to 57db. That is a noise level 500 times louder than our current noise levels; every night for at least a year during completions. There are residents as close as ¼ mile who will experience increased noise levels of 2,200 times. (The current Rule 802 standards are ridiculous and absolutely need to be updated to reflect the changes in technology that have resulted in high density well pads that take multiple years to construct and the encroachment on urban areas. • We are downwind from the section 26 pad. The fresh, country smell of our area will be obliterated by petroleum odors emanating from the pads for months on end. Even if the concentrations of the pollutants are below EPA toxicity limits, the odors are uncomfortable at best and over extended periods of time can be nauseating. And the frequency of reports from other residents close to oil and gas operations indicate it can be even worse than that. • The traffic impact of 100 truck trips per day (of course Crestone has not published a traffic study yet to inform us about the details of the impacts we're facing. These figures come from a traffic study Extraction Oil published for their planned Broomfield operations.) • There is no specification of water sources. Will my neighbors who have wells see them dry up due to enormous amounts of water pumped from aquifers? • Who compensates us for the enjoyment lost due to local wildlife fleeing the area due to the disruption of their habitat? • Who will compensate us for the loss of possibly \$100,000 dollars on our property value due to these operations? We are retired and the value of our house is a very important component of our retirement plan. I please don't tell us there is no evidence. There are several studies indicating reduced values for properties in the vicinity of oil and gas development. Not always--there are other factors that may mitigate that but from what I can tell they don't exist in Boulder County. <p>I would prefer that no fracking take place in Boulder County. It appears to be a waste of money according to this Wall Street article (https://www.wsj.com/articles/wall-streets-fracking-frenzy-runs-dry-as-profits-fail-to-materialize-1512577420). What are you going to do when the price falls through the floor when we get an intelligent leadership that understands that global warming is real and 100's of billions of dollars to support renewables will have to be invested. Will be around to clean up the mess you made or do we have to live with it for decades or a century just like the old mines in the mountains that claim a life every now and then.</p> <p>Re-locate the pads. Please!</p>	<p>Oil and Gas Development</p>	<p>Property Values and Land Use</p>	<p>Operation Duration & Timing</p>
----------------------------	-------------------------------	---	--------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--

12/8/2017 16:22	Denver, CO 80216	We recently heard that Crestone is going to move some well pads and pipeline locations. Therefore, CPW will hold off on sending comments until we can see and analyze the new locations.	Oil and Gas Development	Schedule	Wildlife
12/8/2017 16:22	Longmont, CO 80504	<p>Oxford Road is home of One of the First Open Space Legacy Family Farms in the United States !! Boulder County's Open Space Acquisition and Preservation Program is recognized as one of the First of its' kind in the Country. This year celebrates 50 years that Boulder County citizens have readily given hard earned tax dollars to preserve these working farms and Open Space Lands. This model has spread across the Country and is now used in almost every State.</p> <p>Oxford Road was one of the first Roads to be recognized for preservation in the Boulder County Open Space Programs. The Hartshorn/Stromquist/Henry farms are central to Oxford Road, and are now, right in the path of the proposed Crestone CDP Production Pads.</p> <p>By moving the Crestone Production Pads to Highway 52, like all Community, Governmental and Public Safety groups have requested, These Legacy family farms and the Historic Road they sit on will continue to be protected for generations to come.</p> <p>Through research in the Boulder County records, see the references below, we have learned that these Farms were some the first to be Protect. The Open Space designation have helped preserve and protect Oxford Road to be the pristine, quiet, not developed Road, which is used for, not only farming, but Cycling and minimal impact Sporting Events like running and road race activities for the entire County and State. These activities will now be impacted by large Construction and Drilling, if the Pads are not moved to Highway 52.</p> <p>These Legacy Family farms, which are fully functioning farms 110 years later, rely on the full access of small road and water and growing conditions in and around Oxford Road. The pristine agricultural conditions and protected animal, insect and bird habitat has drawn other Families to continue the Agricultural culture of the area. 100% of the families on Oxford Road are agriculturally employed, have farm or livestock processes or lease their land for farming. Two new families to Oxford Road are developing Organic farmland and certification. All the Oxford Road family farms are now at risk with the threat of massive Production Pads. All of this can be avoided if the Production Pads are moved to Highway 52.