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	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
11	October 16, 2025
12	
13	
	COMMISSION MEMBERS REGARDING
14	AGENDA ITEM 3a:
15	ALBERT CHANG, Chair
16	JOSEPH THOMPSON, Member
17	
	COMMISSION MEMBERS REGARDING
18	AGENDA ITEM 3b:
19	ALBERT CHANG, Chair
20	BAYLEN LAMKIN, Member
21	DR. WILLIAM AMPOMAH, Member
22	
23	COUNSEL TO THE COMMISSION:
24	ZACHARY SHANDLER, ESQ.
25	
	Page 1
	rage 1

```
1
                     APPEARANCES
2.
    FOR COTERRA ENERGY OPERATING CO.:
3
     ABADIE & SCHILL, P.C.
4
      214 McKenzie Street
      Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501
5
      BY: Darin Savage
           darin@abadieschill.com
6
7
    FOR PERMIAN RESOURCES OPERATING and
    READ & STEVENS, INC.:
8
      HOLLAND & HART
9
      110 North Guadalupe St., Ste. 1
      Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504-2208
      BY: Adam Rankin
10
           agrankin@hollandhart.com
11
           Paula M. Vance
           pmvance@hollandhart.com
1 2
13
    FOR EMPIRE NEW MEXICO:
     HINKLE SHANOR, LLP
14
      P.O. Box 2068
      Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504-2068
15
           Dana S. Hardy
16
           dhardy@hinklelawfirm.com
17
     SANTOYO WEHMEYER, PC
      IBC Highway 281
      North Centre Building
18
      12400 San Pedro Ave., Ste. 300
19
      San Antonio, Texas 78216
      BY: Corey F. Wehmeyer
20
           cwehmeyer@swenergylaw.com
21
    FOR GOODNIGHT MIDSTREAM:
22
     HOLLAND & HART
23
      110 North Guadalupe St., Ste. 1
      Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504-2208
          Adam Rankin
24
      BY:
           agrankin@hollandhart.com
25
           Paula M. Vance
           pmvance@hollandhart.com
                                              Page 2
```

1 2	APPEARANCES (Cont'd)
	FOR NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION:
3	
	NM ENERGY, MINERALS AND NATURAL RESOURCES DEPT.
4	1220 South St. Francis Drive
	Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505
5	BY: Chris Moander
	chris.moander@emnrd.nm.gov
6	
7	FOR RICE OPERATING COMPANY and
	PERMIAN LINE SERVICE, LLC:
8	
	PEIFER, HANSON, MULLINS & BAKER, PA
9	P.O. Box 25245
	Albuquerque, New Mexico 87125-5245
10	BY: Matthew M. Beck
	mbeck@peiferlaw.com
11	
12	FOR PILOT WATER SOLUTIONS SWD, LLC:
13	BEATTY & WOZNIAK, PC
14	500 Don Gaspar Ave. Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505
11	BY: Miquel A. Suazo
15	msuazo@bwenergylaw.com
16	
 17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	Page 3

1	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
2	CHAIR CHANG: It 9 o'clock. I'll call the
3	meeting to order.
4	Sheila, please call the roll.
5	MS. APODACA: Roll of the Commission.
6	Commissioner Thompson.
7	COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: Present.
8	MS. APODACA: Commissioner Chang.
9	CHAIR CHANG: Present.
10	MS. APODACA: We have a quorum.
11	CHAIR CHANG: Commissioner Ampomah is absent
12	today.
13	I guess we'll approve the agenda, which
14	is in front of you all, I think. I'll ask for a to
15	approve the agenda.
16	COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: Motion to approve
17	the agenda.
18	CHAIR CHANG: Yes, second. So moved, I will
19	second that motion. Passes without objection.
20	(2-0 vote. Motion approved.)
21	CHAIR CHANG: So starting at 9:00, we're
22	here for continued deliberations on the Coterra and
23	Permian case. So I apologize for dragging you all
24	over here in the morning. We're probably going to go
25	back into closed session. We're working through a

1	draft. We're going to go through it line by line to
2	make sure we understand that we have some work
3	product that we're comfortable with. So we're
4	actually going to go into closed session.
5	You all, of course, are more than
6	welcome to hang out or not hang out. But I am not
7	quite sure how long it's going to take us. If you'd
8	like to simply join us online, we're more than happy
9	if you join us online back at your offices. So you
10	can join us online when we have a decision to
11	announce.
12	MR. SHANDLER: Commissioner Thompson, please
13	make a motion to go into closed session pursuant to
14	the Open Meetings Act.
15	COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: I make a motion to
16	go into closed session.
17	MR. SHANDLER: We need a second.
18	CHAIR CHANG: I will second.
19	MR. SHANDLER: And we'll actually need a
20	roll call.
21	MS. APODACA: Okay. Commissioner Thompson,
22	do you accept the motion to go into closed session?
23	COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: Approved.
24	MS. APODACA: Chair Chang?
25	CHAIR CHANG: Yes.

1	(2-0 vote. Motion approved.)
2	CHAIR CHANG: Without objection, we'll go
3	into closed session. Thank you so much. Closed
4	session 9:04 a.m.
5	(Commission adjourned to
6	closed session at 9:04 a.m.)
7	CHAIR CHANG: Good afternoon. It's now 1:32
8	p.m. and the Commission will be coming back out from
9	executive session.
10	MR. SHANDLER: And, sir, can you attest for
11	the record that only the matters discussed in the
12	motion to go into closed session were the only
13	matters discussed? Do you so attest?
14	CHAIR CHANG: I can so attest. Thank you.
15	We're back on the record, back in open
16	session. I see counsel here for our second case, but
17	we need to wrap up our first case for a few minutes
18	here.
19	The Commission deliberated on OCC Case
20	Number 25371 in closed session this morning. We went
21	through, hopefully, a reasonably thorough decision.
22	And the vote on the order was unanimous.
23	MR. SHANDLER: First let's do this.
24	So, Commissioner Thompson, there's an
25	order in front of you. Do you make a motion to

1	approve it?
2	COMMISSIONER THOMPSON: So moved.
3	MR. SHANDLER: Is there a second?
4	CHAIR CHANG: I second.
5	(2-0 vote. Motion approved.)
6	MR. SHANDLER: Please proceed.
7	CHAIR CHANG: So unanimous approval of the
8	Commission's decision in OCC Case 25371. In this
9	case, the Commission has ruled in favor of Permian.
LO	So that means we have granted Permian's application
L1	in Case Numbers 23508 through 23523; denied Coterra's
L2	application in Case Numbers 23448 through 23455 and
L3	Case Numbers 23594 through 23601.
L4	All other pending motions are denied.
L5	This order will go into effect 20 days from the date
L6	that this order is filed and served, and all
L7	previously issued stays in this case will be lifted
L8	on that same date.
L9	Hopefully the order will be fairly
20	self-explanatory. We did spend a good amount of time
21	on it. And I have signed it. It will be served
22	electronically by the end of the day. But Sheila
23	will have a hard copy. So for counsel who are with
24	us on that particular case, you're welcome to pick up
25	a hard copy from Sheila, from our Commission clerk.

1	Well, with that out of the way, I think
2	we can turn to the next case on our agenda, which is
3	Goodnight versus Empire, for the prehearing order.
4	So give us just a minute to reorganize ourselves and
5	we'll proceed in just a few minutes.
6	(Pause in the proceedings.)
7	CHAIR CHANG: Everybody appears to be
8	present, so I will call the hearing on the pending
9	motions and consolidated cases between Goodnight
10	Midstream and Empire New Mexico. I won't read the
11	whole list of cases because there's quite a few of
12	them. But I presume we are all here for the right
13	case.
14	So if I could have the appearances of
15	counsel, I'd appreciate it.
16	MS. HARDY: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair,
17	Commissioners. Dana Hardy and Corey Wehmeyer on
18	behalf of Empire New Mexico, LLC.
19	CHAIR CHANG: Thank you.
20	MR. RANKIN: Good afternoon, Chair Chang.
21	Adam Rankin with Holland & Hart, appearing on behalf
22	of Goodnight Permian, LLC, with my colleague Paula
23	Vance.
24	With us today in the audience are some
25	representatives from Goodnight Midstream. There's
	Page 8

1	Grant Adams, who is the chief executive officer; and
2	three Goodnight Midstream board members, Mr. Drew
3	Winston, with Tailwater Capital, Mr. Charles Marsh,
4	and Mr. Patrick Walker, also joining us today. Thank
5	you.
6	CHAIR CHANG: Thank you.
7	MR. SUAZO: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair. This
8	is Miguel Suazo, with Beatty & Wozniak, appearing
9	today on behalf of Pilot Water.
10	CHAIR CHANG: Thank you.
11	MR. MOANDER: Chris Moander on behalf of
12	OCD.
13	MR. BECK: Matt Beck on behalf of Rice
14	Operating Company and Permian Line Service, LLC.
15	CHAIR CHANG: Thank you very much.
16	I believe at this point, unless there's
17	any objections, I believe we're ready to proceed
18	according to order that's laid out in the prehearing
19	order. So please proceed.
20	MS. HARDY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
21	I will present the first part of our
22	discussion, and Mr. Wehmeyer will present the second
23	part. And we do have a PowerPoint presentation that
24	we are planning to share. And I will be brief here
25	because I know we don't have a lot of time.

1	But just by way of brief background, we
2	had many-week evidentiary hearing in this matter and
3	the Commission announced its decision in August,
4	suspending Goodnight's injection permits and denying
5	its permits for new wells.
6	The order was entered in September, and
7	then there were exchanges between Goodnight and the
8	Division and suggestions that the Commission's order
9	provided guidance. And it seemed unclear to
10	Goodnight that the permits had been actually
11	suspended. So Goodnight continues to disobey the
12	order and has done nothing to curtail its injection
13	at this point.
14	The suspension order clearly stated that
14 15	The suspension order clearly stated that the Commission suspends Goodnight's existing wells.
	_
15	the Commission suspends Goodnight's existing wells.
15 16	the Commission suspends Goodnight's existing wells. It's not ambiguous. That was done to afford Empire
15 16 17	the Commission suspends Goodnight's existing wells. It's not ambiguous. That was done to afford Empire the opportunity to commence its CO2 enhanced oil
15 16 17 18	the Commission suspends Goodnight's existing wells. It's not ambiguous. That was done to afford Empire the opportunity to commence its CO2 enhanced oil recovery project. But, again, Goodnight continues to
15 16 17 18	the Commission suspends Goodnight's existing wells. It's not ambiguous. That was done to afford Empire the opportunity to commence its CO2 enhanced oil recovery project. But, again, Goodnight continues to inject, despite the order.
15 16 17 18 19 20	the Commission suspends Goodnight's existing wells. It's not ambiguous. That was done to afford Empire the opportunity to commence its CO2 enhanced oil recovery project. But, again, Goodnight continues to inject, despite the order. The Commission's findings were numerous,
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the Commission suspends Goodnight's existing wells. It's not ambiguous. That was done to afford Empire the opportunity to commence its CO2 enhanced oil recovery project. But, again, Goodnight continues to inject, despite the order. The Commission's findings were numerous, as I'm sure you all remember. And one of them
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the Commission suspends Goodnight's existing wells. It's not ambiguous. That was done to afford Empire the opportunity to commence its CO2 enhanced oil recovery project. But, again, Goodnight continues to inject, despite the order. The Commission's findings were numerous, as I'm sure you all remember. And one of them involved the unit agreement. And it's shown here in

1 substances.

2.5

Additional findings of the order that are critical are listed here. The findings were made, again, to allow Empire the opportunity to commence its CO2 project, which it is not able to do while Goodnight is injecting.

And this is important. One finding which the Commission was that water is moving from the San Andres into the Grayburg. And that was found based on Dr. Buchwalter's model. That was noted in the suspension order, and that, itself, establishes waste and violation of correlative rights, because the Grayburg, of course, is included within the unitized interval for the Eunice Monument South Unit.

And that finding was substantiated by core saturations, which also showed vertical fractures in the San Andres and Grayburg, explaining why high water volumes were produced from the Grayburg prior to the waterflood. So we have presented conclusive evidence that water was migrating from the San Andres into the Grayburg.

So in summary, based on the extensive evidence present at the hearing, the Commission correctly denied Goodnight's application to drill new wells, suspended their existing wells and denied the

1	injection increase into the Dawson well. And despite
2	those findings and that order, Goodnight has
3	continued to inject.
4	And Goodnight has also attempted to
5	subvert the Commission's decision through proceedings
6	before the Division. For example, Goodnight recently
7	submitted a filing before the Division where it
8	essentially argued that it prevailed in this
9	proceeding, which is not what the order said that the
10	Commission issued.
11	Goodnight is contesting Empire's
12	standing before the Division to object to the Rocket
13	SWD extension, even though the Commission has already
14	ruled that Empire had standing to apply to revoke
15	that permit. And that application is pending before
16	the Commission.
17	So Goodnight has continued to use
18	processes to sort of to try to subvert the
19	Commission's decision and avoid stopping its
20	injection.
21	The Commission properly issued the
22	suspension order. Goodnight would have the
23	Commission sit by until the hydrocarbons are
24	destroyed and Empire has no option for recovering
25	them. But that argument directly contradicts the

1	Commission's obligation to prevent waste and correct
2	correlative rights under the Oil and Gas Act.
3	The standard for rehearing is high. It
4	requires a change in controlling law, new evidence
5	that was previously unavailable, despite due
6	diligence, or the need correct clear error to correct
7	manifest injustice.
8	None of these circumstances exist here.
9	Goodnight merely wants to take a second bite at the
10	apple and rehash its failed claims that it previously
11	made to the Commission. And importantly, a party may
12	not use a motion for rehearing to re-argue issues
13	already decided or to submit evidence that could have
14	been presented earlier. Otherwise, parties would be
15	able to re-litigate proceedings and there would be no
16	finality, if you could wait until the hearing was
17	over and then decided you should have presented
18	something else, which is exactly what Goodnight is
19	going here.
20	So the statutes on waste, I think we're
21	all familiar with them. The Division and Commission
22	have absolute plenary authority to take action to
23	prevent waste and protect correlative rights.
24	And part of that obligation involves the
25	prevention of encroachment of water that tends to

Τ	reduce the total ultimate recovery of crude petroleum
2	oil from any pool. So it's broad authority and the
3	Commission is obligated to prevent waste, protect
4	correlative rights.
5	And statute, which we've discussed
6	extensively in our briefing, refers to waste as any
7	activity that tends to reduce, which is important
8	language. Because Goodnight is construing it as
9	really actually reduce. And the actual reduction has
10	to be proven, and that is not what is required the by
11	the statute. So we've summarized the statutes in our
12	briefing and Goodnight is misinterpreting them.
13	And in addition, the Commission looked
14	at Statutory Unitization Act, which applies here, of
15	course, and gives Empire the exclusive right to
16	operate within its statutory unitized interval.
17	Goodnight and Rice, in their briefing,
18	incorrectly rely on the Division's provision on
19	injection, which states, it's Part 10 of Rule 26, the
20	Division may restrict the injected volume and
21	pressure for or shut in injection wells or projects
22	that have exhibited failure to confined fluids to the
23	authorized zone.
24	And they have argued that that means
25	that the Commission and Division can only act if

there is a failure of an injection well to confine fluid to the approved zone. And that's not correct under the law.

