1	PUBLIC HEARING
2	STATE OF NEW MEXICO
3	OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION
4	
5	Pecos Hall, 1st Floor, Wendell Chino Building
6	1220 S. Saint Francis Drive
7	Santa Fe, New Mexico
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
14	February 20, 2025
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	COMMISSION MEMBERS:
20	GERASIMOS ROZATOS, Chair
21	GREG BLOOM, Member
22	DR. WILLIAM AMPOMAH, Member
23	
24	HEARD BEFORE:
25	HEARING OFFICER RIPLEY HARWOOD
	Page 1

1	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
2	CHAIR ROZATOS: Good morning to everyone.
3	This is the official Oil Conservation Commission
4	meeting that is slated for today. I am Gerasimos
5	Rozatos. I am the acting director for the Oil
6	Conservation Division. I go by Gerry; makes it
7	easier for everybody.
8	And as I mentioned, this is our Oil
9	Conservation Commission meeting that we have normally
LO	planned. Plus, we also have a hearing that we're
L1	going to be doing.
L2	So before we start, though, I wanted to
L3	start with a roll call. As I said, I'm Gerasimos
L4	Rozatos. I am the acting chair for the commission.
L5	And I'll move to the commissioner to my
L6	right.
L7	COMMISSIONER BLOOM: Morning, everyone. I'm
L8	Greg Bloom, the assistant commissioner for Mineral
L9	Resources at the New Mexico State Land Office. I'm
20	the designee of the land office.
21	And I will be stepping aside today for
22	Case 24123. Unfortunately, my duties up at the
23	legislature preclude me from being here most of this
24	week and next. So Baylen Lamkin will be stepping in
25	for just that case.

1	Baylen, you want to give us a wave so
2	people can see you? He'll introduce himself later.
3	He's a petroleum engineer at the land office.
4	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: I'm Dr. William
5	Ampomah. I'm a professor at New Mexico Tech, a
6	designee of the energy secretary. Thank you.
7	CHAIR ROZATOS: Excellent. So that is the
8	commission. So before we start, we always want to do
9	the approval of our past agendas or the current
10	agenda.
11	So I'm asking for approval for the
12	February 20 through 28, 2025, agenda.
13	COMMISSIONER BLOOM: I so move.
14	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: I second.
15	CHAIR ROZATOS: All in favor.
16	ALL MEMBERS: Aye.
17	CHAIR ROZATOS: Okay. So our agenda has
18	been approved.
19	(Motion approved.)
20	CHAIR ROZATOS: We also need to approve the
21	meeting minutes for the January 16th and 17th and the
22	February 3rd, 2025, meetings. If we could get a
23	motion for that.
24	COMMISSIONER BLOOM: I so move.
25	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: I second.

1	CHAIR ROZATOS: May I get a roll call. All
2	in favor.
3	ALL MEMBERS: Aye.
4	CHAIR ROZATOS: Okay. So that has been
5	approved.
6	(Motion approved.)
7	CHAIR ROZATOS: We're going to move now on
8	to our pending cases. Our first case is Case Number
9	23580, application of Wild Earth Guardians to amend
10	the commission's rules to address PFAS amendments to
11	19.15.2, 19.15.7, 19.15.4, 19.15.16, and 19.15.25 in
12	the New Mexico Administrative Code.
13	This is a status conference to schedule
14	the date for the commission's deliberations. Are all
15	parties present for this? Yay? Nay? People?
16	MR. TREMAINE: Good morning, Mr. Chair.
17	Jesse Tremaine for the Oil Conservation Division.
18	CHAIR ROZATOS: Excellent. Thank you.
19	MR. RANKIN: Good morning, Commissioner
20	Rozatos. Adam Rankin, appearing on behalf of the
21	New Mexico Oil and Gas Association.
22	CHAIR ROZATOS: Excellent. Thank you.
23	And anybody from Wild Earth Guardians?
24	Maybe on the platform? No? Okay. Well, we can
25	go ahead.

1	MR. SAYER: Matthias Sayer on behalf of EOG.
2	CHAIR ROZATOS: Okay. Excellent. Thank
3	you.
4	Well, we'll still proceed and we'll go
5	from there. As I stated, we have a status conference
6	that's scheduled for the commission's deliberations.
7	We did come up with a date for the deliberations.
8	Sheila, is Ms. Orth on the platform?
9	MS. APODACA: I don't see her on the
10	platform.
11	CHAIR ROZATOS: Okay. So the date that was
12	submitted was either March the 11th or March the
13	12th, correct, Sheila?
14	MS. APODACA: Yes. That's the date we were
15	working with.
16	CHAIR ROZATOS: Okay. Does that work for
17	everybody?
18	Mr. Rankin, we'll start with you.
19	MR. RANKIN: I believe so. I believe so.
20	Let me just double check my calendar. Thank you very
21	much. One moment. You said it was March 11th or
22	March 12th?
23	CHAIR ROZATOS: Correct.
24	MR. RANKIN: That should work, Mr. Chair.
25	Thank you.

1	CHAIR ROZATOS: Okay. Thank you.
2	Mr. Tremaine.
3	MR. TREMAINE: No conflicts. We are
4	available.
5	CHAIR ROZATOS: Excellent. Thank you.
6	Mr. Sayer.
7	MR. SAYER: Thank you.
8	CHAIR ROZATOS: Okay. So no conflicts for
9	Mr. Sayer.
10	And we don't know about Wild Earth
11	Guardians, so we're going to set it for March the
12	11th. If they have an issue, they can definitely let
13	the commission know and we can tackle it at that
14	time.
15	So March 11th is the date that we will
16	set for that one, Sheila, if you could note that down
17	for us, please.
18	I do know that those were dates that
19	Ms. Orth that they did work with Ms. Orth, so she
20	is good with that as well. So we'll be able to go
21	that route.
22	Any other questions or comments on this
23	particular case?
24	Excellent. We'll move on to our next
25	case, Case Number 24683, application of Western

1	Environmental Law Center, Citizens Caring For the
2	Future, Conservation Voters of New Mexico Education
3	Fund, Dine' C.A.R.E., Earthworks, Naeva, New Mexico
4	Interfaith Power and Light, San Juan Citizens
5	Alliance, and Sierra Club to amend 19.15.2, 19.15.8,
6	19.15.9 and 19.15.25 in the New Mexico Administrative
7	Code.
8	This is set for a status conference.
9	Are all parties present for that? We'll start with
10	Western Environmental Law Center.
11	MR. TISDEL: Yeah. Kyle Tisdel for Western
12	Environmental Law Center and other co-petitioners.
13	CHAIR ROZATOS: Excellent. Thank you.
14	MR. FELDEWERT: Good morning, Mr. Chair,
15	Members of the Commission. Michael Feldewert of the
16	Santa Fe office of Holland & Hart for Oxy USA.
17	CHAIR ROZATOS: Okay. Excellent.
18	MR. SUAZO: Good morning. Miguel Suazo,
19	with Beatty & Wozniak, appearing on behalf of the
20	New Mexico Oil and Gas Association.
21	CHAIR ROZATOS: Thank you, Mr. Suazo.
22	MR. TREMAINE: Jesse Tremaine on behalf of
23	the Oil Conservation Division.
24	CHAIR ROZATOS: Excellent. Thank you
25	Mr. Tremaine.

1	Anybody on the platform?
2	MS. TRIPP: Good morning, Commission. This
3	is Ann Tripp, on behalf of Hinkle Shanor, appearing
4	for interveners Independent Petroleum Association of
5	New Mexico.
6	CHAIR ROZATOS: Excellent. And you said
7	Tripp, correct, Ms. Tripp, T-R-I-P-P?
8	MS. TRIPP: T-R-I-P-P.
9	CHAIR ROZATOS: Okay. Excellent. Thank
10	you.
11	Anybody else?
12	Okay we'll start with Western
13	Environmental Law Center, or anybody who would like
14	to make a comment.
15	MR. TISDEL: Yeah, thank you, Commission.
16	So our petition was filed in June 24th
17	of 2024. The petition was granted by the commission
18	on July 18th, and a hearing date was set for April.
19	And that was done in September 23rd of 2024.
20	We had set up meetings in October with
21	all of the parties to work through the petition as it
22	had been filed. The Oil Conservation Division was
23	also diligently working through their red-line
24	version of the filed petition. We were anticipating
25	that OCD's red-line would happen by the end of the
	Page 8

1	year. Due to, I think, workflow issues and a number
2	of constraints on OCD's side, we did not get that
3	red-line until February 12th.
4	Mr. Tremaine of OCD also did notify the
5	commission on January 28th that we would need to
6	continue and reschedule the hearing dates that were
7	set in April. So we do have that red-line. I think
8	all the parties at this point are working through
9	that red-line.
10	There is a need, I think, for us to come
11	back together and confer and see if we can come to
12	some agreement on different dates for the hearing.
13	CHAIR ROZATOS: Okay. So we don't have any
14	dates suggested as of now?
15	MR. TISDEL: Not of now.
16	CHAIR ROZATOS: Okay. Mr. Tremaine.
17	MR. TREMAINE: Mr. Chair, good morning.
18	Thank you.
19	There have been a number of discussions
20	between the parties in advance of our sharing of the
21	revised red-line. However, it's going to take some
22	time for everyone to figure out the different that
23	conflicts, et cetera, and propose some dates to the
24	commission.
25	I think that there are some elements to
	Page 9

1	OCD's red-line that will require a different
2	examination of evidence at the hearing, and so we
3	have moved the needle a little bit in terms of what
4	witnesses and what experts might need to be available
5	for all the parties, and absolutely respect that they
6	will need some additional time.
7	So with the eight days since we've
8	circulated the petition, we haven't reached a
9	particular proposed date. But what I would suggest
10	to the commission is that we can communicate between
11	the parties over the next week or two and submit a
12	revised proposed scheduling order for the
13	commission's review.
14	CHAIR ROZATOS: Okay. Mr. Suazo.
15	MR. SUAZO: Sure. Good morning, Mr. Chair
16	and Commissioners.
17	I concur with the parties that, you
18	know, we need to get together and really assess OCD's
19	proposed changes. I think, you know, since the
20	association is made up of members, we just got this
21	last Wednesday, you know, we haven't even had the
22	chance to confer as an industry about what these
23	changes mean and what types of witnesses we're going
24	to require, whether or not this warrants the
25	association proposing their own red lines and so on
	Page 10

1 and so forth. 2 So I think that because the new changes 3 by OCD were received so recently, we are going to need additional time. This is essentially a reset to 4 a degree of the initial proceedings. And so we're 6 not even scheduled to meet as an industry until next After that point, they would need to confirm week. 8 amongst themselves, provide the attorney's feedback, 9 probably have another follow-up meeting. 10 So I think realistically, we're not 11 going to be in a position to, you know, look at 12 dates, you know, that makes sense for us for, I would 13 say, at least 30 to 60 days. Probably more, closer to 30. 14 15 CHAIR ROZATOS: Okay. Thank you. 16 Mr. Feldewert. 17 MR. FELDEWERT: I concur. I think we've kind of had a reset here, and it's going to take some 18 19 time to get the parties together and then determine what evidence is going to be required with the 20 21 changes have been proposed and what additional 22 changes may be needed by my client or other clients. 23 So I think, we're in a position where it's going to 24 take a little time to get this set up again for a 2.5 hearing.

1	CHAIR ROZATOS: Okay. Thank you.
2	Ms. Tripp, did you have anything you
3	wanted to add?
4	MS. TRIPP: Commissioner, thank you. IPNM
5	is in a very similar situation, in the sense that we
6	are a member organization, over 350. And we've not
7	yet set a time to meet to discuss the changes and
8	whether a proposed red-line would be necessary.
9	So concurring with what everyone has
10	said here today, that the parties need to get
11	together and that the timeline for that is likely in
12	the next 30 days or so.
13	CHAIR ROZATOS: Okay. Excellent.
14	So if we need probably another 30
15	days Mr. Tremaine, go ahead.
16	MR. TREMAINE: Mr. Chair, hearing that the
17	parties will require, I understand it, somewhat
18	longer than I had anticipated, my suggestion would to
19	set this for a status conference at the next meeting.
20	CHAIR ROZATOS: And that was what I was just
21	going to say. You beat me to it.
22	MR. TREMAINE: I just wanted to be on the
23	record as stating my position. Thank you.
24	CHAIR ROZATOS: Okay. Excellent.
25	So why don't we set this for a status
	Page 12

1	conference at the next OCC meeting, the March
2	meeting.
3	Sheila, what date is the March meeting.
4	MS. APODACA: March 20th.
5	CHAIR ROZATOS: March 20th. So we'll set it
6	as a status conference for March 20th. Hopefully,
7	you all will have been able to get together and come
8	to some consensus for days.
9	Go ahead, Commissioner Bloom.
10	COMMISSIONER BLOOM: Mr. Chair, I can't
11	remember if this is something we set during your
12	tenure, but we did set some tentative dates and held,
13	based on our calendar, the weeks of the 14th through
14	the 21st. I'm going to assume that those are freed
15	up now and open up my schedule for other meetings.
16	CHAIR ROZATOS: I believe that that's the
17	consensus, we are opening up the April. So April now
18	is open. Those dates will be released. We will meet
19	back again in March for this topic, as a conference,
20	status conference. And as I've mentioned, hopefully,
21	you all will have come to some conclusions and some
22	decisions, and we can probably set a date March 20th.
23	If you need more time, definitely we can discuss it
24	at that point. But maybe we can set that.
25	Just remember everybody, we're going
	Page 13

1	into the summertime here, so schedules will get
2	tighter with summertime. So please be cognizant of
3	that as we're scheduling that out.
4	Excellent. Any other points or
5	questions, comments for this particular case?
6	Great. We'll see you all on March the
7	20th. Thank you.
8	We're going to be moving into our
9	consolidated cases, but before we do that, let's take
10	a few minutes so the parties can have time to change
11	tables and everything. So let's take a 10-minute
12	break.
13	(Off the record.)
14	CHAIR ROZATOS: Okay. Let's start up again.
15	If I could get everybody's attention. We will start
16	out with our next case.
17	Our next case is the consolidated cases
18	by Goodnight Midstream and Empire New Mexico. The
19	case numbers are, as I said, consolidated, so we have
20	Case Numbers 24123, 23614 through 17, Case Number
21	23775, and Case Numbers 24018 through 24020 and
22	24025.
23	This is a matter to be heard by the
24	commission. It's motions and opening statements
25	today and tomorrow, and actual evidentiary

1	evidentiary hearing starting Monday, the 24th through
2	the 28th.
3	Are all parties present? I'm going to
4	start to my right and move across the room.
5	Mr. Rankin.
6	MR. RANKIN: Good morning, Mr. Chairman,
7	Commissioners. May it please the commission. Adam
8	Rankin with the Santa Fe office of Holland & Hart,
9	appearing on behalf of Goodnight Midstream in these
10	cases.
11	CHAIR ROZATOS: Excellent. Thank you.
12	MR. MOANDER: Chris Moander, counsel
13	appearing on behalf of the Oil Conservation Division.
14	CHAIR ROZATOS: Excellent. Thank you.
15	MS. HARDY: Good morning, Commissioners.
16	Dana Hardy appearing on behalf of Empire New Mexico,
17	LLC.
18	CHAIR ROZATOS: Excellent. Thank you.
19	MS. SHAHEEN: Good morning. Sharon Shaheen,
20	also appearing on behalf of Empire New Mexico.
21	CHAIR ROZATOS: Excellent. Thank you.
22	We'll move to the back table, right
23	behind Ms. Shaheen.
24	MR. SUAZO: Good morning, Commissioners
25	Miguel Suazo, with Beatty & Wozniak, appearing on

1	behalf of Pilot Water.
2	CHAIR ROZATOS: Excellent.
3	MR. PADILLA: Members of the Commission,
4	Ernest L. Padilla for Empire New Mexico, LLC.
5	CHAIR ROZATOS: Thank you, Mr. Padilla.
6	MR. BECK: Matt Beck on behalf of
7	interveners, Rice Operating Company and Permian Line
8	Service, LLC.
9	CHAIR ROZATOS: Thank you, Mr. Beck.
10	MR. RANKIN: Mr. Chair, I neglected to
11	introduce my colleague, Julia Broggi, also with
12	Holland & Hart, who will be assisting me in these
13	cases.
14	CHAIR ROZATOS: Excellent. Thank you,
15	Ms. Broggi.
16	As we stated, that this is going to be
17	motions and opening statements today. It is a matter
18	to be heard in front of the commission. We do have a
19	hearing officer with us, Mr. Rip Harwood. So I will
20	transfer it over to Mr. Harwood to begin the
21	proceedings.
22	Mr. Harwood. Mr. Harwood, if you can
23	click on your microphone, the right button. There
24	you go.
25	HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: Just going to ask
	Page 16

1	what illuminates the green light. Okay, good.
2	Good morning, everybody. I have a list
3	of things here I want to go through, but first of
4	all, I have a sheet here of motions that were filed.
5	And I believe that all the prehearing motions have
6	been resolved, but I'd like to hear from the parties
7	if there's any disagreement.
8	And I guess I'll start with you,
9	Mr. Rankin.
LO	MR. RANKIN: Good morning, Mr. Harwood. My
L1	understanding at this time is that all the
L2	preliminary motions that have been filed in advance
L3	of the hearing, have been addressed and disposed of.
L4	So there is nothing pending at this time, is my
L5	understanding.
L6	HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: Yes sir.
L7	MR. MOANDER: Mr. Hearing Officer, Chris
L8	Moander, OCD. My understanding is, all the
L9	prehearing motions that had been filed that were
20	pending, have been resolved.
21	However, OCD will likely be submitting a
22	motion for reconsideration on an order that was
23	entered yesterday. And I anticipate we'll be filing
24	that by the close of business today. So that will be
25	outstanding, I won't speak for the other parties, but

1	
1	I'm not anticipating that there will be any party
2	response to that because it's very specific to a
3	particular order. So that will be forthcoming.
4	I'm not clear who will be addressing
5	that, but I'll ensure that that's filed today.
6	HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: Mr. Moander, I
7	look forward to your outstanding motion. Thank you.
8	Ms. Hardy.
9	MS. HARDY: Good morning, Hearing Examiner.
10	From Empire's perspective, all of the outstanding
11	motions have been resolved.
12	HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: All right. And
13	let's see, Ms. Shaheen.
14	MS. SHAHEEN: Ms. Hardy is speaking for
15	Empire today.
16	HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: I'm sure by the
17	end of next week, I'll know everybody's name.
18	I know you, Mr. Beck. Go ahead.
19	MR. BECK: Yeah, same for Rice and Permian.
20	We understand all the motions are decided.
21	HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: Okay. And for
22	Empire. Oh, I'm sorry, you already spoke for Empire.
23	Let's see. Okay. So there are three of you for
24	Empire. All right. Fair enough.
25	CHAIR ROZATOS: All right. So, Mr. Hearing
	Page 18

1	Examiner, did you ask for Pilot, Mr. Suazo with
2	Pilot.
3	HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: Oh, I'm sorry,
4	Mr. Suazo. Didn't mean to overlook you.
5	MR. SUAZO: No, no problem. Pilot considers
6	the outstanding motion resolved, as well.
7	HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: All right. Thank
8	you very much.
9	Okay. So while we were on the break, I
LO	spoke informally with Mr. Rankin because my
L1	understanding is that we have five days for this
L2	hearing, and in speaking with him, my further
L3	understanding is that we have approximately 22
L4	witnesses to get through.
L5	So I don't know if the rest of you share
L6	Mr. Rankin's pessimism, but he's thinking that five
L7	days is probably not going to be enough for this
L8	hearing, which was news to me. It may not be news to
L9	the commission.
20	But the reason I raise it is because one
21	of the first things I like to go through is the order
22	of presentations and time allotments. My
23	understanding, again, from a sidebar conversation
24	with Mr. Rankin, is that you all have agreed on the
25	order of presentations. Empire could go first,

1	Goodnight to go second. And then OCD to go third.
2	Is that correct?
3	MR. RANKIN: I believe so, Mr. Hearing
4	Officer.
5	CHAIR ROZATOS: Mr. Hearing Officer, was an
6	order, that last paragraph there, that was dated,
7	states the order that we had decided for the actual
8	case. I forget the date of the order.
9	HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: Okay. I'm not
L 0	sure when this was dated, but I guess I should have
L1	read it more carefully. So that solves that issue.
L2	So that's the order of presentations.
L3	Let me hear from you, Empire, Ms. Hardy
L 4	or Ms I'm sorry, I want to get the pronunciation
L 5	correct Shaheen?
L6	MS. SHAHEEN: That's correct.
L7	HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: Let me hear from
L 8	Empire. How long do you think that you will need to
L9	present your case and your witnesses.
20	MS. HARDY: I think that, of course, it
21	depends on the amount of cross-examination time and
22	questions from the commission. But based on the
23	number of witnesses, it seems that it would likely
24	take several days, possibly the first week. But it
25	depends on the time of cross, of course.

1	HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: You know, I used
2	to do a lot of jury trial work and I had judges tell
3	me, "Okay. We have a week for trial. You've got
4	till Wednesday at noon, and then you turn it over to
5	the other side."
6	So I'm assuming that that's not going to
7	be the protocol here and that the five days can
8	stretch into 10 days, 12 days, whatever it takes. I
9	guess the concern there, given the number of people
10	involved, including, you know, the time constraints
11	of all the parties and all the commission members, is
12	that if we go more than five days, there may be some
13	break between the first part of this, quote, unquote,
14	trial and the rest of the proceeding.
15	It's very unlikely, I suspect, and the
16	commission can tell me if I'm wrong, that we'll be
17	able to reconvene the week following next week to
18	continue this hearing immediately.
19	CHAIR ROZATOS: I think you're correct,
20	Mr. Hearing Officer. I think that we're all going
21	into this knowing that we're dedicating the five days
22	next week, and then as of Friday of next week, we'll
23	see where we're at. And then we're going to have to
24	look at schedules.
25	HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: Okay.

1	CHAIR ROZATOS: So I think the goal is to
2	try to get it as soon as we possibly can, to
3	reconvene. But, again, there's a large number of
4	people that are involved, so schedules will
5	definitely be of the utmost concern by next Friday.
6	HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: Okay. So the
7	downside of going beyond five days, obviously, is
8	that there's going to be this proceeding is going
9	to end up being an extended hearing over a period of
10	probably a month or more, would be my guess.
11	Okay. So I don't think it makes any
12	sense at this point, then, to even talk about time
13	allotments. We will assume that on Monday, Empire
14	will start with its first witnesses. We're going to
15	have opening statements today from everyone, correct?
16	So at least we'll get that out of the way.
17	MR. MOANDER: I believe that's correct
18	Mr. Hearing Officer.
19	HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: Any estimate on
20	the length of time you all need for opening
21	statements? Is this the last item on the agenda,
22	Mr. Rozatos.
23	CHAIR ROZATOS: This is the last item on the
24	agenda, and we are slated to potentially go into
25	tomorrow, if need be, for opening statements. This

1	is a very lengthy calendar. So today and tomorrow
2	are slated for opening statements. Evidentiary
3	hearing starts on Monday. So however long it takes
4	once we start.
5	HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: Well, I almost
6	hate to hear that because it encourages people to go
7	on and on. I'll just remind everybody that, you
8	know, opening statements are just to give everybody
9	an overview of what they expect their witnesses to
LO	say and what they expect to prove.
L1	We don't need to hear the whole case
L2	since we're going to hear the whole case from the
L3	witnesses. So just bear that in mind. It would be
L4	nice if we don't have to go into tomorrow.
L5	In fact, if we have tomorrow, and I'm
L6	just floating this idea for everybody, since we only
L7	have five days for trial, is there any chance if we
L8	get through openings today, that we can start the
L9	hearing on the merits with witnesses tomorrow?
20	CHAIR ROZATOS: Mr. Hearing Officer, I
21	think and I apologize, these were all issues we
22	did kind of tackle. The witnesses are only going to
23	be set starting Monday. Schedules for the witnesses
24	were also kind of set with that. So we are kind of
25	on a time crunch.

1	I think all the parties, and correct me
2	if I'm wrong, parties, everybody agreed, especially
3	at the last meeting that we had, that we were going
4	to be as expeditious as we possibly could be.
5	On this particular case, I think
6	everybody was aware that this was going to take more
7	than the five days. And I will actually I
8	apologize for taking this from you, Mr. Hearing
9	Officer, but I'll just start from one side of the
10	room and move my way across.
11	Is that how you understood it,
12	Mr. Rankin.
13	MR. RANKIN: Yes, Mr. Chair. And I think
14	part of the problem with starting on Friday, as we
15	just discussed, is that lots of people are traveling
16	from lots of different places and having to go back
17	on the weekend just didn't make sense. So we just
18	decided to start on Monday.
19	CHAIR ROZATOS: Excellent.
20	Mr. Moander.
21	MR. MOANDER: Mr. Chair, that is OCD's
22	understanding. And we have prepared under that
23	understanding.
24	CHAIR ROZATOS: Okay. Ms. Hardy or
25	Ms. Shaheen.

1	MS. HARDY: Yes, same for Empire.
2	CHAIR ROZATOS: Okay. Mr. Suazo.
3	MR. SUAZO: Same for Pilot.
4	CHAIR ROZATOS: Okay. Mr. Beck?
5	MR. BECK: Yes.
6	CHAIR ROZATOS: Okay. So we all have gone
7	into this knowing that starting Monday, witnesses,
8	and then however long it takes.
9	HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: All right. Well,
10	I didn't mean to open a can of worms, but, you know,
11	time is of the essence in these things.
12	All right. So the next thing on my list
13	here, Goodnight had mentioned that it's expert, Larry
14	Lake, has limited availability at the end of the
15	week. Given the fact that Empire is going to take
16	most of the week, is that even still an issue?
17	MR. RANKIN: Mr. Examiner, I think if
18	Mr. Lake if we're not able to get to our case by
19	the end of the week, then he would just have to
20	appear remotely. I think that will probably be the
21	situation for him.
22	HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: So you'll be able
23	to work around it.
24	MR. RANKIN: I believe so.
25	HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: Okay. Fair

enough.
I don't know if this is something that
happens here or not, or whether it even applies in
these cases. It's on my list. You know, in all the
Civil trials I did, I routinely excluded non-expert
witnesses from being present to overhear the
testimony of other witnesses.
I don't know if in these cases there are
any witnesses other than experts. I'd like to hear
from the parties if the rule of exclusion is even an
issue here. Mr. Rankin.
MR. RANKIN: Mr. Hearing Officer, I don't
believe so. I appreciate you raising the question,
but I believe in every instance all the experts
all the witnesses in these consolidated cases are all
experts across various different overlapping fields.
HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: Can you speak up a
little?
MR. RANKIN: Sure. No. I believe that the
rule of exclusion wouldn't apply here. In every
case, all the witnesses who be testifying are experts
in various overlapping fields.
HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: Okay.
MR. MOANDER: Mr. Hearing Officer, OCD would
agree. I don't think I've seen a witness in this
Page 26

1	case that would be considered a lay witness under the
2	rules of evidence, so I don't think the exclusionary
3	rule matters at this point.
4	HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: Okay. I thought
5	maybe there were principals for Empire or Goodnight
6	that might be testifying, but no.
7	Ms. Hardy.
8	MS. HARDY: Mr. Examiner, thank you. I
9	agree that the witnesses are experts and the
10	exclusionary rule wouldn't apply.
11	And with respect to the presentation, I
12	just wanted to go back for a minute and mention that
13	the parties have agreed to spend approximately 15
14	minutes with each expert on direct because they have
15	filed direct and rebuttal testimony in writing, so we
16	are working to expedite the hearing in that regard.
17	So I think the amount of time that each
18	witness will take will depend really on
19	cross-examination and questions from the commission.
20	So it's possible we could get through Empire's
21	witnesses more quickly, just depending on how that
22	goes.
23	HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: Well, I appreciate
24	that. If that weren't the case, we'd be looking at a
25	month-long trial, right?

1	MS. HARDY: Yes. I agree.
2	HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: Anyone else on
3	this rule of exclusion issue? If I hear nothing,
4	then I'll assume everybody's in agreement.
5	And of course it doesn't apply to expert
6	witnesses, you all understand that, because experts
7	can change their opinions all the way through trial
8	based on what they hear. So they're welcome to sit
9	in and listen if the parties want to pay for that.
10	Okay. So the other thing is, I'm
11	assuming that this hearing will go from 9:00 to 5:00
12	every day next week, or does the commission break
13	earlier?
14	CHAIR ROZATOS: I think we were slated for
15	9:00 to 5:00.
16	HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: 9:00 to 5:00, and
17	then we'll have a lunch break.
18	CHAIR ROZATOS: Correct.
19	HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: And I'm assuming
20	we'll have a mid-morning and mid-afternoon break.
21	CHAIR ROZATOS: Correct.
22	HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: Okay. Fair
23	enough.
24	Let's see. So this is just for
25	everybody's this is mainly for my benefit, I
	Page 28

1	should say. And I'm sure, you know, the commission
2	members are more familiar than I am, but with
3	abbreviations and acronyms, when you guys present
4	your cases, if you could do your best to at least
5	explain that stuff the first time it comes up so
6	that, you know, technical ignoramuses, like myself,
7	can start picking up the jargon. Okay?
8	It's prevalent in government work in
9	general. And there's a whole set of acronyms that
10	apply in the oil and gas field. So these guys may
11	know it, but it would help me if you guys can try and
12	remember that.
13	Okay. The last thing, I just want to
14	make it clear, you know, based on the research that's
15	been done, your substantive presentations in this
16	case are to the commission. They're not to me.
17	Given Mr. Rankin's comprehensive
18	research results, my only role here basically is to
19	resolve procedural issues and, you know, to at least
20	make provisional rulings on evidentiary issues,
21	subject to, you know, the commission's review and
22	possible overruling of my views on the subject.
23	As a hearing officer for other state
24	agencies and most of the hearings for the City of
25	Albuquerque, I'm used to being the complete decision

1	maker. So my role here is a bit of an oddity for me.
2	I feel like I'm half master of ceremonies and half
3	law clerk. So it doesn't really matter to me in this
4	day and age of my semi-retirement. I basically work
5	for boat parts. I spend half the year in Maine and
6	my boat is a typical jealous mistress. It doesn't
7	care what I do so long as I keep feeding it.
8	Anyway, so that's what I will be doing.
9	I will not be making any substantive recommendations
10	to the commission. And at the end of this, whenever
11	that may be, it's a quorum of the commission that
12	will decide all substantive issues raised at this
13	hearing. All right.
14	Okay. Anything further from the
15	commission?
16	Mr. Rubin, anything you'd like to add.
17	MR. RUBIN: Just that everyone else should
18	silence their cell phones.
19	CHAIR ROZATOS: Okay. Excuse me. By the
20	way, I caught a cold coming back from Miami last
21	week, but I want you to know, Doctor, that I don't
22	think it I know it's not COVID, and I don't think
23	it's still contagious. But I apologize for that.
24	So, does anybody need a quick break
25	before we go right into openings? Are you all

1	prepared at this point to begin with your opening
2	statements? All right. Then let's hear from whoever
3	for Empire will be making their opening remarks.
4	MS. HARDY: Thank you, Mr. Examiner,
5	Commissioners. Dana Hardy on behalf of Empire. And
6	I am going to try to share my screen here and
7	hopefully this will work.
8	Okay. So to give you a brief factual
9	background on these matters, these cases involve
10	Goodnight's continuing and proposed additional
11	injection of foreign and incompatible produced
12	saltwater into the San Andres Formation underlying
13	the Eunice Monument South Unit, which we will refer
14	to as the EMSU.
15	The commission's orders approving the
16	unit, that were issued approximately 40 years ago,
17	included the San Andres Formation within the unitized
18	interval. Goodnight's injection causes waste and
19	impairs the correlative rights of each mineral
20	interest owner in the unit, including the majority
21	owners of the minerals, the State of New Mexico,
22	which owns over 58 percent, and the United States
23	which owns over 19 percent, thereby interfering with
24	Empire's operations of the unit.
25	In addition to the continuing injection

1	that is ongoing, Goodnight proposes additional wells
2	and to increase the injection rate into one well,
3	which will only exacerbate the problem.
4	Here you'll see a map of the EMSU
5	boundary. Empire also operates the EMSU-B to the
6	northwest and the AGU unit to the southeast. And as
7	we know, in these cases we are looking at the EMSU
8	specifically.
9	For some background on the unit, the
10	subject field was discovered in 1929. In 1984, the
11	commission approved the unitization of the EMSU and
12	included both the San Andres and Grayburg formations
13	in the unitized interval. At that time, it was
14	estimated that an additional 64.2 million barrels of
15	oil could be recovered by water flooding the
16	reservoir. Since that time, the EMSU has produced
17	approximately 25 million barrels of oil.
18	The unit was first operated by Gulf Oil
19	Corporation, which was subsequently rebranded as
20	Chevron. In 2004, XTO acquired Chevron's interest,
21	and XTO operated the unit from 2004 to 2021.
22	Empire acquired XTO's interest and
23	became the successor operator in March of 2021.
24	Empire acquired the EMSU from XTO because of the
25	significant potential for enhanced oil recovery in
	Page 32
	rage 32

1	the Can Andrea DO7 which is the residual oil sone
1	the San Andres ROZ, which is the residual oil zone,
2	and the Grayburg. XTO's literature on the unit
3	valued the ROZ at approximately \$100 million.
4	With respect to Goodnight's injection,
5	Goodnight first began injecting water into the
6	San Andres unitized interval of the EMSU in July of
7	2020, and as of January 1st, 2025, has injected
8	approximately 63 million barrels of water.
9	Goodnight's injection far exceeds any other injection
10	of produced water into the unitized interval of the
11	EMSU.
12	Here you will see a map of Goodnight's
13	proposed SWDs within the EMSU. They are shown in the
14	red stars and there are four of them here. And you
15	can see the injection rates and pressures listed
16	there, and the rates are significant that are
17	proposed.
18	And as you can also see, these wells are
19	included within sort of a it's a concentrated
20	small area. And these are only the five proposed
21	wells that are at issue here.
22	If you look at this map you can see all
23	of the existing wells as well as the proposed wells
24	within the EMSU there are nine of them, and we've
25	also listed the injection rates there, and they are

1	significant. And, again, as you can see, this is a
2	large amount of injection going into this area of the
3	EMSU and into the unitized interval.
4	Goodnight also operates an additional
5	five SWD wells within approximately one mile of the
б	EMSU, and another SWD well in the San Andres within
7	two and a half miles of the EMSU.
8	Goodnight has permitted an additional
9	two wells, with an approximately 1.25 miles of the
10	unit, which have not yet been drilled. And those are
11	the Rocket and Verlander SWDs.
12	As of January 2025, the total amount of
13	incompatible saltwater injected by Goodnight within
14	or near Empire's operations is at least 126 million
15	barrels of water.
16	Empire's evidence demonstrates that
17	Goodnight's injection to date and proposed injection
18	into the future adversely impacts Empire's ability to
19	recover hydrocarbons in the unitized interval,
20	including both the Grayburg and the San Andres, by,
21	among other things, pressuring up the San Andres
22	Reservoir to levels above the original pressure,
23	requiring Empire to operate its CO2 tertiary recovery
24	project at a higher pressure than necessary, and
25	requiring Empire to inject the produced water into

1	another zone to make room for the CO2 to avoid
2	fracturing the formation.
3	Further re-pressurization of the
4	San Andres increases water influx into the Grayburg
5	Formation through natural fractures, and that is
6	prematurely watering out Empire's Grayburg producers.
7	Let's talk for a minute about the
8	applicable law and the burden of proof, as well as
9	the issues to be decided. And I think all of my
L 0	slides are important. This might be the most
11	important slide, from my perspective.
12	The New Mexico oil and Gas Act requires
13	the commission to prevent waste of hydrocarbons and
14	protect correlative rights. Under the act, the
15	commission is charged with issuing orders, and this
16	is a quote, "to prevent the drowning by water of
17	any stratum or part thereof capable of producing oil
18	or gas or both oil and gas in paying quantities and
19	to prevent the premature and irregular encroachment
20	of water or any other kind of water encroachment that
21	reduces or tends to reduce the total ultimate
22	recovery of crude oil petroleum or gas or both oil
23	and gas from any pool."
24	Goodnight has incorrectly focused on the
25	first phrase of this statute, which refers to paying
	Page 35

1	quantities, and ignores the rest. This argument
2	violates New Mexico's rules of statutory
3	construction, which require that statutes be
4	construed in their entirety. In addition, the
5	provision is included in the commission's enumeration
б	of powers and must be read broadly.
7	Goodnight also misconstrues the term
8	"production in paying quantities." Under New Mexico
9	law, that term means only that income generated from
10	oil and gas production exceeds operating costs. This
11	analysis does not include capital cost or investment.
12	To the extent that Goodnight's witnesses
13	focus on the economic aspects of a proposed tertiary
14	recovery project, that focus is failing to comply
15	with the statute and ignores the actual definition
16	under New Mexico law of production in paying
17	quantities.
18	With respect to the burden of proof, I
19	think we should all agree that administrative
20	proceedings are subject to the common law rule that
21	the moving party bears the burden of proof. The
22	party bringing the application before the commission
23	therefore bears the burden of proving by a
24	preponderance of the evidence that it is entitled to
25	the relief requested in the application.