</p> <p>Please do the right thing and Move the Pads, where they belong to a more suitable area for Drilling. Move them to Highway 52.</p> <p>https://assets.bouldercounty.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/bcpos-40th-anniversary-overview.pdf "Pleasant View Ridge, the hillside along the north edge of Oxford road, just west of County line was a small community with a school, a cemetery and a blacksmith shop in the early 1900's. The Hartshorn family began farming in 1906 with both Big Thompson and Boulder White Rock ditch companies supplying water to rich farmland where corn, sugar beets, wheat, beans, and alfalfa were grown. By the 1960's, the Hartshorn clan, consisting of 6 farm families, farmed over 1000 acres collectively and raised pigs, sheep, and cattle. They were the first farm family to recognize the special quality of this agricultural land southeast of Longmont.</p> <p>This strong dedication to the land led Arthur Stromquist, son-in-law to Denzel Hartshorn (12189 Oxford Rd.), to approach Boulder County officials with the concept of purchasing development rights on Boulder County farm land in order to preserve the agricultural nature of the County. This was the beginning of Boulder County Open Space. The Hartshorn/ Stromquist/Henry farms are all designated Boulder County Open Space and are fully functioning farms 110 years later."</p>	COGCC Rules & Processes	Support for CDP	Siting
12/8/2017 16:34	Longmont, CO 80503	<p>Crestone Peak Resources c/o Jamie Jost</p> <p>RE: Comments on pad locations 12/08/2017</p> <p>Dear Crestone Peak Resources ("Crestone"),</p> <p>Kenosha Road Property Owners ("Kenosha RPO") is sending these comments on the second draft with some</p>	Oil and Gas Development	Health & Safety Concerns	Siting

		<p>reservations. The substance of the “second draft” is not any different than the initial draft. We are therefore reattaching our initial comments for your consideration.</p> <p>At this point, Kenosha RPO would like to formally state its objection to the CDP timeline. Crestone has clearly indicated that it did not have sufficient time to fully consider or incorporate the substantial and substantive comments it received on its initial draft.** As such, this “second draft” was merely a restating of its first draft. We request that Crestone and the COGCC put forward a new timeline that will allow Crestone sufficient time to incorporate these two rounds of public comments into a true “second CDP proposal.”</p> <p>The comments from residents, CDPHE, and the Town of Erie demonstrate that a clear public consensus has formed in support of three to four well pad locations drilling north and south from the Hwy 52 corridor. This public consensus proposal should be put forward in the “second CDP proposal.”</p> <p>Crestone’s statement in the second draft that it could not consider new well pad locations along Hwy 52 because Boulder County Open Space has not given its support for those locations strains credulity. Crestone’s initial proposal was to place four of the six locations on Boulder County Open Space. Crestone did not have Boulder County support for those four well pad locations but now it claims to need Boulder County support for the new locations that the public has requested. Crestone would get far less public opposition if it was willing to give honest responses to the public’s questions and comments.</p> <p>Finally, Kenosha RPO wants to send the strong message that its participation in the CDP is not an endorsement, in any way, of Crestone as the eventual operator within the defined CDP area. Extraction Oil and Gas Inc. (operating in Boulder County as 8 North LLC) has claimed it also has substantial mineral interests in the area. Kenosha RPO’s perspective is that, if Extraction is willing to locate well pads along Hwy 52, it should be considered the “preferred operator” for the entire CDP.</p> <p>Kenosha RPO has attached the recently-enacted City and County of Broomfield / Extraction Operator Agreement to these comments. The Broomfield / Extraction Operator Agreement is a good document to consider because it addresses a similar amount of acreage. Over the last 18 months, Extraction has demonstrated that it was willing to roll up its sleeves and work through a rigorous public engagement process and address many of the concerns of the public and City and County of Broomfield. The following list are 20 of the best management provisions in the Broomfield / Extraction Operator Agreement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Limitation on number of wells (84 new wells down from 144) 2. Moved three well pads 3. Will plug and abandon more than 40 wells 4. Comprehensive Drilling Plan submitted with Form 2A (24 plans and exhibits) 5. Quiet fleet fracking technology 6. Use oil pipelines 7. Gives the local government the right to inspect operations 8. Prohibits use of 23 chemicals of concern 9. All drilling and production equipment will be electric 10. Will use natural gas-powered fracking equipment 11. Best management practices for protection of air quality 12. \$20,000 / year for annual air quality sampling 13. Water quality sampling – baseline samples of ALL water sources within ½ mile. 14. Will meet residential noise levels under Rule 802 during drilling and fracking - (high of 55 d(b) rather than 80d(b)) as measured 1,000 feet from sound walls.) 15. Soil testing at plugged and abandoned locations prior to and following drilling and completion 16. Conduct an alternative site analysis 17. Report any fires or explosions 18. Surface Safety Valve that can be operated remotely 19. Pipeline integrity standards 20. Provide higher insurance coverage than state requirement <p>Kenosha RPO requests that Crestone’s next draft incorporate the general public consensus to locate well pads</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

