An Exclusion at 1.45Q-2(d)(1) appears to have been added to the rule. The idea of excluding CO2 Production wells has obvious merit, but to define them as a well producing in excess of 10% of the total gas stream would eliminate development of most/many hydrocarbon Gas Processing facilities. A simple 51/49 ratio could be used; if you produce more CO2 than Hydrocarbon, maybe that is a CO2 producing well? Arguably, it may be best to look at the intent of producing the field. If the Operator is producing the field for revenue associated with the hydrocarbon extraction, then it is not a CO2 production well. Worldwide there are many hydrocarbon sources with minor constituents of in-situ CO2. Ten percent is minor. The Permian Basin of the USA is of note. There is public domain information showing that in general the associated hydrocarbon gas production ranges from 2% to 17% of in-situ (native) CO2, moving south to north in the basin. There are other gas fields, defined as hydrocarbon gas fields by States and Federal government as such, that contain CO2 above the cutoff of 10% as suggested in this recent proposed rule-making. Establishing a 10% cut-off to define a "CO2 Production Well" lacks mathematical sense. Use of 90% CO2 in the production steam would categorize all known/published CO2 Producing Fields/Domes defined to exist within the US border.