1	Here, Goodnight bears the burden of
2	proving by a preponderance of the evidence that its
3	proposed injection will not result in waste or impair
4	correlative rights. And Empire bears the burden of
5	proving on its applications to revoke Goodnight's
6	permits that the injection is resulting in waste or
7	impairing correlative rights.
8	And I'm raising that issue here because
9	Goodnight has argued in various motions that Empire
10	bears the burden of proof somehow on all of the
11	applications, and that's not correct. It's not a
12	correct statement of the law.
13	With respect to the issues to be decided
14	here, those have been addressed already by the
15	commission in its joint order on the scope of the
16	hearing. And that order states: At said hearing,
17	the parties shall submit all evidence, testimony and
18	legal argument on the issue of the existence, extent
19	of and possible interference with a residual oil zone
20	underlying the Eunice Monument South Unit, the EMSU,
21	by produced water injection activities undertaken by
22	Goodnight.
23	So that is what we are all here to
24	address and that the commission will decide.
25	Empire's witness testimony will

1	demonstrate that a ROZ underlines the EMSU and that
2	Goodnight's injection is interfering with it. Empire
3	relies on voluminous geological and engineering data
4	that supports its position, while Goodnight
5	disregards fundamental geology.
6	Goodnight's spends the majority of its
7	time trying to explain away evidence rather than
8	supporting its case with affirmative evidence.
9	Likely because Goodnight's evidence is weak and
10	flawed, as Empire's witnesses will explain.
11	And to introduce those witnesses, these
12	are the folks you'll be hearing from during the
13	hearing.
14	You'll hear from Jack Wheeler. He is
15	the Empire senior vice president of Land and Legal.
16	He will testify regarding the creation and history of
17	the EMSU, Empire's acquisition of the EMSU and its
18	operations, Division and commission orders relating
19	to the unit, and the location of Goodnight's proposed
20	and currently active or permitted SWDs within the
21	EMSU.
22	Dr. Robert Lindsay is a consulting
23	geologist. Dr. Lindsay wrote his PhD dissertation on
24	the EMSU, and he is the foremost authority on it. He
25	will testify to his characterization of the geology

1	of the San Andres and Grayburg Reservoir, including
2	selection of the top of the San Andres, the presence
3	of a residual oil zone within the San Andres,
4	identifiable vertical fractures within the San Andres
5	and Grayburg that allow for vertical migration of
6	injected saltwater from the San Andres into the
7	Grayburg, and the lack of an effective geologic seal
8	between the Grayburg and San Andres.
9	You'll hear from Galen Dillewyn, a
10	consulting log analyst with NuTech. He will testify
11	on the procedures that NuTech used to determine oil
12	saturations of the Grayburg waterflooded interval in
13	the San Andres ROZ in seven key wells at the EMSU.

He will address the NULOOK process for determining rock properties and oil saturation and carbonate reservoirs sensitivities run on the model, and determination that a ROZ interval exists at the EMSU.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Joseph McShane is a geologist, petroleum geologist with Empire. He will testify regarding his experience reviewing and studying the unitized Grayburg and San Andres interval in the EMSU, including a geologic overview, cross-sections proposed and active Goodnight wells injecting into the interval, subsea structure maps of the Grayburg in San Andres, NuTech's log analysis of oil-in-place,

1	proof of the ROZ in the San Andres, and the lack of a
2	geologic barrier between the Grayburg and San Andres.
3	Ryan Bailey, a consulting geologist with
4	Ops Geologic will testify in rebuttal to Mr. Preston
5	McGuire that Goodnight's selection of a deeper top
6	for the San Andres reduces Goodnight's estimate of
7	the oil-in-place for the San Andres ROZ. Goodnight
8	does not recognize the Lovington Sand as a marker
9	within the Upper San Andres, and many of their picks
10	for top of San Andres are at this sand. And there is
11	considerable oil-in-place in both the Upper and Lower
12	San Andres based on Ops' log interpretation and
13	mapping.
14	Stanley Birkhead is a consulting
14 15	Stanley Birkhead is a consulting geologist with Ops Geologic as well. He will testify
15	geologist with Ops Geologic as well. He will testify
15 16	geologist with Ops Geologic as well. He will testify that Goodnight's estimate of oil saturation is
15 16 17	geologist with Ops Geologic as well. He will testify that Goodnight's estimate of oil saturation is pessimistic due to the log parameters and rock facies
15 16 17 18	geologist with Ops Geologic as well. He will testify that Goodnight's estimate of oil saturation is pessimistic due to the log parameters and rock facies utilized in the interpretation, Goodnight's
15 16 17 18	geologist with Ops Geologic as well. He will testify that Goodnight's estimate of oil saturation is pessimistic due to the log parameters and rock facies utilized in the interpretation, Goodnight's oil-in-place estimate is low due to the use of a
15 16 17 18 19	geologist with Ops Geologic as well. He will testify that Goodnight's estimate of oil saturation is pessimistic due to the log parameters and rock facies utilized in the interpretation, Goodnight's oil-in-place estimate is low due to the use of a San Andres structure top provided to expert witness
15 16 17 18 19 20	geologist with Ops Geologic as well. He will testify that Goodnight's estimate of oil saturation is pessimistic due to the log parameters and rock facies utilized in the interpretation, Goodnight's oil-in-place estimate is low due to the use of a San Andres structure top provided to expert witness Davidson by Goodnight, and that there are high oil
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	geologist with Ops Geologic as well. He will testify that Goodnight's estimate of oil saturation is pessimistic due to the log parameters and rock facies utilized in the interpretation, Goodnight's oil-in-place estimate is low due to the use of a San Andres structure top provided to expert witness Davidson by Goodnight, and that there are high oil saturation intervals in both the Upper and Lower
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	geologist with Ops Geologic as well. He will testify that Goodnight's estimate of oil saturation is pessimistic due to the log parameters and rock facies utilized in the interpretation, Goodnight's oil-in-place estimate is low due to the use of a San Andres structure top provided to expert witness Davidson by Goodnight, and that there are high oil saturation intervals in both the Upper and Lower San Andres, which Goodnight failed to identify due to

1	He will testify about the ROZ fairways that developed
2	in New Mexico and Texas, leaving large volumes of
3	residual oil beneath main pay zones, those are
4	brownfields, and isolated with no main pay, which are
5	greenfields. He will talk about CO2 and enhanced oil
6	recovery success at the Seminole ROZ interval, which
7	is a brownfield and has produced 20,000 barrels of
8	oil per day for over 10 years. He will talk about
9	similarities and the success of the CO2 enhanced oil
10	recovery project at Tall Cotton, which is a
11	greenfield, where no commercial oil production had
12	been established prior to CO2 injection. And he will
13	address core and log information and state that that
14	confirms the presence of a ROZ at the EMSU, the
15	EMSU-B and the AGU.
16	Laurence Melzer is a geological
17	engineer. He will testify about the use of enhanced
18	oil recovery techniques, including CO2, to recover
19	previously unproduced residual oil zones around the
20	world, including in the Permian Basin. He will
21	provide estimates of the recoverable ROZ resources at
22	the EMSU, explain how SWD injection into those
23	reservoirs will severely impair the ROZ for both oil
24	exploration and CO2 storage, thereby creating waste.
25	Frank Marek is a consulting engineer.

1	He will testify to his evaluation of the impact of
2	existing SWD operations on waterflood projects in the
3	EMSU, including his analysis of cross-sections across
4	the unit that show oil saturations, the ways in which
5	injection and further injection of produced water
6	into the unitized interval detrimentally impacts
7	Empire's ability to recover hydrocarbons from the ROZ
8	and, therefore, results in waste.
9	Dr. James Buchwalter is a consulting
10	reservoir engineer. He will testify regarding his

reservoir engineer. He will testify regarding his reservoir model that he constructed for the EMSU, EMSU-B and AGU waterflood units in the San Andres ROZ interval, to obtain pressure in production history match required the water influx from the San Andres occur with the start of production in the 1930s, and he will explain that Goodnight is pressuring up the San Andres at a rate of at least 4 psi's for every million barrels of water injected, and that this would result in 50,000 barrels of water per day entering the Grayburg producing interval within the next two years due to higher San Andres pressure.

And last, but not least, Mr. William
West is Empire's senior vice president of operations.
He will testify about the volumes of Goodnight's SWD
injections to date, their quantifiable impacts on the

1	EMSU secondary recovery operations. He will explain
2	that there's evidence of communication between the
3	San Andres and Grayburg formations. He will provide
4	evidence that there was a ROZ in the San Andres,
5	discuss the estimated area of SWD exposure due to the
6	saltwater within the EMSU, describe SWD impacts on
7	secondary and tertiary recovery projects going
8	forward, and explain how Goodnight's downdip disposal
9	will impact the updip portions of the San Andres and
10	ultimately enter the Grayburg.
11	I am going to attempt some technical
12	wizardry here and show you a simulation that is
13	pretty short. It's about two minutes. The Eunice
14	Monument South Unit is composed of stacked sequences
15	of carbonate material that have been naturally
16	fractured during structure uplift of the San Andres
17	and Grayburg formations.
18	Goodnight's SWDs are impacting the
19	residual oil zone within the San Andres and water is
20	moving through those natural fractures to the
21	Grayburg. So the simulation will give you an idea of
22	the fluid movement in the reservoir.
23	So this is showing you the map, the line
24	of cross-section. And this is a cross-section
25	through the reservoir, showing the San Andres is

1	structurally high to Goodnight's Ryno SWD as we move
2	to the northeast. And it was during this uplift of
3	the structure that natural fractures formed in the
4	Grayburg and San Andres.
5	You can see here that Goodnight
6	saltwater injection is moving updip to Empire's water
7	supply wells and through natural fractures into the
8	Grayburg. And here we see a geologic slice of the
9	reservoir showing the Grayburg and a major portion of
10	the San Andres filled with oil.
11	The Grayburg and San Andres intervals
12	were concentrated with oil until tectonic forces
13	millions of years ago caused the oil from the
14	San Andres to be displaced with water, leaving a
15	residual oil zone.
16	Production began in the Grayburg
17	interval in the 1930s, and in 1986, a waterflood was
18	implemented in the Grayburg. The waterflood in the
19	Grayburg displaces the oil and leaves a residual oil
20	saturation in the Grayburg. Here we see the
21	pressures in the San Andres and Grayburg with
22	pressure in the San Andres currently being higher, as
23	Goodnight continues to inject saltwater the pressure
24	and the San Andres increases and builds up. And as
25	the pressure builds up the water moves through the

1	natural fractures into the Grayburg.
2	The CO2 flood begins to recover oil from
3	the residual oil zone in the San Andres while
4	continuing to waterflood the Grayburg. And since
5	it's likely that CO2 will move through the natural
6	fractures into the Grayburg, the Grayburg area above
7	the CO2 flood will also be prepared for CO2
8	breakthrough.
9	Empire's evidence proves that a ROZ
10	exists within the San Andres Formation in the EMSU.
11	The selection of the tops of the San Andres Formation
12	here is key. Goodnight concedes there is a ROZ, but
13	claims it is in the Grayburg, based on its flawed
14	selection of the top of the San Andres.
15	This is a high level summary of Empire's
16	evidence that will be addressed by our witnesses the
17	existence. The existence of ROZ within San Andres
18	underlying the EMSU and the surrounding area is
19	confirmed by core on the EMSU 679 and RR Bell
20	Number 4 wells within the unit and the north Monument
21	Grayburg/San Andres Unit 522 well, previously
22	operated by Amerada Hiss, which is located near the
23	EMSU-B.
24	So Empire's witnesses and the analysis
25	in this case is based on the actual core from those
	Page 45

1 wells. 2 The self-affirmed statements of engineer Laurence Melzer, which is our Exhibit C, states, "The 3 evidence from the cores taken at depth in the 4 5 San Andres clearly demonstrates residual oil zone of 6 at least 250 feet beneath the two units." 7 Oil saturations obtained in the EMSU 679 8 conventional core and shown in Preston McGuire's 9 B-32, show oil saturations greater than 20 percent in the San Andres down to 4,252 measured depth, or minus 10 11 652 feet subsea. 12 Goodnight uses an incorrect San Andres 13 top of minus 672 subsea, whereas Empire's corrected top of the San Andres is minus 548 subsea. 14 15 demonstrates the problem with Goodnight picking the 16 top of the San Andres deep to avoid saltwater 17 disposal into the Grayburg interval. By selecting a 18 proper San Andres depth for this downdip well, a 104 19 ROZ column exists. And you can see that on this exhibit. 20 21 This is one of Goodnight's exhibits. It's Preston McGuire's B-32. Goodnight Empire's notes are shown 22 23 in yellow, as it's also one of our rebuttal exhibits 24 to Mr. William West's testimony. And it shows that 25 Goodnight uses a San Andres top of minus 672, but the

actual core showed a higher top of minus 548. So
that's 124 feet higher than Goodnight's pick. And if
we use Goodnight's estimate of where the oil
saturation is greater than 20 percent, this shows
there is 104 feet of ROZ, which Goodnight has
excluded from its estimates of oil-in-place. So this
really shows the fundamental problem with their
analysis.
Goodnight indicated during the Piazza

Goodnight indicated during the Piazza hearing on that well, in its Exhibit C-18, which is our Rebuttal Exhibit N-2, which I'm going to show you, the wall selecting the top of the San Andres for water disposal, Goodnight was asked by OCD to use the deeper pick because it would give greater offset to the Grayburg production.

So this is that exhibit from the Piazza hearing and it's exhibit N-2 to our rebuttal. In the yellow notes, our, Empire's, and it states that Goodnight confirmed in their SWD application on Piazza, they had selected a deeper pick than what could have been normal to provide greater offset to the Grayburg production. And they indicate that they continue to use these deeper picks. So that shows the reason for their picks rather than the actual geology.

1	XTO confirmed that both the San Andres
2	and Grayburg have ROZ intervals when it owned the
3	unit. This is one of our exhibits that shows the
4	information that XTO had provided in a cross-section
5	regarding the wells, and it demonstrates the
6	existence of the ROZ. We have colored it in our
7	notes. Empire's notes are in yellow. Those are
8	Mr. West's notes. And it shows the Grayburg and
9	San Andres ROZ intervals. The coloration shows the
10	Grayburg transition zone, an area where San Andres
11	has moved hydrocarb. Removable hydrocarbons are also
12	shown.
13	And Goodnight's witness, Mr. William
14	Knights, confirmed that both the EMSU-658 and 660
15	wells both tested oil in this updip portion of the
16	San Andres. The existence of a ROZ in the San Andres
17	is further confirmed by openhole logs and mudlogs,
18	which will be discussed by Empire's witnesses. I've
19	provided citations for some of those exhibits here.
20	We will show them during the hearing.
21	For example, the EMSU-660 drilling mud
22	log shows good to yellow fluorescence with regions of
23	good cut and strong gas shows across 150 feet of the

San Andres. These other wells also that I've identified here show the existence of a ROZ in the

24

25

1 San Andres. 2 Now, for a summary of Goodnight's evidence, Preston McGuire is the only Goodnight 3 witness who picked formation tops. All of the other 4 5 Goodnight witnesses relied on his picks and did not 6 do any independent evaluation Mr. McGuire is a geologist, but his formation top picks rely entirely 8 on reservoir engineering principles, including 9 pressure data. He ignores voluminous geological data. 10 11 As Dr. Lindsay states in his rebuttal, you should never, ever pick formation tops using 12 13 engineering data, especially when geological data is available. And this area is very well studied 14 15 geologically. Dr. Lindsay discusses that extensively 16 in his testimony. Mr. McGuire's rebuttal does not 17 address Empire's evidence on the this issue. 18 instead focuses on other matters. 19 With respect to the oil saturations in 20 the San Andres, Empire witness, Dr. Lindsay, explains 21 the core analysis from the Empire-679 well and the RR Bell Number 4 show sufficient oil saturations to 22 23 reach a conclusion that the San Andres has a ROZ,

irrespective of whether it was termed as

25 nonproductive in 1984.

24

1	Similarly, Empire's witness from NuTech,
2	Galen Dillewyn, opines. Based on wireline logs for
3	ten wells, there is oil saturation in the San Andres.
4	And I provided a quote from his testimony there. He
5	states the San Andres and Grayburg are primarily a
б	dolomitic rock, with some dispersed limestones, and
7	that both formations show evidence of hydrocarbon
8	saturation.
9	With respect to Goodnight's evidence on
10	oil saturation, they rely primarily on the lack of
11	oil produced by water supply wells within the EMSU.
12	But as Empire's witnesses extensively explain, a
13	residual oil zone can only be produced with CO2
14	tertiary recovery. So the lack of production of oil
15	through water supply wells is irrelevant,
16	essentially.
17	Goodnight concedes that two wells have
18	tested oil in the San Andres, the EMSU-658 and the
19	EMSU-660. This demonstrates the existence of movable
20	oil, which Goodnight saltwater disposal operations
21	are pushing off the lease and outside of the unit.
22	Goodnight's contention that the ROZ
23	exists only in the Grayburg rests on the
24	misidentification of the top of the San Andres
25	Formation. And as I mentioned earlier and showed you
	Page 50

the slide, Goodnight admits that it picked the top
lower at the Oil Conservation Division's
recommendation to increase separation for purposes of
water disposal.
Empire will present extensive evidence
that Goodnight's existing and proposed injection
within the EMSU is damaging the ROZ and impairing
correlative rights. There is no impermeable barrier
between the Grayburg, the San Andres ROZ and
Goodnight's injection.
With respect to Empire's evidence, as
explained by Dr. Lindsay in his direct and rebuttal,
natural fractures exist in both the Grayburg and
San Andres formations and promote communication
between the two intervals. And Dr. Lindsay has
provided the actual fracture studies that confirm
this conclusion.
The San Andres Reservoir pressure
dropped from 1747 psi's at minus 430 feet subsea to
1245 psi's, which is over a 28 percent depletion by
April 1986, with limited production from the
San Andres. And this was measured in the EMSU-211
well. And this is important because it shows prior
to waterflooding, that production from the Grayburg
caused a pressure drop in the San Andres. So that

1 confirms that there was not an impermeable barrier 2. between the two intervals. 3 Empire has also provided water chemistry results that confirm there is no impermeable barrier 4 5 between the injection interval and the San Andres and 6 the Grayburg. 7 Dr. Lindsay discusses those studies. He 8 explains that plumes of water came from the San Andres which contains low salinity water that is 9 10 The presence of San Andres sulfate sulfate rich. 11 water mixing with the Grayburg barium ions and 12 forming barium sulfate scale prior to the waterflood 13 shows that San Andres water entered the Grayburg prior to the waterflood and, therefore, there's no 14 15 impermeable barrier and there is communication 16 between the zones. This interference is also shown by Dr. Buchwalter's model. 17 18 Dr. Trentham, another of Empire's 19 experts, similarly concludes that core and log information confirms the presence of ROZ and that 20 21 Goodnight's continued injection of off lease water 22 will greatly diminish or destroy Empire's ability to 23 use tertiary recovery in the unit. 24 Empire has seen an increase chlorides in 2.5 four wells near the Goodnight SWD wells, which also Page 52

1	indicates that San Andres water is entering the
2	Grayburg Formation.
3	With respect to Goodnight's evidence,
4	Goodnight contends that a 200-foot barrier exists
5	across the EMSU, separating The zone in which
6	Goodnight injects incompatible water from the ROZ
7	that exists in the Grayburg in San Andres.
8	Goodnight's witness, Mr. McGuire, states that
9	additional engineering evidence addressed in their a
LO	testimony confirms his assessment.
L1	The problem with this representation is
L2	that the cross-sections provided by Mr. McGuire do
L3	not show a continuous 200-foot barrier. And each of
L4	Goodnight's witnesses relied on Mr. McGuire's
L5	representations that a 200-foot barrier divides
L6	Goodnight's disposal zone from the existing residual
L7	oil zones.
L8	And I'm going to show you here. I need
L9	to, I think, escape from this for one moment. I'm
20	going to show you Mr. McGuire's cross-section that he
21	relies on and that all of Goodnight's witnesses rely
22	on. And they claim that and I know this is small,
23	so it's a little bit difficult to read. But the main
24	point here, for my purpose right now, is that they
25	claim the solid colored zones constitute impermeable

1	barriers between the injection zones.
2	But as you can see unfortunately, I
3	just lost it. There it is they are not
4	impermeable barriers. You can see a lot of white
5	space there. The white space would allow for flow.
6	So I'm sure Goodnight's witnesses, they
7	rely on that and it's not a correct assessment.
8	Back to my slide.
9	Goodnight's injection is also damaging
10	the ROZ and impairing correlative rights because it
11	is increasing formation pressure the injection causes
12	overpressured formations this. Overpressurization
13	exacerbates existing and causes additional fractures
14	and collapse breccia. Injection of foreign water is
15	also damaging Empire's producing wells.
16	Goodnight is pressuring up the
17	San Andres at a rate of 4 to 7 psi's per 1 million
18	barrels of water injected. By its disposal of over
19	200,000 barrels of water per day, Goodnight will
20	pressure up the San Andres by 292 to 511 psi's in one
21	year's time. This will require that Empire use more
22	CO2 for the San Andres CO2 flood than if the CO2
23	flood is operating at a lower pressure.
24	The disposed water is also known to
25	cause scaling and corrosion, as evidenced by a

workover on Goodnight' Ryno SWD well in October of 2024. The disposal water causes scaling downhole due to high levels of sodium and calcium in the disposal water mixing with sulfates in the San Andres water. So that's another problem that this injection is causing.

Due to the San Andres pressure increase, water influx into the Grayburg through natural fractures will increase and impact Empire's Grayburg waterflood. The areas where water entered from the San Andres into the Grayburg was mapped at the AGU. It can be estimated at the EMSU by the high water production volumes seen in the crustal areas at the EMSU prior to the waterflood. There was an edge water drive from the Goat Seep Aquifer/Grayburg prior to the waterflood, but it was insufficient to cause these high water volumes.

The petroleum geology using the correct San Andres structure top geochemistry, which includes the San Andres sulfate water appearing in the Grayburg, and petrophysics, which includes the core and log analysis showing oil in the San Andres, all show that there is a ROZ in the San Andres and that there is communication between the San Andres and the Grayburg.

1	Physics tells us that pressure increases
2	in the San Andres, and as that occurs, the water
3	influx will increase and this problem will worsen.
4	To address OCD's concern about the
5	migration of injected water to the Capitan Reef, the
6	first point is that this issue is outside the scope
7	of the hearing because the commission must first
8	determine if there is a ROZ within the San Andres and
9	if Goodnight's injection is interfering with
10	correlative right.
11	Dr. Lindsay's direct testimony also
12	addresses OCD's concern. He states there is not a
13	migration pathway between the unitized interval in
14	the Capitan Reef. Empire's injection, including for
15	a CO2 project, is vastly different from Goodnight's
16	injection.
17	Goodnight's injection involves high
18	volumes of water from other formations and areas into
19	the San Andres; whereas, Empire is only injecting
20	water that was produced by the San Andres and
21	Grayburg within the EMSU back into the same
22	formations. Goodnight's injection is causing
23	formation damage, while Empire's is not.
24	OCD does not present any evidence that
25	migration or contamination of the Capitan Reef is

1	actually occurring. And at this time, the commission
2	should not require Empire to implement a monitoring
3	project. The request is unnecessary because OCD does
4	not provide any evidence of a migration pathway, and
5	voluminous geological evidence shows there is no such
6	pathway.
7	In conclusion, Empire's evidence
8	resoundingly demonstrates that there is a ROZ within
9	the San Andres underlying the EMSU, and that
10	Goodnight's injection is interfering with Empire's
11	unitized interval and violating correlative rights.
12	Empire's applications to revoke
13	Goodnight's permits should be granted and Goodnight's
14	applications for approval of additional wells and to
15	increase its injection rate should be denied.
16	Thank you very much.
17	HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: Thank you very
18	much, Ms. Hardy. Thank you, Ms. Hardy.
19	Let's see, I see it's 10:22. Why don't
20	we take a ten-minute break. How about we come back
21	at 10:35, give everybody a little bit of a break.
22	And you can collect your thoughts,
23	Mr. Rankin.
24	(Off the record.)
25	HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: Okay. All right,
	Page 57

1	folks. Let's get on with it. You've had an extra
2	four minutes, so just for the record.
3	All right. I take it, then, that
4	Goodnight will make their opening statement at this
5	point, and I suspect we'll hear something a little
6	bit different.
7	MR. RANKIN: Thank you, Mr. Hearing Officer.
8	May I please the Commission, Chairman Rozatos,
9	Commissioner Bloom, who's an absentia, Commissioner
10	Ampomah.
11	In these consolidated cases, Goodnight
12	seeks approval for five new produced water disposal
13	wells, an authorization to increase the injection
14	rate in one existing well. All these wells target a
15	disposal zone in the San Andres Formation, and all
16	are within the exterior boundaries of the Eunice
17	Monument South Unit, or the EMSU, that is operated by
18	Empire.
19	For the existing well, which is called
20	the Andre Dawson in Case Number 23775, Goodnight
21	requests an increase in the injection rate from
22	25,000 barrels per day up to a maximum of 40,000
23	barrels per day.
24	As explained in the testimony, this
25	increase in the maximum rate is just to accommodate

1	long term peak loads. Goodnight has no intention of
2	running its wells or any of its wells at that maximum
3	rate for prolonged periods. Goodnight's approach is
4	to distribute its load over multiple wells and over a
5	large area.
6	Now, the testimony will show that
7	Goodnight has operated its wells in the EMSU at an
8	average injection rate of less than 15,000 barrels of
9	water per day, and that is the rate they expect to
10	maintain in all of its wells.
11	Four of Goodnight's cases request
12	approval for new wells to dispose into the
13	San Andres. Those are under Case Numbers 23614
14	through 23617. Now, all the details on those wells
15	and the requests, the technical issues are in the
16	testimony.
17	The fifth proposed new well is under
18	Case Number 24123. Now, that's the de novo case in
19	which the Division denied Goodnight its permit
20	previously, back in November of '23. We believe the
21	division's order was erroneous.
22	The evidentiary record simply does not
23	support the order. There was no evidence that the
24	proposed injection would interfere with EMSU
25	operations, cause waste or impair correlative rights.

1	There just was no evidence then and there's still no
2	evidence today.
3	Now, as the testimony will show, all
4	five of Goodnight's proposed new wells and the Andre
5	Dawson rate increase should be improved in addition
6	to Goodnight's six cases, we also have Empire's four
7	applications to revoke Goodnight's injection
8	authority and its four existing SWDs in the unit.
9	What the commission must decide. Okay.
10	At issue, and what the commission ultimately needs to
11	decide, is whether Goodnight's existing and proposed
12	injection will cause waste or impair correlative
13	rights in the EMSU. It's that simple.
14	But there are threshold issues that
15	underlie those ultimate decisions that the commission
16	must evaluate and decide first, including whether
17	Goodnight's San Andres disposal zone in the EMSU
18	contains economic accumulations of oil that are
19	commercially recoverable through a CO2 flood; whether
20	any stratum within the EMSU that is capable of
21	producing oil in paying quantities is being drowned
22	out by water from Goodnight's disposal; and whether

there's a competent geologic seal or barrier that

effectively isolates Goodnight's disposal within the

23

24

25

San Andres.

1	Separately, the commission also must
2	decide whether the San Andres is geologically or
3	hydrologically connected to the Capitan Reef or to
4	any other underground source of drinking water.
5	The testimony that you're going to be
6	reviewing or you have already started reviewing,
7	hopefully, and that you're going to hear next week
8	will establish that the San Andres and the EMSU is an
9	aquifer, not a hydrocarbon reservoir. And I'm
10	talking specifically about Goodnight's disposal zone.
11	Okay?
12	Because it is an aquifer, there are no
13	commercial accumulations of oil in that zone. That
14	means, disposal of produced water can't be causing
15	waste or impairing correlative rights. Nor is it
16	watering on any zone capable of producing oil or gas
17	in paying quantities.
18	And because there is a competent and
19	effective seal that isolates the disposal zone from
20	the EMSU operations above, there's no impairment to
21	correlative rights or to the production in the EMSU,
22	and, therefore, no waste.
23	Much of the evidence supporting these
24	determinations is highly technical and complex, much
25	like the carbonate shelf system that makes up the

1	EMSU itself. But while the subject matter and
2	evidence at the core of this dispute are technical,
3	with a heavy focus on petrophysics, petroleum
4	geology, geochemistry and geology, fundamental tenets
5	of logic and reason ultimately carry the day. Okay?
6	So don't get too concerned or swept up
7	in all the technical issues here. Because,
8	ultimately, logic and reason carry the day.
9	Even without an advanced degree in
10	petroleum engineering and petrophysics, the weight
11	and force of the evidence is clear and supports
12	granting Goodnight's applications and denying
13	Empire's effort to revoke them.
14	Let me give you a little bit of
15	background and context on what we're talking about
16	here. Before I get into the details, I want to go
17	into this history in the background of the San Andres
18	in this area. And I'm going to start sharing my
19	screen and I'm going to show you on the screen here
20	actually something that Empire didn't show you in its
21	opening.
22	I want to point out first, before I get
23	into the details of this map, that in 1965, the
24	New Mexico State Engineer declared the San Andres in
25	this area to be an aquifer subject to permitting

1	requirements for beneficial use. The EMSU's operator
2	at the time, when it was first approved back in the
3	1980s, went to the state engineer and permitted six
4	water supply wells in the San Andres through the
5	state engineer back in the 1980s as a source for
6	waterflood operations. In fact, the whole reason the
7	San Andres was included in the EMSU was because it
8	was the only source of water capable of supplying the
9	volumes needed for the waterflood in the EMSU.
10	Even though the San Andres had no
11	history of primary production, was known to be
12	nonproductive, it was included erroneously as part of
13	the unitized interval. It should never have been
14	included. The commission has no authority to unitize
15	formations that are aquifers.
16	And the evidence presented to the
17	commission was that the San Andres would be used as a
18	water supply and that waterflood injection would be
19	limited to the oil column in the Grayburg and the
20	Lower Penrose above the San Andres.
21	But well before it was declared an
22	underground water basin, the San Andres was, for
23	years, a formation targeted for produced water
24	disposal since at least the 1950s, more than three
25	decades before the unit was created in 1984.