		<p>along Hwy 52. We also request that Crestone consider and incorporate the best management provisions from the Broomfield / Extraction Operator Agreement in the next draft. Kenosha RPO also expects that Crestone and the COGCC will extend the CDP process to allow the public to comment on a true second draft proposal.</p> <p>In the event that Crestone is unwilling to locate wells along Hwy 52, we hope that the COGCC will request Extraction to participate by submitting its own alternative draft CDP. Again, Kenosha RPO, and the public at large, are generally neutral as to which Operator develops the minerals. If oil and gas development has to occur, the Operator that is willing to best address public health, safety and welfare concerns should be granted the privilege to develop the minerals.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Matt Sura For Kenosha Road Property Owners.</p> <p>cc: John Noto, COGCC</p> <p>**For example, page two of the "November 27, 2017 2nd Draft" states (three times), "Crestone is currently conducting an in-depth review and analysis of the potential oil and gas locations noted on Attachment ___ as a result of numerous comments requesting such locations to be located adjacent to Highway 52. Crestone will update Attachment ___ accordingly if locations adjacent to Highway 52 are feasible from a surface and operational perspective."</p>			
12/8/2017 16:48	Longmont, CO, 80501	Move CDP pad to highway 52	Boulder County Rules & Processes	Property Values and Land Use	Siting
12/8/2017 16:54	Boulder, CO 80306	Boulder County submitted comments on the Second Draft Preliminary CDP directly to COGCC staff on Dec. 8, 2017. Thank you for your consideration.			
12/8/2017 16:56	80501	protect our lands -	Oil and Gas Development	CDP Process	Health & Safety
12/8/2017 17:02	Longmont, CO 80504	Move the Production Pads to Highway 52 !		CDP Process	
12/8/2017 19:01	Longmont	<p>I am writing to recommend the pad sites for the CDP all be located on HWY 52. There is already noise associated with this location compared to the other locations. There is infrastructure to support the trucks and other equipment that will be brought in. There are fewer residences to be bothered and put in harms way.</p> <p>I don't understand how this proposal could be approved when there are so many things we do not yet know about how they will do business. For example, what will the traffic impact be? Where will the truck go? Down HWY 287 or down County line Rd? How many trucks and how often? Are the roads able to handle such traffic? What are the emergency plans? What happens if something blows up, dangerous gasses are released, or other problems that we do not yet know could possibly happen? There are so many safety concerns based on things that have happened recently at other locations. What are their safety plans to assure us that these things won't happen? I do not believe that they have proven that they have the necessary mineral rights to be able to do this drilling. This should be the first and easiest thing to back up with documentation. What about the wildlife in the area? There are lots of wildlife in the area that has not been considered and there is no plan to minimize the impact to them. What about the health and well being not only of the adults in the area but more importantly the elderly and children as well as those with compromised health? The impact to them will be even greater than to the general public. What will happened to these locations when Crestone is done with them? They will continue to be eye sores for decades if not more. What is the plan for when and how to return the land to it's original condition (if that is even possible)?</p> <p>Finally, I don't believe that Crestone has made any attempt to answer the questions posed by the public after their first draft. The second draft is nearly exactly the same. There have been no additional facts provided and so many questions remain.</p> <p>In conclusion, Crestone has not provided the answers needed to be able to really assess their intentions for the drilling and how to responsibly and ethically drill in this area. The best we can hope for is that they will either do the work that this CDP process is supposed to provide or move the pads to HWY 52 to avoid disturbing historic</p>	Oil and Gas Development	Health & Safety Concerns	Siting

		agricultural land, endangering the health and safety of residents and protect the innocent lives (human and animal) that are surely to be changed forever with this drilling.			
--	--	---	--	--	--