The duty to prevent waste and protect

correlative rights is an overarching obligation. And really what Goodnight and Rice are trying to do here is read "only" into that provision, the Division may only restrict. And that is not what it says. And according to their interpretation, that would mean that if a producing interval was erroneously included in an injection interval, the Commission and Division could do nothing unless the fluid had escaped the zone. So it's clearly not correct.

Goodnight's claim regarding a continuous barrier is raised in their briefing, and that's the reason that they posit several hundred pages of new exhibits. And they raised the continuous barrier theory throughout their testimony and exhibits, and we've discussed that in our brief. They posited that as a reason that they should be allowed to inject.

So for them to come back and claim now that the Commission erroneously applied a continuous barrier theory is not correct. And in any event, an applicant for injection must always establish a confining zone with upper and lower barriers. That

1 is always the case, and that is well established in 2 the regulations and even in the permits themselves. Goodnight, again, wants a second bite at 3 the apple. They've attached pages and pages of new 4 5 evidence. There's nothing new about the continuous barrier theory. It's a confinement determination 6 that they are required to make. 8 Their exhibits could have been presented 9 at the hearing. For example, they've included seismic data now, after the Commission asked 10 11 Goodnight's witness at hearing if they had seismic data and they said yes, but they could not provide it 12 due to licensing restrictions. Well, they've come 13 back now after they did not get the result they 14 15 wanted and are presenting seismic data in their 16 exhibits to their motion for rehearing. 17 So it's not appropriate to re-litigate these issues after the fact, based on hindsight, and 18 19 none of their new evidence should be considered. 20 They raised constitutional arguments. I'm not going to go into detail. I think they lack 21 22 merit. The injection permits, on their face, state that the Commission and Division retain jurisdiction 23 24 over them to prevent waste and protect correlative rights. 25 They're revocable permits, depending on

1 those parameters. 2 They raise arguments regarding surface ownership and alleged constitutional rights of 3 service owners, when Goodnight itself sought to 4 5 exclude any evidence of surface ownership at the 6 hearing. They objected to that evidence and their objection was sustained. So they can't come back now 8 and arque surface ownership should be considered. 9 They've waived that argument. 10 There's no basis to grant Goodnight the 11 do-over that it seeks. The Commission carefully 12 considered voluminous evidence, and Goodnight's 13 litigation choices do not amount to a basis for 14 rehearing. 15 Rice and OCD submitted responses to the 16 rehearing motions that, specifically with respect to 17 Rice, really constitute a joinder in Goodnight's 18 motion, which isn't a proper response because Empire 19 didn't get a chance to respond to it. instead of filing their own motion for rehearing, 20 21 they submitted arguments in response. 22 And with respect to OCD, OCD had 23 withdrawn from the case, as you know, before the 24 hearing, and is not adversely affected by the order. 2.5 OCD does raise issues regarding

1	enforcement proceedings and how they typically handle
2	them, but this is not an enforcement proceeding. The
3	Commission has already heard and the parties have
4	litigated the validity or invalidity of Goodnight's
5	permits. So the issues regarding the handling of
6	enforcement proceedings are not relevant and they
7	don't apply to this situation. It's a different
8	situation here, where we've had a many-week hearing.
9	Empire has submitted a limited request
10	for rehearing, demonstrating that the permits should
11	be suspended permanently. We have presented evidence
12	of violation of correlative rights and waste.
13	And Goodnight fails to meet its burden
14	for a stay. The Tenneco factors are discussed in our
15	briefing. None of them are met here. They are not
16	met. There's no likelihood that Goodnight will
17	prevail on appeal. There's no irreparable harm.
18	To Goodnight, substantial harm will
19	result to others if a stay is granted. So a stay is
20	inappropriate.
21	Again, we've talked about these issues
22	in our briefing. And clearly, based on the evidence
23	that's been presented extensively and the Commission
24	carefully balanced, the order is correct and the
25	suspension must be enforced.

1	And then I will turn it over to
2	Mr. Wehmeyer.
3	MR. WEHMEYER: Thank you very much.
4	We spent five weeks presenting witnesses
5	in this case. You may recall that despite
6	Goodnight's appearance today, not one single good
7	night witness actually bothered to come here in
8	person. And we also didn't see anybody attend four
9	and a half, five weeks of testimony and official
LO	proceedings from Goodnight during the course of the
L1	case.
L2	History is watching what we're doing
L3	right now. During those four and a half weeks, we
L4	spent a lot of time reading transcripts from
L5	testimony before the Division and Commission from
L6	over 40 years ago. Empire is here asking that the
L7	commission's final suspension order be enforced,
L8	exactly as it's written be forced.
L9	If that suspension order is enforced,
20	this can be a wonderful success case for the State of
21	New Mexico. You have Empire who is here ready,
22	willing and able to execute this ROZ development in
23	the San Andres and, for that matter, also in the
24	Grayburg. And it also intends, for the benefit of
25	the State of New Mexico's minerals and the United

1	States' minerals to continue its waterflood
2	operations in the Grayburg.
3	If the permits are not suspended
4	precisely as the final order of the Commission says
5	they are suspended, and if they continue injecting,
6	this is destined to be a failure. There's no two
7	ways about it. There's no halfway about it. It will
8	be a failure.
9	I want the Commission to remember that
LO	they went into this knowing that the EMSU unitization
L1	order was in effect. They testified that they knew
L2	about it and they proceeded anyway. They continued
L3	to inject in violation of the suspension order.
L4	Empire is merely asking that the
L5	suspension order be enforced, that the permits be
L6	suspended exactly as the Commission ordered they are.
L7	In all of the paper that you've seen
L8	over the last two weeks, neither OCD nor Goodnight
L9	has pointed this Commission to one single instance in
20	the history of time in which a permit was suspended,
21	that is suspended, but injection continued. And
22	we've looked for such a situation and we haven't
23	found one.
24	Additionally, we heard after witness
25	after witness after witness, there are 77 million

1	acres in New Mexico. We're concerned about the
2	injection within 14,000 acres out of those 77 million
3	acres. Tell us where in the history of time in
4	New Mexico a saltwater disposal trash company
5	operator has injected into a unit that, per its
6	expressed terms, gave exclusivity to Empire.
7	Never in the history of time could any
8	Goodnight representative or expert point to a single
9	place on the face of the planet Earth that has ever
10	allowed injection into a unitized interval except for
11	what they're doing here.
12	They told you, despite them coming in
13	here and doing the injection, that they didn't
14	perceive this as being their charge to provide any
15	kind of a science case or an engineering case for
16	what they were actually doing. Their expert
17	witnesses told you all that they perceived their
18	charge as merely throwing rocks and picking at and
19	trying to destroy the science and engineering case
20	that Empire went to the laborious effort to properly
21	develop and bring here.
22	There's discussion about they want
23	curtailment. They want the injection volumes to not
24	stop, exactly as occurs with a suspended permit.
25	They want the volumes to somehow be curtailed on a

1	going-forward basis. After five weeks of testimony
2	and deliberations and argument, the Commission did
3	not order that suspension should be curtailed over
4	some period of time. The Commission ordered that it
5	should be suspended.
6	This is consistent with the pattern of
7	Goodnight from the very jump of this case, which is
8	delay. Because they know that every single day that
9	they thumb their nose at the rights granted in the
LO	1984 unitization order and every single day that goes
L1	by that they thumb their nose at this Commission's
L2	final order ordering suspension of those permits, is
L3	money that they get to put into their pocket and send
L4	back to Dallas, Texas, and Fort Worth, Texas.
L5	Delay equals money, and it has been the
L6	objective of Goodnight from the start to delay this
L7	inevitable outcome as long as they possibly can.
L8	Enough is enough. It needs to stop now.
L9	The Commission's order should have been
20	observed months ago, in August, when it was
21	announced. It should have been observed in September
22	when it came out in writing and was signed
23	unanimously and executed by the Commission. It
24	certainly should stop as we come here today.
25	Why is that so important? You've heard
	Page 22

1	testimony straight from Empire's witnesses about how
2	once the harm is done, it can't be undone. This
3	comes from concepts such as raising the pressure. No
4	doubt the pressure here is being raised in the
5	San Andres through the continued injection. Comes
6	from water incompatibility. This is makeup water
7	that's used in the Grayburg. This is higher
8	operating costs. This is the actual formation being
9	cemented up by the incompatible water.
10	You also heard straight from their
11	expert, Mr. McBeath, he was asked: Will any company,
12	investor, as part of an EOR in the San Andres touch
13	the EMSU while Goodnight continues to inject tens of
14	thousands of barrels of wastewater every single day?
15	And you heard straight from Mr. McBeath
16	that there is nobody on the planet who is going to
17	touch the San Andres ROZ EMSU development, be it
18	pilot project or commercial development, unless and
19	until the injection is stopped.
20	Why are we asking that the Commission
21	step in here and enforce the order? Well, consistent
22	with the Goodnight tactic of delay to the ends of
23	padding its wallet, Goodnight's already reached out
24	to the Commission with a vastly different
25	interpretation of what a suspended permit means as to

1	these four wells. This is in the evidence that has
2	been appended in the recent filings: Goodnight would
3	like to schedule a meeting with the Division
4	regarding the Commission's guidance for implementing
5	the order, when, how, and over what period of time
6	Goodnight will be required to shut in its disposal
7	wells.
8	This Commission did not order
9	curtailment. It did not order that the permits would
LO	be suspended at someday in the future. The
L1	Commission ordered suspension of the permits, full
L2	stop, period, now.
L3	Nowhere will you find, other than
L4	conclusory allegations, any kind of a safety concern
L5	that comes out of stopping the injection. If you
L6	wanted to believe Goodnight, these wells operate on a
L7	vast vacuum, they just suck the water down with no
L8	equipment necessary to even pump it down, that it's
L9	on a vacuum.
20	Nowhere in these papers will you find
21	any kind of a safety issue if they just stop putting
22	the waste into the exclusive depths that Empire, per
23	the 1984 order, has the right to operate and develop
24	with them.
25	The OCD's response was that it cannot

1	and will not make any guarantees or assurances as to
2	how it will ultimately decide to implement the order,
3	including timing and nature of actions OCD may
4	require of either Goodnight or Empire.
5	We cannot get going on our pilot program
6	that the Commission has allowed three years to
7	implement and execute unless and until the injection
8	starts. We agree with Mr. McBeath on that, their
9	expert, Mr. McBeath. We completely agree. It has to
10	stop before we can commence the pilot program that
11	the Commission has allowed.
12	OCD has said it cannot and will not make
13	guarantees on any of that time. We didn't want to
14	come here on the motion to enforce. It's shocking to
15	me that this motion to enforce was necessary.
16	On behalf of the Empire and on behalf of
17	the State of New Mexico's minerals and the United
18	States' minerals, we beg the Commission that we leave
19	here today with certainty that the waste injection,
20	that the harm that's occurring stops today so that
21	Empire can proceed precisely consistent with the
22	property rights that it purchased and that have been
23	established since 1984.
24	There's been no drastic departure.
25	Again, this is the only place on the planet Earth in

1	which anybody has identified a disposal company
2	injecting into a unitized interval in violation of
3	Empire's rights.
4	I'm at my time. If there's any
5	questions, we're very happy to field those. The
6	presentation goes in there's probably three inches
7	of filings you all have gotten. The presentation was
8	our effort to bring it down to 82 slides of points
9	that might be a little easier to digest and less
10	paper.
11	I very much appreciate the Commission's
12	opportunity. I thank the Commission on behalf of
13	Empire for all of its time, the last four and a half
14	weeks and certainly the time today to present these
15	arguments.
16	CHAIR CHANG: Thank you. Feels like we have
17	close to 3 feet of filings, but fair enough.
18	Commissioners, any questions?
19	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Is it possible to
20	listen to other parties and then probably okay.
21	Thank you.
22	CHAIR CHANG: Would you like to also reserve
23	your questions?
24	COMMISSIONER BLOOM: Yeah. I'm fine with
25	that, as well.
- 1	

1	CHAIR CHANG: I do have a couple of
2	questions. It didn't hear much argument about your
3	own motion for a rehearing. You are also seeking for
4	a motion for rehearing.
5	MR. WEHMEYER: It's very narrow. So in
6	contrast to the arguments we've seen over here that
7	accuse the Commission, after all this work, of
8	arbitrary conduct, capricious conduct, and it having
9	no jurisdiction, apparently we spent four and a half
10	weeks and you all didn't have any jurisdiction and
11	this was no use when we got the final.
12	All we are asking for is that in light
13	of the correct legal standards, which we've cited,
14	that just some minor cleaning up in terms of the
15	verbiage in the order. They've said they're going to
16	challenge which way on appeal that they can. We
17	think there's some places that the verbiage could be
18	altered.
19	Additionally, to just address the
20	appellate points, that they say that this Commission,
21	without jurisdiction, have already committed, and
22	then, again, we would maintain our frontline position
23	that with this valuable ROZ everyone agrees it's a
24	ROZ, even their witnesses, that with this valuable
25	ROZ, the permit should just be straight revoked. And

1	in the alternative to revoking, we would ask that the
2	language be cleaned up and against the suspension.
3	We will be back in three years, or
4	earlier, to show this Commission what an outstanding
5	decision it made after four and a half weeks of
6	testimony.
7	CHAIR CHANG: Let me ask a specific question
8	about the Derek versus Standard Nutrition Co. case
9	that you've cited on Page 10 of your packet here.
10	I presume that same standard for
11	rehearing applies to all parties before me. So what
12	new evidence that could not have been presented
13	earlier is Empire proffering to support its motion
14	for rehearing?
15	MR. WEHMEYER: We have no new evidence. So
16	if the standard here is new evidence that wasn't
17	available at the time of hearing, we certainly agree
18	we're not bringing any new evidence. We had four and
19	a half weeks. The Commission was so patient with us.
20	We are not suggesting that any new evidence is
21	appropriate.
22	CHAIR CHANG: That's all the questions I
23	have at this time.
24	Commission counsel, do you have any
25	questions at this time?