1	On this map all the wells that have been
2	approved and actively injecting into the San Andres
3	in and around the three units that Empire operates.
4	The first San Andres disposal well in
5	the area that would become the EMSU started injecting
6	produced water in 1960. And that's this well up
7	here. It's a little yellow triangle here. And
8	you'll see on each of these wells is a date of first
9	injection and the cumulative volumes as of today.
LO	Okay? For some of the wells, we don't have complete
L1	records because they were injecting before the
L2	Division started requiring reporting of all the
L3	injectant volumes. Okay?
L4	So the first well there is the EME
L5	Number 33-M. It's less than 200 feet from the
L6	boundary of the unit. And is operated now by Rice
L7	Operating Company, one of the interveners in this
L8	case, and it has injected more than 60 million
L9	barrels of produced water to date.
20	Then, nearest to the unit boundaries
21	today, in 1966 a saltwater disposal well was approved
22	and started injecting in what is now the EMSU. It's
23	actually within the boundaries, and that's this well
24	here in the southwest corner. It's the EME SWD
25	Number 21. And it's operated by Permian Line
	Page 64

1	Service, who also is an intervenor in this case and
2	it has injected more than 43 million barrels of water
3	to date.
4	As you can see, there are dozens of
5	additional SWDs that have been approved in and around
6	the EMSU and Empire's two other units going back to
7	1952. Most of them are still active. Since the '50s
8	and every decade, numerous additional SWDs started
9	disposal operations within this five-mile area,
10	within the five-mile area surrounding Empire's three
11	units.
12	In 1987 Gulf Oil, itself, who was the
13	operator of the EMSU, converted one of its wells,
14	that actually was the unit log well, to an active
15	disposal well in the San Andres. And that well has
16	continued to be operated by Empire as recently as
17	late in 2024.
18	I'm showing this map because Empire's
19	experts, including their reservoir modeler, says that
20	all SWDs should be shut in and banned within a
21	five-mile radius around Empire's three units.
22	In Empire's testimony, Mr. William West
23	says all SWDs within two miles should be shut in and
24	banned, and no SWDs should be allowed within a
25	five-mile radius unless all the working interest

1 owners in these three units approve. 2 More than 60 SWDs are within that five-mile radius. That's a lot of SWDs. More than 3 90 have been approved for disposal in the San Andres 4 in the area. In fact, in the early '90s, the Division even established a special pool code for 6 San Andres disposal wells that it continues to use 8 today. 9 The history and context is important to understand here because Empire and the EMSU before it 10 11 came to existing disposal in the San Andres within 12 the EMSU; that disposal was pre-existing. Empire knew or should have known about the San Andres 13 disposal when it bought the properties from XTO, but 14 15 remarkably, they somehow only discovered it 16 afterwards. 17 Based on the fact that the disposal in the San Andres existed before the EMSU was created 18 19 and continued to be approved, even after the EMSU was formed, Goodnight Midstream acted in reliance on 20 21 decades of authorized approvals for SWDs and filed applications for its own disposal wells, but only 22 23 after the following. 24 First, Goodnight met with XTO, who was 2.5 then the operator of the EMSU, to discuss potential Page 66

1	locations for their own SWDs in the unit. Second,
2	Rice Operating filed for, and the OCD approved, two
3	additional SWDs in the EMSU in 2018. And that's over
4	here, this little pink well which has a date of first
5	injection of 11/20. This is the P-15 well and it's
6	now owned and operated by Pilot, one of the
7	interveners in this case. And the other well is down
8	here in the maroon color, the darker maroon color.
9	That's the N-11. That is owned and operated now by
10	Permian Line Service.
11	After Rice received its permits in 2018,
12	Goodnight proceeded to file applications for four of
13	its own SWDs in the unit between 2019 and 2020. The
14	first was the Sosa SWD, which was filed in 2019.
15	It's one of these four wells down here in that little
16	grouping. It was approved by the OCD in March of
17	2020. XTO did not object.
18	Next was the Ryno SWD; again, one of
19	these four in this little grouping. It was converted
20	from a Devonian injection well into a San Andres.
21	That application was filed in 2019 and approved by
22	the Division in 2020. No objection from XTO.
23	Next, Goodnight filed two applications
24	for the Dawson and Banks wells. Those were filed in
25	2020 and approved by OCD in February of 2022. Again,

1 no objection from XTO. The evidence will show that Goodnight's 2 3 existing SWDs and its pending applications in the unit were filed in sequence and in reliance on the 4 5 division's long history of approving SWDs in the San Andres, including within the EMSU, and in 6 reliance on the long history that the San Andres was 8 an aquifer and a water management source. Now, what does that reliance look like? 9 It looks like this: Hundred million pipeline that 10 11 Goodnight built moving produced water from areas of 12 high intensity Delaware Basin development, near where 13 the OCD has set up seismic response areas, to Goodnight's saltwater disposal field around the EMSU. 14 15 This is what's at stake in today's hearing. 16 Now, Empire's claims, given the history of the San Andres is, you know -- given the history 17 here, what's the problem? Okay? What's the problem 18 19 with Goodnight's operations. Well, Empire is suddenly saying that 20 21 there's overlooked oil in the San Andres, and they have a plan to produce it. They say that there's 900 22 23 million barrels of oil across their three units. 24 It's a remarkable claim, given that they bought the three units from XTO for a final adjusted price of 2.5 Page 68

1	just about \$16 million. The purchase price was \$17
2	million. After all adjustments were made, it was \$16
3	million.
4	According to Empire, injection of
5	produced water into the San Andres is going to make
6	it costlier for them to produce CO2 from their ROZ
7	zone, and it's impacting their waterflood operations,
8	and that the injection from Goodnight is causing
9	water to migrate into the Grayburg, causing corrosion
LO	scale and encroaching on their waterflood operations.
L1	Now, as the applicant is seeking to
L2	revoke Goodnight's injection authority and to
L3	overturn decades of long-established regulatory
L4	precedent, by converting the San Andres from a water
L5	management zone for produced water disposal and water
L6	production into an oil reservoir, it's Empire's
L7	burden to bring forward sufficient facts to prove
L8	those claims under their applications. There's no
L9	dispute about that.
20	The problem is, they keep changing their
21	story. They keep shifting their position, they keep
22	revising their analysis and their models every time
23	Goodnight's points out a fundamental flaw in their
24	approach. And they keep trying to litigate their
25	claims by ambush, starting with the very first

1 contest between these parties in 2022. 2 Back then, in the Piazza case, Goodnight 3 made a very simple discovery request: Provide all the documents that reflect the presence or absence of 4 oil in the San Andres within the EMSU. One request, 6 just give us what you got. 7 Empire put up a big fight and resisted. 8 The Division agreed with us and issued an order 9 compelling the discovery. Empire gave us seven documents. Four documents were general papers and 10 11 presentations on ROZ and the public announcement of 12 Empire's purchase. The others were marginally 13 responsive to the discovery request, some details on some of their wells. Nothing about an ROZ in the 14 15 San Andres. 16 We show up to hearing and Empire 17 presents as part of their evidence and testimony 18 brochures from XTO that they withheld from discovery 19 in an effort to ambush us at the hearing. hearing officer admitted the exhibits over 20 21 Goodnight's objections. The same thing happened at 22 the outset of these cases, these very cases before 23 the Division one year later in 2023, only on a much 24 bigger scale. 2.5 Just days before the hearing, Goodnight Page 70

1	was forced to compel production and continue that
2	hearing from the day it was set when it became
3	apparent that Empire failed to comply with its
4	discovery obligations, and the cases were eventually
5	referred to the commission.
6	Now at the commission, Empire is playing
7	the same game and still no consequences. After the
8	parties filed direct testimony and exhibits in August
9	2024, Empire saw Goodnight's petrophysics and
10	oil-in-place analyses from its experts at Netherland,
11	Sewell and acted quickly to prepare a revised
12	petrophysics analysis, directing their witness,
13	Mr. Galen Dillewyn, with NuTech, to undertake a
14	different analysis using different inputs and
15	different parameters based on measured water
16	saturation in his core logs, information that Empire
17	had all along from the beginning.
18	Now, based on that new analysis, Empire
19	submitted revised petrophysics testimony and revised
20	geology testimony, with a new oil-in-place analysis,
21	in December, more than three months after the
22	deadline to submit direct testimony, without seeking
23	leave from the commission to do so and without
24	conferring with counsel from the other parties
25	beforehand.

Now, we reached an agreement to file the revised testimony and to file a notice, okay, explaining what was changed, why it was changed and the justification for the timing. So that is all part of the record.

2.5

Now that revision in December required Goodnight's experts and counsel to throw away all the work they had been doing the three months prior on the original analysis that they had done and start over on a new one in December. Remarkably, when asked which version of his testimony he stood behind, Mr. Dillewyn testified in his deposition that he stood behind his original analysis and testimony, not the revised one that Empire had instructed him to prepare.

Then, a month after filing the revised petrophysics and oil-in-place testimonies, Empire disclosed in early January that they were going to present two new witnesses, providing a different petrophysical analysis with different assumptions and different inputs, resulting in a different oil-in-place estimate, based on a new stratigraph analysis, with new tops, for which Empire's new experts think that the -- where the San Andres is actually located.

1	Now, we've had the underlying
2	petrophysical logs and digits for less than a week
3	at this point, so we have not had time to fully
4	evaluate them. But it's apparent that what they're
5	doing is that they're calibrating their new log
6	interpretations to a different core log not in the
7	EMSU, and many of their San Andres top picks are
8	different. We evaluated the top picks that they'd
9	given us in discovery and that were used for their
10	structure maps initially, and approximately half of
11	the tops in their cross-sections and their rebuttal
12	testimony are different than what we had initially.
13	So the fact that Empire has to keep
14	changing their story, while Goodnight's analysis has
15	remained consistent and unwavering, says just about
16	all you need to know.
17	But what is Empire's story and how does
18	all this technical stuff fit into it? What it
19	appears is that Empire's goal here is to confuse and
20	obfuscate. Okay? That is most apparent in their
21	testimony around what is or is not the San Andres.
22	For example, all of Empire's evidence on
23	the alleged migration of produced water is limited to
24	what Empire calls the Upper San Andres. The zone
25	that Goodnight refers to as the Grayburg, not

1	Goodnight's disposal zone. That interval, which is
2	highlighted here in yellow, okay, whatever you want
3	to call it, the Upper San Andres or Lower Grayburg,
4	is not in disputes in these cases, because it is
5	above Goodnight's disposal zone and the perm barrier
6	that we've identified.
7	The only dispute is what to call it.
8	But, you know, even that makes no difference. It's
9	just semantics. Okay? It has no bearing on the
10	analysis of the technical issues in these cases
11	whether there's oil in Goodnight's disposal zone.
12	And the evidence that Empire does
13	present on this purported communication of the
14	San Andres is purely conjectural. For example,
15	Empire insists that the high sulfate San Andres water
16	that was migrating into the Grayburg before the EMSU
17	waterflood even started in 1986, thereby establishing
18	a history of communication between the zones, okay,
19	but they have not presented any evidence of high
20	sulfate San Andres water being produced from the
21	Grayburg Formation before waterflood operations
22	started. So there's no evidence that that's actually
23	the case.
24	And the evidence they do rely on to
25	contend there is communication today, such as the

geochemistry data that they rely on heavily, it's not diagnostic. It just doesn't provide the fingerprint that Empire claims.

Looking for a San Andres fingerprint makes no sense, considering that approximately 350 million barrels or more of San Andres water has been injected into the Grayburg for more than 40 years, completely mixing the chemistry. But setting aside these evidentiary problems and the supposition that Empire makes and the conclusion Empire attempts to draw, are all it related entirely to what is essentially this Upper San Andres zone, not Goodnight's disposal zone.

Empire has presented no direct evidence showing communication between the disposal zone here in blue and the Grayburg or even between the disposal zone in the Upper San Andres. It's really important to understand this and to be clear about what depths Empire or its witnesses are referring to when they discuss the San Andres. By constantly referring to the interval above Goodnight's disposal zone as the San Andres, without specifying depths, Empire's zone confusion about the two main issues in these cases, whether there's communication between the disposal zone and the producing interval, whether there is an

1	economic ROZ in Goodnight's disposal zone, those are
2	the two main issues, and it's important to understand
3	what depths we're talking about, this confusion shows
4	up across every main category of evidence that Empire
5	puts forward.
6	First in the alleged fractures between
7	the San Andres and Grayburg. Those are all premised
8	on Dr. Lindsay's fracture analysis and his testimony,
9	where Dr. Lindsay provides specific depths for his
10	fracture study of a single oriented core, the 679
11	well. The fracture study does not even go to the
12	bottom of the Grayburg in his own analysis. It stops
13	well short of what Empire itself calls the base of
14	the Grayburg.
14 15	the Grayburg. Now, in his rebuttal testimony,
15	Now, in his rebuttal testimony,
15 16	Now, in his rebuttal testimony, Dr. Lindsay supplies additional testimony on two new
15 16 17	Now, in his rebuttal testimony, Dr. Lindsay supplies additional testimony on two new fracture studies in the EMSU to the northwest and the
15 16 17 18	Now, in his rebuttal testimony, Dr. Lindsay supplies additional testimony on two new fracture studies in the EMSU to the northwest and the AGU to the southeast, miles away, but nothing new on
15 16 17 18	Now, in his rebuttal testimony, Dr. Lindsay supplies additional testimony on two new fracture studies in the EMSU to the northwest and the AGU to the southeast, miles away, but nothing new on the EMSU. But even then, he does not provide any
15 16 17 18 19 20	Now, in his rebuttal testimony, Dr. Lindsay supplies additional testimony on two new fracture studies in the EMSU to the northwest and the AGU to the southeast, miles away, but nothing new on the EMSU. But even then, he does not provide any depths for reference in either of his rebuttal
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Now, in his rebuttal testimony, Dr. Lindsay supplies additional testimony on two new fracture studies in the EMSU to the northwest and the AGU to the southeast, miles away, but nothing new on the EMSU. But even then, he does not provide any depths for reference in either of his rebuttal testimony or in his backup documentation that he
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Now, in his rebuttal testimony, Dr. Lindsay supplies additional testimony on two new fracture studies in the EMSU to the northwest and the AGU to the southeast, miles away, but nothing new on the EMSU. But even then, he does not provide any depths for reference in either of his rebuttal testimony or in his backup documentation that he provided to us.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Now, in his rebuttal testimony, Dr. Lindsay supplies additional testimony on two new fracture studies in the EMSU to the northwest and the AGU to the southeast, miles away, but nothing new on the EMSU. But even then, he does not provide any depths for reference in either of his rebuttal testimony or in his backup documentation that he provided to us. If you read it carefully, you'll see he

1	actually documented fractures going into the
2	stratigraphic equivalent of what is Goodnight's perm
3	barrier. You would expect to have seen that in his
4	testimony, what specific depths is he talking about.
5	But he doesn't include it.
6	The second category of data where we see
7	this confusion is in the reservoir pressure
8	measurements from Mr. William West. He makes
9	assumptions about what the pressures are at certain
10	depths to show a purported pressure drawdown in the
11	San Andres as a result of primary production in the
12	Grayburg. He tries to show that there's
13	communication between the formations. But the depths
14	that he uses are well above the top of the barrier
15	isolating Goodnight's disposal zone.
16	So even if his pressure assumptions and
17	calculations are correct, there's significant
18	problems with those. The depths he says in fact,
19	you'll see in the testimony in our rebuttal that says
20	it doesn't actually establish communication, it does
21	the opposite. It shows that the Grayburg is highly
22	compartmentalized and there's not even communication
23	within the vertical layers of the Grayburg, itself.
24	But even if his calculations and
25	assumptions are right, the depths he says are in the

1	San Andres are not in Goodnight's disposal zone. So
2	his erroneous assumptions here on the pressures
3	infects not just his testimony but it infects and
4	invalidates Empire's reservoir simulation that they
5	put forward, which requires having an accurate
6	starting reservoir pressure for Goodnight's disposal
7	zone. He's far above it and it's not an accurate
8	representation of actually what's happening in the
9	disposal zone.
LO	Third, we see this confusion continue
L1	with Empire's ROZ petrophysics and oil-in-place
L2	calculations across the EMSU. And you heard it in
L3	the opening, Empire complains that Goodnight has
L4	excluded roughly 200 vertical feet of the San Andres
L5	from its ROZ calculations, resulting in a lower
L6	oil-in-place calculation for the San Andres. But
L7	that claim is just plain false. Goodnight did not do
L8	its petrophysics or its oil-in-place analysis based
L9	on formations. And contrary to Empire's claims,
20	Goodnight does not exclude the ROZ from its
21	calculations, not at all.
22	In fact, Goodnight's petrophysics and
23	oil-in-place analysis are entirely agnostic with
24	respect to what interval they're in, whether it's
25	Gravburg or San Andres Goodnight's petrophysics is

1	based on facies changes and the oil-in-place analysis
2	is simply divided into tiers based on depth and
3	reservoir quality, without regard to whether a
4	certain interval is called the Grayburg or
5	San Andres.
6	Under this approach, and this was at the
7	at the discretion of our experts, who said, "Look
8	there's a dispute over the tops, so we're not going
9	to get into the tops. We just want to know where the
10	oil is. What does the rock say?"
11	Under this approach the San Andres top
12	does not matter. What matters is whether there is
13	any potential for economic oil and at what depths.
14	Now, according to this analysis that Netherland,
15	Sewell conducted nothing below minus 500 feet, at a
16	maximum, subsea, warrants economic evaluation. It
17	doesn't matter to them. It doesn't matter to the
18	analysis whether that's the Grayburg or San Andres.
19	It's all about depth.
20	In contrast, Empire overinflates its oil
21	saturations, calculating mobile oil where well tests
22	produced 100 percent water, and calculating high oil
23	saturations where there's no oil standing in the
24	core. Empire also includes additional vertical
25	intervals in its ROZ, calculations that are above

Empire's disposal zone and not part of the dispute in
this case, because they're outside of the disposal
zone. This interval should not be calculated as if
it is in the disposal zone.
The bottom line, whatever you hear in
the testimony about the San Andres without specifying
depth, be aware whether the testimony relates to
Goodnight's disposal zone or shallower intervals,
because that's critical.
Now, I want to get into the two main
areas of dispute, okay, whether there's communication
and fractures, and whether there's oil in the ROZ.
On the issue of communication between
the San Andres and the Grayburg, Empire has produced
no data to support their claim that massive volumes
of San Andres water are pluming into the Grayburg.
If they did, they would be able to show it in
field-wide production, or at least in offsetting
wells through well production data. But they haven't
and they can't.
Empire has no production data to support
this claim, so they went out and they got a reservoir
modeler to create a simulation that provided them the
answer that they want. The problem is that
Goodnight's disposal volumes are just not showing up
Page 80

in the Grayburg, as Empire claims.

Empire's witness, Dr. Buchwalter, testified in his deposition that the EMSU was one of the hardest reservoirs that he has ever attempted to model. It took him more than 500 model runs to get what he called a field-wide match. Well, in his deposition he explained his approach was simply trial and error. He started with a reservoir pressure and he started with the initial production volumes and he tried to do a match, and it took him 500 model runs, several months to do so. He said getting that match was like hitting the lottery.

On the assumption that his field-wide match means that his model accurately reflects reality, his written testimony states that the San Andres must be currently contributing about 24,000 barrels of water per day from the San Andres into the Grayburg through fractures across the EMSU. That's 720,000 barrels a month to account for the water production in the EMSU.

Now over a nine-month period, that would be almost six and a half million barrels of water that he says is allegedly pluming up from the San Andres into the Grayburg. If his model were accurate, those volumes would be showing up in the

1	Grayburg in Empire field-wide production data. But
2	we're just not seeing those volumes anywhere in
3	production. In fact, Empire's actual field data
4	shows something very different.
5	Here I'm showing you a slide from
6	Mr. West's direct testimony, and I've highlighted
7	some language. Empire's VP of operations, Mr. West,
8	testified that Empire is injecting 70,000 barrels of
9	water per day as part of its waterflood and producing
LO	about 70,000 barrels per day as part of the
L1	production from the Grayburg.
L2	In other words, Empire is producing
L3	about the same amount of water that they inject every
L4	day. That's current. Just looking at these numbers,
L5	Dr. Buchwalter is saying that nearly one-third of
L6	the volumes that Empire is injecting into the
L7	Grayburg every day is pluming up in I'm sorry.
L8	Let me rephrase that.
L9	Just looking at these numbers,
20	Dr. Buchwalter says that nearly one-third of the
21	volumes that Empire is injecting into the Grayburg
22	every day is pluming up from the San Andres every day
23	as well, 24,000 barrels a day. That means about
24	100,000 barrels of water actually is going into the
25	Grayburg every day, 70,000 from Empire's waterflood

1	injection and 24,000 pluming up from the San Andres.
2	But we're just not seeing those numbers. Okay?
3	Let's look at some of the actual recent
4	numbers that Mr. West himself put in his testimony.
5	These are production figures for a nine-month period,
6	from November '23 to July '24. These are daily
7	average numbers. That means we have if you were
8	to, you know, calculate this out over that period of
9	nine months, there's about 19 million barrels of
10	water that Empire is injecting and producing over
11	that time. It's roughly the same in as going out.
12	But according to Dr. Buchwalter, there
13	should be more than six million barrels difference
14	over these nine months. There's not even a
15	200,000-barrel difference. Okay?
16	Now, is the injection somehow affecting
17	oil production? You know, that's their claim. But
18	here's a slide showing, from Empire's own data,
19	field-wide production data going back to 1970.
20	There's no impact. In fact, the most recent month
21	shows that it's the slowest or lowest decline over
22	the entire period, going back to 1970.
23	Zooming in on this period from March of
24	2021, when Empire acquired and started operating the
25	unit, we see that in interval that Mr. West

identifies in his testimony, in Exhibit I-18, where
he purports that there's an unreasonable decline in
oil between November 2023 and July '24, all he did
was he subtracted July '24 from November '23 and he
sees a big drop. But he's not telling you that the
months after, it rebounded.

He's also not telling you that during

He's also not telling you that during that same period there was a -- if you look at the well count in the field, the well count has been going down over time, but production's been holding pretty constant. So we're not seeing an impact in produced water and we're not seeing an impact in oil production or decline.

There's just no abnormal decline and no impact. The water's just not showing up and there's nothing indicating any problems with the EMSU operations. Empire's claim and its reliance on modeling and simulation that's not reflected in actual field data is just smoke and mirrors and does not match reality.

Now, rather than plumes of San Andres water coming up into the Grayburg, what's actually happening is that there's edge water encroachment from the Grayburg and the Goat Seep. That's the answer to the water mystery in the EMSU. Only it's

1	not a mystery. The encroachment from the Goat Seep
2	and edge water moving into the Grayburg has been
3	known about and written about since the 1930s, almost
4	as long as the field has been producing. Throughout
5	its long history, there's never been any discussion
6	in the literature on the EMSU or EMSU well files of
7	the Division or Division case files that there is
8	San Andres water pluming up into the Grayburg through
9	extensive natural fracturing, as Empire describes.
10	Empire is trying to rewrite history here
11	and reframe the facts to suit their story. In
12	support, Empire points to a single 1996 Chevron paper
13	that addresses corrosion and scale problems that were
14	encountered during the waterflood due to the known
15	incompatibility of the San Andres water and the
16	Grayburg. The authors speculate that apparently
17	San Andres water was finding its way into some EMSU
18	Grayburg producers in the wells, and postulate that
19	water may have entered the well more directly, not
20	that the water was going into the Grayburg Formation

The supposed bottom water also would not be water in communication with Grayburg's disposal zone. This, again, is that disputed area, the disputed interval that we say is above our

21

22

23

24

25

through fractures.

1	permeability. It is above our permeability barrier,
2	which is isolated from Goodnight's disposal.
3	In short, there's no statement in this
4	paper that the San Andres is pluming into the
5	Grayburg nor is there any data or documentation
6	attached or referenced to establish that.
7	Two years later, in 1998, another
8	Chevron team published a paper, an SPE paper, Society
9	of Professional Engineers, on a different topic
10	involving the EMSU: It's terrible waterflood
11	conformance issues.
12	Now, this paper's lead author was
13	Chevron's Tracy Love. Chevron was the operator at
14	the time. He was a petroleum engineer who was in
15	charge of the waterflood and production issues in the
16	unit.
17	The purpose of the paper was to diagnose
18	waterflood problems, design treatments, implement
19	process improvements. He explained that there was
20	poor waterflood conformance and it caused Chevron to
21	do a substantial project, starting in 1996, to
22	characterize the unit and to evaluate how they can
23	improve the waterflood.
24	Reservoir character characterization, he
25	said, included mapping high perm streaks, doing

material balance, tracking what goes in and what
comes out, and other engineering calculations, like
zonal processing. In that paper, he identifies that
the San Andres has a source of water encroachment
into the Grayburg. He states that there are plumes
of unaccounted -- he does not state that there are
plumes of unaccounted-for water coming into the
Grayburg from the San Andres.

He instead found all kinds of other problems, including rapid breakthrough, high perm streaks, injection into the gas cap and other issues. But he didn't find any unaccounted-for water from the San Andres.

Two years later, Mr. Love testified at the Division, in 2000, over requested increases to surface injection pressures within the waterflood. In that case, there was a dispute about the EMSU water escaping from the waterflood into the Penrose and Queen formations, impacting shallower formations. He was asked directly if Chevron had identified any unaccounted-for water in the EMSU, and he testified that Chevron had conducted and completed a full field reservoir simulation for the EMSU and that the only unaccounted-for water was downdip edge water coming in from the from the Grayburg.

1	Four years after Chevron's corrosion
2	paper in 1996 speculated about potential San Andres
3	water in the EMSU well waters, there was no further
4	discussion about San Andres water migrating into the
5	Grayburg, no discussions of fractures and no data or
6	documentation showing that the San Andres water ever
7	plumed up into the Grayburg before the waterflood or
8	after.
9	Finally, the definitive, tangible
10	evidence that there is an area of extensive competent
11	seal isolating its disposal zone is the pressure
12	difference between the disposal zone and the
13	formations above.
14	When drilling each of its wells,
15	Goodnight has passed through a normally pressured
16	zone in the Grayburg into a substantially
17	under-pressured interval in the disposal zone, where
18	Goodnight has lost circulation and returns. They had
19	the same experience at the same stratigraph interval
20	when they drilled each of their wells.
21	The testimony and exhibits will show
22	that there's just no data or documentation supporting
23	the claim that the San Andres water is migrating into
24	the Grayburg, as Empire contends.
25	Now on to the ROZ claims. This is the

1	last main issue before the Division, whether there's
2	an ROZ in the EMSU. That's true that Goodnight's
3	experts have identified a potential ROZ in the EMSU
4	between approximately minus 350 feet subsea and a
5	maximum of minus 500 feet subsea. That's about 200
6	feet above Goodnight's current injection disposal
7	interval, depending on where you are in the
8	structure.
9	But according to Netherland, Sewell,
10	nothing below that depth warrants further economic

But according to Netherland, Sewell, nothing below that depth warrants further economic evaluation. According to them, there is ample data to make that assessment now. There's no need to do a pilot CO2 at that depth to confirm what we already know, especially not within the disposal zone.

And they say even the potential ROZ identified in the main producing interval, the zone above minus 350, is going to require significant additional evaluation to determine if a CO2 project could even be economically viable in that zone. Why? Why is the success of even the shallower zones so uncertain? Because the EMSU is effectively a failed waterflood, and the same reasons the waterflood failed are likely going to cause a CO2 flood to fail as well, especially a CO2 that's a water alternating gas flood.

1	Empire notes at the time the EMSU
2	waterflood was approved, it was projected to produce
3	64.2 million barrels through waterflood operations.
4	And Empire goes on to say that it has produced
5	approximately 25 million barrels of oil since 1984.
6	But that 25 million barrels of oil includes 14
7	million barrels of primary production. So between
8	1984 and when the waterflood commenced, there was an
9	additional 14 million barrels of primary production.
10	That means the EMSU has produced only about 11
11	million barrels under the waterflood.
12	In the 1983 technical committee report,
13	which is in evidence in this case, they projected
14	that the optimum recovery case would produce 63.2
15	million barrels of oil over a 30-year flood life,
16	while the minimum recovery case would yield 23.7
17	million barrels, over the same period. Having
18	produced only 11 million barrels after nearly 40
19	years of waterflood is a colossal failure; that is
20	less than half of what the minimum recovery case was
21	projected to be back in 1983.
22	Now, the EMSU is a complex carbonate
23	shelf system. It has dozens of sea level changes,
24	has been sub aerially exposed, resulting in
25	substantial compartmentalization and severe

1	conformance issues that have plagued the water
2	flood's performance and effectiveness from the start,
3	and it would plague a potential CO2 flood for exactly
4	the same reasons. This complex carbonate system is a
5	problem for CO2 flood in intervals, even with the
6	highest oil concentrations far above Goodnight's
7	disposal zone. But for Goodnight's disposal zone,
8	where the uppermost 400 feet of aquifer contains an
9	average oil saturation of less than 11 percent,
10	according to the petrophysical analysis that we've
11	done, which is far below the threshold oil
12	concentrations of any known pilot CO2 or commercial
13	CO2 project, there's no chance for economic ROZ.
14	How can I say that with such confidence.
15	Well, let's look at what we know about ROZs. The
16	definition of an ROZ comes from Goodnight's own
17	experts. They've got two ROZ experts, Dr. Trentham
18	and Mr. Steve Melzer. This is from one of their
19	papers and actually from their testimony in this
20	case.
21	It shows that the highest oil
22	concentrations and saturations in the ROZ are the
23	shallowest, and that oil saturations drop with depth.
24	They also tell us that commercial oil saturations or
25	rather commercial ROZs have oil saturations between

1	about 20 and 40 percent. That's directly from
2	numerous papers and presentations on record from
3	Mr. Melzer and Dr. Trentham. And it's in the direct
4	testimony. And it's restated and adopted by Empire
5	in its previous statement, as well.
6	This next slide here is from Goodnight's
7	witness Preston McGuire. It reflects Mr. Melzer and
8	Dr. Trentham's work on the Goldsmith-Landreth
9	San Andres Unit, which they refer to. And it shows
10	the recorded oil saturations in that core and where
11	they place the base of the ROZ in that field right at
12	20 percent, where the oil saturations drop off.
13	I'm going to note here, okay, that they
14	call the 20 percent oil saturation point the limit of
15	a commercial CO2 flood interval, because below that,
16	saturations drop off below economic levels.
17	Now, where you see that telltale drop
18	off in the oil saturations at about 20 percent, that
19	generally represents what they call the
20	"paleo-oil-water contact," according to them. The
21	paleo-oil-water contact is the deepest point in the
22	formation that was, at some point in the
23	paleogeologic time, previously saturated with oil
24	until Mother Nature's waterflood.
25	Mother Nature's waterflood is when the

1	Permian Basin tilted, allowing massive volumes of
2	meteoric water to flush through the Grayburg and
3	San Andres, acting like a manmade waterflood,
4	sweeping oil out of formations to the south and
5	southeast, and updip, under substantial hydraulic
6	pressure.
7	This next slide here shows the general
8	path from, Empire's testimony. Multiple volumes
9	swept through the Grayburg and San Andres over
10	millions of years, until there was a shift in the
11	Grand Rift, cutting that hydraulic head off and
12	essentially turning off Mother Nature's waterflood.
13	Note that the EMSU is right in the
14	middle of the path of this Mother Nature's
15	waterflood. And Dr. Trentham measured the
16	permeability in the San Andres here as high as 100
17	millidarcy. It's also worth noting that they also
18	identified a geologic seal in the San Andres at the
19	top.
20	Now, before Mother Nature's waterflood
21	was turned off, so much water came through, just like
22	a manmade waterflood, that essentially all the mobile
23	oil was swept out. All that was left behind in terms
24	of oil was bound to the rocks and the pores and was
25	essentially immobile at static and in situ reservoir

1 conditions. 2 Now, after that, according to Empire's expert, Dr. Lindsay, some of the oil that had been 3 swept migrated back into the EMSU after that 4 5 hydraulic head was turned off, partially 6 re-saturating the Grayburg, but not the San Andres. He testified in his deposition that the San Andres 8 never re-saturated. The only oil left in the San Andres was immobile oil that had been swept and 9 at very low concentration saturations. That is what 10 11 residual oil is, oil that was left behind in the 12 residual oil zone. 13 Now, according to Empire's experts, what you see after the Mother Nature's waterflood are oil 14 15 saturations that are very similar to what you see 16 after a manmade waterflood. 17 Now, Goodnight's experts mostly agree with this story, except for one big thing. They 18 19 don't think that the evidence supports the conclusion that the San Andres was ever saturated with oil. 2.0 21 They think the evidence instead supports concluding 22 that the San Andres was more likely a migratory 23 pathway for oil, moving through the San Andres updip from source rock in the Delaware Basin. 24 2.5 And why do they think that? Because the

1 residual oil saturations are too low in the 2. San Andres to have been saturated with oil. And the 3 sparse, intermittent oil accumulations that they see in their wrong interpretations are not mappable 4 5 across the area. That means that the San Andres at the 6 EMSU does not match the definition of an ROZ in the 7 8 literature or in practice. It doesn't have the oil 9 saturations necessary for a commercial development 10 because it was never saturated. It was only ever a 11 migratory pathway and it was never re-saturated at 12 the end of Mother Nature's waterflood, unlike the 13 overlying Grayburg. What does that mean for the EMSU? 14 Tt. 15 means that we would expect to see good residual oil 16 saturations at or above 20 percent down to the base 17 of the Grayburg, because the Grayburg was at one time 18 saturated before Mother Nature's waterflood, and it 19 re-saturated.

But before the Grayburg -- but below the Grayburg into the San Andres, we would expect to see oil saturations below 20 percent, because it was never saturated. It was only ever a migratory pathway for oil and was never re-saturated after Mother Nature's waterflood. And that's just what we

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

1	see. Okay?
2	This is a slide again from Goodnight's
3	exhibits that shows all the core data that we have
4	for the EMSU. And, again, it shows that Goodnight
5	has picked minus 652 subsea as the last point where
6	there are consecutive core oil saturations above 20
7	percent. Below that, oil saturations drop off. That
8	makes the base of the Grayburg ROZ at about minus 652
9	subsea, above where Goodnight's disposal zone starts
L O	here, at about minus 700 feet subsea, where the core
L1	oil saturations are all below 7 percent.
L2	Empire's expert, Dr. Trentham, testified
L3	in his deposition that he could not disagree with
L4	that depth as the base of the ROZ, but he might put
L5	it a few feet deeper. That would make the ROZ in the
L6	EMSU a little more than 300 feet thick.
L7	Based on what we know about the ROZ oil
L8	saturations decreasing with depth, there's no basis
L9	to believe that there will be any higher oil
20	saturations deeper in the San Andres than what has
21	already been revealed in more shallow zones,
22	especially not below what is depicted here to be the
23	paleo-oil-water contact.
24	How does his testimony support all this?

This is a table from Dr. Trentham's testimony.