1	MR. SHANDLER: No.
2	CHAIR CHANG: All right. In that case, I
3	invite Goodnight for the presentation.
4	MR. RANKIN: Commissioners, Chair Chang,
5	Commissioner Ampomah, Commissioner Lamkin, good
6	afternoon. May it please the Commission.
7	Goodnight respectfully filed its
8	application for hearing to correct several critical
9	errors that were included in the order. To avoid
10	error and entry of an order that's arbitrary,
11	capricious, and not in accordance with the law, we
12	respectfully ask the Commission to grant Goodnight's
13	application and issue in amended order that
14	incorporates the legal and factual corrections that
15	we've outlined in our application.
16	Specifically, we ask that an amended
17	order be issued that approves Goodnight's
18	applications, withdraws the suspension of Goodnight's
19	existing injection operations, and removes the
20	San Andres from the EMSU unitized interval.
21	First, based on the findings in the
22	order, the Commission lacked authority to order the
23	relief Empire requested and properly refuse to revoke
24	Goodnight's injection permits. But the very same
25	findings that were insufficient to revoke Goodnight's

1	injection permits, also were insufficient to grant
2	the partial relief Empire did not even request:
3	Temporary suspension of Goodnight's injection.
4	Second, in granting partial relief, the
5	Commission failed to apply its own regulations that
6	control under what circumstances the Commission or
7	Division even has discretion to curtail, shut in or
8	suspend injection operations. Instead, it applied a
9	new, more stringent, continuous barrier standard that
10	is being invoked for the first time against
11	Goodnight, and only Goodnight, and has not been
12	applied against any other injection operations in the
13	state, including those EOR operations within the EMSU
14	itself.
15	Third, compounding that error, the
16	Commission improperly shifted and applied the burden
17	of proof to Goodnight, when the burden should have
18	been on Empire, as applicants seeking to shut in
19	Goodnight's injection.
20	And finally, the Commission's key
21	findings on two issues, that both Goodnight and
22	Empire agreed are dispositive in these cases,
23	including all the cases that are currently pending
24	before the Commission and stayed, actually support
25	denial of Empire's claims and requested relief.

1	Those dispositive findings are that the
2	purported ROZ is not recoverable, and that there is
3	no finding that it is even capable of producing in
4	paying quantities.
5	And I'll just point out that we
6	strenuously disagree that there is an ROZ down in
7	Goodnight's disposal zone, and that Goodnight's
8	injection is not impairing Empire's operations in the
9	EMSU.
10	Empire agreed in its briefing on the
11	scope of this hearing, that those two issues would be
12	dispositive of all the cases against Goodnight. And
13	the Commission has now found in Goodnight's favor on
14	those two key issues.
15	There are at least four broad,
16	overarching reasons that Goodnight's requested
17	rehearing and modification order is warranted. I'll
18	walk through each point that are outlined in detail
19	in our papers and that support our requested relief
20	here, in whole or in part.
21	First, the Commission's order goes
22	beyond its authority, because it didn't find there
23	was impairment and it didn't find hydrocarbons
24	capable of being produced in paying quantities.
25	Second, Empire failed to carry its
	Page 31

1	evidentiary burden, and the Commission applied the
2	incorrect legal standard.
3	Third, the Commission's findings
4	actually support Goodnight's position and continued
5	injection.
6	And fourth, if the Commission maintains
7	its continuous barrier standard, Goodnight should be
8	given the opportunity to present evidence addressing
9	this new standard that was announced only after the
LO	hearing.
L1	Finally, if the Commission nevertheless
L2	disagrees with Goodnight and declines to grant the
L3	requested relief or the alternative relief proposed,
L4	Goodnight asks for this alternative relief.
L5	First, to amend the order to clarify
L6	that suspension of injection is delayed until Empire
L7	actually commences CO2 flood operations that actually
L8	targets Goodnight's disposal zone, and not some
L9	shallower target. Or, provide that Goodnight's
20	suspension is to be implemented over time, as Empire
21	meets its demonstrable milestones necessary to
22	implement a CO2, that they're so certain to do.
23	I'll talk through each point and go
24	through the requested relief. First, the Commission
25	acted beyond its authority. It did so in at least a

1	couple of ways. First, most glaringly, the
2	Commission erroneously reaffirmed the error that it
3	made back in 1984, when it confirmed that there are
4	no recoverable hydrocarbons in the San Andres, but
5	nevertheless allows the San Andres to remain within
6	the EMSU's unitized interval. Thereby, authorizing
7	the unitization of an aquifer, which belongs
8	exclusively to the public in contravention of the
9	State's Constitution.
10	And the order also violates the
11	Statutory Unitization Act, because it confirms in the
12	order that there are no recoverable hydrocarbons in
13	the San Andres, which has never produced any
14	hydrocarbons through primary production, and finds
15	that the San Andres was included in the EMSU solely
16	because it was a water supply source. There's simply
17	no legal or factual basis for the San Andres to be
18	included within the unitized interval.
19	Having found that there are no
20	recoverable hydrocarbons in Goodnight's disposal zone
21	and that Goodnight's injection is not impairing
22	Empire's operations in the EMSU, findings that there
23	is no waste and no impairment of correlative rights,
24	the Commission lacks authority and discretion under

its own regulations and statute to shut in

25

1 Goodnight's injection. There's just no valid legal 2 justification for it. 3 The order only found that there's a potential for future impairment of waste, but that 4 5 finding is premised on an invalid evidentiary standard, and we believe also incorrect, 6 unsubstantiated facts. 8 Second, Empire failed to carry its evidentiary burden that there is waste and 9 impairment. But the Commission also applied the 10 11 wrong standard and improperly shifted the burden to 12 Goodnight. As part of its burden to prove waste and 13 impairment, Empire had to show that the purported ROZ is capable of producing in paying quantities. 14 15 Without that foundational showing, there can be no 16 waste and no impairment of correlative rights because 17 there's no recoverable oil and gas to waste and no 18 share of production to protect. 19 But Empire did not make that showing. It couldn't prove that the hydrocarbons in the ROZ 20 are even recoverable, let alone that they can be 21 22 produced in paying quantities. Empire has, 23 therefore, been unable to show impairment of 24 correlative rights in either the Grayburg or the San Andres. 2.5

1	As to the Grayburg, Empire was unable to
2	show any volumes in the Grayburg that are not being
3	recovered due to Goodnight's injection, or that there
4	has even been a reduction in production from the
5	Grayburg at all. In the San Andres, Empire was
6	unable to show that the alleged ROZ can be
7	practicably produced from the Grayburg or the
8	San Andres, or that it could even be recovered at
9	all.
10	In fact, Empire did not present a single
11	witness who analyzed ROZ recoverability based on
12	actual data from the EMSU, so there's not even an
13	evidentiary basis in the record from which to draw up
14	the necessary conclusion.
15	For a reservoir to be within the
16	jurisdiction and authority of the Commission to
17	protect, it needs two things. One, to find that
18	there are hydrocarbons capable of producing; and that
19	they are capable of being produced in paying
20	quantities.
21	Having found that Empire could not prove
22	and did not prove that the ROZ was even recoverable,
23	especially not in Goodnight's disposal zone, the
24	Commission did not even need to reach the decision
25	about whether the ROZ is capable of producing in

paying quantities. But in any event, Empire did not
make out even a basic economic case because it failed
to use any of the EMSU data or analyses relied on by
any of its experts in its made-up economic model that
was instead based entirely on assumptions unsupported
by actual EMSU data.

2.5

The Commission, therefore, properly found that Empire did not prove recoverability by preponderance of the evidence and, therefore, did not need to reach the question of whether the ROZ could even produce in paying quantities. Empire's ROZ claim died before proof on the paying quantities element was even necessary to assess. Because without proof of recoverable ROZ, there is no waste and there is no impairment of correlative rights.

Now, Empire also failed to carry its burden to show Goodnight's wells have exhibited failure to confine injected fluids within the disposal zone. That's under the regulations. That standard comes directly out of the Commission's own regulations that govern and define under what circumstances the Commission has direct discretion to curtail, shut in or suspend injection. Without proof of actual failure to confine injection fluids, the Commission is without authority to curtail, shut in

or suspend Goodnight's injection.

2.5

The instance where Ms. Hardy referenced where if there was some error in the inclusion of an improper zone, that's not the case here. There's no question that the injection fluids are going into the authorized injection zone. The question is whether or not those injection fluids are being confined.

As the applicant to shut in Goodnight's injection, the burden to prove failure to confine was solely good Empire's, and they failed to make that showing. And nowhere in the order does the Commission make the necessary finding that there was lack of confinement. Instead, the Commission improperly flipped the burden and mistakenly determined that Goodnight failed to refute potential future waste and impairment, because it did not prove the existence of a single continuous barrier.

But that's a new made-up standard that conflicts with governing regulations, with the agency's federal UIC primacy authority, and improperly shifted the burden from Empire to Goodnight. That standard, to my knowledge, has never been applied before, nor has it been applied to existing waterflood injection operations within the EMSU or anywhere else in the state. That is the

1	definition of arbitrary, capricious and not in
2	accordance with the law.
3	Moreover, the continuous barrier
4	standard creates a new precedent that will have
5	far-reaching negative consequences on the Division's
6	UIC program, including existing and future disposal
7	operations, as well as enhanced oil recovery
8	injection, risking the stability and reliability of
9	the State's injection program and its ability to
10	manage, produce water disposal, and EOR projects
11	going forward. That raises substantial concerns of
12	great public interest.
13	Now, while the Commission did not find
14	Goodnight's wells exhibited a failure to contain
15	
	injection fluids, a critical finding that they didn't
16	injection fluids, a critical finding that they didn't make, it actually found the opposite, that there is
16 17	
	make, it actually found the opposite, that there is
17	make, it actually found the opposite, that there is no communication between Goodnight's disposal zone
17 18	make, it actually found the opposite, that there is no communication between Goodnight's disposal zone and the Grayburg.
17 18 19	make, it actually found the opposite, that there is no communication between Goodnight's disposal zone and the Grayburg. Now, the citation that the counsel for
17 18 19 20	make, it actually found the opposite, that there is no communication between Goodnight's disposal zone and the Grayburg. Now, the citation that the counsel for Empire referenced, Paragraph 47 of the Commission's
17 18 19 20 21	make, it actually found the opposite, that there is no communication between Goodnight's disposal zone and the Grayburg. Now, the citation that the counsel for Empire referenced, Paragraph 47 of the Commission's order, is referencing the potential for future

San Andres. The finding regarding Dr. Buchwalter's

25

1	analysis is that it could potentially lead to
2	communication between the San Andres and the Grayburg
3	and the San Andres, as the Commission ordered
4	subsequently identifies that there has been no
5	communication to date and no impairment.
6	So, based on what it actually found,
7	what the Commission should have determined, based on
8	the findings it made in a correct application of the
9	law, is that because the Empire did not prove failure
10	to confine injection fluids, the evidentiary burden
11	never shifted to Goodnight. There is nothing for
12	Goodnight to refute.
13	Now, the third reason Goodnight's
14	application for rehearing should be granted is that
15	the Commission's findings that are substantiated by
16	the evidence support Goodnight, not Empire.
17	Real quick. The Commission found that
18	ROZ recoverability and paying quantities have not
19	been proven. Without those findings, there is no
20	waste and no impairment of correlative rights.
21	The Commission found that correlative
22	rights are not currently being impaired, based on
23	Goodnight's compelling engineering, injection and
24	pressure data.
25	And the Commission also made no finding

1	that Empire approved Goodnight's wells have exhibited
2	a failure to confine the injected fluids. That
3	Empire was unable to prove lack of confinement after
4	more than six decades of continuous injection into
5	the San Andres in and around the EMSU is substantial
6	evidence that injection is and will be and continue
7	to be confined to the disposal zone.
8	Now, if the Commission rejects
9	Goodnight's arguments and maintains its new
10	continuous barrier standard, Goodnight should be
11	afforded the opportunity to present evidence at a
12	limited, narrow rehearing addressing this new
13	standard.
14	Up to and through the hearing, Goodnight
15	believed and understood reasonably that the
16	applicable standard required to show only that the
17	injection was being confined to the injection
18	interval, which was done. It relied on its
19	engineering and injection data for that reason, which
20	the Commission found to be the most compelling
21	evidence of no communication.
22	Now, if Goodnight had known that it was
23	required to actually prove the existence of a
24	continuous barrier, then it would have presented at
25	the hearing additional evidence and analysis of its

1 3D seismic data. 2 Now, it's in our application for a hearing. We did include an initial analysis of its 3 3D seismic data that ties the geophysical analysis to 4 5 well logs and confirms the existence of a laterally 6 extensive confining strata 60 to 200 feet thick, demonstrating that Goodnight's injection is and will 8 remain confined. Now, if the Commission maintains this 9 continuous barrier standard, Goodnight should be 10 11 given the chance to present a full analysis on this 12 data and a subsurface model, to avoid prejudice. 13 Now, in the event the Commission refuses to grant in whole or in part Goodnight's requested 14 15 relief to rescind the order temporarily suspending 16 its injection and grant Goodnight's pending 17 application, Goodnight requests that the order be 18 amended to provide the requested alternative relief. 19 First, because the evidence Why? 20 supports it; and second, because Goodnight has 21 invested millions of dollars on its four wells at issue in this case that support actively and 22 23 currently more than 30,000 barrels of existing oil 24 production per day, and it has invested more than 2.5 \$300 million in its Llano pipeline system and

1	associated injection infrastructure.
2	In contrast, Empire has taken no steps,
3	invested no capital necessary to begin recovery of
4	its purported ROZ, let alone demonstrate that it's
5	recoverable.
6	Given the status and the Commission's
7	finding, why should Goodnight be forced to
8	immediately shed in its wells? It shouldn't.
9	Given that the ROZ contains, by
10	definition, only oil that cannot be mobilized by
11	water, continued disposal of produced water until
12	Empire might be approved for a CO2 EOR project will
13	not affect the ROZ. There's no evidence it will be
14	impacted.
15	Even if the Commission refuses
16	Goodnight's alternative rather, even if the
17	Commission refuses Goodnight's rehearing request, we
18	should nevertheless amend the order to clarify that
19	Goodnight's injection can continue until Empire
20	actually begins a CO2 flood that actually targets
21	Goodnight's disposal interval and not some shallower
22	zone.
23	Doing so would require Empire to obtain
24	all the necessary regulatory permits for EOR
25	injection, implement the necessary capital

1	expenditures and facility modifications, procure the
2	necessary CO2 for injection and rights of way, and
3	demonstrate that it's prepared to immediately
4	commence CO2 flood operations.
5	This alternative relief aligns with the
6	Commission's finding in the order that disposal
7	cannot coincide with the proposed CO2 flood operations
8	in the same interval. That's the key. It has to be
9	the same interval.
10	If the Commission determines that
11	Goodnight's injection should nevertheless be
12	curtailed or suspended in advance of CO2 flood, then
13	injection should be curtailed in an orderly schedule
14	tied to Empire's demonstration of concrete milestones
15	towards its EOR project. If any of those milestones
16	are missed, we believe that Goodnight's injection
17	should be allowed and then resumes and the injection
18	suspension lifted and Empire's project terminated.
19	So requiring Empire to meet these
20	milestones is justified and necessary, where its
21	viability as a going concern is uncertain and has
22	been for years.
23	Finally, should the Commission refuse
24	Goodnight's application for rehearing and reject its
25	proposed alternative relief, the Commission should