25

1	Dr. Trentham says that the EMSU, in his estimation,
2	based on what he understands from Dr. Lindsay, has
	<u>-</u> ·
3	a it all depends on where you put the oil-water
4	contact or the producing oil-water contact. Trentham
5	says that the EMSU has a 370-foot thick ROZ. That's
6	almost already thicker than any ROZ interval that has
7	been developed. Okay? You can see them all here.
8	XTO, in its brochures, in an effort to
9	sell the property, told Empire in its documents that
10	they think there's a potential for a 300-foot thick
11	ROZ down to as deep as minus 700. In contrast,
12	Empire in his petrophysic analysis is essentially
13	saying that there's a commercial ROZ in the Grayburg
14	and the San Andres that is at least 1200 feet thick
15	or more, with substantial oil saturations all the way
16	to the base of the San Andres.
17	That would be at least three times
18	thicker than any known commercial or pilot ROZ
19	anywhere in the Permian Basin. That's extremely
20	unlikely. Not only is it unlikely that the core oil
21	saturations, that average 7 percent at that depth,
22	for 100 feet, are suddenly going to increase over 20
23	percent, based on what we know about ROZs. But it's
24	also unlikely for at least the following reasons,
25	just based on Empire's own experts.

1	Dr. Lindsay testified in his deposition
2	that the only confirmed ROZ that he knew of in the
3	EMSU is limited to the Grayburg, and it follows the
4	base of the Grayburg structure because there's a
5	composite sequence boundary that he says serves as a
6	barrier to flow. Here's a slide from Dr. Lindsay's
7	testimony and he's identifying right here the ROZ
8	terminates at this base of the Grayburg because of
9	this composite sequence boundary. And he says it's
LO	mostly on the western half of the EMSU.
L1	Asked whether he was aware of any ROZ
L2	that spans a composite sequence boundary like the one
L3	between the San Andres and the Grayburg, he testified
L4	no, it would be unique.
L5	He also testified in his deposition that
L6	there was only a potential ROZ in the Upper
L7	San Andres, and that it is speculation that there's
L8	an ROZ in the Lower San Andres.
L9	What if we step back and look at this
20	from a wider angle. Does the broader production
21	history align with this interpretation that I'm
22	proposing to you, that the San Andres in and around
23	the EMSU was never a saturated oil reservoir and
24	therefore would not be a potential ROZ? Yes.
25	Our expert, Mr. Bill Knights, reviewed

1	the production history in and around the margin of
2	the central basin platform, where the EMSU is
3	located. Unlike the fields around it, more than
4	seven miles away, the EMSU does not have a productive
5	San Andres interval. To the South and to the north,
6	there are fields with production in both the Grayburg
7	and San Andres. Okay? When I look east, across the
8	top of the central basin platform and the northern
9	shelf, there are fields that also produce from deeper
10	zones down into the San Andres.
11	This all has to do with the fact that
12	each of these productive San Andres fields have
13	unique characteristics for production that don't
14	apply to the EMSU, and it all has to do with oil
15	migratory pathways.
16	Does the same pattern show up in ROZ
17	place? In fact, there are no ROZs on the west side
18	of the central basin platform and south of the
19	San Simon Channel, let alone any that target the
20	San Andres.
21	Why is that? Well, there's a reason for
22	it. And it's not because the San Andres or ROZ have
23	been overlooked at the EMSU. It's because it does
24	not have the oil saturations necessary.
25	At the beginning of this opening, I

2.5

promised that despite all the technical testimony and all the technical issues, that logic and reason would ultimately carry the day. I'll leave you with three simple things to keep in mind as you review the exhibits and listen to the testimony.

First, remember to ask yourself is the testimony that you're reviewing and you're hearing on the San Andres specific to Goodnight's disposal zone, or is it something shallower?

Second, Goodnight has encountered a very real and substantial pressure differential below its perm barrier, at the same stratigraph level across all of its wells inside and outside the unit. That is a very real, tangible demonstration that there is an extensive and effective perm barrier between the disposal zone and everything above.

Third, there's no need to conduct any more tests, collect any more data or conduct any pilot projects on the disposal zone. It has been subjected to a definitive ROZ test through a massive depressurization over more than three decades. 380 million barrels of water has been withdrawn from that same zone, and not a single barrel of oil or skim oil has been produced or reported. If there was a residual oil zone down there at the saturations that

1	Empire's experts are claiming, some of that oil would
2	have been mobilized and produced. It's not the case.
3	The testimony will show that Goodnight
4	has painstakingly evaluated the San Andres in this
5	area. It's an ideal location for produced water
6	disposal. It's expansive and it's got lots of
7	capacity, making it a critical resource for managing
8	disposed produced water from horizontal well
9	development in the Delaware Basin. It's
10	under-pressured and has significant capacity because
11	it has been depleted after decades of massive water
12	withdrawals from across the area, not just in the
13	EMSU.
14	There are 16, 17, 18 additional water
15	supply wells that have withdrawn massive barrels out
16	of the EMSU. Goodnight has calculated anywhere
17	between 850 million to 1 billion barrels of water
18	have been withdrawn out of the San Andres in this
19	area.
20	It has substantial and effective
21	geological seals which prevent communication between
22	the injection zone and the overlying production
23	formation as well.
24	In short, the overwhelming not in
25	short anymore weight of the evidence will show
	Page 101

1	that the proposed injection will not interfere and
2	has not interfered with unit operations, will not
3	cause waste and will be protective of correlative
4	rights and otherwise comply with the Oil and Gas Act.
5	Now, I want to make one additional
6	statement. Each of Goodnight's experts have
7	conducted an independent analysis. They've been
8	unbounded by my direction or Goodnight's direction.
9	We did not direct them to an answer. Their direction
10	from me and Goodnight was, "What is the answer here?
11	Is there an ROZ? Can it be recovered? Is it
12	economic? Is the disposal water communicating with
13	any of the formations above? The EMSU waterflood
14	operations, are they being impacted? Is there any
15	evidence of a geochemical fingerprint reflecting
16	Goodnight's disposal in EMSU operations?"
17	We told them what we think, but we
18	wanted them to test our analysis. We asked them,
19	"Tell us. Are we wrong? Why are we wrong? Or tell
20	us we're right."
21	I cannot wait to get them in this room.
22	Okay? I cannot wait to get them in this room and I
23	want you to ask them all your questions. Okay?
24	With that, Mr. Chair and Commissioners,
25	after you hear all the evidence, we ask that you

1	approve Goodnight's applications and that you deny
2	Empire's efforts to revoke their existing saltwater
3	disposal wells. Thank you.
4	HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: Okay. Thank you,
5	Mr. Rankin.
6	Mr. Moander, you have any idea how long
7	your opening will be?
8	MR. MOANDER: I'm anticipating 15 minutes
9	probably, at the maximum. It will be abbreviated
10	relative to other openings today.
11	HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: Well, if it's that
12	short, I guess my suggestion is that we simply
13	proceed and that'll bring this conveniently to the
14	lunch hour. If it's longer than that, then we may
15	cut you off and bring you back.
16	MR. MOANDER: I will happily accept a break,
17	if that's required. But I'm pretty confident I can
18	get through what I need to.
19	HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: Is that okay with
20	everybody, then, that we just proceed? All right.
21	CHAIR ROZATOS: Yeah, I think it's good.
22	HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: All right. OCD,
23	Mr. Moander, you're on.
24	MR. MOANDER: Thank you, Mr. Hearing
25	Officer, Commissioners, Mr. Chair.

1	Now for something completely different
2	than what you've heard this morning. OCD comes
3	before the commission with an information problem.
4	Some of the commissioners may be familiar with this;
5	it comes from economics. It's the idea that when
6	information is imbalanced in a dynamic, usually more
7	than two parties, that somebody in that dynamic is
8	probably going to lose unfairly or will be shortened.
9	OCD looks at this issue as essentially
10	the problem is as follows: OCD doesn't know what it
11	doesn't know about potential impacts from San Andres
12	injection in the EMSU to the Capitan Reef via what we
13	suspect is the Hobbs Channel. So OCD actually agrees
14	with Empire that we don't have evidence proving
15	something one way or the other, that's why we're here
16	because we want to find out.
17	OCD's hypothesis is simply that it
18	suspects there's an underground hydrogeologic event
19	occurring that ties together the EMSU to the Hobbs
20	Channel and the Capitan Reef. OCD does not know what
21	that event is, but it fears that injection of
22	produced water from oil and gas operations is a
23	contributing factor to the increased water volume in
24	the Capitan Reef, potentially leading to Reef
25	contamination, violation of the Safe Drinking Water

1	Act, and ultimately a possible exemption of the
2	Capitan Reef Aquifer.
3	OCD's proposed solution to resolve both
4	the problem in its hypothesis is to obtain OCC
5	authorization and implement an investigation and
6	monitoring program to assess and characterize the
7	relationship between the San Andres Formation in the
8	EMSU and the Capitan Reef.
9	Probably not surprising, OCD lacks the
LO	resources and labor pool to effectively conduct this
L1	project on its own. This is a heady task before the
L2	OCD and it's going to require assistance of Industry
L3	to accomplish this.
L4	OCD's evidence is laid out in four or
L5	five different groupings. OCD will start with what
L6	we're calling the lay of the land. We're going to
L7	provide and you'll notice I'm not putting up all
L8	these maps, because you've seen plenty of that today,
L9	so this is going you will see these. I believe
20	you've already got them.
21	A current overview of all wells and all
22	the UIC Class II permitted wells in the EMSU. Also,
23	we'll narrow down a bit further to both Goodnight and
24	Empire wells that are currently in this waterflood.
25	OCD is also going to provide Department

1	of Interior New Mexico Tech reports on disposal
2	operations in the Permian. As both parties have
3	provided today, the barrels and just as a
4	reminder, these are 42-gallon barrels the volume
5	of barrels injected in the EMSU is a lot. It is a
6	humongous number. I would say when we you start
7	doing the math on 42 times any given number of
8	proposed assessments of water injected, it starts to
9	get astronomical in size.
10	Also, this particular document between
11	Department of Interior and Tech, also confirms that
12	the San Andres has largely been deemed a preferable
13	location for produced water disposal.
14	The second category of evidence that
15	will be presented to the OCC involves section
16	70-2-12.B of the New Mexico Statutes, which outlines
17	OCD powers, authority and so on. We'll walk through
18	those and show the various sections, which have been
19	argued at some length in the motions already, that
20	OCD has authority to pursue this investigation and
21	monitoring project.
22	This will also include a brief
23	discussion about the Unitization Act. Now why that's
24	important is because the Unitization Act has as part
25	of its foundation, or at least a contributing factor,

25

1	what's called the UIC program. It's the underground
2	injection control. This program has its roots in EPA
3	regulations tied to the Safe Drinking Water Act.
4	The hallmark exhibit of the law here
5	that governs what OCD is attempting to accomplish, is
6	what's called the Appendix 2. And what that document
7	does is it grants OCD primacy status to enforce the
8	Safe Drinking Water Act in New Mexico. But it also
9	obligated you should look at that as an
LO	obligation. That's a requirement.
L1	Specifically relevant to the aquifer
L2	evaluation program, that falls underneath both the
L3	UIC program at the state level and the Safe Drinking
L4	Water Act at the federal, OCD is tasked was studying,
L5	classifying, delineating and then protecting
L6	potential potable water sources. This particular
L7	program, as well as the EPA regulations, are
L8	applicable to the San Andres Formation and the EMSU.
L9	Turning to the expertise documents,
20	you're going to hear almost all of this testimony
21	from OCD witness Philip Goetze, who is the UIC
22	program manager, and has extensive experience in not
23	only managing the program, but produced water issues
24	generally when it comes to injection.
25	First you'll see a series of these

1 expert papers. Several of them are written by the 2 same author, and there's a theme running here. first article that we'll have a talk about will be 3 one written by a fellow named Hiss. He has mapped 4 out a good -- the most of this work was done in the 6 '70s. We acknowledge openly and without question, this is aged data. Unfortunately, OCD believes it's 8 the best data available in terms of a summary or 9 collection that one could look at to get a sense of 10 what's gone on with underground injection down in the 11 EMSU. 12 The first Hiss article has maps on it

The first Hiss article has maps on it that are going to show where Hiss suspects, based on his chloride ion testing, there is a Hobbs Channel, or a form of an underground water pathway, that flows near or around the EMSU. And it generally shows the relationship between the Hobbs Channel and the Capitan Reef.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The next Hiss article that OCD will walk you through is what I have labeled the "notorious Hiss paper from 1975." It has caused quite a bit of an uproar. It's, at this point, arguably controversial. But it's the keystone document upon which OCD built its current UIC program. It was also influential in the Appendix 2 that granted from the

1 EPA to New Mexico the primacy to regulate underground 2 injection and protect water, potable water. This article also sets OCD standards for 3 addressing disposal, as well as its views on the 4 5 existence of the Hobbs Channel. Through all of the 6 presentation of this paper, there's going to be multiple maps. They're going to be demonstrating 8 where this flow goes, and that's in relation not just 9 about the Hops Channel or the Capitan Reef, it's also going to address where some of these wells at issue 10 11 in this case are located. 12 The next article is the Rassenfoss 13 article, which came out of an industry journal. Ιt states that water production in the New Mexico 14 15 portion of the Permian Basin is increasing during oil 16 recovery processes. For example, the Delaware Basin 17 experienced water cuts of 80 to 90 percent during 18 production operations. 19 Next we'll shift to articles by 20 Mr. Lewis Land, who, interestingly, posits that the 21 reef is already too brackish for human consumption. There's also an additional article to 22 23 that from 1984, the proposes the reef, because of 24 brackish, should be an exempt aguifer, based on the Hiss documents. 2.5

1	Now, I'm going to point out something
2	here. One of the things that you will witness and
3	that OCD will present is there is a significant
4	amount of conflicting authority at this point. And I
5	use authority from a legal sense. But I'll say more
6	in a scientific sense, it's influential or
7	informative.
8	There's also another article by Land
9	that maintains the reef is isolated from the Hobbs
LO	Channel, but also notes again that there are rising
L1	water levels being shown out of production.
L2	The last, and I'll call them expert
L3	articles, is from the Texas Water Development Board.
L4	I believe the commission is likely aware that Texas
L5	has a very different view on how it regulates oil and
L6	gas production, so, again, we're going to have a
L7	contrasting, differing, distinct view.
L8	This document shows that the rising
L9	water level issue in the Permian Basin does exist,
20	but acknowledges there may be a hydraulic connection
21	between the reef and the San Andres. Once we've gone
22	through all this and Mr. Goetze has provided his
23	input on it, which is, it appears like there's
24	something going on, but we don't really know what it
25	is, and the solution, again, to that is to get an

1	investigation and monitoring program into place, OCD
2	will walk you through OCD's analysis of the matter
3	through the lens of some of the cases that now form
4	the main case before you.
5	Some of these will involve documents
6	going back to 1954 reports that were submitted to OCD
7	per regulations and requirements, and will extend all
8	the way through 2022.
9	As noted, these are early filings, at a
10	time when, well, the unit didn't exist, but there had
11	been some pooling that had gone on, but, again, it'll
12	work up all the way past the unitization up to
13	effectively today.
14	OCD is also going to provide a selection
15	of its communications with various state and federal
16	regulations concerning protection from the Capitan
17	Reef. These documents address historical water level
18	changes in the reef. It also reflects OCD's
19	investments in injection impact on the reef, which
20	has, in OCD's view, largely validated OCD's concerns
21	as they've arisen through this case.
22	Talking about what will happen with a
23	program, OCD can't speculate, won't speculate as to
24	what it's going to learn. That's the whole purpose
25	of having the program implemented. But what OCD can

speak to is going to be the consequences,
potentially, of a lack of a program.
OCD will present a chronology of what
happens to a state, in this case, the State of
California, that fails to protect drinking water by
allowing oil and gas operators to tap into a
protected aquifer, in violation of the Safe Drinking
Water Act. Spoiler alert, it goes very badly for
California.
Further consequences, though, more
specific to New Mexico if OCD does not obtain
direction and implement its program. And, again,
you'll hear this from Mr. Goetze. First will be
exemption of the Capitan Reef Aquifer. Now, that has
a special meaning under the Safe Drinking Water Act,
which we'll walk you through that. That means that
the aquifer may be used for oil and gas operations,
which is not currently the case. The other corollary
of that is there's a loss of potentially potable
drinking water source in southeast New Mexico.
On top of all that, violations of the
Safe Drinking Water Act include a whole panoply of
potential consequences, but a primary concern to OCD
is it would result in the OCD underground injection
control group being directly supervised by the EPA

1	out of Washington, DC. OCD would lose all local
2	control of the program. This also would come along
3	with increased and onerous reporting requirements
4	that would already delay OCD action and paperwork.
5	And then, finally, the reputational
6	black eye for New Mexico that New Mexico managed to
7	end up with an exempted aquifer that, theoretically,
8	at this point, could have been drinking water in a
9	rather arid and water devoid location in the state.
10	Turning to the opposing evidence, the
11	opinions from the from Empire and Goodnight at
12	this point are just another opinion on top of another
13	opinion on top of another opinion on top of another
14	opinion.
15	The solution to that is to resolve all
16	doubt and to allow OCD to pursue its investigation
17	and monitoring program. Just through the documents
18	I've walked through today, there is no consensus or
19	generally accepted understanding of the overall
20	situation involving the Capitan Reef in relation to
21	the Hobbs Channel, the San Andres and the Permian
22	Basin.
23	OCD's proposed project should provide
24	insight and clarification on that and, hopefully,
25	drive towards a generally accepted understanding.

1 OCD is well positioned to take up the responsibility 2 of working towards that consensus or generally accepted understanding through its proposed plan. 3 4 So what is the proposed plan? On a 5 surface level, OCD wants to institute this program to 6 determine the hydrologic relationship between the Capitan Reef and the Hobbs Channel, determine any 8 impacts to water quality if commingling does exist between disposal fluids injected in the San Andres 9 and the Capitan Reef, and then, finally, characterize 10 11 the Capitan Reef in this area to determine the 12 current status as protectable, with the intent of 13 either establishing a monitoring plan for continued management, which would be continued protection, or 14 15 as an underground source of drinking water, or 16 considering the possibility for aquifer exemption for the portion of the Capitan Reef from the Hobbs 17 18 Channel to the New Mexico state line. 19 During the hearing, Mr. Goetze will go into the minutia and the detail on this plan, just 20 21 exactly what OCD seeks to require of operators. OCD 22 is aware that these sorts of plans are certainly not 23 popular, but in this instance, the loss of UIC 24 privacy would probably border on the catastrophic and

it would reduce OCD's ability to continue protecting

25

1	underground sources of drinking water locally.
2	OCD looks forward to seeing everybody
3	next week and is eager to put Mr. Goetze on the stand
4	to help provide more support for OCD's proposed
5	investigation and monitoring plan.
6	Thank you for your time today,
7	Commissioners and Hearing Officer.
8	HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: Thank you,
9	Mr. Moander. I assume that you have Empire's
10	agreement to your proposed monitoring program and
11	they agree to split the cost of it?
12	MR. MOANDER: No, Mr. Hearing Officer.
13	Unfortunately, that is not in the cards in this case.
14	But I appreciate your optimism that settlement
15	negotiation is ever ripe and evergreen.
16	HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: All right. Well,
17	hope does spring eternal, even in these proceedings.
18	All right. I'm thinking we don't need
19	this afternoon then. And is there is there other
20	item of business or anything else.
21	CHAIR ROZATOS: I think Mr. Rankin
22	MR. BECK: I think that we and Pilot have
23	brief opening statements.
24	HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: Okay. So what's
25	the commission's preference? Would you like to hear

1	those now or adjourn and come back after lunch? We
2	have the luxury of the entire afternoon if we want
3	it.
4	CHAIR ROZATOS: Mr. Beck and Mr. Suazo, how
5	long do you think yours are going to take?
6	MR. SUAZO: Mine will take five to ten
7	minutes, at most.
8	CHAIR ROZATOS: Okay. Mr. Beck.
9	MR. BECK: Same.
10	CHAIR ROZATOS: I say we kind of plow
11	through this and we then are done. Does that sound
12	okay with the commissioners?
13	Mr. Hearing Officer, is that okay with
14	you.
15	HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: I defer to the
16	commission on all matters of any importance
17	whatsoever. So you guys want to flip a coin, or you
18	know who's going first.
19	MR. BECK: I defer to my friend, Mr. Suazo.
20	MR. SUAZO: I'm glad to start.
21	All right. Good morning, Commissioners,
22	Mr. Chair, Mr. Hearing Examiner, Miguel Suazo on
23	behalf of Pilot Water Solutions, with the law firm
24	Beatty & Wozniak.
25	Pilot appreciates the opportunity to be
	Page 116
	i age 110

1	in part of this case on behalf of Pilot, and largely
2	Pilot's in support of Goodnight's position. Pilot
3	feels that this case presents a fundamental issue of
4	regulatory integrity, geologic reality and the fair
5	administration of longstanding orders governing the
6	Eunice Monument South, EMSU.
7	Now, Pilot has a small interest in the
8	EMSU and operates only a small, marginal well, as
9	Mr. Rankin mentioned, the P-15. But Pilot has
10	significant operations in the surrounding area that
11	would be impacted by a decision in favor of Empire in
12	this case.
13	Now Pilot's team has reviewed the
14	evidence in this case and adamantly opposes the
15	claims that injection into the San Andres migrates to
16	the Hobbs Channel and then migrates to the Capitan
17	Reef.
18	Pilot believes that the facts and
19	science are clear and that there's a lot of
20	fundamental flaws in Empire's analysis and that the
21	San Andres Formation should be moved from that scope.
22	The San Andres is not and has never been
23	a commercially viable hydrocarbon reservoir within
24	the EMSU. For more than 60 years, it has been
25	designated by OCD as a water management zone, a

1	formation for produced water disposal and reliable
2	water supply for secondary recovery operations. The
3	inclusion of the San Andres and the EMSU unitized
4	interval was, we believe, and agree with Goodnight, a
5	historical error, and one that must be corrected to
6	reflect the true geologic and regulatory framework.
7	Now, there are lots of implications for
8	a decision in favor of Empire in this case. As
9	Mr. Rankin mentioned there's over 60 SWDs just in the
10	vicinity, and there are a lot of operators that would
11	be affected, as with the entire oil and gas industry.
12	Pilot believes that the San Andres is
13	geologically distinct from the Capitan Reef complex.
14	And Goodnight's stratigraphic analysis confirms that
15	the San Andres Formation is not stratigraphically or
16	temporally equivalent to the Capitan Reef. The
17	Capitan Reef is laterally separated from the
18	San Andres by more than two miles, eliminating any
19	possibility of contamination. And OCD has repeatedly
20	approved Goodnight's disposal wells in the San Andres
21	under this understanding, most recently in March of
22	2023.
23	Again, Pilot takes a position that this
24	is not an oil-bearing reservoir in this region, so
25	Empire's claims of waste and correlative rights

1	violations are essentially baseless. The Capitan
2	Reef does not play a significant role in domestic
3	water supplies in Lea County, as the primary
4	municipal water source is the Ogallala Aquifer.
5	The Capitan Reef is highly saline, with
6	a total TDS of over 10,000 milligrams per liter.
7	Pilot believes that Empire's claims are
8	based on misinterpretation and speculation. They
9	claim that the San Andres contains a residual oil
10	zone of commercially recoverable hydrocarbons. Pilot
11	does not believe that's the case.
12	They also claim that Goodnight's
13	injection wells are watering out the Grayburg
14	production and impairing secondary recovery.
15	Empire's ROZ argument is unsupported by the reliable
16	data and contradicts historical production records,
17	Mr. Rankin mentioned in his opening and as his
18	evidence will show in this case.
19	Now, it's important that operators in
20	this area have regulatory stability, and that's where
21	the role of the commission comes in. Beyond the
22	geological and technical facts, this case carries
23	significant regulatory implications. And OCD is
24	rightly concerned that amending decades' old orders
25	could destabilize established regulatory frameworks.

1	And Pilot is sensitive to OCD's assertion about the
2	UIC program, however, we think that the facts and
3	evidence in this case, you know, does not warrant
4	those concerns.
5	So in conclusion, the evidence
6	overwhelmingly we believe supports Goodnight's
7	position and we respectfully request that the
8	commission recognize the fundamental flaws in
9	Empire's claims and reject its efforts to rewrite the
10	history of this area and grant the release on
11	Goodnight. Thank you.
12	HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: Thank you,
13	Mr. Suazo. I didn't mean to overlook you or Rice
14	Operating, so appreciate that.
15	MR. SUAZO: No problem.
16	HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: Mr. Beck, I'll
17	turn it over to you for Rice Operating.
18	MR. BECK: Mr. Chair, Commissioners, Hearing
19	Officer, Rice Operating Company and Permian Line
20	Service, LLC, want to state their position. They
21	want to underscore the OCD's concern for
22	institutional stability. All of that supports
23	denying Empire's applications to revoke Goodnight's
24	valid injection permits in these hearings.
25	You heard a little bit about Rice and

1	the Permian from Mr. Rankin. Rice began operating in
2	New Mexico in the 1950s. It currently operates three
3	saltwater disposal systems, including the Eunice
4	Monument, EMont, EME Saltwater Disposal System.
5	The EM articles of agreement were
6	executed in June 1958, almost 67 years ago. Gulf oil
7	Corporation, Empire's predecessor in interest, was an
8	original party to the articles of agreement for the
9	EME SWD system. In addition, over the last 60 years
10	Rice has operated as many as nine saltwater disposal
11	systems in and around that area.
12	Permian Line Service was established in
13	2013. Its predecessor in interest began in the early
14	1980s as a line servicer and roustabout company
15	primarily for Rice.
16	In addition, Permian Line Service
17	operates the N-11 well in the EMSU and the L-21. All
18	of Rice's and Permian Line Service's wells inject
19	into the San Andres what you heard referred to as the
20	Goodnight disposal zone. They all inject on vacuum
21	only.
22	Rice has operated wells including wells
23	dating back to the 1950s, including in the EME system
24	in the EMSU, as you heard.
25	This hearing raises concerns not only

1	for the commission, not only for the OCD, not only
2	for Empire and Goodnight, not only for the
3	interveners Rice, Permian and Pilot. As the Division
4	points out in its direct testimony from Deputy
5	Director Powell, and I'll quote, "This action does,
6	however, have the potential to have not only regional
7	effects, but also more profound, far-reaching
8	consequences."
9	He goes on to point out that the OCD
LO	would specifically point out, through the respective
L1	applications, one of the remedies sought is adverse
L2	actions regarding previously issued OCD, orders
L3	pertinent to the operator's injection authority.
L4	Deputy Director Powell wishes to convey
L 5	the importance of only doing so with an abundance of
L6	caution and offers the following in support, that
L7	when operators apply for OCD permits to inject, they
L8	do so through rules promulgated by the OCC. It
L9	should be recognized that the rules promulgated by
20	the OCC now allow an offset operator with concerns
21	the opportunity to contest a permit prior to
22	issuance.
23	Empire's predecessors and interest never
24	did that, and as I mentioned Gulf Oil Corporation was
25	part of the EME system, the same EME system in which

Empire remains a party today.

A result of such permit approval leads operators to invest money, time, equipment costs and other expenses in both preparing to apply for the permit, but also afterwards in the actual process of implementing the permit by preparing a well site, drilling a well and then subsequent injection. In essence, operators rely on the injection permit as the bedrock for the operator's investment in a given well or wells.

The oil and gas industry is built on nearly a century of regulations and statutes executed through permits and orders, permits and orders that were validly issued to Goodnight, which Empire now seeks to revoke.

Direct testimony of Deputy Director

Powell goes on to say it is in the interest of OCD

and, therefore, New Mexicans and the regulated

community, for OCC to build and maintain a stable and

reliable regulatory structure that yields industry

compliance with OCD regulations and statutes. Such

consistency reduces uncertainty for operators working

in a dynamic interest industry. A dependable

regulatory regime likewise allows for operators to

act efficiently, which in turn generates tax revenues

1	for the state. Therefore, the risks of adversely
2	affecting existing orders are significant and should
3	only be done with cautions and only if there is an
4	abundance of evidence.
5	OCD's position in this case is that the
6	burden lies with the operator moving for that adverse
7	modification to demonstrate to the commission the
8	level of information to meet such a threshold to
9	justify an order of modification. That threshold to
10	justify the order of modification is an abundance of
11	evidence.
12	This represents an existential threat to
13	the regulated industry's efficient operations.
14	Empire has not and cannot meet that significant
15	threshold of an abundance of evidence to warrant
16	revocation of validly issued permits, permits which
17	had the ability and the opportunity itself and
18	through its predecessor and interest to object to,
19	but as you heard from Mr. Rankin, it did not.
20	As you heard from the OCD, all operators
21	in this area recognize that the San Andres is a
22	commercially viable disposal target for permit
23	operations throughout the area.
24	We all know disposal water is a
25	necessary byproduct of oil and gas production. All

1	parties here commercially disposed in the San Andres,
2	Goodnight, Rice, Permian, Pilot and even Empire.
3	In the OCD's prehearing statement, UIC
4	Manager Philip Goetze says that he reported to the
5	EPA in 2020 that, quote, the industry is still
6	interested in using the San Andres as a disposal
7	zone.
8	There's additional support for denying
9	Empire's applications found in the OCD's response to
10	Goodnight's motion for partial summary judgment on
11	the EMSU unitization orders. The OCD points out it's
12	recognized facing relief-affecting validly issued
13	orders, there are legal principles, including stare
14	decisis and laches that weigh in support of
15	precluding such relief.
16	In that filing, the OCD said, quote,
17	Goodnight-sought relief will result in regulatory
18	instability and is well past ripe for consideration
19	to the point reconsideration would cause a mix of
20	harms.
21	It says that in relation to a
22	unitization order that was entered in 1984, 41 years
23	ago, it says that overturning that would result in
24	regulatory instability as well as entice operators to
25	challenge longstanding unitization and other orders.

1	The OCD points out that the doctrine of
2	laches should preclude that; that parties should not
3	be permitted to grieve about orders it and other EMSU
4	operators could have addressed long ago. In the
5	OCD's words, and I'm sorry I'm not as good at Latin
6	as Mr. Moander is invokes the doctrine of ab assuetis
7	non fit injuria, and luckily right, in that pleading
8	after he says that, he says what it means in English,
9	which I can read, which is no injury is done by
10	things long acquiesced.
11	While Rice and Permian disagrees with
12	the application of that to the 1984 unitization
13	order, it applies here for Rice and Permian
14	specifically, where Rice has had validly issued
15	Division permits to inject for over 60 years into the
16	San Andres, or what you heard referred to as
17	Goodnight's disposal zone.
18	Now, this isn't to stress a parade of
19	horribles or talk about concerns in the abstract.
20	Empire filed applications to revoke Rice's and
21	Permian injection permits, including for the over

horribles or talk about concerns in the abstract.