1	enter a partial stay of the order, staying suspension
2	of Goodnight's injection until final resolution of an
3	appeal. Failure to do so will have substantial
4	adverse effects on Goodnight, offsetting production
5	operations and third-party disposal operators, as
6	well as the state and public interest more generally.
7	We've outlined those arguments in
8	support in our papers, including the self-affirmed
9	statement of Goodnight's chief executive, Mr. Grant
LO	Adams, and we believe the motion more than meets the
L1	requirements to issue a stay.
L2	But I'll make just two points in
L3	response to Empire's opposition. First, Empire seems
L4	to believe that Goodnight's arguing it has a vested
L5	property interest in its injection permits. That's
L6	not the case. Goodnight has a vested property
L7	interest in the San Anders pore space through its
L8	leasehold, the State. And the Commission's order,
L9	without a finding of recoverable hydrocarbons and
20	current impairment, completely wipes out Goodnight's
21	property interest in that pore space without a proper
22	purpose. That is a regulatory taking.
23	Second, Empire complains that Goodnight
24	seeks an asymmetrical stay, staying only the
25	provisions applicable to Goodnight and not the

1	three-year time frame to implement the EOR project.
2	Empire elected not to challenge that
3	three-year timeline to conduct the EOR, so there's no
4	basis to stay that aspect of the order.
5	In conclusion, you have been more than
6	attentive throughout these proceedings, briefing and
7	arguments presented by the parties, and we appreciate
8	your careful consideration.
9	The decision in this case, and getting
LO	it right based on the facts and the law, is important
L1	to Goodnight. It's also critical to the State of
L2	New Mexico, offsetting operators and third-party
L3	disposal operators.
L 4	But it's also of utmost importance to
L5	ensure a stable and reliable permitting program under
L6	the Class 2 UIC, including enhanced oil recovery.
L7	Before I conclude, a couple points just
L8	to make a response to some of the comments that
L9	Empire made in their statements.
20	The evidence of the fractures, this is
21	in our papers, that were presented to the Commission
22	that alleged to be the pathway for communication do
23	not reach the confining zone that Goodnight is
24	identifying. They're more than 90 feet short.
25	There's no direct evidence and no indirect evidence

of any fractures that would allow for communication between the two zones.

The reason Goodnight objected to the introduction of its leases and arguments around leases at the hearing was because Empire was seeking to introduce that evidence to show alleged trespass outside of its authorized boundary. So we objected for a different reason, not because we objected on the introduction of the surface lease agreements. They were presented to the Commission previously already. They're of record. We just objected for their testimony alleging that there was a trespass.

unable to identify any other, in the history of the world, saltwater disposal well, anywhere on the face of the earth throughout history that failed to inject -- that authorized ejection within another unit, that's not true. The testimony actually identified at least one other in the North Monument Unit here in New Mexico. There are more than one instance where the Division or Commission has authorized a saltwater disposal well in a unit. And often it's a similar situation as this one, where it's injecting into the San Andres. Because the San Andres is nonproductive, and it was erroneously

1	included in the unit, and it shouldn't have been.
2	Okay? It's not been a hydrocarbon-producing zone.
3	And that's the reason it's different.
4	It's not that the saltwater came to the disposal,
5	came to the unit. The unit came to the pre-existing
6	saltwater disposal.
7	As to the unit itself, again, the unit
8	erroneously included the San Andres, and it shouldn't
9	have.
10	We appreciate your attention. On behalf
11	of Goodnight Midstream and the board, I'm grateful
12	for your attention and careful consideration in this
13	very important matter. Thank you.
14	CHAIR CHANG: Any questions from
15	commissioners at this point?
16	MS. APODACA: I'll reserve my questions.
17	COMMISSIONER BLOOM: Not at this point.
18	CHAIR CHANG: Commission counsel?
19	MR. SHANDLER: No.
20	CHAIR CHANG: Thank you. I don't have any
21	questions for you at this point.
22	We will proceed, then, to OCD.
23	MR. MOANDER: Good afternoon, Commissioners,
24	Chairman Chang. Just a point of clarification on the
25	order. I have not heard any party reserve any

1	remaining time left and just want to clarify that
2	will not be available in the future? Is that
3	correct, Chair Chang?
4	CHAIR CHANG: That is correct.
5	MR. MOANDER: Okay. Thank you.
6	I'm going to do this in slightly reverse
7	order than I had intended. I'll discuss OCD's motion
8	as the secondary aspect of things. But first off,
9	I'm going to address the targeted criticisms towards
10	OCD made by Empire initially to clear that up.
11	The first argument that was made by
12	Empire towards OCD and their role in forcing the
13	subject order at issue here is that OCD was not
14	adversely affected. And that's just pure basura.
15	That is not true.
16	OCD had obligations imposed upon it,
17	additional duties, et cetera, from the Commission.
18	So it has, in fact, actually been adversely affected
19	and it's certainly I'll get to the issue of duties
20	and obligations that OCD now has placed upon it by
21	the Commission.
22	The second argument made was that this
23	is not an enforcement proceeding. That's abundantly
24	clear. And at no point did OCD claim it ever was.
25	That's a red herring argument. The reason why that

1	was brought up was only because OCD's primary
2	experience, which was provided through an affidavit
3	and resume, Deputy Director Brandon Powell outlined
4	that enforcement proceedings are the context in which
5	OCD is most familiar with suspension of permits and
6	the process that tends to follow from them. And that
7	is why it's made the proposals that it did, that I'll
8	address here in a minute.
9	Therefore, OCD would contend that its
10	experiences are highly relevant and should inform the
11	Commission about how it handles these suspensions.
12	At this point, this appears that Empire
13	is being coy and disingenuous about matters. I mean,
14	there was a whole bunch of flattery made to the State
15	and the Commission in oral argument.
16	OCD's suspicion here because Empire
17	didn't actually touch OCD's proposal for their plan,
18	not at all. And why would that be? Well, during the
19	course of testimony in the hearing, it did, in fact,
20	come out that Empire has financial problems. And if
21	an EOR project is permitted to proceed, which this
22	Commission has, in fact, ordered, there are no
23	guardrails on how that project should proceed. No
24	discussion of filing deadlines, no discussions of
25	proofs provided to OCD that progress is, in fact,

1	actually being made. Because at the end of the day,
2	this is a veiled effort to park this area, park this
3	particular project and hold on for three years
4	without actually having to demonstrate anything until
5	that three-year deadline expires. So this is why OCD
6	is involved and seeks the clarity that I'll address
7	momentarily.
8	OCD has a duty to ensure it complies
9	with this order, and it requires clarity as to, for
10	example, shutting down injection wells, which entails
11	issues like safety and also prevention of additional
12	waste. And there are environmental considerations
13	that also come into play. And it would appear that
14	that's just not a concern of Empire whatsoever here.
15	So having put to rest the criticisms
16	that were made of OCD, I'm going to go ahead and turn
17	to our proposing. OCD had some difficulty in
18	deciding whether a rehearing was actually, in and of
19	itself, the correct vector to take to address its
20	concerns, but ultimately chose to respond to both the
21	application and motions for rehearing.
22	What OCD has proposed here, and this can
23	be found on Exhibit A, Page 5, Paragraph 10, is
24	conventionally, when OCD suspends a permit, it does
25	allow benchmark like sub-deadlines under a major

1	deadline of 90 days for winding up operations. This
2	is largely done to ensure that the wind-down is done
3	properly, safely and thoroughly.
4	This can be done a number of ways, which
5	is why I think perhaps some additional testimony
6	might be useful for the Commission as to how that
7	proceeds in more excruciating detail. But
8	ultimately, in no event should it takes longer than
9	90 days to do a shutdown. And from OCD's
10	perspective, that's reasonable, safe and appropriate,
11	because it does prevent potential waste, almost above
12	anything else.
13	There also is a lingering question here
14	in OCD's mind whether or not this suspension is
15	effective immediately, and if so, would seek that 90
16	days in order to allow Goodnight to properly wind
17	down everything and shut in the wells to OCD's
18	satisfaction.
19	Alternatively, if the suspension were to
20	be contingent, although the order doesn't seem to
21	reflect that, I do think it's worth mentioning,
22	contingent on Empire starting, initiating, otherwise
23	advancing its EOR project, that would be a very
24	different scenario and OCD would want some additional
25	guidance on that point.

1	Now, turning to Empire, the order only
2	provides a three-year deadline and nothing more as to
3	how Empire is to proceed with its EOR project.
4	Deputy Director Powell's recommendations are found on
5	Page 7, the enumerated paragraphs of OCD's response.
б	These are a bit more specific, primarily because OCD
7	has handled other pilot projects in the past. That's
8	something that Deputy Director Powell is pretty
9	experienced in. And this sets out some deadlines as
10	to performance by Empire to complete that project.
11	But just as importantly, there's a
12	question of if deadlines are missed, whether or not
13	OCD may be able to construe a failure on Empire at
14	any given point in time as a failure of the project,
15	at which point that would need to be addressed again
16	with the OCC, because the suspensions are contingent
17	on the EOR project. If the EOR project fails, that
18	brings into question the status of the suspension of
19	Goodnight's permits, which will need further
20	clarification.
21	The additional factor in this is that
22	recoverability, as OCD reads the order, is not
23	guaranteed. It has not been proven. That brings
24	into question the potential success of this project.
25	While that may be the intention of the project,

1	that's still a concern for OCD, thus OCD believes
2	that the EOR project that Empire now has the right to
3	proceed with needs additional guardrails, deadlines,
4	clarifications.
5	And so with that, I will pass the
6	microphone back to the Commission.
7	CHAIR CHANG: Thank you.
8	Commissioners, any questions at this
9	point for OCD counsel.
10	MS. APODACA: I'll reserve and then come
11	back. Thank you.
12	CHAIR CHANG: At this point, counsel?
13	MR. SHANDLER: No.
14	CHAIR CHANG: Great. Thank you.
15	I don't have any questions either.
16	We'll proceed to statements from Rice, please.
17	MR. BECK: Commission, Chairman Chang, thank
18	you. Thank you all for your attention. Thank you
19	for bringing us back again. It's wonderful to see
20	you all again. Hopefully this won't be the last
21	time.
22	You know, there's been a lot of
23	criticisms of the Commission's order, and no one has
24	ever accused me of writing ten words when five words
25	was suffice let me say that again. No one has

1 ever accused me of writing five words when ten words 2 were suffice. And so sometimes that happens. I think that the Commission's order is 3 clear in context. And I may be not joined by a lot 4 5 of folks in that opinion. But it seems to me, particularly when you read the headings, that the 6 Commission reached the finding that it is possible 8 that there is a ROZ down in the San Andres that may 9 be produced at some point in the future. It seems the Commission said we want to 10 see if that's possible. It seems the Commission 11 12 said, seems like the evidence said to us that if 13 there's ongoing injection by Goodnight in the targeted zone, where they want to produce the ROZ, 14 15 that conflicts with their ability to test that space. 16 Now this seems to me more like a gotcha, 17 or, as my colleague said, coy and disingenuous. think we can see that from the ad hominem attacks 18 19 from Empire. I think we can see that from its classification of the Commission's order as, quote, 20 21 the suspension order, which it is not. It is an 22 order that provides Empire the ability to go and test 23 its pilot project as Empire requested. 24 And it does so after finding that there 2.5 is not current waste or impairment of correlative

1	rights. It does so in finding that the injection of
2	Goodnight is not impairing recovery or causing waste
3	in the Grayburg currently. But it might, for a pilot
4	project, if and when Empire comes to the Commission
5	or the Division, applies for that and is granted that
6	authority.
7	Empire attacked Goodnight here and in
8	all the papers for seeking guidance from the
9	Division, for going to the Division and saying, we
LO	attended the September 12th hearing, we requested of
L1	the Commission the timeline for suspension of our
L2	permits.
L3	The Commission told us the Division is
L4	charged with implementing this order, go to the
L5	Division. Goodnight heeded that advice, sent an
L6	e-mail to the Division requesting that meeting,
L7	carbon copied all counsel, inviting everyone to go
L8	and do that.
L9	The Division took them up on that, and
20	that's when the motion to the emergency motion to
21	enforce the order happened and the motion to stay
22	happened.
23	Now that was the proper thing for
24	Goodnight to do. That is being a prudent operator.
25	Is heeding the Commission's directive that the

1	Division would implement this order. And I think
2	that we can all see from the Division's response why
3	that is the proper route for this to take.
4	Now, the Commission was not aided by
5	briefing on what suspension means and what happens
6	when there's a suspension. That's because it came up
7	as an idea in the hearing, was not aided in briefing
8	with the parties. It was not outlined what the
9	standards are or what the effects are of suspension.
LO	And again, that makes sense in the
L1	context of the Commission's order, that if and when
L2	Empire seeks applications to commence a pilot project
L3	for CO2 EOR recovery, then the Division will look at
L4	that order and Goodnight's injection authority will
L5	be suspended at that time.
L6	Now, the gotcha nature of this order,
L7	this proceeding by Empire, I think is most
L8	exemplified by what is now new evidence, which is
L9	that they cannot go forward now if Goodnight's
20	injection authority Goodnight's injection
21	continues. They just can't do it.
22	And it's interesting that that is
23	nowhere in the Commission's findings. The Commission
24	was very specific in its findings of where it came up
25	with this idea. And that appears in Paragraph 64 and

1	65 of the Commission's orders.
2	When Dr. Ampomah asked whether Empire
3	would be okay with suspending Goodnight's injection
4	permits while it did an EOR project. And in that
5	exchange, it says: Would Empire be open to that?
6	You know, you're getting me in more and more trouble
7	with Mr. West, but I think we could do it within a
8	couple of years.
9	So within a couple of years Empire will
10	have the opportunity to drill the other wells?
11	Yes sir.
12	And proof to see that if any of those
13	claims, you know, real evidence that the ROZ indeed
14	exists, it's recoverable?
15	Yes sir.
16	Commission goes on talking to
17	Mr. Wheeler, mainly speaking about: If you guys had
18	consent from the Commission to establish an EOR
19	project and you committed capital from your company,
20	what do you think the timeline is in reference to
21	Commissioner Ampomah's question about performing a
22	pilot to verify that the ROZ is there and it's
23	producible?
24	You just do a small, small pilot project
25	and the Commission requests it, I believe that we can

get it and do it within that two-year period, where
we're talking about drilling the wells and coring and
then the analysis and everything of that to present
it to the Commission.
Nowhere in that exchange was it
qualified that only if Goodnight's injection stopped
immediately they could proceed with that. Why?
Because that was never part of it.
Now, Mr. Wehmeyer said that this I
wrote it down, suspension order says that it suspends
existing Goodnight's injection wells, the Dawson, the
Banks, Sosa, Rhino, full stop, now.
If you look at Paragraph 3, on Page 13
of the order, that's not at all what it says. And
it's important that's not at all what it says,
because as I said, I think the Commission's order was
clear.
It says: Suspends existing Goodnight's
injection wells, Dawson, Banks, Sosa, Rhino. And it
goes on. In order to provide Empire with the
opportunity to establish the CO2 EOR pilot project.
And so the Commission had in mind, as is
clear from the order, that this would happen if and
when Empire sought a CO2 EOR pilot project and was
granted that authority.