Empire filed applications to revoke Rice's and

Permian injection permits, including for the over

60-year-old well that Mr. Rankin described to you

earlier today. As part of these proceedings, the

commission stayed those applications. It lifted that

stay to dismiss all of those applications, but

22

23

24

25

1	without prejudice. And it did so because Empire
2	specifically reiterated in those dismissals that it
3	wanted to have the opportunity to refile those cases
4	and seek to invalidate Rice's and Permian's
5	longstanding injection permits in the future.
6	So Rice and Permian stand behind
7	Goodnight, and they reiterate the far-reaching
8	implications to the regulated industry and Empire's
9	requested relief here to revoke Goodnight's validly
LO	issued injection permits. The commission should not
L1	grant that relief.
L2	To the extent that the commission
L3	decides to grant relief, it should do so with these
L4	thoughts in mind. And it should do so in a narrowly
L5	tailored manner, that recognizes the necessary
L6	industry reliance on the institution of the
L7	commission and the Division, including respecting
L8	validly issued Division orders. Thank you.
L9	HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: Thank you,
20	Mr. Beck. I believe that that concludes all the
21	scheduled presentations for today. Is that the
22	understanding of the commission?
23	MR. RUBIN: Mr. Hearing Examiner, Members of
24	the Commission, I was considering whether or not I
25	needed to make any initial comments, give any

1 additional advice to the commission. 2 Based upon what I've heard by the very 3 capable attorneys here and by the excellent presentations, I don't really see too much in the way 4 5 of red herrings. I don't want to get in the way of lunch, but there are, if I may -- and of course I 6 have the luxury of taking you all to -- of giving you 8 advice in closed session at the end of this, as well. 9 But if I may, I do have one point that I would like to address to counsel, as it would be 10 11 helpful for me ultimately in advising the commission, 12 if I may. 13 HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: Don't let me constrain you on time. We've got all afternoon for 14 15 lunch. Take the time you need, Mr. Rubin. 16 MR. RUBIN: I just have one comment I think at this point, perhaps two, and then we'll break for 17 18 lunch. 19 My first issue that occurred to me that 20 might be helpful here, something from the parties, is to the extent that there is an ROZ that's dependent 21 22 upon CO2 flooding, this goes back to my state 23 engineer days, to the extent that that is -- there's 24 an impairment argument to be made based upon 25 increased costs to Empire, I am not sure what the

1	impairment standard would be as to what would be more
2	than a de minimus cost, what is the cost that would
3	constitute an impairment of correlative rights.
4	I don't know if I'm going to hear
5	testimony on that. We certainly had case law that
6	talks about how it's about variable costs, not fixed
7	costs. And the case law they talked to, that goes to
8	that point. That would be something that might be
9	helpful for me to hear.
10	There's been a lot of there's been
11	some discussion about laches and delays, and I can
12	tell the parties here that I do have a concern about
13	equitable issues such as laches in what has come
14	before and stability coming into play, when we
15	have when this commission has a statutory
16	obligation, which as stated capable by the lawyers,
17	goes to protecting correlative rights, avoiding
18	waste, avoiding drowning, and also the standards that
19	govern produced water injections, as well.
20	Now, of course, like a district court
21	situation, Empire has a lawsuit against Goodnight,
22	and the doctrine of laches in District Court might be
23	a good defense to that trespass case. But here, I am
24	concerned that this commission do anything based upon
25	upsetting what came before if it gets in the way of

1	honoring its statutory obligations now.
2	So I think that's probably helpful for
3	the parties to hear, as well. But that's all I have.
4	Thank you.
5	HEARING OFFICER HARWOOD: Thank you,
6	Mr. Rubin.
7	Then is there anything further based on
8	Mr. Rubin's statements that the parties would like to
9	respond to or address at this time? I guess it falls
10	into the category of food for thought between now and
11	Monday morning.
12	And if there's nothing further, then
13	Mr. Rozatos, I'll leave it to you to, you know, do
14	the technicalities necessary to bring this meeting to
15	a close, with the understanding that we'll all be
16	back here Monday morning at 9 o'clock. All right?
17	CHAIR ROZATOS: Just like our hearing
18	officer said, we are now dismissed until Monday
19	morning at 9 o'clock.
20	All opening statements were made.
21	Evidentiary hearing will start on Monday, so we'll
22	see you all on Monday. Thank you.
23	(Proceedings adjourned.)
24	
25	

1	RE: NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION
2	
3	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
4	I, PAUL BACA, CCR #112, DO HEREBY CERTIFY
5	that the foregoing transcript was prepared from a
6	provided audio recording, that the audio was reduced
7	to typewritten transcript by Kelli Gallegos, and that
8	the foregoing pages are a true and correct
9	transcription of the recorded proceedings, to the best
10	of our knowledge and hearing ability. The audio
11	quality was FAIR to POOR.
12	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither employed
13	by nor related to nor contracted with (unless excepted
14	by the rules) any of the parties or attorneys in this
15	matter, and that I have no interest whatsoever in the
16	final disposition of this matter.
17	Poul Bacq
18	
19	PAUL BACA NEW MEXICO CCR #112
19	Commission Expires: 12/31/25
20	Commission Expires: 12/31/23
21	
22	
23	
23 24	
2 4 25	
ر ک	
	Page 131

[& - 23775]

&	14th 13:13	1965 62:23	2013 121:13
& 7:16,19 15:8	15 27:13 67:5	1966 64:21	2018 67:3,11
15:25 16:12	103:8 117:9	1970 83:19,22	2019 67:13,14
116:24	15,000 59:8	1975 108:21	67:21
1	150 48:23	1980s 63:3,5	2020 33:7
	16 69:1,2	121:14	67:13,17,22,25
1 54:17 101:17	101:14	1983 90:12,21	125:5
1.25 34:9	16th 3:21	1984 32:10	2021 32:21,23
10 14:11 21:8	17 14:20 69:1	49:25 63:25	83:24
41:8	101:14	90:5,8 109:23	2022 67:25
10,000 119:6	1747 51:19	125:22 126:12	70:1 111:8
100 33:3 79:22	17th 3:21	1986 44:17	2023 70:23
93:16 97:22	18 47:10 84:1	51:21 74:17	84:3 118:22
100,000 82:24	101:14	1987 65:12	2024 8:17,19
104 46:18 47:5	18th 8:18	1996 85:12	55:2 65:17
10:22 57:19	19 31:23 83:9	86:21 88:2	71:9
10:35 57:21	19.15.16 4:11	1998 86:7	2025 1:14 3:12
11 67:9 90:10	19.15.2 4:11	1st 1:5 33:7	3:22 33:7
90:18 91:9	7:5	2	34:12
121:17	19.15.25 4:11	2 47:11,17	20th 13:4,5,6
11/20 67:5	7:6	107:6 108:25	13:22 14:7
112 131:4,19	19.15.4 4:11	20 1:14 3:12	21 64:25
11th 5:12,21	19.15.7 4:11	46:9 47:4 92:1	121:17
6:12,15	19.15.8 7:5	92:12,14,18	211 51:22
12 21:8	19.15.9 7:6	95:16,22 96:6	21st 13:14
12/31/25	1929 32:10	97:22	22 19:13
131:19	1930s 42:15	20,000 41:7	23 59:20 83:6
1200 97:14	44:17 85:3	200 53:4,13,15	84:4
1220 1:6	1950s 63:24	64:15 78:14	23.7 90:16
124 47:2	121:2,23	89:5	23580 4:9
1245 51:20	1952 65:7	200,000 54:19	23614 14:20
126 34:14	1954 111:6	83:15	59:13
12th 5:13,22	1958 121:6	2000 87:15	23617 59:14
9:3	1960 64:6	2000 87:13 2004 32:20,21	23775 14:21
14 90:6,9		2004 32.20,21	58:20

[23rd - accumulations]

AA 1 0 10	1050 1510	(50 46 10 05	11 600 10 7
23rd 8:19	4,252 46:10	672 46:13,25	able 6:20 13:7
24 83:6 84:3,4	40 31:16 75:7	679 45:19 46:7	21:17 25:18,22
24,000 81:17	90:18 92:1	49:21 76:10	80:17
82:23 83:1	40,000 58:22	7	abnormal
24018 14:21	400 91:8	7 54:17 96:11	84:14
24020 14:21	41 125:22	97:21	above 34:22
24025 14:22	42 106:4,7	70,000 82:8,10	45:6 61:20
24123 2:22	43 65:2	82:25	63:20 74:5
14:20 59:18	430 51:19	70-2-12.b	75:21 77:14
24683 6:25	5	106:16	78:7 79:25
24th 8:16 15:1	50,000 42:19	700 96:10	85:25 86:1
25 32:17 90:5,6	500 79:15 81:5	97:11	88:13 89:6,17
25,000 58:22	81:10 89:5	70s 108:6	91:6 95:16
250 46:6	50s 65:7	720,000 81:19	96:6,9 100:16
28 3:12 51:20	50s 63.7 511 54:20	,	102:13
28813 131:18	511 34:20 522 45:21	8	absence 70:4
28th 9:5 15:2	548 46:14 47:1	80 109:17	absentia 58:9
202 7122	340 40.14 4/.]	0.50 101 15	
292 54:20		850 101:17	absolutely 10:5
292 54:20	58 31:22	850 101:17 9	absolutely 10:5 abstract 126:19
3	58 31:22 6	9	
3 30 11:13,14	58 31:22 6 60 11:13 64:18	9 9 130:16,19	abstract 126:19
3 30 11:13,14 12:12,14 90:15	58 31:22 6 60 11:13 64:18 66:2 117:24	9 130:16,19 90 66:4 109:17	abstract 126:19 abundance
30 11:13,14 12:12,14 90:15 300 96:16	58 31:22 6 60 11:13 64:18 66:2 117:24 118:9 121:9	9 9 130:16,19 90 66:4 109:17 900 68:22	abstract 126:19 abundance 122:15 124:4
30 11:13,14 12:12,14 90:15 300 96:16 97:10	58 31:22 6 60 11:13 64:18 66:2 117:24 118:9 121:9 126:15,22	9 130:16,19 90 66:4 109:17 900 68:22 90s 66:5	abstract 126:19 abundance 122:15 124:4 124:10,15
30 11:13,14 12:12,14 90:15 300 96:16 97:10 32 46:9,22	58 31:22 6 60 11:13 64:18 66:2 117:24 118:9 121:9 126:15,22 63 33:8	9 130:16,19 90 66:4 109:17 900 68:22 90s 66:5 9:00 28:11,15	abstract 126:19 abundance 122:15 124:4 124:10,15 accept 103:16
30 11:13,14 12:12,14 90:15 300 96:16 97:10 32 46:9,22 33 64:15	6 60 11:13 64:18 66:2 117:24 118:9 121:9 126:15,22 63 33:8 63.2 90:14	9 130:16,19 90 66:4 109:17 900 68:22 90s 66:5 9:00 28:11,15 28:16	abstract 126:19 abundance 122:15 124:4 124:10,15 accept 103:16 accepted
30 11:13,14 12:12,14 90:15 300 96:16 97:10 32 46:9,22 33 64:15 350 12:6 75:5	58 31:22 6 60 11:13 64:18 66:2 117:24 118:9 121:9 126:15,22 63 33:8	9 130:16,19 90 66:4 109:17 900 68:22 90s 66:5 9:00 28:11,15 28:16	abstract 126:19 abundance 122:15 124:4 124:10,15 accept 103:16 accepted 113:19,25
30 11:13,14 12:12,14 90:15 300 96:16 97:10 32 46:9,22 33 64:15 350 12:6 75:5 89:4,17	6 60 11:13 64:18 66:2 117:24 118:9 121:9 126:15,22 63 33:8 63.2 90:14	9 130:16,19 90 66:4 109:17 900 68:22 90s 66:5 9:00 28:11,15 28:16 a ab 126:6	abstract 126:19 abundance 122:15 124:4 124:10,15 accept 103:16 accepted 113:19,25 114:3
30 11:13,14 12:12,14 90:15 300 96:16 97:10 32 46:9,22 33 64:15 350 12:6 75:5 89:4,17 370 97:5	6 60 11:13 64:18 66:2 117:24 118:9 121:9 126:15,22 63 33:8 63.2 90:14 64.2 32:14 90:3	9 130:16,19 90 66:4 109:17 900 68:22 90s 66:5 9:00 28:11,15 28:16 a ab 126:6 abbreviated	abstract 126:19 abundance 122:15 124:4 124:10,15 accept 103:16 accepted 113:19,25 114:3 accommodate
30 11:13,14 12:12,14 90:15 300 96:16 97:10 32 46:9,22 33 64:15 350 12:6 75:5 89:4,17 370 97:5 380 100:21	6 60 11:13 64:18 66:2 117:24 118:9 121:9 126:15,22 63 33:8 63.2 90:14 64.2 32:14 90:3 652 46:11 96:5	9 130:16,19 90 66:4 109:17 900 68:22 90s 66:5 9:00 28:11,15 28:16 a ab 126:6 abbreviated 103:9	abstract 126:19 abundance 122:15 124:4 124:10,15 accept 103:16 accepted 113:19,25 114:3 accommodate 58:25
3 30 11:13,14 12:12,14 90:15 300 96:16 97:10 32 46:9,22 33 64:15 350 12:6 75:5 89:4,17 370 97:5 380 100:21 3rd 3:22	6 60 11:13 64:18 66:2 117:24 118:9 121:9 126:15,22 63 33:8 63.2 90:14 64.2 32:14 90:3 652 46:11 96:5 96:8	9 130:16,19 90 66:4 109:17 900 68:22 90s 66:5 9:00 28:11,15 28:16 a ab 126:6 abbreviated 103:9 abbreviations	abstract 126:19 abundance
30 11:13,14 12:12,14 90:15 300 96:16 97:10 32 46:9,22 33 64:15 350 12:6 75:5 89:4,17 370 97:5 380 100:21	6 60 11:13 64:18 66:2 117:24 118:9 121:9 126:15,22 63 33:8 63.2 90:14 64.2 32:14 90:3 652 46:11 96:5 96:8 658 48:14	9 130:16,19 90 66:4 109:17 900 68:22 90s 66:5 9:00 28:11,15 28:16 a ab 126:6 abbreviated 103:9 abbreviations 29:3	abstract 126:19 abundance 122:15 124:4 124:10,15 accept 103:16 accepted 113:19,25 114:3 accommodate 58:25 accomplish 105:13 107:5
3 30 11:13,14 12:12,14 90:15 300 96:16 97:10 32 46:9,22 33 64:15 350 12:6 75:5 89:4,17 370 97:5 380 100:21 3rd 3:22	6 60 11:13 64:18 66:2 117:24 118:9 121:9 126:15,22 63 33:8 63.2 90:14 64.2 32:14 90:3 652 46:11 96:5 96:8 658 48:14 50:18	9 130:16,19 90 66:4 109:17 900 68:22 90s 66:5 9:00 28:11,15 28:16 a ab 126:6 abbreviated 103:9 abbreviations 29:3 ability 34:18	abstract 126:19 abundance 122:15 124:4 124:10,15 accept 103:16 accepted 113:19,25 114:3 accommodate 58:25 accomplish 105:13 107:5 account 81:19
30 11:13,14 12:12,14 90:15 300 96:16 97:10 32 46:9,22 33 64:15 350 12:6 75:5 89:4,17 370 97:5 380 100:21 3rd 3:22	6 60 11:13 64:18 66:2 117:24 118:9 121:9 126:15,22 63 33:8 63.2 90:14 64.2 32:14 90:3 652 46:11 96:5 96:8 658 48:14 50:18 660 48:14,21	9 130:16,19 90 66:4 109:17 900 68:22 90s 66:5 9:00 28:11,15 28:16 a ab 126:6 abbreviated 103:9 abbreviations 29:3 ability 34:18 42:7 52:22	abstract 126:19 abundance
30 11:13,14 12:12,14 90:15 300 96:16 97:10 32 46:9,22 33 64:15 350 12:6 75:5 89:4,17 370 97:5 380 100:21 3rd 3:22 4 4 42:17 45:20	6 60 11:13 64:18 66:2 117:24 118:9 121:9 126:15,22 63 33:8 63.2 90:14 64.2 32:14 90:3 652 46:11 96:5 96:8 658 48:14 50:18 660 48:14,21 50:19	9 130:16,19 90 66:4 109:17 900 68:22 90s 66:5 9:00 28:11,15 28:16 a ab 126:6 abbreviated 103:9 abbreviations 29:3 ability 34:18	abstract 126:19 abundance 122:15 124:4 124:10,15 accept 103:16 accepted 113:19,25 114:3 accommodate 58:25 accomplish 105:13 107:5 account 81:19 accumulations 60:18 61:13

[accurate - albuquerque]

accurate 78:5,7	45:25 47:1,24	addressed	affirmative
81:25	51:16 82:3	17:13 37:14	38:8
accurately	83:3 84:19	45:16 53:9	affirmed 46:2
81:14	123:5	126:4	afternoon
acknowledge	actually 24:7	addresses	28:20 115:19
108:6	57:1 62:20	56:12 85:13	116:2 128:14
acknowledges	64:23 65:14	addressing	age 30:4
110:20	72:25 74:22	18:4 109:4	aged 108:7
acquiesced	77:1,20 78:8	adjourn 116:1	agencies 29:24
126:10	82:24 84:22	adjourned	agenda 3:10,12
acquired 32:20	91:19 104:13	130:23	3:17 22:21,24
32:22,24 83:24	adam 4:20 15:7	adjusted 68:25	agendas 3:9
acquisition	adamantly	adjustments	agnostic 78:23
38:17	117:14	69:2	ago 31:16
acronyms 29:3	add 12:3 30:16	administration	44:13 121:6
29:9	addition 31:25	117:5	125:23 126:4
act 35:12,14	36:4 60:5	administrative	agree 26:25
102:4 105:1	121:9,16	4:12 7:6 36:19	27:9 28:1
106:23,24	additional 10:6	admits 51:1	36:19 94:17
107:3,8,14	11:4,21 31:10	admitted 70:20	115:11 118:4
112:8,15,22	32:1,14 34:4,8	adopted 92:4	agreed 19:24
123:25	53:9 54:13	advance 9:20	24:2 27:13
acted 66:20	57:14 65:5,8	17:12	70:8
71:11	67:3 76:16,25	advanced 62:9	agreement 9:12
acting 2:5,14	79:24 89:18	adverse 122:11	28:4 72:1
93:3	90:9 101:14	124:6	115:10 121:5,8
action 113:4	102:5 109:22	adversely	agrees 104:13
122:5	125:8 128:1	34:18 124:1	agu 32:6 41:15
actions 122:12	address 4:10	advice 128:1,8	42:12 55:11
active 38:20	37:24 39:14	advising	76:18
39:23 65:7,14	41:13 49:17	128:11	ahead 4:25
actively 64:2	56:4 109:10	aerially 90:24	12:15 13:9
activities 37:21	111:17 128:10	affected 118:11	18:18
actual 14:25	130:9	affecting 83:16	albuquerque
20:7 36:15		124:2 125:12	29:25

[alert - apodaca]

alert 112:8	49:21 55:22	51:25 52:5,9	96:20 97:14,16
align 98:21	69:22 71:12,14	52:10,13 53:1	98:13,17,18,22
alleged 73:23	71:18,20 72:9	53:7 54:17,20	99:5,7,10,12,20
76:6	72:13,20,23	54:22 55:4,7	99:22 100:8
allegedly 81:23	73:14 74:10	55:11,19,20,22	101:4,18
alliance 7:5	76:8,12 78:18	55:23,24 56:2	104:11 105:7
allotments	78:23 79:1,14	56:8,19,20	106:12 107:18
19:22 22:13	79:18 91:10	57:9 58:15	110:21 113:21
allow 39:5 54:5	97:12 102:7,18	59:13 60:17,25	114:9 117:15
113:16 122:20	111:2 117:20	61:2,8 62:17	117:21,22
allowed 65:24	118:14	62:24 63:4,7	118:3,12,15,18
allowing 93:1	analyst 39:10	63:10,17,20,22	118:20 119:9
112:6	andre 58:20	64:2,4 65:15	121:19 124:21
allows 123:24	60:4	66:4,7,11,13,18	125:1,6 126:16
alternating	andres 31:12	67:20 68:6,7	angle 98:20
89:24	31:17 32:12	68:17,21 69:5	ann 8:3
ambush 69:25	33:1,6 34:6,20	69:14 70:5,15	announcement
70:19	34:21 35:4	72:24 73:7,21	70:11
amend 4:9 7:5	39:1,2,3,4,6,8	73:24 74:3,14	answer 80:24
amending	39:13,21,25	74:15,20 75:4	84:25 102:9,10
119:24	40:1,2,6,7,9,10	75:6,12,17,20	anticipate
amendments	40:12,20,23	75:22 76:7	17:23
4:10	42:12,14,17,21	77:11 78:1,14	anticipated
amerada 45:22	43:3,4,9,16,19	78:16,25 79:5	12:18
amount 20:21	43:25 44:4,10	79:11,18 80:6	anticipating
27:17 34:2,12	44:11,14,21,22	80:14,16 81:16	8:24 18:1
82:13 110:4	44:24 45:3,10	81:17,24 82:22	103:8
ample 89:11	45:11,14,17,21	83:1 84:21	anybody 4:23
ampomah 1:22	46:5,10,12,14	85:8,15,17	8:1,11,13
3:4,5,14,25	46:16,18,25	86:4 87:4,8,13	30:24
58:10	47:12 48:1,9	88:2,4,6,23	anymore
analyses 71:10	48:10,16,16,24	92:9 93:3,9,16	101:25
analysis 36:11	49:1,20,23	93:18 94:6,7,9	anyway 30:8
39:25 42:3	50:3,5,18,24	94:20,22,23	apodaca 5:9,14
45:24 47:8	51:9,14,18,22	95:2,6,21	13:4

[apologize - assumptions]

1 1 22 21	20.10.00.14		100 10 10 20
apologize 23:21	29:10 99:14	aquifer 55:15	109:12,13,22
24:8 30:23	122:17 123:4	61:9,12 62:25	110:8
apparent 71:3	appreciate	68:8 91:8	articles 109:19
73:4,20	26:13 27:23	105:2 107:11	110:13 121:5,8
apparently	115:14 120:14	109:24 112:7	aside 2:21 75:8
85:16	appreciates	112:14,17	asked 47:13
appear 25:20	116:25	113:7 114:16	72:11 87:20
appearing 4:20	approach 59:3	119:4	98:11 102:18
7:19 8:3 15:9	69:24 79:6,11	aquifers 63:15	asking 3:11
15:13,16,20,25	81:7	area 33:20 34:2	aspects 36:13
55:20	approval 3:9	43:5 45:6,18	assertion 120:1
appears 73:19	3:11 57:14	48:10 49:14	assess 10:18
110:23	58:12 59:12	59:5 62:18,25	105:6
appendix 107:6	123:2	64:5 65:9,10	assessment
108:25	approvals	66:5 85:24	53:10 54:7
applicable 35:8	66:21	88:10 95:5	89:12
107:18	approve 3:20	101:5,12,19	assessments
applicant 69:11	66:1 103:1	114:11 117:10	106:8
application 4:9	approved 3:18	119:20 120:10	assistance
6:25 36:22,25	3:19 4:5,6	121:11 124:21	105:12
47:19 67:21	32:11 63:2	124:23	assistant 2:18
126:12	64:2,21 65:5	areas 55:10,13	assisting 16:12
applications	66:4,19 67:2	56:18 68:11,13	association
37:5,11 57:12	67:16,21,25	80:11	4:21 7:20 8:4
57:14 60:7	90:2 118:20	arguably	10:20,25
62:12 66:22	approving	108:22	assuetis 126:6
67:12,23 68:3	31:15 68:5	argued 37:9	assume 13:14
69:18 103:1	approximately	106:19	22:13 28:4
120:23 122:11	19:13 27:13	argument 36:1	115:9
125:9 126:20	31:16 32:17	37:18 119:15	assuming 21:6
126:24,25	33:3,8 34:5,9	128:24	28:11,19
applies 26:3	73:10 75:5	arid 113:9	assumption
126:13	89:4 90:5	arisen 111:21	81:13
apply 26:20	april 8:18 9:7	article 108:3,12	assumptions
27:10 28:5	13:17,17 51:21	108:19 109:3	72:20 77:9,16
			,

[assumptions - beck]

77:25 78:2	97:21	banned 65:20	45:13,25 50:2
astronomical	avoid 35:1	65:24	66:17 71:15,18
106:9	46:16	barium 52:11	72:22 78:18
attached 86:6	avoiding	52:12	79:1,2 96:17
attempt 43:11	129:17,18	barrel 83:15	97:2,23,25
attempted 81:4	aware 24:6	100:23	108:13 109:24
attempting	80:7 98:11	barrels 32:14	119:8 128:2,24
107:5	110:14 114:22	32:17 33:8	129:24 130:7
attempts 75:10	aye 3:16 4:3	34:15 41:7	baseless 119:1
attention 14:15	b	42:18,19 54:18	basically 29:18
attorney's 11:8	b 32:5 41:15	54:19 58:22,23	30:4
attorneys 128:3	42:12 45:23	59:8 64:19	basin 41:20
131:14	46:9,22	65:2 68:23	63:22 68:12
audio 131:6,6	baca 131:4,18	75:6 81:17,19	93:1 94:24
131:10	back 9:11	81:22 82:8,10	97:19 99:2,8
august 71:8	13:19 15:22	82:23,24 83:9	99:18 101:9
author 86:12	24:16 27:12	83:13 90:3,5,6	109:15,16
108:2	30:20 54:8	90:7,9,11,15,17	110:19 113:22
authority 38:24	56:21 57:20	90:18 100:22	basis 96:18
60:8 63:14	59:20 63:2,5	101:15,17	baylen 2:24 3:1
69:12 106:17	65:6 70:2	106:3,4,5	bear 23:13
106:20 110:4,5	83:19,22 90:21	barrier 40:2	bearing 74:9
122:13	94:4 98:19	51:8 52:1,4,15	118:24
authorization	103:15 111:6	53:4,13,15	bears 36:21,23
58:13 105:5	116:1 121:23	60:23 74:5	37:1,4,10
authorized	128:22 130:16	77:3,14 86:1	beat 12:21
66:21	background	98:6 100:12,15	beatty 7:19
authors 85:16	31:9 32:9	barriers 54:1,4	15:25 116:24
availability	62:15,17	base 76:13	beck 16:6,6,9
25:14	backup 76:21	92:11 95:16	18:18,19 25:4
available 6:4	badly 112:8	96:8,14 97:16	25:5 115:22
10:4 49:14	bailey 40:3	98:4,8	116:4,8,9,19
108:8	balance 87:1	based 13:13	120:16,18
average 59:8	banks 67:24	20:22 28:8	127:20
83:7 91:9	~ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	29:14 40:12	

[bedrock - calls]

bedrock 123:9	bigger 70:24	103:16 128:17	business 17:24
began 33:5	bill 98:25	breakthrough	115:20
44:16 121:1,13	billion 101:17	45:8 87:10	button 16:23
beginning	birkhead 40:14	breccia 54:14	byproduct
71:17 99:25	bit 10:3 30:1	brief 31:8	124:25
begins 45:2	53:23 57:21	106:22 115:23	
behalf 4:20 5:1	58:6 62:14	bring 69:17	c
7:19,22 8:3	105:23 108:21	103:13,15	c 46:3 47:10
15:9,13,16,20	120:25	130:14	c.a.r.e. 7:3
16:1,6 31:5	black 113:6	bringing 36:22	calcium 55:3
116:23 117:1	bloom 1:21	broader 98:20	calculate 83:8
believe 5:19,19	2:17,18 3:13	broadly 36:6	calculated 80:3
13:16 17:5	3:24 13:9,10	brochures	101:16
20:3 22:17	58:9	70:18 97:8	calculating
25:24 26:13,14	blue 75:16	broggi 16:11	79:21,22
26:19 59:20	board 110:13	16:15	calculation
96:19 105:19	boat 30:5,6	brownfield	78:16
110:14 118:4	bob 40:25	41:7	calculations
119:11 120:6	border 114:24	brownfields	77:17,24 78:12
127:20	bottom 76:12	41:4	78:15,21 79:25
believes 108:7	80:5 85:22	buchwalter	87:2
117:18 118:12	bought 66:14	42:9 81:2	calendar 5:20
119:7	68:24	82:15,20 83:12	13:13 23:1
bell 45:19	bound 93:24	buchwalter's	calibrating
49:22	boundaries	52:17	73:5
beneath 41:3	58:16 64:20,23	build 123:19	california
46:6	boundary 32:5	building 1:5	112:5,9
beneficial 63:1	64:16 98:5,9	builds 44:24,25	call 2:13 4:1
benefit 28:25	98:12	built 68:11	74:3,7 92:14
best 29:4 108:8	brackish	108:24 123:11	92:19 110:12
131:9	109:21,24	burden 35:8	called 58:19
beyond 22:7	break 14:12	36:18,21,23	79:4 81:6
119:21	19:9 21:13	37:1,4,10	107:1,6
big 70:7 84:5	28:12,17,20	69:17 124:6	calling 105:16
94:18	30:24 57:20,21	07.17 127.0	calls 73:24
77.10	30.27 37.20,21		76:13

[cap - changes]

	I	I	I
cap 87:11	23:11,12 24:5	caught 30:20	4:18,22 5:2,11
capable 35:17	25:18 26:21	cause 54:25	5:16,23,24 6:1
60:20 61:16	27:1,24 29:16	55:16 59:25	6:5,8 7:13,14
63:8 128:3	38:8 45:25	60:12 89:23	7:17,21,24 8:6
129:16	58:20 59:13,18	102:3 125:19	8:9 9:13,16,17
capacity 101:7	59:18 64:18	caused 44:13	10:14,15 11:15
101:10	65:1 67:7 70:2	51:25 86:20	12:1,13,16,20
capital 36:11	74:23 80:2	108:21	12:24 13:5,10
capitan 56:5,14	85:7 87:17	causes 31:18	13:16 14:14
56:25 61:3	90:13,14,16,20	54:11,13 55:2	15:11,14,18,21
104:12,20,24	91:20 101:2	causing 55:6	16:2,5,9,10,14
105:2,8 108:18	109:11 111:4	56:22 61:14	18:25 20:5
109:9 111:16	111:21 112:4	69:8,9	21:19 22:1,23
112:14 113:20	112:18 115:13	caution 122:16	23:20 24:13,19
114:7,10,11,17	117:1,3,12,14	cautions 124:3	24:21,24 25:2
117:16 118:13	118:8 119:11	ccr 131:4,19	25:4,6 28:14
118:16,17	119:18,22	cell 30:18	28:18,21 30:19
119:1,5	120:3 124:5	center 7:1,10	102:24 103:21
carbonate	129:5,7,23	7:12 8:13	103:25 115:21
39:15 43:15	cases 4:8 14:9	central 99:2,8	116:4,8,10,22
61:25 90:22	14:17 15:10	99:18	120:18 130:17
91:4	16:13 26:4,8	century 123:12	chairman 15:6
cards 115:13	26:15 29:4	ceremonies	58:8
care 30:7	31:9 32:7	30:2	challenge
carefully 20:11	58:11 59:11	certain 77:9	125:25
76:23	60:6 70:22,22	79:4	chance 10:22
caring 7:1	71:4 74:4,10	certainly	23:17 91:13
carries 119:22	75:23 111:3	114:22 129:5	change 14:10
carry 62:5,8	127:3	certificate	28:7
100:3	catastrophic	131:3	changed 72:3,3
case 2:22,25	114:24	certify 131:4,12	changes 10:19
4:8,8 6:23,25	category 76:4	cetera 9:23	10:23 11:2,21
6:25 14:5,16	77:6 106:14	chair 1:20 2:2	11:22 12:7
14:17,19,20,20	130:10	2:14 3:7,15,17	79:1 90:23
14:21 20:8,19		3:20 4:1,4,7,16	111:18

[changing - commission]

changing 69:20	circulated 10:8	closed 128:8	comes 29:5
73:14	circulation	closer 11:13	87:2 91:16
channel 99:19	88:18	club 7:5	104:2,5 107:24
104:13,20	citations 48:19	co2 34:23 35:1	119:21
108:14,17	citizens 7:1,4	41:5,9,12,18,24	coming 30:20
109:5,9 110:10	city 29:24	45:2,5,7,7	84:22 87:7,24
113:21 114:7	civil 26:5	50:13 54:22,22	129:14
114:18 117:16	claim 53:22,25	54:22 56:15	commenced
character	68:24 78:17	60:19 69:6	90:8
86:24	80:15,22 83:17	89:13,18,23,24	comment 8:14
characteristics	84:17 88:23	91:3,5,12,13	128:16
99:13	119:9,12	92:15 128:22	comments 6:22
characterizati	claiming 101:1	code 4:12 7:7	14:5 127:25
38:25 86:24	claims 45:13	66:6	commercial
characterize	68:16 69:18,25	cognizant 14:2	41:11 61:13
86:22 105:6	75:3 78:19	coin 116:17	91:12,24,25
114:10	81:1 88:25	cold 30:20	92:15 95:9
charge 86:15	117:15 118:25	collapse 54:14	97:13,18
charged 35:15	119:7 120:9	colleague 16:11	commercially
check 5:20	clarification	collect 57:22	60:19 117:23
chemistry 52:3	113:24	100:18	119:10 124:22
75:8	class 105:22	collection	125:1
chevron 32:20	classifying	108:9	commingling
85:12 86:8,13	107:15	color 67:8,8	114:8
86:20 87:20,22	clear 18:4	coloration 48:9	commission 1:3
chevron's	29:14 62:11	colored 48:6	1:19 2:3,9,14
32:20 86:13	75:18 117:19	53:25	3:8 6:13 7:15
88:1	clearly 46:5	colossal 90:19	8:2,15,17 9:5
chino 1:5	clerk 30:3	column 46:19	9:24 10:10
chloride 108:14	click 16:23	63:19	14:24 15:7
chlorides 52:24	client 11:22	come 5:7 9:10	16:3,18 19:19
chris 15:12	clients 11:22	9:11 13:7,21	20:22 21:11,16
17:17	close 17:24	57:20 113:2	27:19 28:12
chronology	130:15	116:1 129:13	29:1,16 30:10
112:3			30:11,15 32:11

[commission - confident]

25.12 15 26.22	26.20	aamplatad	121.25 122.20
35:13,15 36:22	common 36:20	completed 87:22	121:25 122:20 126:19
37:15,24 38:18	communicate		
56:7 57:1 58:8	10:10	completely	concludes
60:9,10,15	communicating	75:8 104:1	52:19 127:20
61:1 63:14,17	102:12	complex 61:24	concluding
71:5,6,23	communication	90:22 91:4	94:21
104:3 110:14	43:2 51:14	118:13	conclusion
116:16 119:21	52:15 55:24	compliance	49:23 51:17
120:8 122:1	74:13,18,25	123:21	57:7 75:10
124:7 126:24	75:15,24 77:13	comply 36:14	94:19 120:5
127:10,12,17	77:20,22 80:11	71:3 102:4	conclusions
127:22,24	80:13 85:23	composed	13:21
128:1,11	101:21	43:14	concur 10:17
129:15,24	communicati	composite 98:5	11:17
131:1,19	111:15	98:9,12	concurring
commission's	community	comprehensive	12:9
4:10,14 5:6	123:19	29:17	conditions 94:1
10:13 29:21	company 16:7	concedes 45:12	conduct 100:17
31:15 36:5	64:17 120:19	50:17	100:18 105:10
115:25	121:14	concentrated	conducted
commissioner	compartment	33:19 44:12	79:15 87:22
2:15,17,18 3:4	90:25	concentration	102:7
3:13,14,24,25	compartment	94:10	confer 9:11
4:19 12:4 13:9	77:22	concentrations	10:22
13:10 58:9,9	compel 71:1	91:6,12,22	conference
commissioners	compelling	concern 21:9	4:13 5:5 7:8
10:16 15:7,15	70:9	22:5 56:4,12	12:19 13:1,6
15:24 31:5	competent	112:23 120:21	13:19,20
102:24 103:25	60:23 61:18	129:12	conferring
104:4 115:7	88:10	concerned 62:6	71:24
116:12,21	complains	119:24 129:24	confidence
120:18	78:13	concerning	91:14
committee	complete 29:25	111:16	confident
90:12	64:10	concerns	103:17
		111:20 120:4	

[confirm - core]

confirm 11:7	4:17 7:2,23	consulting	continues
51:16 52:4	8:22 15:13	38:22 39:10	44:23 66:7
89:13	51:2 131:1	40:3,14 41:25	continuing
confirmed	considerable	42:9	31:10,25 45:4
45:19 47:19	40:11	consumption	continuous
48:1,14,17	consideration	109:21	53:13
98:2	125:18	contact 92:20	contracted
confirms 41:14	considered	92:21 96:23	131:13
52:1,20 53:10	27:1	97:4,4	contradicts
106:11 118:14	considering	contagious	119:16
conflicting	75:5 114:16	30:23	contrary 78:19
110:4	127:24	contains 52:9	contrast 79:20
conflicts 6:3,8	considers 19:5	60:18 91:8	97:11
9:23	consistency	119:9	contrasting
conformance	123:22	contamination	110:17
86:11,20 91:1	consistent	56:25 104:25	contributing
confuse 73:19	73:15	118:19	81:16 104:23
confusion	consolidated	contend 74:25	106:25
75:23 76:3	14:9,17,19	contends 53:4	control 107:2
77:7 78:10	26:15 58:11	88:24	112:25 113:2
conjectural	constant 84:11	contention	controversial
74:14	constantly	50:22	108:23
connected 61:3	75:20	contest 70:1	conveniently
connection	constitute	122:21	103:13
110:20	53:25 129:3	context 62:15	conventional
consecutive	constrain	66:9	46:8
96:6	128:14	continue 9:6	conversation
consensus 13:8	constraints 9:2	21:18 47:23	19:23
13:17 113:18	21:10	71:1 78:10	converted
114:2	constructed	114:25	65:13 67:19
consequences	42:11	continued	converting
71:7 112:1,10	construction	52:21 65:16	69:14
112:23 122:8	36:3	66:19 114:13	convey 122:14
conservation	construed 36:4	114:14	core 41:13
1:3 2:3,6,9			45:19,25 46:8