1	And that makes sense, because if we go
2	back to the beginning of this entire exercise, it is
3	about an ROZ, a residual oil zone. And what you did
4	not hear from Empire, but you did from Goodnight, is
5	what we all know is the definition of a residual oil
б	zone, which is that the oil has been washed out by
7	Mother Nature's waterflood and it is immobile to
8	water.
9	And so the continued injection of
10	Goodnight, even if there is an ROZ down there, does
11	not cause waste, does not impair correlative rights.
12	That oil is immobile to water. It is now, it has
13	been since it was there and it was washed out by
14	Mother Nature's waterflood. And it will be if and
15	when anyone ever seeks to do a recovery project in
16	the Lower San Andres where Goodnight is injecting.
17	So I think it is incumbent on the
18	Commission to, now that you've been presented with
19	this, make that clear. I think that the OCD
20	standards set forth are reasonable.
21	What I do think, that from the
22	Commission's order, that suspension is and should be
23	contingent upon Empire applying for and being
24	authorized to conduct the pilot project.
25	Thank you.

1	CHAIR CHANG: Thank you.
2	Any questions from the Commission at
3	this time, or would you like to reserve?
4	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Yeah, I'll reserve if
5	Pilot has anything. Yeah, thank you.
6	CHAIR CHANG: Counsel?
7	MR. SHANDLER: No.
8	CHAIR CHANG: And thank you. I don't have
9	any questions either at this time. Thank you very
LO	much.
L1	And I believe we have Pilot Water
L2	Solutions.
L3	MR. SUAZO: Good afternoon, Commissioners
L4	and Mr. Chair. This is Miguel Suazo again, appearing
L5	today on behalf of Pilot Water Solutions, SWD. I can
L6	assure you I'll be brief.
L7	Pilot appears today in support of the
L8	motions for rehearing submitted by Goodnight and
L9	Permian in an opposition to the one submitted by
20	Empire. We think that a limited rehearing to correct
21	the internal inconsistencies and to make
22	clarifications in the order would be proper,
23	especially since, you know, all the parties here are
24	going to be living under this order for the
25	foreseeable future.

1	Now, Pilot has taken a pretty small role
2	in this proceeding, despite its length and
3	complexity. And that's because the well that it has
4	in the EMSU is pretty marginal compared to some of
5	the other wells in and around it.
6	But Pilot has followed these proceedings
7	very keenly, you know, awaiting the outcome in the
8	Commission's decision. And Pilot is concerned that
9	this decision is going to impact not just it, but
10	others in the industry that perform in the same lines
11	of business.
12	So in my distillation and understanding
13	of what the order entails, we don't believe that
14	Empire did adduce substantial evidence that its
15	correlative rights in the Grayburg are impaired. And
16	we think the record pretty clearly demonstrated that
17	there's no fluid migration, that the San Andres
18	Reservoir is in material balance, and there's no
19	evidence of cross-formational communication.
20	So I think those are pretty important
21	points that should be reevaluated by the Commission
22	as they're thinking through what to do following this
23	proceeding.
24	So for these reasons, you know, Pilot
25	respectfully supports the motions for rehearing we

1	urge the Commission to grant rehearing for the
2	limited purpose of reconsidering the suspension
3	provisions of the order to clarify the Commission's
4	findings of no current waste or impairment, and to
5	reaffirm that any suspension of injection authority
6	must rest on specific findings of failure to confine
7	injected fluids under 19-15-26-10.E. And this
8	approach, we think, respects the Commission's prior
9	work, corrects procedural inconsistencies, and
10	restores the certainty that the Oil and Gas Act
11	requires.
12	Thank you.
13	CHAIR CHANG: Thank you very much. I will
14	open the floor to commissioners again for questions
15	for any of the parties.
16	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
17	I do have a couple of questions, at least as I think
18	through this to help me at least to be able to make
19	some decisions here. I will start with OCD.
20	So in your prehearing statement, and
21	even you touched on it today, so on Page 4, Item
22	Number 3, OCD request that the OCC provide the OCD a
23	deadline framework for suspension of Goodnight's
24	SWD's injection permits per OCD's suggestion.
25	So my question to OCD is, based on the

1	OCC order, why is it difficult for OCD to actually
2	move forward and implement? You've made some
3	suggestions as to the procedures as, let's say, some
4	of these SWD's can be shut. So why, OCD, do you have
5	these processes? Why is OCD believing that you do
6	not have enough information to be able to execute the
7	order?
8	MR. MOANDER: So a few points on that,
9	Dr. Ampomah. First is OCD reading the order and OCD
LO	would agree with Rice's point that Paragraph 3 from
L1	OCD's perspective, does not actually specify an
L2	immediate suspension or a future suspension. But it
L3	does potential here for an implication that
L4	there's a contingent event before suspension could
L5	occur. And that's the last clause after Rhino, in
L6	order to provide Empire with an opportunity to
L7	establish the CO2 EOR pilot project.
L8	That's the main so the threshold
L9	question from OCD is, when does this suspension
20	actually is it effectuated? Because it can really be
21	effectuated under two conditions here, at least as
22	the evidence has been provided and the arguments have
23	been made.
24	One of them is effective upon issuance
25	of the order, or, say, you know, 90 days later, some

1 other very date certain determination. 2 The second option would be that that suspension would become effective or it would be 3 4 triggered by a certain action by Empire in regards to 5 the EOR. OCD is very careful about suspending 6 7 permits, because those in no way claim that they are 8 constitutional interests of any kind, nothing of that They do remain financial interests that are 9 sort. owned by operators, and so OCD does not take it 10 11 lightly to just suspend a permit, just sort of ad hoc 12 or without any concern about the effects of that. 13 Now, in addition to that, OCD likes to supervise these wind-downs of these wells with 14 15 certain filings. OCD response was not intended to be 16 a catchall with all the detail that would be expected 17 if there was a reconvened hearing. So that's why OCD seeking clarification from the Commission as to 18 19 precisely what it wants OCD to do. 2.0 Now, when OCD conventionally does 21 suspensions, they do that under enforcement 22 proceedings, which, while they certainly can appear 23 before the OCC, most of the time, they simply don't.

And that's the end of it. And it's OCD's discretion that's in play, because the OCC is not brought in.

24

2.5

1	And since both OCD and OCC have concurrent
2	jurisdiction in this instance, OCD prefers to defer
3	to the Commission, sitting as the final adjudicator
4	of this matter to provide that guidance.
5	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Thank you, sir.
6	So I'll move down to Number 6 Page 6,
7	Item B. If OCC seeks a suspension date that is not
8	immediate, OCD recommends tying the suspension of
9	Empire's accomplishment of specific criteria tied to
10	Empire's EOR project, such as date of first injection
11	by Empire.
12	So my question to you is, does the
13	Commission have the authority to really impose some
14	strict deadlines on Empire?
15	MR. MOANDER: I am cautious about advising
16	the Commission on its authority because that's not
17	necessarily my role? But from OCD's perspective, OCD
18	doesn't see why the Commission wouldn't have that
19	authority.
20	Here, the enabling act, the Oil and Gas
21	Act, provides extraordinarily broad authority to the
22	Commission. So I don't think there's a restriction
23	on the Commission. I'm sure there may be
24	counter-arguments to that, that I would genuinely be
25	curious to hear, but OCD does not see any prohibition

1	or restriction on the OCC's authority to provide more
2	detailed deadlines, compliance, etc.
3	Now alternatively, you know, and I
4	didn't push this argument terribly hard in the
5	response, if the OCC wishes, they can give OCD
6	essentially what amounts to plenary authority to
7	enforce, with a few clarifications that I think are
8	necessary, like when the suspension is in effect.
9	But I think that's also an option, to allow OCD to
10	conduct this as it sees fits, so long as it
11	accomplishes the purposes and the intent of the
12	order. That's not also made clear here, given
13	there's some language that there's some conflict
14	in the final order, what is it, 24004.
15	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: I would like to ask
16	the other parties if they can provide a response to
17	the same questions that I just posed to OCD.
18	MR. WEHMEYER: On behalf of Empire, I'll
19	take a shot at it, and Ms. Hardy can clean up behind
20	me.
21	Certainly there's sweeping authority and
22	discretion on behalf of OCC. The issue here with the
23	idea of a milestone approach is one that was in no
24	shape, form or fashion part of the OCC's final order
25	that suspended the permits.

Secondly, there was zero technical
testimony during the development of the case to
inform a staged approach, and so, as you look at
economic aspects, as you look at technical aspects,
as you look at permitting aspects of the tertiary EOR
project in the San Andres, what has come for the
first time out of OCD's filing is completely
arbitrary. There is zero technical testimony that
was developed during the four and a half weeks that
anything they say there on paper could be achieved
from an economic or technical or practical
perspective. And so we understand the OCC's final
order that we have three years. And Empire,
consistent with its testimony, is prepared to execute
and be back here within the three years.
In terms of arbitrary milestones during
the interim, or that that would somehow affect
Goodnight's clear obligation to immediately suspend
the injection so that the pilot can go forward,
there's zero basis for that in the text of the
Commission's suspension order.
So I'm not sure if that I hope that
answered the question. But again, what OCD came up
with, they didn't point to any instance in the
history of time that the OCD has actually staged I

1	wasn't intending to be funny. I apologize to OCD if
2	I was. But the idea of a staged implementation with
3	milestones in the arbitrary fashion that came out of
4	Mr. Moander's filings, there is zero point to any
5	time historically that's ever happened before. And
6	again, it is utterly arbitrary, because there was
7	zero technical testimony about the idea of that being
8	feasible.
9	Ms. Hardy, is there anything I could
10	have said better or more accurately?
11	MS. HARDY: No. You did a good job. Thank
12	you.
13	MR. RANKIN: Dr. Ampomah, if I may just
14	confirm the question that I'm answering. Is it
15	whether the Commission has authority to impose?
16	So I think in this instance, the
17	Commission would have broad authority. If it's going
18	to authorize or request an EOR project, it would have
19	authority to put some guardrails on what that process
20	would look like. And I think, I think as Mr. Moander
21	said, the Commission does have broad authority,
22	especially in areas where it does have clear
23	jurisdiction under the statute, which is to
24	oversee injection, EOR projects.
25	And here, as I read the order, I tend to

1	agree that I read the order initially to suggest
2	that injection would not be suspended would only
3	be suspended contingent upon the commencement of an
4	EOR project.
5	So to address the question about, well,
6	what would those milestones be, there are a few
7	things we know have to happen for an EOR project to
8	be approved or to go forward. The first of which is
9	there needs to be an application filed for CO2
10	injection. And so what milestones might fall from
11	that, well, we simply would look to the application
12	that Empire, itself, files, what is it planning to
13	do, and then we can dictate from that what the
14	milestone should be.
15	If Empire is ready, willing and able
16	right now to go forward with an ROZ, then let's see
17	the application, and then from that, we can determine
18	what the milestone should be, upon which an orderly
19	and scheduled shut-in or suspension can be
20	implemented.
21	Again, you know, the way I read the
22	order and the way I understand the intent, is that
23	the injection of Goodnight need not be suspended
24	until and when and if Empire actually commences
25	injection. Key to that for an EOR project is it has

1	to be in the zone that Goodnight's injecting into.
2	If Empire decides to pursue a different interval,
3	then it's not clear to us that there would need to be
4	a suspension of injection. But that that's for the
5	Commission to dictate.
6	But as to the milestones, I do believe
7	the Commission has broad authority. I think if
8	there's any question about what the milestone should
9	be, we could certainly have a narrow hearing on what
10	those are, or simply look to what application Empire
11	actually files to dictate what those milestones
12	should be.
13	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Thank you.
14	So back to OCD. So is it OCD's position
15	that the current order does not provide enough room
16	for CD to work with Empire, you know, to implement
17	the CO2 EOR project within the three years?
18	MR. MOANDER: I wouldn't go that far,
19	Dr. Ampomah. OCD wants clear well, I think the
20	key, the threshold issue for that determination is
21	how the suspension of Goodnight's permits would
22	operate. Getting clarity on that would certainly
23	make it easier for OCD to start requesting
24	information, and, as Mr. Wehmeyer said, put arbitrary
25	deadlines on Empire's performance, which actually are
	Page 70
	Jo , v

not going to be arbitrary. There are processes that
do exist that apparently Empire is unaware of at the
moment.
But that's really the threshold issue,
to make that determination, would be what is the OCC
wanting done with those permits? Because, again, if
they're tied to performance milestones by Empire,
then that would change how OCD approaches this.
COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Now to Empire. So
you ask about, you know, in the rehearing that you
are requesting for the Commission to completely shut
the SWDs from Goodnight. Is that a fair description?
MR. WEHMEYER: It's the mere distinction
between suspended from September to three years
versus permanently revoked. This is New Mexico's
minerals. This is United States' minerals. This is
Empire's vested leasehold.
We think the evidence was sufficient and
conclusive so that right now we can just say those
four permits are full-stop revoked. We respect the
Commission's decision about the three-year
suspension, but suspension means suspension, not
curtailment.
If the Commission was disinclined to
permanently revoke, and we understand that that's
Page 71

1	where your decision is, and we respect that, despite
2	the rehearing papers, the suspension means suspended.
3	You cannot inject if your permit is suspended. And
4	the Commission said, present tense, the four permits
5	are suspended. So there should be no saltwater going
6	into that hole while the permit is, present tense,
7	suspended.
8	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: So on that, my
9	question to Empire is, if you look at the 1984 order,
10	we discussed during the entire hearing about the
11	intent of the San Andres being added to the unit.
12	There was a lot of discussion about that.
13	So my question to you about what you are
14	requesting, so after a three-year period, or let's
15	say at some point Empire believes that this project
16	is not economical and they don't want to progress on
17	that project, would that more or less support why the
18	OCC probably would say let's suspend for now?
19	MR. WEHMEYER: I understand the Commission's
20	reasoning, and so I think if I take it in pieces,
21	here's why so I've told you, we're going to
22	execute in three years on the pilot. If the
23	Commission wants to know why is it important to
24	Empire that right now the rehearing be granted to
25	completely revoke, we heard about \$5 billion in gross

1	revenue, \$1.5 billion approximately in royalty to the
2	State of New Mexico and to the United States. This
3	requires hundreds of millions of dollars in capex
4	expenditure to execute that project.
5	And consistent with what Mr. McBeath
6	conceded for Goodnight on the stand, if it's
7	permanently revoked, as we think the evidence is
8	conclusive it should be, then it's a lot easier to go
9	forward in terms of executing a larger program. But
10	whatever that looks like, whether that's just Empire,
11	whether that's partners, whether that's raising
12	money, whether that's borrowing money, in terms of
13	people, consistent with what Mr. McBeath said, as
14	third parties or internal parties, investors look at
15	the project, the revoked is important.
16	But if the Commission is disinclined to
17	revisit its decision and to leave it as suspended for
18	three years, we are going to make this a success. We
19	will be back on or before three years to show the
20	Commission that at that point in time, permanent
21	revocation is appropriate so that we can go forward
22	and get this value out of the ground and avoid the
23	waste of the State's natural resources.
24	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Thank you.
25	Let me tie my attention to Goodnight.