[core - december]

	ı		T
47:1 49:21	cost 36:11	current 3:9	64:8,19 65:3
52:19 55:21	115:11 129:2,2	82:14 89:6	67:4
62:2 71:16	costlier 69:6	105:21 108:24	dated 20:6,10
73:6 76:10	costs 36:10	114:12	dates 6:18 9:6
79:24 92:10	123:3 128:25	currently 38:20	9:12,14,23
96:3,6,10	129:6,7	44:22 81:16	11:12 13:12,18
97:20	cotton 41:10	105:24 112:18	dating 121:23
cores 46:4	counsel 15:12	121:2	davidson 40:21
corner 64:24	71:24 72:7	cut 48:23	dawson 58:20
corollary	128:10	103:15	60:5 67:24
112:18	count 84:9,9	cuts 109:17	day 28:12 30:4
corporation	county 119:3	cutting 93:11	41:8 42:19
32:19 121:7	course 20:20,25	d	54:19 58:22,23
122:24	28:5 128:6	daily 83:6	59:9 62:5,8
correct 5:13,23	129:20	damage 56:23	71:2 81:17
8:7 20:2,15,16	court 129:20,22	damaging 51:7	82:9,10,14,17
21:19 22:15,17	covid 30:22	54:9,15	82:22,22,23,25
24:1 28:18,21	create 80:23	dana 15:16	100:3
37:11,12 54:7	created 63:25	31:5	days 10:7 11:13
55:18 77:17	66:18	darker 67:8	12:12,15 13:8
131:8	creating 41:24	data 38:3 49:9	19:11,17 20:24
corrected 46:13	creation 38:16	49:10,13,13	21:7,8,8,12,21
118:5	critical 80:9	75:1 77:6	22:7 23:17
correlative	101:7	80:15,19,21	24:7 70:25
31:19 35:14	cross 20:21,25	82:1,3 83:18	128:23
37:4,7 51:8	27:19 39:22	83:19 84:19	dc 113:1
54:10 56:10	42:3 43:24,24	86:5 88:5,22	de 59:18 129:2
57:11 59:25	48:4 53:12,20	89:11 96:3	deadline 71:22
60:12 61:15,21	73:11	100:18 108:7,8	decade 65:8
102:3 118:25	crude 35:22	119:16	decades 63:25
129:3,17	crunch 23:25	date 4:14 5:7	66:21 69:13
corrosion	crustal 55:13	5:11,14 6:15	100:21 101:11
54:25 69:9	cumulative	8:18 10:9 13:3	119:24
85:13 88:1	64:9	13:22 20:8	december
		34:17 42:25	71:21 72:6,10
		JT.11 74.4J	

[decide - different]

decide 30:12	definitive 88:9	depending	despite 100:1
37:24 60:9,11	100:20	27:21 89:7	destabilize
60:16 61:2	degree 11:5	depends 20:21	119:25
decided 18:20	62:9	20:25 97:3	destroy 52:22
20:7 24:18	delaware 68:12	depicted 96:22	detail 114:20
35:9 37:13	94:24 101:9	depleted 90.22	details 59:14
decides 127:13	109:16	101:11	62:16,23 70:13
decision 29:25	delay 113:4	depletion 51:20	determination
117:11 118:8	delays 129:11	deposition	39:17
decisions 13:22	deliberations	72:12 81:3,7	determinations
60:15	4:14 5:6,7	94:7 96:13	61:24
decisis 125:14	delineating	98:1,15	determine
declared 62:24	107:15	depressurizat	11:19 39:11
63:21	demonstrate	100:21	56:8 89:18
decline 83:21	38:1 124:7	depth 46:4,10	114:6,7,11
84:2,13,14	demonstrates	46:18 79:2,19	determining
decreasing	34:16 46:5,15	80:7 89:10,13	39:14
96:18	48:5 50:19	91:23 96:14,18	detrimentally
dedicating	57:8	97:21	42:6
21:21	demonstrating	depths 75:18	developed 41:1
deemed 106:12	109:7	75:22 76:3,9	97:7
deep 46:16	demonstration	76:20 77:4,10	development
97:11	100:14	77:13,18,25	68:12 95:9
deeper 40:5	denied 57:15	79:13	101:9 110:13
47:14,20,23	59:19	deputy 122:4	devoid 113:9
96:15,20 99:9	deny 103:1	122:14 123:16	devonian 67:20
deepest 92:21	denying 62:12	describe 43:6	diagnose 86:17
defense 129:23	120:23 125:8	described	diagnostic 75:2
defer 116:15,19	department	126:22	difference 74:8
definitely 6:12	105:25 106:11	describes 85:9	83:13,15 88:12
13:23 22:5	depend 27:18	design 86:18	different 9:12
definition	dependable	designated	9:22 10:1
36:15 91:16	123:23	117:25	24:16 26:16
95:7	dependent	designee 2:20	56:15 58:6
	128:21	3:6	71:14,14,15

[different - documented]

	I	I	I
72:19,20,21,21	disagrees	60:24 61:10,14	disputed 85:24
73:6,8,12 82:4	126:11	61:19 63:24	85:25
86:9 104:1	disclosed 72:18	64:4,21 65:9	disputes 74:4
105:15 110:15	discovered	65:15 66:4,7	disregards 38:5
differential	32:10 66:15	66:11,12,14,17	dissertation
100:11	discovery 70:3	66:22 68:14	38:23
differing	70:9,13,18	69:15 74:1,5	distinct 110:17
110:17	71:4 73:9	74:11 75:13,15	118:13
difficult 53:23	discretion 79:7	75:16,21,24	distribute 59:4
digits 73:2	discuss 12:7	76:1 77:15	district 129:20
diligently 8:23	13:23 43:5	78:1,6,9 80:1,2	129:22
dillewyn 39:9	66:25 75:20	80:4,8,25	divided 79:2
50:2 71:13	discussed 24:15	85:23 86:2	divides 53:15
72:12	48:18	88:11,12,17	division 2:6
diminish 52:22	discusses 49:15	89:6,14 91:7,7	4:17 7:23 8:22
dine 7:3	52:7	96:9 100:8,16	15:13 38:18
direct 27:14,15	discussion 85:5	100:19 101:6	59:19 64:12
51:12 56:11	88:4 106:23	102:12,16	66:6 67:22
71:8,22 75:14	129:11	103:3 106:1,13	70:8,23 85:7,7
82:6 92:3	discussions	109:4 114:9	87:15 89:1
102:9 122:4	9:19 88:5	118:1,20 121:3	122:3 126:15
123:16	dismiss 126:25	121:4,10,20	127:17,18
directing 71:12	dismissals	124:22,24	division's 51:2
direction 102:8	127:2	125:6 126:17	59:21 68:5
102:8,9 112:12	dismissed	dispose 59:12	doctor 30:21
directly 85:19	130:18	disposed 17:13	doctrine 126:1
87:20 92:1	dispersed 50:6	54:24 101:8	126:6 129:22
112:25	displaced 44:14	125:1	document
director 2:5	displaces 44:19	disposition	106:10 107:6
122:5,14	disposal 43:8	131:16	108:23 110:18
123:16	46:17 47:13	dispute 62:2	documentation
disagree 96:13	50:20 51:4	69:19 74:7	76:21 86:5
disagreement	53:16 54:18	79:8 80:1,11	88:6,22
17:7	55:2,3 58:12	87:17	documented
	58:15 60:17,22		77:1

[documents - empire]

documents	drilled 34:10	earth 4:9,23	eight 10:7
70:4,10,10	88:20	6:10	either 5:12
97:9 107:19	drilling 48:21	earthworks 7:3	76:20 114:13
109:25 111:5	88:14 123:7	easier 2:7	elements 9:25
111:17 113:17	drinking 61:4	east 99:7	eliminating
doing 2:11 30:8	104:25 107:3,8	economic 36:13	118:18
72:8 73:5	107:13 112:5,7	60:18 76:1	em 121:5
86:25 106:7	112:15,20,22	79:13,16 89:10	eme 64:14,24
122:15	113:8 114:15	91:13 92:16	121:4,9,23
dolomitic 50:6	115:1	102:12	122:25,25
domestic 119:2	drive 1:6 55:15	economically	emont 121:4
double 5:20	113:25	89:19	empire 14:18
doubt 113:16	drop 51:25	economics	15:16,20 16:4
downdip 43:8	84:5 91:23	104:5	18:15,22,22,24
46:18 87:24	92:12,16,17	edge 55:14	19:25 20:13,18
downhole 55:2	96:7	84:23 85:2	22:13 25:1,15
downside 22:7	dropped 51:19	87:24	27:5 31:3,5
dozens 65:4	drowned 60:21	education 7:2	32:5,22,24
90:23	drowning	effective 39:7	34:23,25 37:4
dr 1:22 3:4	35:16 129:18	61:19 100:15	37:9 38:2,15
38:22,23 40:25	due 9:1 40:17	101:20	39:19 49:20,21
42:9 49:11,15	40:19,23 42:21	effectively	51:5 52:3,24
49:20 51:12,15	43:5 55:2,7	60:24 89:21	54:21 56:19
52:7,17,18	85:14	105:10 111:13	57:2 58:18
56:11 76:8,9	duties 2:22	effectiveness	62:20 64:3
76:16 81:2	dynamic 104:6	91:2	65:16 66:10,12
82:15,20 83:12	104:7 123:23	effects 122:7	68:20 69:4
91:17 92:3,8	e	efficient 124:13	70:7,9,16 71:3
93:15 94:3	eager 115:3	efficiently	71:6,9,16,18
96:12,25 97:1	earlier 28:13	123:25	72:14,17 73:13
97:2 98:1,6	50:25 126:23	effort 62:13	73:24 74:12,15
draw 75:11	early 66:5	70:19 97:8	75:3,10,10,14
drawdown	72:18 111:9	efforts 103:2	75:19 76:4,13
77:10	121:13	120:9	78:13 79:20,24
	121.13		80:14,21 81:1

[empire - equipment]

82:1,8,12,16,21	97:25 101:1	81:20 84:16,25	128:23
83:10,24 85:9	103:2 115:9	85:6,6,17	engineering
85:10,12 88:24	117:20 118:25	86:10 87:17,21	38:3 49:8,13
90:1,4 92:4	119:7,15 120:9	87:23 88:3	53:9 62:10
97:9,12 104:14	120:23 121:7	89:2,3,21 90:1	87:2
105:24 113:11	122:23 125:9	90:10,22 93:13	engineers 86:9
117:11 118:8	127:8	94:4 95:7,14	english 126:8
122:2 123:1,14	employed	96:4,16 97:1,5	enhanced
124:14 125:2	131:12	98:3,10,23	32:25 41:5,9
126:20 127:1	emsu 31:14	99:2,4,14,23	41:17
128:25 129:21	32:4,5,7,11,16	101:13,16	ensure 18:5
empire's 18:10	32:24 33:6,11	102:13,16	enter 43:10
27:20 31:24	33:13,24 34:3	104:12,19	entered 17:23
34:14,16,18	34:6,7 37:20	105:8,22 106:5	52:13 55:10
35:6 37:25	38:1,17,17,21	107:18 108:11	85:19 125:22
38:10,17 42:7	38:24 39:13,17	108:16 117:6,8	entering 42:20
42:23 44:6	39:21 41:14,15	117:24 118:3	53:1
45:9,15,24	41:22 42:3,11	121:17,24	entice 125:24
46:13,22 47:18	42:12 43:1,6	125:11 126:3	entire 83:22
48:7,18 49:17	45:10,18,19,23	emsu's 63:1	116:2 118:11
50:1,12 51:11	46:7 48:14,21	encountered	entirely 49:7
52:18,22 54:15	50:11,18,19	85:14 100:10	75:11 78:23
55:9 56:14,23	51:7,22 53:5	encourages	entirety 36:4
57:7,10,12	55:12,14 56:21	23:6	entitled 36:24
60:6 62:13	57:9 58:17	encroaching	enumeration
65:6,10,18,21	59:7,24 60:13	69:10	36:5
65:22 68:16	60:17,20 61:8	encroachment	environmental
69:16 70:12	61:20,21 62:1	35:19,20 84:23	7:1,10,12 8:13
72:23 73:17,19	63:7,9 64:5,22	85:1 87:4	eog 5:1
73:22 75:22	65:6,13 66:10	energy 3:6	epa 107:2,17
78:4,11,19	66:12,18,19,25	enforce 107:7	109:1 112:25
80:1 81:2 82:3	67:3 68:6,14	engineer 3:3	125:5
82:7,25 83:18	70:5 73:7	41:17,25 42:10	equipment
84:17 93:8	74:16 76:17,19	46:2 62:24	123:3
94:2,13 96:12	78:12 81:3,18	63:3,5 86:14	

[equitable - exempted]

aquitable	estimated	37:2,17 38:7,8	27:19
equitable 129:13	32:14 43:5		examiner 18:9
		38:9 43:2,4	
equivalent 77:2	55:12	45:9,16 46:4	19:1 25:17
118:16	estimates 41:21	49:3,17 50:7,9	27:8 31:4
ernest 16:4	47:6	51:5,11 53:3,9	116:22 127:23
erroneous	estimation 97:1	56:24 57:4,5,7	example 48:21
59:21 78:2	et 9:23	59:23 60:1,2	73:22 74:14
erroneously	eternal 115:17	61:23 62:2,11	109:16
63:12	eunice 31:13	63:16 68:2	exceeds 33:9
error 81:8	37:20 43:13	70:17 73:22	36:10
118:5	58:16 117:6	74:12,19,22,24	excellent 3:7
escape 53:19	121:3	75:14 76:4	4:18,22 5:2 6:5
escaping 87:18	evaluate 60:16	88:10 90:13	6:24 7:13,17
especially 24:2	73:4 86:22	94:19,21	7:24 8:6,9
49:13 89:14,24	evaluated 73:8	101:25 102:15	12:13,24 14:4
96:22	101:4	102:25 104:14	15:11,14,18,21
essence 25:11	evaluation 42:1	105:14 106:14	16:2,14 24:19
123:8	49:6 79:16	113:10 117:14	128:3
essentially 11:4	89:11,18	119:18 120:3,5	except 94:18
50:16 75:12	107:12	124:4,11,15	excepted
93:12,22,25	event 104:18,21	evidenced	131:13
97:12 104:9	eventually 71:4	54:25	exclude 78:20
119:1	evergreen	evidentiary	excluded 26:5
establish 61:8	115:15	14:25 15:1	47:6 78:14
77:20 86:6	everybody 2:7	23:2 29:20	exclusion 26:10
established	5:17 13:25	59:22 75:9	26:20 28:3
41:12 66:6	17:2 23:7,8,16	130:21	exclusionary
69:13 119:25	24:2,6 57:21	exacerbate	27:2,10
121:12	103:20 115:2	32:3	excuse 30:19
establishing	everybody's	exacerbates	executed 121:6
74:17 114:13	14:15 18:17	54:13	123:12
estimate 22:19	28:4,25	exactly 91:3	exempt 109:24
40:6,16,19	evidence 10:2	114:21	exempted
47:3 72:22	11:20 27:2	examination	113:7
	34:16 36:24	10:2 20:21	

[exemption - feel]

exemption	95:15,21	explaining 72:3	facts 69:17
105:1 112:14	expedite 27:16	explains 49:20	85:11 117:18
114:16	expeditious	52:8	119:22 120:2
exhibit 46:3,20	24:4	exploration	factual 31:8
47:10,11,16,17	expenses 123:4	41:24	fail 89:23
84:1 107:4	experience	exposed 90:24	failed 40:23
exhibits 46:21	39:20 88:19	exposure 43:5	71:3 89:21,23
46:23 48:3,19	107:22	extend 111:7	failing 36:14
70:20 71:8	experienced	extended 22:9	fails 112:5
88:21 96:3	109:17	extensive 51:5	failure 90:19
100:5	expert 25:13	85:9 88:10	fair 18:24
exist 51:13	26:5 27:14	100:15 107:22	25:25 28:22
110:19 111:10	28:5 40:20	extensively	117:4 131:11
114:8	94:3 96:12	49:15 50:12	fairways 41:1
existed 66:18	98:25 108:1	extent 36:12	falls 107:12
existence 37:18	110:12	37:18 127:12	130:9
45:17,17 48:6	expertise	128:21,23	false 78:17
48:16,25 50:19	107:19	exterior 58:16	familiar 29:2
109:5	experts 10:4	extra 58:1	104:4
existential	26:9,14,16,21	extremely	far 33:9 78:7
124:12	27:9 28:6	97:19	91:6,11 122:7
existing 33:23	52:19 65:19	eye 113:6	127:7
42:2 51:6	71:10 72:7,24	f	favor 3:15 4:2
53:16 54:13	79:7 89:3	facies 40:17	117:11 118:8
58:14,19 60:8	91:17,17 94:13	79:1	fe 1:7 7:16 15:8
60:11 66:11,12	94:17 97:25	facing 125:12	fears 104:21
68:3 103:2	101:1 102:6	fact 23:15	february 1:14
124:2	expires 131:19	25:15 63:6	3:12,22 9:3
exists 39:17	explain 29:5	66:5,17 73:13	67:25
45:10 46:19	38:7,10 41:22	77:18 78:22	federal 107:14
50:23 53:4,7	42:16 43:1,8	82:3 83:20	111:15
expansive	50:12	99:11,17	feedback 11:8
101:6	explained	factor 104:23	feeding 30:7
expect 23:9,10	51:12 58:24	106:25	feel 30:2
59:9 77:3	81:7 86:19		

[feels - formations]

feels 117:3	filings 111:9	fixed 129:6	follows 98:3
feet 46:6,11	filled 44:10	flaw 69:23	104:10
47:2,5 48:23	final 68:25	flawed 38:10	food 130:10
51:19 64:15	131:16	45:13	foot 53:4,13,15
78:14 79:15	finally 88:9	flaws 117:20	97:5,10
89:4,5,6 91:8	113:5 114:10	120:8	force 62:11
96:10,15,16	find 87:12	flip 116:17	forced 71:1
97:14,22	104:16	floating 23:16	forces 44:12
feldewert 7:14	finding 85:17	flood 45:2,7	foregoing
7:15 11:16,17	fingerprint	54:22,23 60:19	131:5,8
fellow 108:4	75:2,4 102:15	89:23,25 90:15	foreign 31:11
field 29:10	firm 116:23	91:3,5 92:15	54:14
32:10 68:14	first 4:8 17:3	flood's 91:2	foremost 38:24
80:18 81:6,13	19:21,25 20:24	flooding 32:15	forget 20:8
82:1,3 83:19	21:13 22:14	128:22	form 108:15
84:9,19 85:4	29:5 32:18	floor 1:5	111:3
87:22 92:11	33:5 35:25	flow 54:5 98:6	formation
fields 26:16,22	56:6,7 60:16	109:8	31:12,17 35:2
99:3,6,9,12	62:22 63:2	flows 108:15	35:5 45:10,11
fifth 59:17	64:4,8,14	fluid 43:22	49:4,7,12
fight 70:7	66:24 67:4,14	fluids 114:9	50:25 53:2
figure 9:22	69:25 76:6	fluorescence	54:11 56:23
figures 83:5	100:6 107:25	48:22	58:15 63:23
file 67:12 72:1	108:3,12	flush 93:2	74:21 85:20
72:2	112:13 116:18	focus 36:13,14	92:22 101:23
filed 8:16,22,24	128:19	62:3	105:7 107:18
17:4,12,19	fit 73:18 126:7	focused 35:24	117:21 118:1
18:5 27:15	five 19:11,16	focuses 49:18	118:15
66:21 67:2,14	21:7,12,21	folks 38:12	formations
67:21,23,24	22:7 23:17	58:1	32:12 43:3,17
68:4 71:8	24:7 33:20	follow 11:9	50:7 51:14
126:20	34:5 58:12	following 21:17	54:12 56:18,22
files 85:6,7	60:4 65:9,10	66:23 97:24	63:15 77:13
filing 17:23	65:21,25 66:3	122:16	78:19 87:19,19
72:16 125:16	105:15 116:6		88:13 93:4

[formations - go]

102:13	fracturing 35:2	game 71:7	geologically
formed 44:3	85:9	gas 4:21 7:20	49:15 61:2
66:20	framework	29:10 35:12,18	118:13
forming 52:12	118:6	35:18,22,23	geologist 38:23
forth 11:1	frameworks	36:10 48:23	39:18,19 40:3
forthcoming	119:25	61:16 87:11	40:15,25 49:7
18:3	francis 1:6	89:25 102:4	geology 38:5,25
forward 18:7	frank 41:25	104:22 110:16	47:25 55:18
43:8 69:17	freed 13:14	112:6,17	62:4,4 71:20
76:5 78:5	friday 21:22	118:11 123:11	gerasimos 1:20
115:2	22:5 24:14	124:25	2:4,13
found 87:9	friend 116:19	general 29:9	gerry 2:6
125:9	front 16:18	70:10 93:7	getting 81:11
foundation	full 87:22	generally 92:19	give 3:1 23:8
106:25	fully 73:3	107:24 108:16	31:8 43:21
four 33:14	fund 7:3	113:19,25	47:14 57:21
52:25 58:2	fundamental	114:2	62:14 70:6
59:11 60:6,8	38:5 47:7 62:4	generated 36:9	127:25
67:12,15,19	69:23 117:3,20	generates	given 21:9
70:10 88:1	120:8	123:25	25:15 29:17
105:14	further 19:12	geochemical	68:16,17,24
fracture 51:16	30:14 35:3	102:15	73:9 106:7
76:8,10,11,17	42:5 48:17	geochemistry	123:9
76:25	88:3 89:10	55:19 62:4	giving 128:7
fractured	105:23 112:10	75:1	glad 116:20
43:16	130:7,12	geologic 39:7	go 2:6 4:25 5:4
fractures 35:5	131:12	39:22 40:2,4	6:20 12:15
39:4 43:20	future 7:2	40:15 44:8	13:9 16:24
44:3,7 45:1,6	34:18 127:5	60:23 93:18	17:3 18:18
51:13 54:13	g	117:4 118:6	19:21,25 20:1
55:9 76:6,24	galen 39:9 50:2	geological 38:3	20:1 21:12
77:1 80:12	71:13	41:16 49:9,13	22:24 23:6,14
81:18 85:21	gallegos 131:7	57:5 101:21	24:16 27:12
88:5	gallon 106:4	119:22	28:11 30:25
	3		62:16 76:11

[go - grayburg]

114:19	105:12,16,19	58:4,11,20	71:9 72:7
goal 22:1 73:19	105:25 107:20	59:1,7,19	73:14 74:1,5
goat 55:15	108:13 109:6,7	66:20,24 67:12	74:11 75:13,21
84:24 85:1	109:10 110:1	67:23 68:11	76:1 77:2,15
goes 27:22 87:1	110:16,24	69:8 70:2,25	78:1,6,22,25
90:4 109:8	111:6,14,24	73:25 78:13,17	80:8,25 86:2
112:8 122:9	112:1 116:5,18	78:20 88:15,18	89:2,6 91:6,7
123:17 128:22	129:4	96:4 100:10	91:16 92:6
129:7,17	goldsmith 92:8	101:3,16	94:17 96:2,9
goetze 107:21	good 2:2 4:16	102:10 105:23	100:8 102:6,8
110:22 112:13	4:19 6:20 7:14	113:11 118:4	102:16 103:1
114:19 115:3	7:18 8:2 9:17	120:11 121:20	117:2 118:14
125:4	10:15 15:6,15	122:2 123:14	118:20 119:12
going 2:11 4:7	15:19,24 17:1	125:2,17 127:7	120:6,23
6:11 9:21	17:2,10 18:9	129:21	125:10 126:17
10:23 11:3,11	48:22,23 95:15	goodnight's	127:9
11:18,20,23	103:21 108:5	31:10,18 33:4	govern 129:19
12:21 13:14,25	116:21 126:5	33:9,12 34:17	governing
14:8 15:3	129:23	36:12 37:5	117:5
16:16,25 19:17	goodnight	38:2,6,9,19	government
21:6,20,23	14:18 15:9	40:5,6,16,18	29:8
22:7,8,8,14	20:1 25:13	42:24 43:8,18	governs 107:5
23:12,22 24:3	27:5 32:1 33:5	44:1 46:21	grand 93:11
24:6 25:15	34:4,8,13	47:2,3 48:13	grant 120:10
31:6 34:2 43:7	35:24 36:7	49:2 50:9,22	127:11,13
43:11 47:11	37:1,9,22 38:4	51:6,10 52:21	granted 8:17
53:18,20 61:5	39:23 40:7,21	53:3,8,14,16,21	57:13 108:25
61:7 62:18,19	40:23 42:16	54:6,9 56:9,15	granting 62:12
65:6 69:5	44:5,23 45:12	56:17,22 57:10	grants 107:7
72:18 77:1	46:12,15,22,25	57:13,13 59:3	grayburg 32:12
79:8 82:24	47:5,9,13,19	59:11 60:4,6,7	33:2 34:20
83:11,19,22	49:3,5 50:17	60:11,17,22,24	35:4,6 39:1,5,7
84:10 85:20	50:20 51:1	61:10 62:12	39:8,12,21,24
89:17,23 92:13	52:25 53:4,6	68:2,14,19	40:2 42:20
97:22 104:8	54:16,19 55:1	69:12,23 70:21	43:3,10,17,21

[grayburg - hearing]

44 4 0 0 11 16	41 50 00	1 . 70.0	1 1 02 11
44:4,8,9,11,16	greatly 52:22	happening 78:8	head 93:11
44:18,19,20,21	green 17:1	84:23	94:5
45:1,4,6,6,13	greenfield	happens 26:3	heady 105:11
45:21 46:17	41:11	112:4	hear 17:6 20:13
47:15,22 48:2	greenfields	happily 103:16	20:17 23:6,11
48:8,10 50:5	41:5	hardest 81:4	23:12 26:9
50:23 51:9,13	greg 1:21 2:18	hardy 15:15,16	28:3,8 31:2
51:24 52:6,11	grieve 126:3	18:8,9,14	38:14 39:9
52:13 53:2,7	group 112:25	20:13,20 24:24	58:5 61:7 80:5
55:8,9,11,15,21	grouping 67:16	25:1 27:7,8	102:25 107:20
55:25 56:21	67:19	28:1 31:4,5	112:13 115:25
63:19 69:9	groupings	57:18,18	129:4,9 130:3
73:25 74:3,16	105:15	harms 125:20	heard 1:24
74:21 75:7,16	guardians 4:9	hart 7:16 15:8	14:23 16:18
76:7,12,14	4:23 6:11	16:12	78:12 104:2
77:12,21,23	guess 17:8	harwood 1:25	120:25 121:19
78:25 79:4,18	20:10 21:9	16:19,20,22,22	121:24 124:19
80:14,16 81:1	22:10 103:12	16:25 17:10,16	124:20 126:16
81:18,24 82:1	130:9	18:6,12,16,21	128:2
82:11,17,21,25	gulf 32:18	19:3,7 20:9,17	hearing 1:1,25
84:22,24 85:2	65:12 121:6	21:1,25 22:6	2:10 8:18 9:6
85:8,16,18,20	122:24	22:19 23:5	9:12 10:2
86:5 87:5,8,25	guys 29:3,10,11	25:9,22,25	11:25 12:16
88:5,7,16,24	116:17	26:17,23 27:4	15:1 16:19,25
93:2,9 94:6	h	27:23 28:2,16	17:13,16,17
95:13,17,17,20	half 30:2,2,5	28:19,22 57:17	18:6,9,12,16,21
95:21 96:8	34:7 73:10	57:25 103:4,11	18:25 19:3,7
97:13 98:3,4,8	81:22 90:20	103:19,22	19:12,18 20:3
98:13 99:6		115:8,16,24	20:5,9,17 21:1
119:13	98:10	116:15 120:12	21:18,20,25
grayburg's	hall 1:5 hallmark 107:4	120:16 127:19	22:6,9,18,19
85:23		128:13 130:5	23:3,5,19,20
great 14:6	happen 8:25	hate 23:6	24:8 25:9,22
greater 46:9	111:22	he'll 3:2	25:25 26:12,17
47:4,14,21	happened		26:23,24 27:4
	70:21		,

[hearing - impacted]

	1	1	
27:16,23 28:2	87:10 93:16	hope 115:17	i
28:11,16,19,22	higher 34:24	hopefully 13:6	idea 23:16
29:23 30:13	42:21 44:22	13:20 31:7	43:21 103:6
37:16,16 38:12	47:1,2 96:19	61:7 113:24	104:5
38:13 47:10,17	highest 91:6,21	hops 109:9	ideal 101:5
48:20 56:7	highlighted	horizontal	identifiable
57:17,25 58:7	74:2 82:6	101:8	39:4
68:15 70:16,19	highly 61:24	horribles	identified
70:20,25 71:2	77:21 119:5	126:19	48:25 74:6
100:7 103:4,11	hinkle 8:3	hour 103:14	87:20 89:3,16
103:19,22,24	hiss 45:22	human 109:21	93:18
114:19 115:7,8	108:4,12,13,19	humongous	identifies 84:1
115:12,16,24	108:21 109:25	106:6	87:3
116:13,15,22	historical	hundred 68:10	identify 40:23
120:12,16,18	111:17 118:5	hydraulic 93:5	identifying
121:25 127:19	119:16	93:11 94:5	98:7
127:23 128:13	history 38:16	110:20	ignoramuses
130:5,17,21	42:13 62:17	hydrocarb	29:6
131:10	63:11 66:9	48:11	ignores 36:1,15
hearings 29:24	68:5,7,16,17	hydrocarbon	49:9
120:24	74:18 85:5,10	50:7 61:9	ii 105:22
heavily 75:1	98:21 99:1	117:23	illuminates
heavy 62:3	120:10	hydrocarbons	17:1
held 13:12	hitting 81:12	34:19 35:13	imbalanced
help 29:11	hobbs 104:13	42:7 48:11	104:6
115:4	104:19 108:14	119:10	immediately
helpful 128:11	108:17 109:5	hydrogeologic	21:18
128:20 129:9	110:9 113:21	104:18	immobile 93:25
130:2	114:7,17	hydrologic	94:9
herrings 128:5	117:16	114:6	
high 40:21 44:1	holding 84:10	hydrologically	impact 42:1 43:9 55:9
45:15 55:3,12	holland 7:16	61:3	83:20 84:11,12
55:17 56:17	15:8 16:12	hypothesis	84:15 111:19
68:12 74:15,19	honoring 130:1	104:17 105:4	
79:22 86:25			impacted 102:14 117:11
			104.14 117.11

[impacting - injection]

impacting	119:19	increase 32:2	informally
43:18 69:7	improve 86:23	51:3 52:24	19:10
87:19	improved 60:5	55:7,9 56:3	information
impacts 34:18	improvements	57:15 58:13,21	41:13 48:4
42:6,25 43:6	86:19	58:25 60:5	52:20 71:16
104:11 114:8	include 36:11	97:22	104:3,6 124:8
impair 37:3	77:5 106:22	increased	informative
41:23 59:25	112:22	104:23 113:3	110:7
60:12	included 31:17	128:25	initial 11:5
impairing 37:7	32:12 33:19	increases 35:4	81:9 127:25
51:7 54:10	36:5 63:7,12	44:24 56:1	initially 73:10
61:15 119:14	63:14 86:25	87:15	73:12
impairment	includes 55:19	increasing	inject 34:25
61:20 128:24	55:21 79:24	54:11 109:15	44:23 82:13
129:1,3	90:6	independent	121:18,20
impairs 31:19	including 21:10	8:4 49:6 102:7	122:17 126:15
impermeable	31:20 34:20	indicate 47:22	injectant 64:13
51:8 52:1,4,15	39:1,22 41:18	indicated 47:9	injected 33:7
53:25 54:4	41:20 42:3	indicates 53:1	34:13 39:6
implement 57:2	49:8 56:14	indicating	42:18 54:18
86:18 105:5	60:16 65:19	84:16	56:5 64:18
112:12	68:6 87:10	industry 10:22	65:2 75:7
implemented	121:3,22,23	11:6 105:12	106:5,8 114:9
44:18 111:25	125:13 126:21	109:13 118:11	injecting 33:5
implementing	127:17	123:11,20,23	39:23 56:19
123:6	inclusion 118:3	125:5 127:8,16	64:2,5,11,22
implications	income 36:9	industry's	82:8,16,21
118:7 119:23	incompatibility	124:13	83:10
127:8	85:15	infects 78:3,3	injection 31:11
importance	incompatible	influential	31:18,25 32:2
116:16 122:15	31:11 34:13	108:25 110:6	33:4,9,9,15,25
important	53:6	influx 35:4	34:2,17,17
35:10,11 51:23	incorrect 46:12	42:14 55:8	37:3,6,21 38:2
66:9 75:17	incorrectly	56:3	41:12,22 42:5
76:2 106:24	35:24		42:5 44:6 51:6

[injection - isolates]

51:10 52:5,21	institute 114:5	intermittent	invalidate
54:1,9,11,14	institution	95:3	127:4
55:5 56:9,14	127:16	interpretation	invalidates
56:16,17,22	institutional	40:12,18,24	78:4
57:10,15 58:13	120:22	98:21	invest 123:3
58:21 59:8,24	instructed	interpretations	investigation
60:7,12 63:18	72:14	73:6 95:4	105:5 106:20
64:9 67:5,20	insufficient	interval 31:18	111:1 113:16
69:4,8,12 83:1	55:16	32:13 33:6,10	115:5
83:16 87:11,16	integrity 117:4	34:3,19 39:12	investment
89:6 101:22	intensity 68:12	39:17,21,24	36:11 123:9
102:1 104:12	intent 114:12	41:6 42:6,13	investments
104:21 107:2	intention 59:1	42:20 44:17	111:19
107:24 108:10	interest 31:20	46:17 52:5	invokes 126:6
109:2 111:19	32:20,22 65:25	56:13 57:11	involve 31:9
112:24 117:15	117:7 121:7,13	63:13 74:1	111:5
119:13 120:24	122:23 123:17	75:21,25 78:24	involved 21:10
122:13 123:7,8	123:23 124:18	79:4 80:3	22:4
126:21 127:5	131:15	83:25 85:25	involves 56:17
127:10	interested	88:17,19 89:7	106:15
injections	125:6	89:16 92:15	involving 86:10
42:25 129:19	interestingly	97:6 99:5	113:20
injects 53:6	109:20	118:4	ion 108:14
injuria 126:7	interfaith 7:4	intervals 40:22	ions 52:11
injury 126:9	interfere 59:24	44:11 48:2,9	ipnm 12:4
input 110:23	102:1	51:15 52:2	irregular 35:19
inputs 71:14	interfered	79:25 80:8	irrelevant
72:21	102:2	91:5	50:15
inside 100:13	interference	interveners 8:4	irrespective
insight 113:24	37:19 52:16	16:7 64:17	49:24
insists 74:15	interfering	67:7 122:3	isolated 41:4
instability	31:23 38:2	intervenor 65:1	86:2 110:9
125:18,24	56:9 57:10	introduce 3:2	isolates 60:24
instance 26:14	interior 106:1	16:11 38:11	61:19
114:23	106:11		