1	And I read through all your briefs. I appreciate
2	that.
3	Now, I just want to ask you, is it
4	Goodnight's understanding that some way, somehow, the
5	Commission is tying the decision to suspend the
6	injection to the performance of the EOR?
7	MR. RANKIN: Commissioner Ampomah, the way
8	the order was written and the findings that were made
9	and the conclusion that the order would be
10	implemented by the Division, as both counsel for Rice
11	and the Division stated, it appeared to be
12	potentially contingent on the Empire going forward
13	with the EOR project.
14	And because delegation of the order
15	was implementation of the order was delegated to
16	the Division, it was unclear to us what was the
17	intent. And if the intent of the Commission was to
18	fully delegate that to the Division which is why,
19	at the time the order was issued, I asked a series of
20	questions to understand, as best I could, what the
21	intent of the Commission was, whether there was
22	intended to be an immediate shut-in. So I asked that
23	question. And the response I got was that it was the
24	intent of the Commission to delegate the
25	implementation to the Division.

1	So to answer your question, our
2	understanding was that it was a little unclear, but
3	that the intent was to delegate implementation to the
4	Division, to implement suspension of the injection
5	pursuant to the discretion of the Division. Our view
6	was that the guidance provided in the order was such
7	that suspension could be rather, injection could
8	be suspended only as and when any EOR project was
9	commenced.
10	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Thank you. So, I'm
11	reading through your this will be your pre-hearing
12	statement, Goodnight Midstream, LLC, for the
13	application for rehearing. I'm reading from Page 3,
14	and I'll start from the last paragraph, and it starts
15	with second.
16	The order creates two clear
17	constitutional conflicts. 1, that it erroneously
18	affirms the utilization of the public waters in
19	contravention of the New Mexico Constitution.
20	But I'm not interested in that one. Let
21	me go to the the order confirms there are no
22	recoverable hydrocarbons in the San Andres and was
23	included in the EMSU as a source of water supply
24	violates the Statutory Unitization Act.
25	2, until there is an actual finding that
	Page 75

1	there are recoverable hydrocarbons in paying
2	quantities in Goodnight's San Andres disposal zone
3	and as exhibited failure to confine injected fluids,
4	the order constitutes an impermissible regulatory
5	taking of both Goodnight's property interest and the
6	surface owner's pore space in the San Andres zone.
7	So I do have a couple of I just
8	wanted to have some clarification on this one. I
9	thought there was a lot of evidence, you know, a lot
L O	of discussion during the hearing about the
L1	containment. We asked a lot about it, and if I
L2	recall correctly, Goodnight's response was that: We
L3	are injecting into a vacuum.
L4	Now, you also talked about Empire didn't
	Now, you also talked about Empire didn't have the burden of proof. But I thought it was clear
L4	
L4 L5	have the burden of proof. But I thought it was clear
L4 L5 L6	have the burden of proof. But I thought it was clear that each party had their own burden of proof. So do
L4 L5 L6 L7	have the burden of proof. But I thought it was clear that each party had their own burden of proof. So do you believe that Goodnight was able to show the
L4 L5 L6 L7	have the burden of proof. But I thought it was clear that each party had their own burden of proof. So do you believe that Goodnight was able to show the Commission during the hearing, this is how much I'm
L4 L5 L6 L7 L8	have the burden of proof. But I thought it was clear that each party had their own burden of proof. So do you believe that Goodnight was able to show the Commission during the hearing, this is how much I'm injecting, this is where it is, during the hearing?
14 15 16 17 18	have the burden of proof. But I thought it was clear that each party had their own burden of proof. So do you believe that Goodnight was able to show the Commission during the hearing, this is how much I'm injecting, this is where it is, during the hearing? MR. RANKIN: So the answer to your question
14 15 16 17 18 19	have the burden of proof. But I thought it was clear that each party had their own burden of proof. So do you believe that Goodnight was able to show the Commission during the hearing, this is how much I'm injecting, this is where it is, during the hearing? MR. RANKIN: So the answer to your question is, I think the question that we need the burden
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	have the burden of proof. But I thought it was clear that each party had their own burden of proof. So do you believe that Goodnight was able to show the Commission during the hearing, this is how much I'm injecting, this is where it is, during the hearing? MR. RANKIN: So the answer to your question is, I think the question that we need the burden that we need to prove, there's two different things,
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	have the burden of proof. But I thought it was clear that each party had their own burden of proof. So do you believe that Goodnight was able to show the Commission during the hearing, this is how much I'm injecting, this is where it is, during the hearing? MR. RANKIN: So the answer to your question is, I think the question that we need the burden that we need to prove, there's two different things, just to break it down.

1	for new wells. And that was to demonstrate that its
2	proposed injection was going to be confined within
3	the injection interval. That's for the new
4	applications.
5	Conversely, as the applicant seeking to
6	revoke Goodnight's existing injection, Empire had the
7	burden to show, through proof, that Goodnight's
8	existing injection exhibited a failure to confine the
9	injection fluids into the disposal zone. That was
10	its affirmative duty to prove.
11	During the course of the hearing, I
12	believe that Goodnight successfully showed that its
13	injection fluids were not leaving the San Andres
14	disposal zone. They were being confined within that
15	interval, whether it's to what extent it went
16	horizontally, is not an issue for the regulations or
17	under the governing regulations.
18	The question is whether it's being
19	confined below and above. And based on the evidence
20	adduced and the engineering and injection data, I do
21	believe that that showing was made, that we
22	confirmed, through evidence, that Goodnight's
23	injection was staying within the disposal zone.
24	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: So I'll turn to the
25	order, and I can see I know we've had a lot of

1	discussion on that today. So I'll just read that.
2	However the Commission concluded it is pretty much
3	sure at present to grant Empire's application to
4	permanently revoke the injection authority of the
5	existing wells because the Commission found Empire
6	did not adduce substantial evidence that the
7	correlative rights in the Grayburg are currently
8	impaired by a Goodnight's injection into the
9	San Andres.
10	So on this one is it this provision that
11	Goodnight is saying that the Commission says that
12	Empire's resources are not impaired?
13	MR. RANKIN: So there's two reasons we're
14	saying we understand that Empire's resources are not
15	impaired. Number one, the primary one, is that the
16	purported ROZ has been determined not to be
17	recoverable currently. They have not demonstrated
18	recoverability. They cannot show that it's being
19	recovered or can be recovered. If it can't be
20	recovered, then there's no waste, there's no
21	impairment, there's no share of production that they
22	have a right to that we're preventing them from
23	obtaining. Okay?
24	So if there's no recoverability, then
25	there's nothing that's been harmed, whether you're

1	looking at waste or impairment of correlative rights.
2	So that's as to the ROZ, and that's specifically as
3	to the San Andres. Okay?
4	Now, as to the Grayburg, this next
5	section here addresses primarily potential impacts to
6	the Grayburg. Here, as I understand the order and
7	the findings, unlike the potential future impairment
8	that the Commission found, there has been no
9	demonstration of current communication between the
10	San Andres disposal zone and the overlying Grayburg.
11	The engineering data, the pressure data
12	and the injection data presented by Goodnight was, I
13	understand, to be found compelling to show that there
14	is no communication between the disposal zone and any
15	overlying zones as laid out here under Paragraph C.
16	So because of that and because there's
17	no hydrocarbons that are recoverable in the
18	San Andres and the only potential impairment would be
19	operations in the Grayburg and there's no finding
20	that there's been any communication to the Grayburg,
21	there's, therefore, no impairment of any correlative
22	rights in the EMSU based on the Commission's
23	findings.
24	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: So then on the same
25	page, that C provision was just specifically to the
	Page 79

1	Grayburg?
2	MR. RANKIN: Correct. I agree. And another
3	finding in the Commission's order that there is no
4	ROZ that's recoverable addresses the San Andres.
5	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: You're saying that in
6	the order, the Commission made it clear that the ROZ
7	is not recoverable?
8	MR. RANKIN: Yes.
9	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Can you point me to
LO	that?
L1	MR. RANKIN: I'll have to take a moment to
L2	find it, but I know I cited it several times in the
L3	rehearing.
L4	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Yeah, it was
L5	interesting. I saw that. So during the hearing,
L6	there was
L7	MR. RANKIN: Okay. I have it. Sorry.
L8	So it's the next paragraph, D, and it's
L9	on Page 10 of the order, Paragraph D: In addition,
20	the Commission concluded it is premature at present
21	to grant Empire's applications to permanently revoke
22	the injection authority of the existing wells. The
23	Commission found there was insufficient evidence
24	presented at hearing to prove whether the ROZ was
25	recoverable.

1	So there's no evidence that it is
2	recoverable. Having found that it's not recoverable,
3	at present, there's no current finding that it's
4	recoverable, there's no therefore, there can be no
5	finding of waste and no finding of impairment of
6	correlative rights in the San Andres, because that's
7	the only potential hydrocarbon in the San Andres.
8	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: So the use of
9	"insufficient evidence," so is that what you are
10	interpreting that was entirely no evidence presented
11	to the Commission?
12	MR. RANKIN: Well, again, as to each party,
13	we each have a burden of proof, and the burden of
14	proof is preponderance of the evidence. And because,
15	under that standard, the Commission found that there
16	was insufficient evidence, meaning they did not meet
17	their burden of proof, they did not meet the
18	preponderance of the evidence standard, there has
19	been a finding that there is no recoverable
20	hydrocarbons in the San Andres.
21	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: So from an
22	engineering point of view, during the hearing, the
23	course of the hearing, I recall that, you know, in
24	this type of project, you have to do the, you would
25	have to go through the scooping period. And during

1	the hearing, Empire presented that that would be your
2	first pass, the scoping. And normally you have to
3	use analogous information to be able to back up your
4	analysis. And during that, we believe, at that
5	time I think the discussion went back and forth,
6	we really need more specific site field information.
7	So maybe you and I, we are reading it
8	differently, meaning into the insufficient evidence.
9	So don't you believe that at least there was some
10	scoping analysis that was presented to the Commission
11	to prove that this ROZ could be recovered?
12	MR. RANKIN: I disagree, respectfully,
13	Commissioner Ampomah. Because the scoping analysis
14	that was done, remember, was a Kinder Morgan
15	screening tool. And it used an 18 percent oil
16	recovery that was unattached to any data from the
17	EMSU. And Empire, during the course of the hearing,
18	failed to connect that 18 percent recovery to any
19	data, not only within the EMSU, but to any other
20	analogous field. Further, it didn't even identify
21	whether that scoping tool was applicable to a
22	conventional oil field or to an ROZ.
23	And we presented contrary evidence,
24	through Dr. Lake, that, in fact, the 18 percent
25	recovery factor is several standard deviations above

1	what even he identified through actual data is
2	reasonable to expect in a conventional field. And he
3	had uncontroverted testimony that the recovery factor
4	is more likely to be in the range of 1 to 6 percent.
5	So I do disagree, and that actually the
6	evidence in the record establishes the converse, that
7	they did not present any reliable testimony based on
8	any actual data tied to the EMSU that there could be
9	any recovery of any of those hydrocarbons. And that
10	was, I understand, the findings of the Commission.
11	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: And don't you believe
12	that that is also the reason why the Commission, in
13	their order, specified that Empire has to proceed
14	with a pilot project to prove that?
15	MR. RANKIN: So I do understand that's why
16	the Commission wanted them to go forth with that
17	project. However, the time for the game has passed.
18	And what happened is, Empire had an obligation to
19	come forward with this evidence. And it came forward
20	in the hearing with this evidence, and it didn't meet
21	the standard of proof.
22	And so at that time and as we sit here
23	today, there's no evidence that any of those
24	potential ROZ hydrocarbons are recoverable.
25	And so I understand the Division the

1	Commission is interested in potentially seeing what
2	the future holds, but because there's been no
3	evidence showing that there's impairment or waste in
4	the San Anders disposal zone, there's no basis to
5	shut in Goodnight's injection.
6	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Thank you. I will
7	pause here. I think I do have a lot of answers. So
8	I appreciate that. Thank you.
9	CHAIR CHANG: Any other commissioners, Board
10	counsel, question?
11	COMMISSIONER LAMKIN: I don't have any
12	questions.
13	CHAIR CHANG: My only question is procedural
14	at this point. The two parties provided
15	demonstratives or slide decks or whatever you want to
16	call them. Do you wish them to be admitted into the
17	record? And if so, is there any objection?
18	MR. RANKIN: Well, I haven't had a chance to
19	look at all the pages that are here. I suppose I
20	don't have an objection to Pages 1 through 31 being
21	submitted, but I do have an objection to the others.
22	CHAIR CHANG: Well, do you even want them
23	admitted as part of the record, first question?
24	MR. WEHMEYER: Yeah, I think just given how
25	carefully the proceeding progressed on all matters of

1	evidence and what was actually filed, Empire's
2	position would be that it would be safest to just
3	have them not admitted as part of the record.
4	But both sides have given physical
5	handouts. They could be used if helpful or not, but
6	not be part of the record would be the Empire
7	preference.
8	CHAIR CHANG: Is that fine?
9	MR. RANKIN: I agree.
10	CHAIR CHANG: Fair enough. All right.
11	That's all we've got. I think you have all given the
12	Commission a lot to think through and to sort
13	through, so at this point, I'd like to invite a
14	motion for the Commission to go into an executive
15	session so we can sift through all of the arguments
16	presented today.
17	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Mr. Chair, I do so
18	move.
19	CHAIR CHANG: May I have a second?
20	COMMISSIONER LAMKIN: I second.
21	CHAIR CHANG: Hearing no objection
22	MR. SHANDLER: A vestige of the law requires
23	a roll call.
24	MS. APODACA: Commissioner Ampomah, do you
25	approve?

1	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Approve.
2	MS. APODACA: Commissioner Chang?
3	CHAIR CHANG: Approve.
4	MS. APODACA: Commissioner Lamkin?
5	COMMISSIONER LAMKIN: Approve.
6	(3-0 vote. Motion approved.)
7	CHAIR CHANG: Thank you all very much. I
8	don't think you all need to stick around for the rest
9	of the day. If we have anything to announce, I'm
10	sure we can announce on the online platform, if that
11	is sufficient. But certainly you are all welcome to
12	stay if you wish.
13	MR. WEHMEYER: And just for clarity, because
14	there was an open possibility of today and bleeding
15	into tomorrow, the online announcement, no one would
16	be here physically tomorrow.
17	CHAIR CHANG: No, I don't think so. I'm
18	sure yeah, I'm sure we. Hopefully, I mean it's
19	already 4:00 well, it's only 3:18. So maybe we
20	can get this done today. But if not, I'm sure
21	whatever happens when we come back out of the
22	executive session will merely be an announcement of
23	whatever decision has been made.
24	MR. WEHMEYER: Thank you so much for the
25	clarity.

1	CHAIR CHANG: Thank you.
2	(Commission adjourned to
3	closed session at 3:19 p.m.)
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
2 4	
25	
	D
	Page 87

1	AFFIRMATION OF COMPLETION OF TRANSCRIPT
2	
3	I, Kelli Gallegos, DO HEREBY AFFIRM that on
4	October 16, 2025, a hearing of the New Mexico Oil
5	Conservation Commission was taken before me via video
6	conference.
7	I FURTHER AFFIRM that I did report in
8	stenographic shorthand the proceedings as set forth
9	herein, and the foregoing is a true and correct
10	transcript of the proceedings to the best of my
11	ability.
12	I FURTHER AFFIRM that I am neither employed
13	by nor related to any of the parties in this matter
14	and that I have no interest in the final disposition
15	of this matter.
16	Bell Gallon.
17	Kelli Gallegos
	VERITEXT LEGAL SOLUTIONS
18	500 Fourth Street, NW, Suite 105
	Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	Page 88

[& - actively]

		I	I
&	23448 7:12	6	able 11:5 13:15
& 2:3,7,8,22	23455 7:12	6 65:6,6 83:4	19:22 52:13
3:8,13 8:21 9:8	23508 7:11	60 41:6	62:18 63:6
1	23523 7:11	64 56:25	69:15 76:17
	23594 7:13	65 57:1	82:3
1 2:9,23 75:17	23601 7:13	7	above 51:11
83:4 84:20	24004 66:14		77:19 82:25
1.5 73:1	25245 3:9	7 52:5	absent 4:11
10 10:23 14:19	25371 6:20 7:8	77 20:25 21:2	absolute 13:22
28:9 50:23	26 14:19	78216 2:19	abundantly
80:19	281 2:17	8	48:23
105 88:18	28943 88:16	82 26:8	accept 5:22
110 2:9,23	3	87102 88:18	accomplishes
1220 1:6 3:4	3 26:17 58:13	87125-5245 3:9	66:11
12400 2:18	62:22 63:10	87501 2:4	accomplishm
12th 55:10	75:13	87504-2068	65:9
13 58:13	3-0 86:6	2:15	accordance
14,000 21:2	30,000 41:23	87504-2208 2:9	29:11 38:2
16 1:11 88:4	300 2:18 41:25	2:23	accurately
18 82:15,18,24	31 84:20	87505 3:4,14	68:10
19-15-26-10.e.	3:18 86:19	9	accuse 27:7
62:7	3:19 87:3	-	accused 53:24
1984 22:10	3:19 87.3 3a 1:14	9 4:2	54:1
24:23 25:23	3b 1:18	90 45:24 51:1,9	achieved 67:10
33:3 72:9		51:15 63:25	acres 21:1,2,3
1st 1:5	3d 41:1,4	9:00 4:21	act 5:14 13:2
2	4	9:04 6:4,6	14:14,25 33:11
2 45:16 75:25	4 62:21	a	62:10 65:20,21
2-0 4:20 6:1 7:5	40 19:16	a.m. 6:4,6	75:24
20 7:15	47 38:20	abadie 2:3	acted 32:25
200 41:6	4:00 86:19	abadieschill.c	action 13:22
2025 1:11 88:4	5	2:5	64:4
2068 2:14	5 50:23 72:25	ability 38:9	actions 25:3
214 2:4	500 3:13 88:18	54:15,22 88:11	actively 41:22
	3.13 00.10	,	
	1	1	1

[activity - ampomah]