[isolating - lea]

isolating 77:15	ionuory 2:21	knights 48:14	129:13,22
88:11	january 3:21 9:5 33:7 34:12	98:25	lack 39:7 40:1
issuance	72:18	know 6:10,13	50:10,14 112:2
122:22		6:18 10:18,19	lacks 105:9
issue 6:12	jargon 29:7	10:21 11:11,12	laid 105:14
20:11 25:16	jealous 30:6 jesse 4:17 7:22	18:17,18 19:15	lake 25:14,18
26:11 28:3	joint 37:15	·	lamkin 2:24
	•	21:1,10 23:8	
33:21 37:8,18 49:17 56:6	joseph 39:18	25:10 26:2,4,8	land 2:19,20
	journal 109:13	29:1,6,11,14,19	3:3 38:15
60:10 80:13	juan 7:4	29:21 30:21,22	105:16 109:20
89:1 104:9	judges 21:2	32:7 53:22	110:8
109:10 110:19	judgment	68:17 73:16	landreth 92:8
117:3 128:19	125:10	74:8 79:9 83:8	language 82:7
issued 31:16	julia 16:11	83:17 89:14	large 22:3 34:2
70:8 122:12	july 8:18 33:6	91:15 96:17	41:2 59:5
123:14 124:16	83:6 84:3,4	97:23 104:10	largely 106:12
125:12 126:14	june 8:16 121:6	104:11,20	111:20 117:1
127:10,18	jury 21:2	110:24 116:18	larry 25:13
issues 9:1 23:21	justification	120:3 124:24	late 65:17
29:19,20 30:12	72:4	129:4 130:13	laterally
35:9 37:13	justify 124:9,10	knowing 21:21	118:17
59:15 60:14	k	25:7	latin 126:5
62:7 74:10	keep 30:7 69:20	knowledge	laurence 41:16
75:23 76:2	69:21,21,24	131:10	46:3
86:11,15 87:11	73:13 100:4	known 54:24	law 7:1,10,12
91:1 100:2	kelli 131:7	63:11 66:13	8:13 30:3 35:8
107:23 129:13	key 39:13 45:12	85:3,14 91:12	36:9,16,20
issuing 35:15	keystone	97:18	37:12 107:4
it'll 111:11	108:23	kyle 7:11	116:23 129:5,7
item 22:21,23	kind 11:18	l	lawsuit 129:21
115:20	23:22,24,24	l 16:4 121:17	lawyers 129:16
j	35:20 116:10	labeled 108:20	lay 27:1 105:16
jack 38:14	kinds 87:9	labor 105:10	layers 77:23
james 42:9	knew 66:13	laches 125:14	lea 119:3
	98:2	126:2 129:11	

[lead - lower]

lead 86:12	likely 12:11	litigate 69:24	longer 12:18
leading 104:24	17:21 20:23	little 10:3 11:24	103:14
leads 123:2	38:9 45:5	26:18 53:23	longstanding
learn 111:24	89:23 94:22	57:21 58:5	117:5 125:25
lease 50:21	110:14	62:14 64:7	127:5
52:21	likewise 123:24	67:4,15,19	look 11:11 18:7
leave 71:23	limestones 50:6	96:16 120:25	21:24 33:22
100:3 130:13	limit 92:14	llc 15:17 16:4,8	68:9 79:7 83:3
leaves 44:19	limited 25:14	120:20	84:8 91:15
leaving 41:2	51:21 63:19	load 59:4	98:19 99:7
44:14	73:23 98:3	loads 59:1	107:9 108:9
left 93:23 94:8	lindsay 38:22	local 113:1	looking 27:24
94:11	38:23 49:11,15	locally 115:1	32:7 75:4
legal 37:18	49:20 51:12,15	located 45:22	82:14,19
38:15 110:5	52:7 76:9,16	72:25 99:3	looks 68:10
125:13	94:3 97:2 98:1	109:11	104:9 115:2
legislature 2:23	lindsay's 56:11	location 38:19	lose 104:8
length 22:20	76:8 98:6	101:5 106:13	113:1
106:19	line 8:23,25 9:3	113:9	loss 112:19
lengthy 23:1	9:7,9,21 10:1	locations 67:1	114:23
lens 111:3	12:8 16:7	log 39:10,25	lost 54:3 88:18
level 45:15	43:23 64:25	40:12,17 41:13	lot 21:2 54:4
90:23 100:12	67:10 80:5	48:22 52:19	66:3 106:5
107:13 110:19	114:18 120:19	55:22 65:14	117:19 118:10
111:17 114:5	121:12,14,16	73:5,6	129:10
124:8	121:18	logic 62:5,8	lots 24:15,16
levels 34:22	lines 10:25	100:2	101:6 118:7
55:3 92:16	list 17:2 25:12	logs 48:17 50:2	lottery 81:12
110:11	26:4	71:16 73:2	love 86:13
lewis 109:20	listed 33:15,25	long 20:18 23:3	87:14
lies 124:6	listen 28:9	25:8 27:25	lovington 40:8
life 90:15	100:5	30:7 59:1 68:5	low 40:19 52:9
lifted 126:24	liter 119:6	68:7 69:13	94:10 95:1
light 7:4 17:1	literature 33:2	85:4,5 103:6	lower 40:11,22
	85:6 95:8	116:5 126:4,10	51:2 54:23

[lower - members]

62.20.74.2	75.5 10 77.0		
63:20 74:3	75:5,10 77:8	marek 41:25	mcguire's 46:8
78:15 98:18	96:8	margin 99:1	46:22 49:16
lowest 83:21	making 30:9	marginal 117:8	53:14,20
luckily 126:7	31:3 101:7	marginally	mcshane 39:18
lunch 28:17	managed 113:6	70:12	mean 10:23
103:14 116:1	management	marker 40:8	19:4 25:10
128:6,15,18	68:8 69:15	maroon 67:8,8	95:14 120:13
luxury 116:2	114:14 117:25	massive 80:15	meaning
128:7	manager	93:1 100:20	112:15
m	107:22 125:4	101:11,15	means 36:9
m 64:15	managing	master 30:2	61:14 81:14
made 10:20	101:7 107:23	match 42:14	82:23 83:7
69:2 70:3	manmade 93:3	81:6,10,11,14	90:10 95:6,15
128:24 130:20	93:22 94:16	84:20 95:7	112:16 126:8
main 41:3,4	manner 127:15	material 43:15	measured
53:23 75:23	map 32:4 33:12	87:1	46:10 51:22
76:2,4 80:10	33:22 43:23	math 106:7	71:15 93:15
89:1,16 111:4	62:23 64:1	matt 16:6	measurements
maine 30:5	65:18	matter 14:23	77:8
maintain 59:10	mappable 95:4	16:17 30:3	meet 11:6 12:7
123:19	mapped 55:11	62:1 79:12,17	13:18 124:8,14
	108:4	79:17 111:2	meeting 2:4,9
maintains	mapping 40:13	131:15,16	3:21 11:9
110:9	86:25	matters 27:3	12:19 13:1,2,3
major 44:9	maps 39:24	31:9 49:18	24:3 130:14
majority 31:20	73:10 105:18	79:12 116:16	meetings 3:22
38:6	108:12 109:7	matthias 5:1	8:20 13:15
make 8:14	march 5:12,12	maximum	melzer 41:16
24:17 29:14,20	5:21,22 6:11	58:22,25 59:2	46:3 91:18
35:1 58:4 69:5	6:15 13:1,3,4,5	79:16 89:5	92:3,7
89:12 96:15	13:6,19,22	103:9	member 1:21
102:5 127:25	14:6 32:23	mcguire 40:5	1:22 12:6
maker 30:1	67:16 83:23	49:3,6 53:8,12	members 1:19
makes 2:6	118:21	92:7	3:16 4:3 7:15
11:12 22:11	110.21) 4.1	10:20 16:3
61:25 74:8			10.20 10.3

[members - month]

21:11 29:2	migrate 69:9	millions 44:13	moander 15:12
127:23	migrated 94:4	93:10	15:12 17:17,18
mention 27:12	migrates migrates	mind 23:13	18:6 22:17
mention 27.12 mentioned 2:8	117:15,16	100:4 127:14	24:20,21 26:24
13:20 25:13	migrating	mine 116:6	103:6,8,16,23
50:25 117:9	74:16 88:4,23	mineral 2:18	103:24 115:9
118:9 119:17	migration 39:5	31:19	115:12 126:6
122:24	56:5,13,25	minerals 31:21	mobile 79:21
merits 23:19	57:4 73:23	minimum	93:22
met 66:24	migratory	90:16,20	mobilized
meteoric 93:2	94:22 95:11,23	minimus 129:2	101:2
mexicans	99:15	minus 46:10,13	model 39:16
123:18	miguel 7:18	46:14,25 47:1	42:11 52:17
mexico 1:2,7	15:25 116:22	51:19 79:15	81:5,5,10,14,24
2:19 3:5 4:12	mile 34:5 65:9	89:4,5,17 96:5	modeler 65:19
4:21 7:2,3,6,20	65:10,21,25	96:8,10 97:11	80:23
8:5 14:18	66:3	minute 14:11	modeling 84:18
15:16,20 16:4	miles 34:7,9	27:12 35:7	models 69:22
31:21 35:12	65:23 76:18	57:20	modification
36:8,16 41:2	99:4 118:18	minutes 3:21	124:7,9,10
62:24 106:1,16	millidarcy	14:10 27:14	moment 5:21
107:8 109:1,14	93:17	43:13 58:2	53:19
112:11,20	milligrams	103:8 116:7	monday 15:1
113:6,6 114:18	119:6	minutia 114:20	22:13 23:3,23
121:2 131:1,19	million 32:14	mirrors 84:19	24:18 25:7
mexico's 36:2	32:17 33:3,8	misconstrues	130:11,16,18
miami 30:20	34:14 42:18	36:7	130:21,22
michael 7:15	54:17 64:18	misidentifica	money 123:3
microphone	65:2 68:10,23	50:24	monitoring
16:23	69:1,2,3 75:6	misinterpreta	57:2 105:6
mid 28:20,20	81:22 83:9,13	119:8	106:21 111:1
middle 93:14	90:3,5,6,7,9,11	mistress 30:6	113:17 114:13
midstream	90:15,17,18	mix 125:19	115:5,10
14:18 15:9	100:22 101:17	mixing 52:11	month 22:10
66:20		55:4 75:8	27:25 72:16

[month - normally]

44:1 45:5	93:20 94:14	never 49:12
	, ,	63:13 85:5
48:11 117:21		94:8 95:10,11
movement	near 34:14	95:23,24 98:23
43:22	45:22 52:25	117:22 122:23
moves 44:25	68:12 108:16	new 1:2,7 2:19
moving 14:8	nearest 64:20	3:5 4:12,21 7:2
36:21 43:20	nearly 82:15,20	7:3,6,20 8:5
44:6 68:11	90:18 123:12	11:2 14:18
85:2 94:23	necessary 12:8	15:16,20 16:4
124:6	34:24 95:9	31:21 35:12
mud 48:21	99:24 124:25	36:2,8,16 41:2
mudlogs 48:17	127:15 130:14	58:12 59:12,17
multiple 59:4	need 3:20 9:5	60:4 62:24
93:8 109:7	9:10 10:4,6,18	71:18,20 72:10
municipal	11:4,7 12:10	72:19,22,23,23
119:4	12:14 13:23	73:5 76:16,18
mystery 84:25	20:18 22:20,25	106:1,16 107:8
85:1	23:11 30:24	109:1,14
n	53:18 73:16	112:11,20
n 47·11 17 67·9	89:12 100:17	113:6,6 114:18
, and the second	103:18 115:18	121:2 123:18
	128:15	131:1,19
	needed 11:22	news 19:18,18
	63:9 127:25	nice 23:14
	needle 10:3	nine 33:24
	needs 60:10	81:21 83:5,9
•	neglected 16:10	83:14 121:10
	negotiation	non 26:5 126:7
	115:15	nonproductive
, in the second	neither 131:12	49:25 63:12
, ,	netherland	noon 21:4
	71:10 79:14	normal 47:21
<u> </u>	89:9	normally 2:9
92:25 93:12,14		88:15
	moved 10:3 48:11 117:21 movement 43:22 moves 44:25 moving 14:8 36:21 43:20 44:6 68:11 85:2 94:23 124:6 mud 48:21 mudlogs 48:17 multiple 59:4 93:8 109:7 municipal 119:4 mystery 84:25 85:1 n n 47:11,17 67:9 121:17 naeva 7:3 name 18:17 named 108:4 narrow 105:23 narrowly 127:14 natural 35:5 43:20 44:3,7 45:1,5 51:13 55:8 85:9 naturally 43:15 nature's 92:24	moved10:395:12,18,2548:11 117:21nay4:15movementnear34:1443:2245:22 52:25moving14:868:12 108:1636:21 43:20nearest64:2044:6 68:1190:18 123:1285:2 94:23necessary12:8124:634:24 95:9mud 48:21necessary12:8mudiple59:499:24 124:2593:8 109:799:24 124:25municipal11:4,7 12:10119:412:14 13:23mystery84:2520:18 22:20,2585:123:11 30:24n47:11,17 67:9121:17naeva7:3needed11:22name108:489:12 100:17name108:4128:15narrowly127:14needed11:22natural35:5needle10:343:20 44:3,745:1,5 51:13needed11:12naturally43:15neither131:12netherland71:10 79:14netherland71:10 79:1489:9

[north - oh]

north 45:20	numerous 65:8	occurs 56:2	october 8:20
99:5	92:2	ocd 9:4 11:3	55:1
northeast 44:2	nutech 39:10	17:18,21 20:1	oddity 30:1
northern 99:8	39:11 50:1	26:24 47:13	offers 122:16
northwest 32:6	71:13	56:24 57:3	office 2:19,20
76:17	nutech's 39:25	67:2,16,25	3:3 7:16 15:8
note 6:16 92:13	0	68:13 103:22	officer 1:25
93:13	o'clock 130:16	104:2,9,10,13	16:19,25 17:16
noted 111:9	130:19	104:20 105:9	17:17 18:6,12
notes 46:22	obfuscate	105:12,15,25	18:16,21 19:3
47:18 48:7,7,8	73:20	106:17,20	19:7 20:4,5,9
90:1 110:10	object 67:17	107:5,7,14,21	20:17 21:1,20
notice 72:2	124:18	108:7,19,24	21:25 22:6,18
105:17	objection 67:22	109:3 110:3	22:19 23:5,20
notify 9:4	68:1	111:1,6,14,23	24:9 25:9,22
noting 93:17	objections	111:25 112:3	25:25 26:12,17
notorious	70:21	112:11,23,24	26:23,24 27:4
108:20	obligated 107:9	113:1,4,16	27:23 28:2,16
november	obligation 19719	114:1,5,21,21	28:19,22 29:23
59:20 83:6	107:10 129:16	115:2 117:25	57:17,25 58:7
84:3,4	obligations	118:19 119:23	70:20 103:4,11
novo 59:18	71:4 130:1	122:1,9,12,17	103:19,22,25
nulook 39:14	obtain 42:13	123:17,21	115:7,8,12,16
number 4:8	105:4 112:11	124:20 125:11	115:24 116:13
6:25 9:1,19	obtained 46:7	125:16 126:1	116:15 120:12
14:20 20:23	obviously 22:7	ocd's 8:25 9:2	120:16,19
21:9 22:3	occ 13:1 105:4	10:1,18 24:21	127:19 128:13
45:20 49:22	106:15 122:18	56:4,12 104:17	130:5,18
58:20 59:18	122:20 123:19	105:3,14 111:2	official 2:3
64:15,25 106:6	occur 42:15	111:18,20,20	offset 47:14,21
106:7	occurred	113:23 114:25	122:20
numbers 14:19	128:19	115:4 120:1,21	offsetting 80:18
14:20,21 59:13	occurring 57:1	124:5 125:3,9	ogallala 119:4
82:14,19 83:2	104:19	126:5	oh 18:22 19:3
83:4,7			

[oil - operators]

oil 1:3 2:3,5,8	92:14,18,20,21	62:5 64:10,13	67:6,9 121:10
4:17,21 7:20	92:23 93:4,23	68:18 72:2	121:22
7:23 8:22	93:24 94:3,8,9	73:20 74:2,9	operates 32:5
15:13 29:10	94:11,11,12,14	74:18 80:11	34:4 64:3
32:15,17,18,25	94:20,23 95:1	83:2,15 92:13	117:8 121:2,17
33:1 35:12,17	95:2,3,8,15,22	96:1 97:7 99:7	operating 16:7
35:18,22,22	95:24 96:6,7	102:22,23	36:10 54:23
36:10 37:19	96:11,17,19,23	103:4,19	64:17 67:2
39:3,11,15,25	97:3,4,15,20	115:24 116:8	83:24 120:14
40:7,11,16,19	98:23 99:14,24	116:12,13	120:17,19
40:21 41:3,5,8	100:23,23,25	old 119:24	121:1
41:9,11,18,19	101:1 102:4	126:22	operations
41:23 42:4	104:22 109:15	once 23:4	31:24 34:14
43:19 44:10,12	110:15 112:6	110:21	38:18 42:2,23
44:13,15,19,19	112:17 118:11	onerous 113:3	43:1 50:20
45:2,3 46:5,7,9	118:24 119:9	ongoing 32:1	59:25 61:20
47:3,6 48:15	121:6 122:24	open 13:15,18	63:6 65:9
49:19,22 50:3	123:11 124:25	25:10	68:19 69:7,10
50:10,11,13,14	131:1	openhole 48:17	74:21 82:7
50:18,20 51:2	okay 3:17 4:4	opening 13:17	84:17 90:3
53:17 55:22	4:24 5:2,11,16	14:24 16:17	102:2,14,16
60:18,21 61:13	6:1,8 7:17 8:9	22:15,20,25	104:22 106:2
61:16 63:19	8:12 9:13,16	23:2,8 31:1,3	109:18 112:17
65:12 68:21,23	10:14 11:15	58:4 62:21	117:10 118:2
69:16 70:5	12:1,13,24	78:13 99:25	124:13,23
71:10,20 72:17	14:14 17:1	103:7 115:23	operator 32:23
72:22 74:11	18:21,23 19:9	119:17 130:20	63:1 65:13
78:11,16,18,23	20:9 21:3,25	openings 23:18	66:25 86:13
79:1,10,13,20	22:6,11 24:24	30:25 103:10	122:20 124:6
79:21,22,23	25:2,4,6,25	openly 108:6	operator's
80:12 83:17	26:23 27:4	operate 34:23	122:13 123:9
84:3,12 90:5,6	28:10,22 29:7	operated 32:18	operators
90:15 91:6,9	29:13 30:14,19	32:21 45:22	112:6 114:21
91:11,21,23,24	31:8 57:25	58:17 59:7	118:10 119:19
91:25 92:10,12	60:9 61:11	64:16,25 65:16	122:17 123:3,8

[operators - parties]

123:22,24	organization	overturning	108:21 109:6
124:20 125:24	12:6	125:23	paper's 86:12
126:4	oriented 76:10	overview 23:9	papers 70:10
opines 50:2	original 34:22	39:22 105:21	91:19 92:2
opinion 113:12	72:9,13 121:8	overwhelming	108:1
113:13,13,14	orth 5:8 6:19	101:24	paperwork
opinions 28:7	6:19	overwhelmin	113:4
113:11	outlines 106:16	120:6	parade 126:18
opportunity	outset 70:22	own 10:25	paragraph
116:25 122:21	outside 50:21	66:22 67:1,13	20:6
124:17 127:3	56:6 80:2	76:12 83:18	parameters
opposes 117:14	100:13	91:16 97:25	40:17 71:15
opposing	outstanding	105:11	part 21:13
113:10	17:25 18:7,10	owned 48:2	24:14 35:17
opposite 77:21	19:6	67:6,9	63:12 70:17
ops 40:4,12,15	overall 113:19	owner 31:20	72:5 80:1 82:9
optimism	overhear 26:6	owners 31:21	82:10 106:24
115:14	overinflates	66:1	117:1 122:25
optimum 90:14	79:20	owns 31:22,23	126:23
order 10:12	overlapping	oxy 7:16	partial 125:10
17:22 18:3	26:16,22	p	partially 94:5
19:21,25 20:6	overlook 19:4	p 8:7,7,8,8 67:5	particular 6:23
20:7,8,12	120:13	117:9	10:9 14:5 18:3
37:15,16 59:21	overlooked	padilla 16:3,4,5	24:5 106:10
59:23 70:8	68:21 99:23	pages 131:8	107:16
124:9,10	overlying 95:13	painstakingly	parties 4:15 7:9
125:22 126:13	101:22	101:4	8:21 9:8,20
orders 31:15	overpressured	paleo 92:20,21	10:5,11,17
35:15 38:18	54:12	96:23	11:19 12:10,17
117:5 119:24	overpressuriz	paleogeologic	14:10 15:3
122:12 123:13	54:12	92:23	17:6,25 21:11
123:13 124:2	overruling	panoply 112:22	24:1,2 26:10
125:11,13,25	29:22	paper 85:12	27:13 28:9
126:3 127:18	overturn 69:13	86:4,8,8,17	37:17 70:1
		87:3 88:2	71:8,24 104:7

[parties - pilot's]

	I	I	I
106:2 125:1	47:4 51:20	permits 37:6	petrophysics
126:2 128:20	79:22 91:9	57:13 67:11	55:21 62:3,10
129:12 130:3,8	92:1,12,14,18	120:24 122:17	71:9,12,19
131:14	95:16,22 96:7	123:13,13	72:17 78:11,18
parts 30:5	96:11 97:21,23	124:16,16	78:22,25
party 18:1	109:17	126:15,21	pfas 4:10
36:21,22 121:8	performance	127:5,10	phd 38:23
123:1	91:2	permitted 34:8	philip 107:21
passed 88:15	period 22:9	38:20 63:3	125:4
past 3:9 111:12	81:21 83:5,8	105:22 126:3	phones 30:18
125:18	83:22,23 84:8	permitting	phrase 35:25
path 93:8,14	90:17	62:25	physics 56:1
pathway 56:13	periods 59:3	perspective	piazza 47:9,16
57:4,6 94:23	perm 74:5 77:2	18:10 35:11	47:20 70:2
95:11,24	86:25 87:10	pertinent	pick 47:2,14,20
108:15	100:12,15	122:13	49:12
pathways	permeability	pessimism	picked 49:4
99:15	86:1,1 93:16	19:16	51:1 96:5
pattern 99:16	permian 16:7	pessimistic	picking 29:7
paul 131:4,18	18:19 41:20	40:17	46:15
pay 28:9 41:3,4	64:25 67:10	petition 8:16	picks 40:9
paying 35:18	93:1 97:19	8:17,21,24	47:23,24 49:5
35:25 36:8,16	106:2 109:15	10:8	49:7 73:7,8
60:21 61:17	110:19 113:21	petitioners	pilot 16:1 19:1
peak 59:1	120:19 121:1	7:12	19:2,5 25:3
pecos 1:5	121:12,16,18	petroleum 3:3	67:6 89:13
pending 4:8	122:3 125:2	8:4 35:22	91:12 97:18
17:14,20 68:3	126:11,13,21	39:18 55:18	100:19 115:22
penrose 63:20	127:6	62:3,10 86:14	116:23,25
87:18	permian's	petrophysic	117:1,2,7,9,18
people 3:2 4:15	127:4	97:12	118:12,23
21:9 22:4 23:6	permit 59:19	petrophysical	119:7,10 120:1
24:15	122:21 123:2,5	72:20 73:2	122:3 125:2
percent 31:22	123:6,8 124:22	91:10	pilot's 117:2,13
31:23 46:9			

[pink - present]

pink 67:4	plus 2:10	posits 109:20	predecessor
pipeline 68:10	point 9:8 11:7	possibility	121:7,13
place 39:25	13:24 22:12	114:16 118:19	124:18
40:7,11,19	27:3 31:1	possible 27:20	predecessors
47:6 71:10,20	53:24 56:6	29:22 37:19	122:23
72:17,22 78:11	58:5 62:22	105:1	preferable
78:16,18,23	73:3 92:14,21	possibly 20:24	106:12
79:1 92:11	92:22 96:5	22:2 24:4	preference
99:17 111:1	108:22 110:1,4	postulate 85:18	115:25
places 24:16	113:8,12 122:9	potable 107:16	prehearing
plague 91:3	122:10 125:19	109:2 112:19	17:5,19 125:3
plagued 91:1	128:9,17 129:8	potential 32:25	prejudice
plain 78:17	points 14:4	66:25 79:13	127:1
plan 68:22	69:23 85:12	88:2 89:3,15	preliminary
114:3,4,13,20	122:4 125:11	91:3 97:10	17:12
115:5	126:1	98:16,24	premature
planned 2:10	pool 35:23 66:6	104:11 107:16	35:19
plans 114:22	105:10	112:23 122:6	prematurely
platform 4:24	pooling 111:11	potentially	35:6
5:8,10 8:1 99:2	poor 86:20	22:24 104:24	premised 76:7
99:8,18	131:11	112:2,19	prepare 71:11
play 119:2	popular 114:23	powell 122:5	72:15
129:14	pores 93:24	122:14 123:17	prepared 24:22
playing 71:6	portion 44:9	power 7:4	31:1 45:7
pleading 126:7	48:15 109:15	powers 36:6	131:5
please 6:17	114:17	106:17	preparing
14:2 15:7 58:8	portions 43:9	practice 95:8	123:4,6
plenty 105:18	position 11:11	pre 66:12	preponderance
plow 116:10	11:23 12:23	precedent	36:24 37:2
plumed 88:7	38:4 69:21	69:14	presence 39:2
plumes 52:8	117:2 118:23	preclude 2:23	41:14 52:10,20
84:21 87:5,7	120:7,20 124:5	126:2	70:4
pluming 80:16	positioned	precluding	present 4:15
81:23 82:17,22	114:1	125:15	7:9 15:3 20:19
83:1 85:8 86:4			26:6 29:3 51:5

[present - production]

56:24 72:19	54:16	probably 11:9	process 39:14
74:13 110:3	pressurization	11:13 12:14	86:19 123:5
112:3	35:3	13:22 19:17	
		22:10 25:20	processes 109:16
presentation 27:11 109:6	preston 40:4	103:9 104:8	
	46:8,21 49:3 92:7	105:9 104.8	processing 87:3
presentations	1		produce 68:22
19:22,25 20:12	pretty 43:13	130:2	69:6 90:2,14
29:15 70:11	84:11 103:17	problem 19:5	99:9
92:2 127:21	prevalent 29:8	24:14 32:3	produced
128:4	prevent 35:13	46:15 47:7	31:11 32:16
presented	35:16,19	53:11 55:5	33:10 34:25
63:16 74:19	101:21	56:3 68:18,18	37:21 41:7
75:14 106:15	previous 92:5	69:20 80:24	42:5 50:11,13
presents 70:17	previously	91:5 104:3,10	56:20 58:12
117:3	41:19 45:21	105:4 120:15	61:14 63:23
president 38:15	59:20 92:23	problems 75:9	64:6,19 68:11
42:23	122:12	77:18 84:16	69:5,15 73:23
pressure 34:22	price 68:25	85:13 86:18	74:20 79:22
34:24 42:13,21	69:1	87:10	80:14 84:12
44:22,23,25	primacy 107:7	procedural	90:4,10,18
49:9 51:18,25	109:1	29:19	100:24 101:2,5
54:11,20,23	primarily 50:5	procedures	101:8 104:22
55:7 56:1 77:7	50:10 121:15	39:11	106:13 107:23
77:10,16 78:6	primary 63:11	proceed 5:4	118:1 129:19
81:8 88:11	77:11 90:7,9	103:13,20	producers 35:6
93:6 100:11	112:23 119:3	proceeded	85:18
pressured	principals 27:5	67:12	producing
88:15,17	principles 49:8	proceeding	35:17 42:20
101:10	125:13	21:14 22:8	54:15 60:21
pressures	prior 41:12	proceedings	61:16 75:25
33:15 44:21	51:23 52:12,14	1:13 2:1 11:5	82:9,12 83:10
77:9 78:2	55:14,15 72:8	16:21 36:20	85:4 89:16
87:16	122:21	115:17 126:23	97:4
pressuring	privacy 114:24	130:23 131:9	production
34:21 42:16			36:8,10,16

[production - quality]

41:11 42:13,15	56:15 57:3	proposes 32:1	provides 76:9 providing 72:19 proving 36:23 37:2,5 104:14 provision 36:5 provisional 29:20
44:16 47:15,22	86:21 89:18	109:23	
50:14 51:21,24	91:13 105:11	proposing	
55:13 61:21	106:21 113:23	10:25 98:22	
63:11 69:16	projected 90:2	protect 35:14	
71:1 77:11	90:13,21	109:2 112:5	
80:18,19,21	projects 42:2	protectable	
81:9,20 82:1,3	43:7 100:19	114:12	
82:11 83:5,17	prolonged 59:3	protected 112:7 protecting 107:15 114:25	psi's 42:17
83:19 84:13	promised 100:1		51:19,20 54:17
86:15 90:7,9	promote 51:14		54:20
98:20 99:1,6	promulgated		public 1:1
99:13 101:22 109:14,18 110:11,16 119:14,16 124:25 production's	122:18,19 pronunciation 20:14 proof 35:8 36:18,21 37:10 40:1	129:17 protection 111:16 114:14 protective 102:3 protocol 21:7	70:11 published 86:8 purchase 69:1 70:12 purely 74:14 purported
84:10	proper 46:18	prove 23:10	74:13 77:10
productive	properties	69:17	purports 84:2
99:4,12	39:15 66:14	proves 45:9	purpose 53:24
professional	property 97:9	provide 11:8	86:17 111:24
86:9	propose 9:23	41:21 43:3	purposes 51:3
professor 3:5	proposed 10:9	47:21 57:4	pursue 106:20
profound 122:7	10:12,19 11:21	70:3 75:2	113:16
program 105:6	12:8 31:10	76:19 105:17	pushing 50:21
107:1,2,12,13	33:13,17,20,23	105:25 111:14	put 70:7 78:5
107:17,22,23	34:17 36:13	113:23 115:4	83:4 96:14
108:24 111:1 111:23,25 112:2,12 113:2 113:17 114:5 115:10 120:2 project 34:24 36:14 41:10	37:3 38:19 39:23 51:6 59:17,24 60:4 60:11 102:1 105:3 106:8 113:23 114:3,4 115:4,10	provided 40:20 48:4,19 50:4 51:16 52:3 53:12 76:22 80:23 106:3 110:22 131:6	97:3 115:3 puts 76:5 putting 105:17 q quality 79:3 114:8 131:11

[quantifiable - red]

quantifiable	25:24 26:11,12	really 10:18	reconsideration
42:25	26:19 57:23	27:18 30:3	17:22 125:19
quantities	58:7 103:5	47:7 75:17	reconvene
35:18 36:1,8	115:21 117:9	110:24 128:4	21:17 22:3
36:17 60:21	118:9 119:17	reason 19:20	record 12:23
61:17	121:1 124:19	47:24 62:5,8	14:13 57:24
queen 87:19	126:22	63:6 99:21	58:2 59:22
question 26:13	rankin's 19:16	100:2	72:5 92:2
108:6	29:17	reasons 89:22	recorded 92:10
questions 6:22	rapid 87:10	91:4 97:24	131:9
14:5 20:22	rassenfoss	rebounded	recording
27:19 102:23	109:12	84:6	131:6
quick 30:24	rate 32:2 42:17	rebranded	records 64:11
quickly 27:21	54:17 57:15	32:19	119:16
71:11	58:14,21,25	rebuttal 27:15	recover 34:19
quite 108:21	59:3,8,9 60:5	40:4 46:23	41:18 42:7
quorum 30:11	rates 33:15,16	47:11,17 49:11	45:2
quote 21:13	33:25	49:16 51:12	recoverable
35:16 50:4	rather 38:7	73:11 76:15,20	41:21 60:19
122:5 125:5,16	47:24 84:21	77:19	119:10
r	91:25 113:9	received 11:3	recovered
	reach 49:23	67:11	32:15 102:11
r 8:7,8	reached 10:8	recent 83:3,20	recovery 32:25
radius 65:21,25 66:3	72:1	recently 11:3	34:23 35:22
	reaching 122:7	65:16 118:21	36:14 41:6,10
raise 19:20 raised 30:12	127:7	recognize 40:8	41:18 43:1,7
raised 30.12 raises 121:25	read 20:11 36:6	120:8 124:21	50:14 52:23
raising 26:13	53:23 76:23	recognized	90:14,16,20
37:8	126:9	122:19 125:12	109:16 118:2
rankin 4:19,20	real 100:11,14	recognizes	119:14
5:18,19,24	realistically	127:15	red 8:23,25 9:3
15:5,6,8 16:10	11:10	recommendat	9:7,9,21 10:1
17:9,10 19:10	reality 81:15	51:3	10:25 12:8
19:24 20:3	84:20 117:4	recommendat	33:14 128:5
24:12,13 25:17		30:9	

[reduce - requested]

reduce 35:21	reframe 85:11	relating 38:18	remember
114:25	regard 27:16	relation 109:8	13:11,25 29:12
reduced 131:6	79:3	113:20 125:21	100:6
reduces 35:21	regarding	relationship	remind 23:7
40:6 123:22	38:16 39:19	105:7 108:17	reminder 106:4
reef 56:5,14,25	42:10 48:5	114:6	remotely 25:20
61:3 104:12,20	122:12	relative 103:10	removable
104:24,24	regime 123:24	release 120:10	48:11
105:2,8 108:18	region 118:24	released 13:18	repeatedly
109:9,21,23	regional 122:6	relevant 107:11	118:19
110:9,21	regions 48:22	reliable 118:1	rephrase 82:18
111:17,18,19	regulate 109:1	119:15 123:20	report 90:12
112:14 113:20	regulated	reliance 66:20	reported
114:7,10,11,17	123:18 124:13	68:4,7,9 84:17	100:24 125:4
117:17 118:13	127:8	127:16	reporter's
118:16,17	regulates	relied 49:5	131:3
119:2,5	110:15	53:14	reporting
refer 31:13	regulations	relief 36:25	64:12 113:3
92:9	107:3,17 111:7	125:12,15,17	reports 106:1
reference 76:20	111:16 123:12	127:9,11,13	111:6
referenced 86:6	123:21	relies 38:3	representation
referred 71:5	regulatory	53:21	53:11 78:8
121:19 126:16	69:13 117:4	rely 49:7 50:10	representations
referring 75:19	118:6 119:20	53:21 54:7	53:15
75:20	119:23,25	74:24 75:1	represents
refers 35:25	123:20,24	123:8	92:19 124:12
73:25	125:17,24	remained 73:15	reputational
refile 127:3	reiterate 127:7	remains 123:1	113:5
reflect 70:4	reiterated	remarkable	request 57:3
118:6	127:2	68:24	59:11 70:3,5
reflected 84:18	reject 120:9	remarkably	70:13 120:7
reflecting	related 75:11	66:15 72:10	requested
102:15	131:13	remarks 31:3	36:25 87:15
reflects 81:14	relates 80:7	remedies	127:9
92:7 111:18		122:11	

[requests - right]

requests 58:21	reservoirs	respond 130:9	72:16
59:15	39:16 41:23	response 18:2	revising 69:22
require 10:1,24	81:4	68:13 125:9	revision 72:6
12:17 36:3	reset 11:4,18	responsibility	revocation
54:21 57:2	residual 33:1	114:1	124:16
89:17 105:12	37:19 39:3	responsive	revoke 37:5
114:21	41:3,19 43:19	70:13	57:12 60:7
required 11:20	44:15,19 45:3	rest 19:15	62:13 69:12
42:14 72:6	46:5 50:13	21:14 36:1	103:2 120:23
103:17	53:16 94:11,12	restated 92:4	123:15 126:20
requirement	95:1,15 100:25	rests 50:23	127:9
107:10	119:9	result 37:3	rewrite 85:10
requirements	resisted 70:7	42:19 77:11	120:9
63:1 111:7	resolve 29:19	112:24 123:2	rice 16:7 18:19
113:3	105:3 113:15	125:17,23	64:16 67:2,11
requires 35:12	resolved 17:6	resulting 37:6	120:13,17,19
78:5	17:20 18:11	72:21 78:15	120:25 121:1
requiring	19:6	90:24	121:10,15,22
34:23,25 64:12	resoundingly	results 29:18	122:3 125:2
reschedule 9:6	57:8	42:8 52:4	126:11,13,14
research 29:14	resource 101:7	retirement 30:4	127:6
29:18	resources 2:19	returns 88:18	rice's 121:18
reservoir 32:16	41:21 105:10	revealed 96:21	126:20 127:4
34:22 39:1	respect 10:5	revenues	rich 52:10
42:10,11 43:22	27:11 33:4	123:25	rift 93:11
43:25 44:9	36:18 37:13	review 10:13	right 2:16 15:4
49:8 51:18	49:19 50:9	29:21 100:4	15:22 16:23
61:9 65:19	51:11 53:3	reviewed 98:25	18:12,24,25
69:16 77:7	78:24	117:13	19:7 25:9,12
78:4,6 79:3	respectfully	reviewing	27:25 30:13,25
80:22 81:8	120:7	39:20 61:6,6	31:2 53:24
86:24 87:23	respecting	100:7	56:10 57:25
93:25 98:23	127:17	revised 9:21	58:3 77:25
117:23 118:24	respective	10:12 71:11,19	92:11 93:13
	122:10	71:19 72:2,14	98:7 102:20

[right - san]

103:20,22	roustabout	6:5,8 7:13,17	runs 81:5,10
115:16,18	121:14	7:21,24 8:6,9	ryan 40:3
116:21 126:7	route 6:21	9:13,16 10:14	ryno 44:1 55:1
130:16	routinely 26:5	11:15 12:1,13	67:18
rightly 119:24	roz 33:1,3 38:1	12:20,24 13:5	S
rights 31:19	39:13,17 40:1	13:16 14:14	s 1:6
35:14 37:4,7	40:7 41:1,6,14	15:11,14,18,21	safe 104:25
51:8 54:10	41:21,23 42:7	16:2,5,9,14	107:3,8,13
57:11 59:25	42:12 43:4	18:25 20:5	112:7,15,22
60:13 61:15,21	45:9,12,17	21:19 22:1,22	saint 1:6
102:4 118:25	46:19 47:5	22:23 23:20	saline 119:5
129:3,17	48:2,6,9,16,25	24:19,24 25:2	salinity 52:9
rip 16:19	49:23 50:22	25:4,6 28:14	saltwater 31:12
ripe 115:15	51:7,9 52:20	28:18,21 30:19	34:13 39:6
125:18	53:6 54:10	58:8 103:21	43:6 44:6,23
ripley 1:25	55:23 56:8	115:21 116:4,8	46:16 50:20
rising 110:10	57:8 69:6	116:10 130:13	64:21 68:14
110:18	70:11,14 76:1	130:17	103:2 121:3,4
risks 124:1	78:11,15,20	rozs 91:15,25	121:10
robert 38:22	79:25 80:12	97:23 99:17	san 7:4 31:12
rock 39:15	88:25 89:2,3	rr 45:19 49:21	31:17 32:12
40:17 50:6	89:15 91:13,16	rubin 30:16,17	33:1,6 34:6,20
79:10 94:24	91:17,22 92:11	127:23 128:15	34:21 35:4
rocket 34:11	95:7 96:8,14	128:16 130:6	39:1,2,3,4,6,8
rocks 93:24	96:15,17 97:5	rubin's 130:8	39:13,21,25
role 29:18 30:1	97:6,11,13,18	rule 26:10,20	40:1,2,6,7,9,10
119:2,21	98:2,7,11,16,18	27:3,10 28:3	40:12,20,23
roll 2:13 4:1	98:24 99:16,22	36:20	42:12,14,17,21
room 15:4	100:20 102:11	rules 4:10 27:2	43:3,4,9,16,19
24:10 35:1	119:15 128:21	36:2 122:18,19	43:25 44:4,10
102:21,22	rozatos 1:20	131:14	44:11,14,21,22
roots 107:2	2:2,5,14 3:7,15	rulings 29:20	44:24 45:3,10
roughly 78:14	3:17,20 4:1,4,7	run 39:16	45:11,14,17,21
83:11	4:18,20,22 5:2	running 59:2	46:5,10,12,14
	5:11,16,23 6:1	108:2	46:16,18,25
			- , - ,—-

[san - see]

47:12 48:1,9	88:2,4,6,23	saturations	scheduling
48:10,16,16,24	92:9 93:3,9,16	39:12 42:4	10:12 14:3
49:1,20,23	93:18 94:6,7,9	46:7,9 49:19	science 117:19
50:3,5,18,24	94:20,22,23	49:22 79:21,23	scientific 110:6
51:9,14,18,22	95:2,6,21	91:22,23,24,25	scope 37:15
51:25 52:5,9	96:20 97:14,16	92:10,12,16,18	56:6 117:21
52:10,13 53:1	98:13,17,18,22	94:10,15 95:1	screen 31:6
53:7 54:17,20	99:5,7,10,12,19	95:9,16,22	62:19,19
54:22 55:4,7	99:20,22 100:8	96:6,7,11,18,20	sea 90:23
55:11,19,20,22	101:4,18	97:15,21 99:24	seal 39:7 60:23
55:23,24 56:2	104:11 105:7	100:25	61:19 88:11
56:8,19,20	106:12 107:18	saw 71:9	93:18
57:9 58:15	110:21 113:21	sayer 5:1,1 6:6	seals 101:21
59:13 60:17,25	114:9 117:15	6:7,9	second 3:14,25
61:2,8 62:17	117:21,22	saying 68:20	20:1 67:1 77:6
62:24 63:4,7	118:3,12,15,18	82:15 97:13	100:10 106:14
63:10,17,20,22	118:20 119:9	says 65:19,23	secondary 43:1
64:2,4 65:15	121:19 124:21	73:15 76:24	43:7 118:2
66:4,7,11,13,18	125:1,6 126:16	77:18,19,25	119:14
67:20 68:6,7	sand 40:8,10	81:23 82:20	secretary 3:6
68:17,21 69:5	santa 1:7 7:16	97:1,5 98:5,9	section 43:24
69:14 70:5,15	15:8	125:4,21,23	43:24 48:4
72:24 73:7,21	saturated	126:8,8	53:20 106:15
73:24 74:3,14	92:23 94:8,20	scale 52:12	sections 39:22
74:15,20 75:4	95:2,10,11,18	69:10 70:24	42:3 53:12
75:6,12,17,20	95:19,23,24	85:13	73:11 106:18
75:22 76:7	98:23	scaling 54:25	see 3:2 5:9 9:11
77:11 78:1,14	saturating 94:6	55:2	14:6 18:13,23
78:16,25 79:5	saturation	schedule 4:13	21:23 28:24
79:11,18 80:6	39:15 40:16,22	13:15	32:4 33:12,15
80:14,16 81:16	44:20 47:4	scheduled 5:6	33:18,22 34:1
81:17,24 82:22	50:3,8,10	11:6 127:21	44:5,8,20
83:1 84:21	71:16 91:9	schedules 14:1	46:20 54:2,4
85:8,15,17	92:14	21:24 22:4	57:19,19 64:8
86:4 87:4,8,13		23:23	65:4 76:23

[see - shown]

	I	I	
77:6,19 78:10	senior 38:15	68:13 71:2	shift 93:10
83:25 92:17	42:23	sets 109:3	109:19
94:14,15 95:3	sense 11:12	setting 75:8	shifting 69:21
95:15,21 96:1	12:5 22:12	settlement	short 43:13
97:7 105:19	24:17 75:5	115:14	76:13 86:3
107:25 128:4	108:9 110:5,6	seven 39:13	101:24,25
130:22	sensitive 120:1	70:9 99:4	103:12
seeing 82:2	sensitivities	several 20:24	shortened
83:2 84:11,12	39:16	81:11 108:1	104:8
115:2	separated	severe 90:25	show 42:4
seek 127:4	118:17	severely 41:23	43:12 46:9
seeking 69:11	separately 61:1	sewell 71:11	47:11 48:20,25
71:22	separating 53:5	79:15 89:9	49:22 50:7
seeks 58:12	separation 51:3	shaheen 15:19	53:13,18,20
114:21 123:15	september 8:19	15:19,23 18:13	55:23 59:6
seems 20:23	sequence 68:4	18:14 20:15,16	60:3 62:19,20
seen 26:25	98:5,9,12	24:25	68:2 70:16
52:24 55:13	sequences	shallow 96:21	77:10,12 80:17
77:3 105:18	43:14	shallower 80:8	88:21 99:16
seep 55:15	series 107:25	87:19 89:20	101:3,25
84:24 85:1	serves 98:5	100:9	106:18 108:13
sees 84:5	service 16:8	shallowest	119:18
seismic 68:13	65:1 67:10	91:23	showed 47:1
selected 47:20	120:20 121:12	shanor 8:3	50:25
selecting 46:17	121:16	share 19:15	showing 43:23
47:12	service's	31:6	43:25 44:9
selection 39:2	121:18	sharing 9:20	55:22 65:18
40:5 45:11,14	servicer 121:14	62:18	75:15 80:25
111:14	session 128:8	sharon 15:19	81:25 82:5
self 46:2	set 6:11,16 7:8	sheet 17:4	83:18 84:15
sell 97:9	8:18,20 9:7	sheila 5:8,13	88:6
semantics 74:9	11:24 12:7,19	6:16 13:3	shown 33:13
semi 30:4	12:25 13:5,11	shelf 61:25	46:8,22 48:12
seminole 41:6	13:12,22,24	90:23 99:9	52:16 110:11
	23:23,24 29:9		

[shows - spoke]

shows 46:24	simply 59:22	sodium 55:3	southwest
47:4,7,23 48:3	79:2 81:7	solid 53:25	64:24
48:8,9,22,23	103:12 104:17	solution 105:3	space 54:5,5
51:23 52:13	simulation	110:25 113:15	spans 98:12
57:5 76:3	43:12,21 78:4	solutions	sparse 95:3
77:21 82:4	80:23 84:18	116:23	spe 86:8
83:21 91:21	87:23	solves 20:11	speak 17:25
92:9 93:7 96:3	single 76:10	somebody	26:17 112:1
96:4 108:16	85:12 100:23	104:7	speaking 18:14
110:18	sir 17:16	somewhat	19:12
shut 65:20,23	sit 28:8	12:17	special 66:6
side 9:2 21:5	site 123:6	soon 22:2	112:15
24:9 99:17	situ 93:25	sorry 18:22	specific 18:2
sidebar 19:23	situation 12:5	19:3 20:14	76:9 77:4
sierra 7:5	25:21 113:20	82:17 126:5	100:8 112:11
signature	129:21	sort 33:19	specifically
131:18	six 60:6 63:3	sorts 114:22	32:8 61:10
significant	81:22 83:13	sosa 67:14	107:11 122:10
32:25 33:16	size 106:9	sought 122:11	126:14 127:2
34:1 77:17	skim 100:23	125:17	specify 76:24
89:17 101:10	slated 2:4	sound 116:11	specifying
110:3 117:10	22:24 23:2	source 61:4	75:22 80:6
119:2,23 124:2	28:14	63:5,8 68:8	speculate 85:16
124:14	slice 44:8	87:4 94:24	111:23,23
silence 30:18	slide 35:11 51:1	112:20 114:15	speculated 88:2
similar 12:5	54:8 82:5	119:4	speculation
94:15	83:18 92:6	sources 107:16	98:17 119:8
similarities	93:7 96:2 98:6	115:1	spend 27:13
41:9	slides 35:10	south 31:13	30:5
similarly 50:1	slowest 83:21	37:20 43:14	spends 38:6
52:19	small 33:20	58:17 93:4	split 115:11
simon 99:19	53:22 117:7,8	99:5,18 117:6	spoiler 112:8
simple 60:13	smoke 84:19	southeast 32:6	spoke 18:22
70:3 100:4	society 86:8	76:18 93:5	19:10
		112:20	

[spring - subsea]

		1	1107710
spring 115:17	state 1:2 2:19	statutes 36:3	44:3 55:19
stability 119:20	29:23 31:21	106:16 123:12	73:10 89:8
120:22 129:14	41:13 62:24	123:21	98:4 123:20
stable 123:19	63:3,5 87:6	statutory 36:2	studied 49:14
stacked 43:14	107:13 111:15	129:15 130:1	studies 51:16
stake 68:15	112:4,4 113:9	stay 126:25	52:7 76:17,25
stand 115:3	114:18 120:20	stayed 126:24	study 76:10,11
127:6	124:1 128:22	step 98:19	studying 39:20
standard 129:1	stated 5:5	stepping 2:21	107:14
standards	16:16 129:16	2:24	stuff 29:5 73:18
109:3 129:18	statement	steve 91:18	suazo 7:18,18
standing 79:23	37:12 58:4	stood 72:11,13	7:21 10:14,15
stanley 40:14	86:3 92:5	stops 76:12	15:24,25 19:1
stare 125:13	102:6 125:3	storage 41:24	19:4,5 25:2,3
stars 33:14	statements	story 69:21	116:4,6,19,20
start 2:12,13	14:24 16:17	73:14,17 85:11	116:22 120:13
3:8 5:18 7:9	22:15,21,25	94:18	120:15
8:12 14:14,15	23:2,8 31:2	stratigraph	sub 90:24
15:4 17:8	46:2 115:23	72:22 88:19	subject 29:21
22:14 23:4,18	130:8,20	100:12	29:22 32:10
24:9,18 29:7	states 20:7	stratigraphic	36:20 62:1,25
42:15 62:18	31:22 37:16	77:2 118:14	subjected
72:9 91:2	46:3 47:18	stratigraphica	100:20
105:15 106:6	49:11 50:5	118:15	submit 10:11
116:20 130:21	53:8 56:12	stratum 35:17	37:17 71:22
started 61:6	81:15 87:5	60:20	submitted 5:12
64:5,12,22	109:14	streaks 86:25	71:19 111:6
65:8 74:17,22	static 93:25	87:11	submitting
81:8,9 83:24	stating 12:23	stress 126:18	17:21
starting 15:1	status 4:13 5:5	stretch 21:8	subsea 39:24
23:23 24:14	7:8 12:19,25	strong 48:23	46:11,13,14
25:7 69:25	13:6,20 107:7	structurally	51:19 79:16
78:6 86:21	114:12	44:1	89:4,5 96:5,9
starts 23:3 96:9	statute 35:25	structure 39:24	96:10
106:8	36:15	40:20 43:16	

[subsequent - technical]

subsequent	supervised	suspect 21:15	take 9:21 11:18
123:7	112:25	58:5 104:13	11:24 14:9,11
subsequently	supplies 76:16	suspects 104:18	20:24 24:6
32:19	119:3	108:13	25:15 27:18
substantial	supply 44:7	swd 34:5,6	57:20 58:3
86:21 90:25	50:11,15 63:4	41:22 42:2,24	114:1 116:5,6
93:5 97:15	63:18 101:15	43:5,6 44:1	128:15
100:11 101:20	118:2	47:19 52:25	taken 46:4
substantially	supplying 63:8	55:1 64:24	takes 21:8 23:3
88:16	support 59:23	67:14,18 121:9	25:8 118:23
substantive	80:15,21 85:12	swds 33:13	talk 22:12 35:7
29:15 30:9,12	96:24 115:4	34:11 38:20	41:5,8 108:3
subtracted	117:2 122:16	43:18 60:8	126:19
84:4	125:8,14	65:5,8,20,23,24	talked 129:7
success 41:6,9	supporting	66:2,3,21 67:1	talking 61:10
89:20	38:8 61:23	67:3,13 68:3,5	62:15 76:3
successor 32:23	88:22	118:9	77:4 111:22
suddenly 68:20	supports 38:4	sweeping 93:4	talks 129:6
97:22	62:11 94:19,21	swept 62:6 93:9	tall 41:10
sufficient 49:22	120:6,22	93:23 94:4,9	tangible 88:9
69:17	supposed 85:22	system 61:25	100:14
suggest 10:9	supposition	90:23 91:4	tap 112:6
suggested 9:14	75:9	121:4,9,23	target 58:14
suggestion	sure 10:15	122:25,25	99:19 124:22
12:18 103:12	18:16 20:10	systems 121:3	targeted 63:23
suit 85:11	26:19 29:1	121:11	task 105:11
sulfate 52:10	54:6 128:25	t	tasked 107:14
52:10,12 55:20	surface 87:16	t 8:7,8	tax 123:25
74:15,20	114:5	table 15:22	tds 119:6
sulfates 55:4	surprising	96:25	team 86:8
summary 45:15	105:9	tables 14:11	117:13
49:2 108:8	surrounding	tackle 6:13	tech 3:5 106:1
125:10	45:18 65:10	23:22	106:11
summertime	117:10	tailored 127:15	technical 29:6
14:1,2			43:11 59:15

[technical - three]

(1.04.60.07	4 4 1 40 17	100 4 100 16	110 2 126 10
61:24 62:2,7	tested 48:15	122:4 123:16	110:2 126:10
73:18 74:10	50:18	129:5	think 9:1,7,10
90:12 100:1,2	testified 72:12	testing 108:14	9:25 10:19
119:22	81:3 82:8	tests 79:21	11:2,10,17,23
technicalities	87:14,21 94:7	100:18	20:18,20 21:19
130:14	96:12 98:1,13	texas 41:2	21:20 22:1,11
techniques	98:15	110:13,14	23:21 24:1,5
40:24 41:18	testify 38:16,25	thank 3:6 4:18	24:13 25:17,20
tectonic 44:12	39:10,19 40:4	4:22 5:2,20,25	26:25 27:2,17
tell 21:2,16	40:15 41:1,17	6:1,5,7 7:13,21	28:14 30:22,22
91:24 102:19	42:1,10,24	7:24 8:9,15	35:9 36:19
102:19 129:12	testifying 26:21	9:18 11:15	53:19 72:24
telling 84:5,7	27:6	12:1,4,23 14:7	94:19,21,25
tells 56:1	testimonies	15:11,14,18,21	97:10 102:17
telltale 92:17	72:17	16:5,9,14 18:7	103:21 115:21
temporally	testimony 26:7	19:7 27:8 31:4	115:22 116:5
118:16	27:15 37:17,25	57:16,17,18	120:2 128:16
ten 50:3 57:20	46:24 49:16	58:7 103:3,4	130:2
116:6	50:4 53:10	103:24 115:6,8	thinking 19:16
tends 35:21	56:11 58:24	120:11,12	115:18
tenets 62:4	59:6,16 60:3	127:18,19	third 20:1
tentative 13:12	61:5 65:22	130:4,5,22	78:10 82:15,20
tenure 13:12	70:17 71:8,19	theme 108:2	100:17
term 36:7,9	71:20,22 72:2	theoretically	thought 27:4
59:1	72:11,13 73:12	113:7	130:10
termed 49:24	73:21 76:8,15	thereof 35:17	thoughts 57:22
terminates 98:8	76:16,21 77:4	thick 96:16	127:14
terms 10:3	77:19 78:3	97:5,10,14	threat 124:12
93:23 108:8	80:6,7 81:15	thicker 97:6,18	three 18:23
terrible 86:10	82:6 83:4 84:1	thing 25:12	63:24 64:3
tertiary 34:23	88:21 91:19	28:10 29:13	65:10,21 66:1
36:13 43:7	92:4 93:8	70:21 94:18	68:23,25 71:21
50:14 52:23	96:24,25 98:7	things 17:3	72:8 97:17
test 100:20	100:1,5,7	19:21 25:11	100:3,21 121:2
102:18	101:3 107:20	34:21 100:4	

[threshold - typical]

threshold	today 2:4,21	tops 45:11 49:4	trials 26:5
60:14 91:11	12:10 14:25	49:12 72:23	triangle 64:7
124:8,9,15	16:17 17:24	73:11 79:8,9	tried 81:10
throw 72:7	18:5,15 22:15	total 34:12	tries 77:12
tied 107:3	23:1,18 60:2	35:21 119:6	tripp 8:2,3,7,7
tiers 79:2	64:9,21 66:8	towards 113:25	8:8 12:2,4
ties 104:19	74:25 103:10	114:2	true 89:2 118:6
tighter 14:2	105:18 106:3	tracking 87:1	131:8
till 21:4	111:13 113:18	tracy 86:13	try 22:2 29:11
tilted 93:1	115:6 123:1	transcript 1:13	31:6
time 6:14 9:22	126:23 127:21	2:1 131:5,7	trying 38:7
10:6 11:4,19	today's 68:15	transcription	69:24 85:10
11:24 12:7	together 9:11	131:9	turn 21:4
13:23 14:10	10:18 11:19	transfer 16:20	120:17 123:25
17:11,14 19:22	12:11 13:7	transition	turned 93:21
20:21,25 21:10	104:19	48:10	94:5
22:12,20 23:25	told 97:9	traveling 24:15	turning 93:12
25:11 27:17	102:17	treatments	107:19 113:10
29:5 32:13,16	tomorrow	86:18	two 10:11 34:7
38:7 54:21	14:25 22:25	tremaine 4:16	34:9 42:21
57:1 63:2	23:1,14,15,19	4:17 6:2,3 7:22	43:13 46:6
69:22 73:3	took 81:5,10	7:22,25 9:4,16	50:17 51:15
83:11 84:10	top 39:2 40:5	9:17 12:15,16	52:2 65:6,23
86:14 90:1	40:10,20 45:14	12:22	67:2,23 72:19
92:23 95:17	46:13,14,16,25	trentham 40:25	75:23 76:2,16
111:10 115:6	47:1,12 49:7	52:18 91:17	80:10 86:7
123:3 128:14	50:24 51:1	92:3 93:15	87:14 91:17
128:15 130:9	55:19 73:7,8	96:12 97:1,4	104:7 118:18
timeline 12:11	77:14 79:11	trentham's	128:17
times 97:17	93:19 99:8	92:8 96:25	types 10:23
106:7	112:21 113:12	trespass 129:23	typewritten
timing 72:4	113:13,13	trial 21:2,3,14	131:7
tisdel 7:11,11	topic 13:19	23:17 27:25	typical 30:6
8:15 9:15	86:9	28:7 81:7	

[uic - uses]

u	underlines 38:1	unit 31:13,16	unproduced
uic 105:22	underlying	31:20,24 32:6	41:19
107:1,13,21	31:12 37:20	32:9,18,21	unquote 21:13
107:1,13,21	45:18 57:9	33:2 34:10	unreasonable
120:2 125:3	73:1	37:20 38:19	84:2
ultimate 35:21	underneath	42:4 43:14	unsupported
60:15	107:12	45:20,21 48:3	119:15
ultimately	underscore	50:21 52:23	unwavering
43:10 60:10	120:21	58:17 60:8	73:15
62:5,8 100:3	understand	63:25 64:16,20	updip 43:9
105:1 128:11	12:17 18:20	65:14 67:1,13	44:6 48:15
unaccounted	28:6 66:10	68:4 83:25	93:5 94:23
87:6,7,12,21,24	75:18 76:2	86:16,22 92:9	uplift 43:16
unbounded	understanding	100:13 102:2	44:2
102:8	17:11,15,18	111:10	upper 40:9,11
uncertain	19:11,13,23	united 31:22	40:22 73:24
89:21	24:22,23	unitization	74:3 75:12,17
uncertainty	113:19,25	32:11 106:23	98:16
123:22	114:3 118:21	106:24 111:12	uppermost
under 24:22	127:22 130:15	125:11,22,25	91:8
27:1 35:14	understands	126:12	uproar 108:22
36:8,16 59:13	97:2	unitize 63:14	upsetting
59:17 69:18	understood	unitized 31:17	129:25
79:6,11 88:17	24:11	32:13 33:6,10	usa 7:16
90:11 93:5	undertake	34:3,19 39:20	use 40:19 41:17
101:10 112:15	71:13	42:6 56:13	47:3,13,23
118:21	undertaken	57:11 63:13	52:23 54:21
underground	37:21	118:3	63:1 66:7
61:4 63:22	unfairly 104:8	units 42:12	110:5
104:18 107:1	unfortunately	46:6 64:3 65:6	used 21:1 29:25
108:10,15	2:22 54:2	65:11,21 66:1	39:11 63:17
109:1 112:24	108:7 115:13	68:23,25	73:9 112:17
114:15 115:1	unique 98:14	unnecessary	uses 46:12,25
underlie 60:15	99:13	57:3	77:14

[using - water]

	Ι .	T T	
using 49:12	views 29:22	116:17 120:20	63:4,8,18,22,23
55:18 71:14	109:4	120:21 128:5	64:6,19 65:2
125:6	violates 36:2	wanted 2:12	68:8,11 69:5,9
usually 104:6	violating 57:11	12:3,22 27:12	69:14,15,15
utilized 40:18	violation	102:18 127:3	71:15 73:23
utmost 22:5	104:25 112:7	wants 114:5	74:15,20 75:6
v	violations	warrant 120:3	79:22 80:16
vacuum 121:20	112:21 119:1	124:15	81:17,20,22
valid 120:24	volume 104:23	warrants 10:24	82:9,13,24
validated	106:4	79:16 89:10	83:10 84:12,22
111:20	volumes 41:2	washington	84:23,25 85:2
validly 123:14	42:24 55:13,17	113:1	85:8,15,17,19
124:16 125:12	56:18 63:9	waste 31:18	85:20,22,23
126:14 127:9	64:9,13 80:15	35:13 37:3,6	87:4,7,12,18,21
127:18	80:25 81:9,25	41:24 42:8	87:24,24 88:3
valued 33:3	82:2,16,21	59:25 60:12	88:4,6,23
variable 129:6	93:1,8	61:15,22 102:3	89:24 91:1
various 26:16	voluminous	118:25 129:18	92:20,21 93:2
26:22 37:9	38:3 49:9 57:5	water 16:1	93:21 96:23
106:18 111:15	voters 7:2	32:15 33:5,8	97:3,4 100:22
vastly 56:15	vp 82:7	33:10 34:15,25	101:5,8,11,14
verlander	W	35:4,16,20,20	101:17 102:12
34:11	wait 102:21,22	37:21 42:5,14	104:22,23,25
version 8:24	walk 102:21,22	42:18,19 43:19	106:8,13 107:3
72:11	108:19 111:2	44:6,14,25	107:8,14,16,23
vertical 39:4,5	112:16	47:13 50:11,15	108:15 109:2,2
77:23 78:14	walked 113:18	51:4 52:3,8,9	109:14,17
79:24	walked 113.16	52:11,13,21	110:11,13,19
viable 89:19	want 3:1,8 17:3	53:1,6 54:14	111:17 112:5,8
117:23 124:22	20:14 28:9	54:18,19,24	112:15,20,22
vice 38:15	29:13 30:21	55:2,4,4,8,10	113:8,9 114:8
42:23	62:16,22 74:2	55:12,15,17,20	114:15 115:1
vicinity 118:10	79:9 80:10,24	56:2,5,18,20	116:23 117:25
view 110:15,17	102:5,23	58:12 59:9	118:1,2 119:3
111:20	104:16 116:2	60:22 61:4,14	119:4 124:24

[water - work]

129:19	we've 10:7	67.15 24 70.14	65.22 77.0
water's 84:15		67:15,24 70:14 80:19 85:18	65:22 77:8
	11:17 12:6		wireline 50:2
waterflood	33:24 73:1	88:14,20	wishes 122:14
42:2,12 44:17	74:6 91:10	100:13 101:15	withdrawals
44:18 45:4	110:21 128:14	103:3 105:21	101:12
52:12,14 55:10	weak 38:9	105:22,24	withdrawn
55:14,16 63:6	wednesday	109:10 118:20	100:22 101:15
63:9,18 69:7	10:21 21:4	119:13 121:18	101:18
69:10 74:17,21	week 2:24	121:22,22	withheld 70:18
82:9,25 85:14	10:11 11:7	123:10	witness 26:25
86:10,15,18,20	18:17 20:24	wendell 1:5	27:1,18 37:25
86:23 87:16,18	21:3,17,17,22	went 63:3	40:20 48:13
88:7 89:22,22	21:22 25:15,16	80:22	49:4,20 50:1
90:2,3,8,11,19	25:19 28:12	west 42:23	53:8 71:12
92:24,25 93:3	30:21 61:7	65:22 77:8	81:2 92:7
93:12,15,20,22	73:2 115:3	82:7 83:4,25	107:21 110:2
94:14,16 95:12	weekend 24:17	99:17	witnesses 10:4
95:18,25	weeks 13:13	west's 46:24	10:23 19:14
102:13 105:24	weigh 125:14	48:8 82:6	20:19,23 22:14
waterflooded	weight 62:10	western 6:25	23:9,13,19,22
39:12	101:25	7:10,11 8:12	23:23 25:7
waterflooding	welcome 28:8	98:10	26:6,7,9,15,21
51:24	wells 32:1	whatsoever	27:9,21 28:6
watering 35:6	33:18,21,23,23	116:17 131:15	36:12 38:10,11
61:16 119:13	34:5,9 39:13	wheeler 38:14	45:16,24 48:18
waters 88:3	39:23 44:7	white 54:4,5	49:5 50:12
wave 3:1	45:20 46:1	wide 80:18	53:14,21 54:6
way 22:16	48:5,15,24	81:6,13 82:1	72:19 75:19
24:10 28:7	50:3,11,15,17	83:19	wizardry 43:12
30:20 85:17	52:25,25 54:15	wider 98:20	words 82:12
97:15 104:15	57:14 58:13,14	wild 4:9,23	126:5
111:8,12 128:4	59:2,2,4,7,10	6:10	work 5:16,24
128:5 129:25	59:12,14 60:4	william 1:22	6:19 8:21 21:2
ways 42:4	63:4 64:1,8,10	3:4 42:22	25:23 29:8
	65:13 66:7,22	46:24 48:13	30:4 31:7 72:8

[work - zooming]

92:8 108:5	year 9:1 30:5	80:4,8 85:24
111:12	70:23 90:15	88:11,12,16,17
workflow 9:1	126:22	89:14,16,19
working 5:15	year's 54:21	91:7,7 94:12
8:23 9:8 27:16	years 31:16	96:9 100:8,16
65:25 114:2	41:8 42:21	100:19,23,25
123:22	44:13 63:23	101:22 117:25
workover 55:1	75:7 86:7	119:10 121:20
world 41:20	87:14 88:1	125:7 126:17
worms 25:10	90:19 93:10	zones 41:3,19
worsen 56:3	117:24 121:6,9	52:16 53:17,25
worth 93:17	125:22 126:15	54:1 74:18
wozniak 7:19	yellow 46:23	76:25 89:20
15:25 116:24	47:18 48:7,22	96:21 99:10
writing 27:15	64:7 74:2	zooming 83:23
written 81:15	yesterday	
85:3 108:1,4	17:23	
wrong 21:16	yield 90:16	
24:2 95:4	yields 123:20	
102:19,19	Z	
wrote 38:23	zonal 87:3	
X	zone 33:1 35:1	
xto 32:20,21,24	37:19 39:3	
48:1,4 66:14	43:19 44:15	
66:24 67:17,22	45:3 46:5	
68:1,25 70:18	48:10 50:13	
97:8	53:5,16 58:15	
xto's 32:22	60:17 61:10,13	
33:2	61:16,19 69:7	
y	69:15 73:24	
yay 4:15	74:1,5,11	
yay 4.13 yeah 7:11 8:15	75:12,13,15,17	
18:19 103:21	75:21,22,25	
10.17 103.21	76:1 77:15	
	78:1,7,9 80:1,3	