actual 14:9 52:15 addresses 79:5 affirms 75:18 alleging 46:12 33:8 35:12 36:6,24 75:25 80:4 afforded 40:11 50:25 51:16 83:1,8 addressing afternoon 6:7 66:9 actually 5:4,19 32:8 40:12 8:16,20 9:7 allowed 15:20 10:10 14:9 adduce 61:14 60:13 43:17 30:24 32:4,17 adjourned 6:5 agenda 1:14,18 43:17 32:17 38:16 39:6 40:23 87:2 adjudicator agenda 1:14,18 altered 27:18 altered 27:18 alternative 28:1 32:13,14 4:18 42:16 22:20 41:18 42:16 43:5,25 agrenkin 2:10 41:18 42:16 43:5,25 43:5,25 alternative 43:5,25 43:13,14 43:12 agree 25:8,9 41:18 42:16 43:5,25 43:5,25 43:5,25 43:19 42:18 ambiguous 40:19 51:19 66:3 42:18 42:18 42:18 42:18 42:18 <th>activity 14:7</th> <th>addressed</th> <th>affirmed 44:8</th> <th>46:6</th>	activity 14:7	addressed	affirmed 44:8	46:6
23:8 35:12 36:6,24 75:25 80:4 addressing actually 5:4,19 32:8 40:12 32:6 47:23 21:10 25:6,11 43:17 30:24 32:4,17 38:16 adjourned 6:5 adjudicator 39:6 40:23 42:20,20 46:18 48:18 49:17 50:1,4,18 63:1 63:11,20 67:25 69:24 70:11,25 advancing 23:8 58:1 admitted 84:16 34:18 64:11 34:18 49:17 address 9:1 44:10 adwerse 44:4 adverse 44:4 adverse 44:10 adwing 65:15 addition 14:13 64:13 80:19 additional 11:2 48:14,18 49:17 50:11,51,5,24 50:21,53:3 additionally 20:24 27:19 additionally 20:24 27:19 address 27:19 48:9 49:8 50:6 50:19 69:5 76:25 77:10 alleged 17:3 75:10 77:24				
36:6,24 75:25 80:4 addressing afternoon 6:7 66:9 actually 5:4,19 32:8 40:12 8:16,20 9:7 allowed 15:20 10:10 14:9 adduce 61:14 29:6 47:23 21:10 25:6,11 19:7 21:16 78:6 60:13 43:17 30:24 32:4,17 adjuced 77:20 agency's 37:20 allows 33:5 39:6 40:23 87:2 4:13,15,17 8:2 altered 27:18 48:18 49:17 65:3 adjudicator ago 19:16 28:1 32:13,14 48:18 49:17 65:3 admitted 84:16 agrankin 2:10 43:5,25 69:24 70:11,25 advance 43:12 agree 25:8,9 51:19 66:3 83:5 85:1 advancing 28:17 63:10 ambiguous ad 54:18 64:11 adversely 31:10 42:18 added 72:11 advice 55:15 agreed 30:22 amended 29:13 44:10 advice 55:15 affect 42:13 46:9 17:13				
83:1,8 addressing afternoon 6:7 66:9 actually 5:4,19 32:8 40:12 8:16,20 9:7 allowed 15:20 10:10 14:9 adduce 61:14 29:6 47:23 21:10 25:6,11 19:7 21:16 78:6 60:13 43:17 30:24 32:4,17 adjourned 6:5 agency's 37:20 allows 33:5 39:6 40:23 87:2 4:13,15,17 8:2 altered 27:18 42:20,20 46:18 49:17 65:3 adjudicator ago 19:16 28:1 32:13,14 48:18 49:17 65:3 admitted 84:16 agrankin 2:10 43:5,25 63:11,20 67:25 advance 43:12 agree 25:8,9 51:19 66:3 83:5 85:1 advance 43:12 agree 25:8,9 51:19 66:3 adderssl adversely 31:10 42:18 amend 32:15 44:10 advice 55:15 agreement amended 29:13 40:25 48:17 affected <				
actually 5:4,19 32:8 40:12 8:16,20 9:7 allowed 15:20 10:10 14:9 adduce 61:14 29:6 47:23 21:10 25:6,11 19:7 21:16 78:6 60:13 43:17 30:24 32:4,17 adjourned 6:5 agency's 37:20 32:17 38:16 adjourned 6:5 agenda 1:14,18 39:6 40:23 87:2 4:13,15,17 8:2 altered 27:18 48:18 49:17 65:3 22:20 41:18 42:16 28:1 32:13,14 50:1,4,18 63:1 admitted 84:16 agrankin 2:10 43:5,25 69:24 70:11,25 advance 43:12 agree 25:8,9 51:19 66:3 83:5 85:1 advancing 28:17 63:10 ambiguous 69:1 80:2 85:9 10:16 amend 32:15 8:21 adversely 31:10 42:18 amend 32:15 44:10 advice 55:15 agreement amended 29:13 aditional 11:2 48:14,18	· ·			
10:10 14:9 adduce 61:14 29:6 47:23 21:10 25:6,11 19:7 21:16 78:6 60:13 43:17 30:24 32:4,17 adduced 77:20 agency's 37:20 allows 33:5 32:17 38:16 adjourned 6:5 agenda 1:14,18 altered 27:18 39:6 40:23 87:2 4:13,15,17 8:2 alternative 42:20,20 46:18 48:18 49:17 65:3 22:20 41:18 42:16 50:1,4,18 63:1 65:3 admitted 84:16 agrankin 2:10 43:5,25 69:24 70:11,25 84:23 85:3 2:24 alternatively 83:5 85:1 advance 43:12 agree 25:8,9 51:19 66:3 82:1 advancing 28:17 63:10 ambiguous 69:1 80:2 85:9 10:16 amend 32:15 8:21 adversely 31:10 42:18 84:10 advise 55:15 advising 65:15 agreement amended 29:13 44:10 advising 65:15 agreements amount 7:20 40:25 48:17 48:14,18 aided 56:4,7 4:11 26:19 40:25 48:1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
19:7 21:16	· ·		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
30:24 32:4,17 adduced 77:20 agency's 37:20 allows 33:5 32:17 38:16 39:6 40:23 87:2 4:13,15,17 8:2 altered 27:18 42:20,20 46:18 48:18 49:17 65:3 22:20 41:18 42:16 50:1,4,18 63:1 admitted 84:16 agrankin 2:10 43:5,25 69:24 70:11,25 advance 43:12 agree 25:8,9 51:19 66:3 83:5 85:1 advancing 28:17 63:10 ambiguous ad 54:18 64:11 51:23 69:1 80:2 85:9 10:16 adams 9:1 17:24 48:14,18 agreed 30:22 amend 32:15 44:10 advice 55:15 agreement amended 29:13 addition 14:13 64:13 80:19 67:17 agreements amount 7:20 additional 11:2 48:14,18 aided 56:4,7 4:11 26:19 additionally 88:12 3:9 88:18 65:5 66:15 additionally 88:12 3:9 88:18 65:5 66:15 20:24 27:19 affirmation aligns 43:5 68:13 70:13,19 48:9 49:8 50:6 76:25 77:10 alleged 17:3<				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
32:17 38:16 adjourned 6:5 agenda 1:14,18 altered 27:18 39:6 40:23 87:2 4:13,15,17 8:2 alternative 42:20,20 46:18 adjudicator ago 19:16 28:1 32:13,14 48:18 49:17 65:3 22:20 41:18 42:16 50:1,4,18 63:1 admitted 84:16 agrankin 2:10 43:5,25 69:24 70:11,25 advance 43:12 agree 25:8,9 51:19 66:3 83:5 85:1 advancing 28:17 63:10 ambiguous ad 54:18 64:11 51:23 agreed 30:22 amend 32:15 8:21 adverse 44:4 agreement amend 32:15 44:10 advice 55:15 agreement amended 29:13 44:13 80:19 affect 42:13 46:9 17:13 additional 11:2 affected 17:24 ahead 50:16 amounts 66:6 40:25 48:17 48:14,18 aided 56:4,7 4:11 26:19 29:5 57:				
39:6 40:23 87:2 4:13,15,17 8:2 alternative 42:20,20 46:18 adjudicator ago 19:16 28:1 32:13,14 48:18 49:17 65:3 22:20 41:18 42:16 50:1,4,18 63:1 admitted 84:16 agrankin 2:10 43:5,25 63:11,20 67:25 84:23 85:3 2:24 alternatively 69:24 70:11,25 advance 43:12 agree 25:8,9 51:19 66:3 83:5 85:1 advancing 69:1 80:2 85:9 10:16 adam 2:10,24 adverse 44:4 agreed 30:22 amend 32:15 8:21 adversely 31:10 42:18 added 72:11 advising 65:15 agreement amended 29:13 44:10 advising 65:15 agreements amount 7:20 addition 14:13 67:17 agrees 27:23 amounts 66:6 additional 11:2 48:14,18 aided 56:4,7 4:11 26:19 50:11 51:5,24 48:14,18 aided 56:4,7 4:11 26:19 52:21 53:3 affirm 88:3,7 albert 1:15,19 29:5 57:2 60:4 52:21 59:3 <td< td=""><td>· ·</td><td></td><td> -</td><td></td></td<>	· ·		-	
42:20,20 46:18 adjudicator ago 19:16 28:1 32:13,14 48:18 49:17 65:3 22:20 41:18 42:16 50:1,4,18 63:1 admitted 84:16 agrankin 2:10 43:5,25 69:24 70:11,25 84:23 85:3 2:24 alternatively 51:19 66:3 83:5 85:1 advance 43:12 agree 25:8,9 51:19 66:3 83:5 85:1 advancing 28:17 63:10 ambiguous ad 54:18 64:11 51:23 69:1 80:2 85:9 10:16 adams 2:10,24 adversely 31:10 42:18 adams 9:1 17:24 48:14,18 agreement amend 32:15 44:10 advice 55:15 agreement amount 7:20 addition 14:13 67:17 agrees 27:23 amount 7:20 additional 11:2 48:14,18 aided 56:4,7 4:11 26:19 50:11 51:5,24 affidavit 49:2 albert 1:15,19 29:5 57:2 60:4				
48:18 49:17 65:3 22:20 41:18 42:16 50:1,4,18 63:1 admitted 84:16 agrankin 2:10 43:5,25 63:11,20 67:25 84:23 85:3 2:24 alternatively 69:24 70:11,25 advance 43:12 agree 25:8,9 51:19 66:3 83:5 85:1 advancing 28:17 63:10 ambiguous ad 54:18 64:11 51:23 69:1 80:2 85:9 10:16 adam 2:10,24 adverse 44:4 agreed 30:22 amend 32:15 8:21 adversely 31:10 42:18 added 72:11 advice 55:15 10:22 29:16 41:18 addition 14:13 affect 42:13 46:9 17:13 additional 11:2 affected 17:24 ahead 50:16 ampomah 1:21 40:25 48:17 48:14,18 aided 56:4,7 4:11 26:19 50:11 51:5,24 affidavit 49:2 albert 1:15,19 29:5 57:2 60:4 52:21 53:3 affirm 88:3,7 albuquerque 62:16 63:9 3:9 88:18 65:5 66:15 68:13 70:13,19 48:9 49:8 50:6 affirmative 24:14 73:24 74:7 50:19 69:5 76:25 77:10			, ,	
50:1,4,18 63:1 admitted 84:16 agrankin 2:10 43:5,25 63:11,20 67:25 84:23 85:3 2:24 alternatively 69:24 70:11,25 advance 43:12 agree 25:8,9 51:19 66:3 83:5 85:1 advancing 28:17 63:10 ambiguous ad 54:18 64:11 51:23 69:1 80:2 85:9 10:16 adam 2:10,24 adverse 44:4 agreed 30:22 amend 32:15 8:21 adversely 31:10 42:18 adams 9:1 17:24 48:14,18 agreement amended 29:13 44:10 advising 65:15 agreements amount 7:20 addition 14:13 affect 42:13 46:9 17:13 additional 11:2 affected 17:24 ahead 50:16 ampounts 66:6 additionally 88:12 albert 1:15,19 29:5 57:2 60:4 55:25 23:3 affirm 88:3,7 albuquerque 62:16 63:9 3editionally 88:12 3:9 88:18 65:5 66:15 20:24 27:19 affirmation aligns 43:5 68:13 70:13,19 48:9 49:8 50:6 <	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
63:11,20 67:25 84:23 85:3 2:24 alternatively 69:24 70:11,25 advance 43:12 agree 25:8,9 51:19 66:3 83:5 85:1 advancing 28:17 63:10 ambiguous ad 54:18 64:11 51:23 69:1 80:2 85:9 10:16 adam 2:10,24 adverse 44:4 agreed 30:22 amend 32:15 8:21 adversely 31:10 42:18 adams 9:1 17:24 48:14,18 agreement amended 29:13 44:10 advising 65:15 agreements amount 7:20 addition 14:13 affect 42:13 46:9 17:13 64:13 80:19 67:17 agrees 27:23 amounts 66:6 additional 11:2 48:14,18 aided 50:16 ampomah 1:21 40:25 48:17 48:14,18 aided 56:4,7 4:11 26:19 50:11 51:5,24 affidavit 49:2 albert 1:15,19 29:5 57:2 60:4 52:21 53:3 affirm 88:3,7 albuquerque 62:16 63:9 3editionally 88:12 3:9 88:18 65:5 66:15 48:9 49:8 50:6 affirmat				
69:24 70:11,25 advance 43:12 agree 25:8,9 51:19 66:3 83:5 85:1 advancing 28:17 63:10 ambiguous ad 54:18 64:11 51:23 69:1 80:2 85:9 10:16 adam 2:10,24 adverse 44:4 agreed 30:22 amend 32:15 8:21 adversely 31:10 42:18 adams 9:1 17:24 48:14,18 agreement amended 29:13 44:10 advice 55:15 agreements amount 7:20 addition 14:13 66:17 agrees 27:23 amounts 66:6 additional 11:2 48:14,18 aided 50:16 ampomah 1:21 40:25 48:17 48:14,18 aided 56:4,7 4:11 26:19 50:11 51:5,24 affidavit 49:2 albert 1:15,19 62:16 63:9 additionally 88:12 3:9 88:18 65:5 66:15 20:24 27:19 affirmation aligns 43:5 68:13 70:13,19 48:9 49:8 50:6 affirmative 24:14 73:24 74:7 50:19 69:5 76:25 77:10 alleged 17:3 75:10 77:24	, ,			· ·
83:5 85:1 advancing 28:17 63:10 ambiguous ad 54:18 64:11 51:23 69:1 80:2 85:9 10:16 adam 2:10,24 adverse 44:4 agreed 30:22 amend 32:15 8:21 adversely 31:10 42:18 adams 9:1 17:24 48:14,18 agreement amended 29:13 44:10 advice 55:15 10:22 29:16 41:18 added 72:11 advising 65:15 agreements amount 7:20 addition 14:13 67:17 agrees 27:23 amounts 66:6 additional 11:2 48:14,18 aided 56:4,7 4:11 26:19 40:25 48:17 48:14,18 aided 56:4,7 4:11 26:19 50:11 51:5,24 affidavit 49:2 albert 1:15,19 29:5 57:2 60:4 52:21 53:3 affirm 88:3,7 albuquerque 62:16 63:9 additionally 88:12 3:9 88:18 65:5 66:15 20:24 27:19 affirmation allegations 71:9 72:8 48:9 49:8 50:6 affirmative 24:14 73:24 74:7 50:19 69:5 76:25 77:10 alleged 17:3 75:10 77:24	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
ad54:18 64:1151:2369:1 80:2 85:910:16adam2:10,24adverse 44:4agreed 30:22amend 32:158:21adversely31:1042:18adams9:117:24 48:14,18agreementamended 29:1344:10advice 55:1510:2229:16 41:18added 72:11advising 65:15agreementsamount 7:20addition 14:1367:17agrees 27:23amounts 66:6additional 11:2affected 17:24ahead 50:16ampomah 1:2140:25 48:1748:14,18aided 56:4,74:11 26:1950:11 51:5,24affidavit 49:2albert 1:15,1929:5 57:2 60:452:21 53:3affirm 88:3,7albuquerque62:16 63:9additionally88:123:9 88:1865:5 66:1520:24 27:19affirmationaligns 43:568:13 70:13,1948:9 49:8 50:6affirmative24:1473:24 74:750:19 69:576:25 77:10alleged 17:375:10 77:24	′			
adam 2:10,24 adverse 44:4 agreed 30:22 amend 32:15 adams 9:1 17:24 48:14,18 agreement amended 29:13 44:10 advice 55:15 10:22 29:16 41:18 added 72:11 advising 65:15 agreements amount 7:20 addition 14:13 affect 42:13 46:9 17:13 amount 7:20 additional 11:2 affected 17:24 ahead 50:16 ampomah 1:21 40:25 48:17 48:14,18 aided 56:4,7 4:11 26:19 29:5 57:2 60:4 50:11 51:5,24 affirm 88:3,7 albuquerque 62:16 63:9 62:16 63:9 additionally 88:12 3:9 88:18 65:5 66:15 20:24 27:19 affirmation aligns 43:5 68:13 70:13,19 48:9 49:8 50:6 affirmative 24:14 73:24 74:7 50:19 69:5 76:25 77:10 alleged 17:3 75:10 77:24				
8:21 adamsadversely 17:24 48:14,18 advice31:10 agreement 10:2242:18 amendedadded72:11 additionadvising65:15 affectagreements 42:13amount7:20additional11:2 40:25 48:17 50:11 51:5,24 additionally67:17 afficatedagrees 48:14,18 albert27:23 aheadamount 50:16 albertamounts 4:11 26:19additionally 20:24 27:19 addressaffidavit 48:14 48:9 49:8 50:648:1 affirmation affirmative 76:25 77:1031:10 46:9 agreements alead 46:9 ahead 50:16 albert 3:9 88:18 albuquerque 3:9 88:18 allegations 24:14 48:14 73:24 74:7 75:10 77:24				
adams9:117:24 48:14,18agreementamended29:1344:10advice55:1510:2229:16 41:18added72:11advising65:15agreementsamount7:20addition14:1367:17agrees27:23amounts66:6additional11:2affected17:24ahead50:16ampomah1:2140:25 48:1748:14,18aided56:4,74:11 26:1950:11 51:5,24affidavit49:2albert1:15,1929:5 57:2 60:452:21 53:3affirm88:3,7albuquerque62:16 63:9additionally88:123:9 88:1865:5 66:1520:24 27:19affirmationaligns43:568:13 70:13,19address27:1988:1allegations71:9 72:848:9 49:8 50:6affirmative24:1473:24 74:750:19 69:576:25 77:10alleged17:375:10 77:24	,		_	
44:10 advice 55:15 10:22 29:16 41:18 added 72:11 advising 65:15 agreements amount 7:20 addition 14:13 affect 42:13 46:9 17:13 additional 11:2 affected 17:24 ahead 50:16 ampounts 66:6 additional 48:14,18 aided 56:4,7 4:11 26:19 50:11 51:5,24 affidavit 49:2 albert 1:15,19 29:5 57:2 60:4 52:21 53:3 affirm 88:3,7 albuquerque 62:16 63:9 additionally 88:12 3:9 88:18 65:5 66:15 20:24 27:19 affirmation aligns 43:5 68:13 70:13,19 address 27:19 88:1 allegations 71:9 72:8 48:9 49:8 50:6 affirmative 24:14 73:24 74:7 50:19 69:5 76:25 77:10 alleged 17:3 75:10 77:24				
added72:11advising65:15agreementsamount7:20addition14:1367:17agrees27:23amounts66:6additional11:2affected17:24ahead50:16ampomah1:2140:25 48:1748:14,18aided56:4,74:11 26:1950:11 51:5,24affidavit49:2albert1:15,1929:5 57:2 60:452:21 53:3affirm88:3,7albuquerque62:16 63:9additionally88:123:9 88:1865:5 66:1520:24 27:19affirmationaligns43:568:13 70:13,19address27:1988:1allegations71:9 72:848:9 49:8 50:6affirmative24:1473:24 74:750:19 69:576:25 77:10alleged17:375:10 77:24		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
addition14:13affect42:1346:917:1364:13 80:1967:17agrees27:23amounts66:6additional11:2affected17:24ahead50:16ampomah1:2140:25 48:1748:14,18aided56:4,74:11 26:1950:11 51:5,24affidavit49:2albert1:15,1929:5 57:2 60:452:21 53:3affirm88:3,7albuquerque62:16 63:9additionally88:123:9 88:1865:5 66:1520:24 27:19affirmationaligns43:568:13 70:13,19address27:1988:1allegations71:9 72:848:9 49:8 50:6affirmative24:1473:24 74:750:19 69:576:25 77:10alleged17:375:10 77:24				
64:13 80:19 67:17 agrees 27:23 amounts 66:6 additional 11:2 affected 17:24 ahead 50:16 ampomah 1:21 40:25 48:17 48:14,18 aided 56:4,7 4:11 26:19 50:11 51:5,24 affidavit 49:2 albert 1:15,19 29:5 57:2 60:4 52:21 53:3 affirm 88:3,7 albuquerque 62:16 63:9 additionally 88:12 3:9 88:18 65:5 66:15 20:24 27:19 affirmation aligns 43:5 68:13 70:13,19 48:9 49:8 50:6 affirmative 24:14 73:24 74:7 50:19 69:5 76:25 77:10 alleged 17:3 75:10 77:24				
additional 11:2 affected 17:24 ahead 50:16 ampomah 1:21 40:25 48:17 48:14,18 aided 56:4,7 4:11 26:19 50:11 51:5,24 affidavit 49:2 albert 1:15,19 29:5 57:2 60:4 52:21 53:3 affirm 88:3,7 albuquerque 62:16 63:9 additionally 88:12 3:9 88:18 65:5 66:15 20:24 27:19 affirmation aligns 43:5 68:13 70:13,19 address 27:19 88:1 allegations 71:9 72:8 48:9 49:8 50:6 affirmative 24:14 73:24 74:7 50:19 69:5 76:25 77:10 alleged 17:3 75:10 77:24				
40:25 48:17 48:14,18 aided 56:4,7 4:11 26:19 50:11 51:5,24 affidavit 49:2 albert 1:15,19 29:5 57:2 60:4 52:21 53:3 affirm 88:3,7 albuquerque 62:16 63:9 additionally 88:12 3:9 88:18 65:5 66:15 20:24 27:19 affirmation aligns 43:5 68:13 70:13,19 address 27:19 88:1 allegations 71:9 72:8 48:9 49:8 50:6 affirmative 24:14 73:24 74:7 50:19 69:5 76:25 77:10 alleged 17:3 75:10 77:24				
50:11 51:5,24 affidavit 49:2 albert 1:15,19 29:5 57:2 60:4 52:21 53:3 affirm 88:3,7 albuquerque 62:16 63:9 additionally 88:12 3:9 88:18 65:5 66:15 20:24 27:19 affirmation aligns 43:5 68:13 70:13,19 address 27:19 88:1 allegations 71:9 72:8 48:9 49:8 50:6 affirmative 24:14 73:24 74:7 50:19 69:5 76:25 77:10 alleged 17:3 75:10 77:24				_
52:21 53:3 affirm 88:3,7 albuquerque 62:16 63:9 additionally 88:12 3:9 88:18 65:5 66:15 20:24 27:19 affirmation aligns 43:5 68:13 70:13,19 address 27:19 88:1 allegations 71:9 72:8 48:9 49:8 50:6 affirmative 24:14 73:24 74:7 50:19 69:5 76:25 77:10 alleged 17:3 75:10 77:24		· ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
additionally 88:12 3:9 88:18 65:5 66:15 20:24 27:19 affirmation aligns 43:5 68:13 70:13,19 address 27:19 88:1 allegations 71:9 72:8 48:9 49:8 50:6 affirmative 24:14 73:24 74:7 50:19 69:5 76:25 77:10 alleged 17:3 75:10 77:24	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
20:24 27:19 affirmation aligns 43:5 68:13 70:13,19 address 27:19 88:1 allegations 71:9 72:8 48:9 49:8 50:6 affirmative 24:14 73:24 74:7 50:19 69:5 76:25 77:10 alleged 17:3 75:10 77:24				
address 27:19 88:1 allegations 71:9 72:8 48:9 49:8 50:6 affirmative 24:14 73:24 74:7 50:19 69:5 76:25 77:10 alleged 17:3 75:10 77:24				
48:9 49:8 50:6 affirmative 24:14 73:24 74:7 50:19 69:5 76:25 77:10 alleged 17:3 75:10 77:24				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
50:19 69:5 76:25 77:10 alleged 17:3 75:10 77:24				
\downarrow \downarrow \uparrow	JU.17 U7.J	10.23 / /.10	35:6 45:22	
35:6 45:22 79:24 80:5,9			33.0 43.22	17.44 00.3,9

[ampomah - argument]

00.14.01.0.01	22.0	c0.17	47.10.74.1
80:14 81:8,21	32:9	60:17	47:10 74:1
82:13 83:11	announcement	appellate 27:20	84:8
84:6 85:17,24	86:15,22	appended 24:2	approach 62:8
86:1	answer 75:1	apple 13:10	66:23 67:3
ampomah's	76:20	16:4	approaches
57:21	answered	applicable	71:8
analogous 82:3	67:23	40:16 44:25	appropriate
82:20	answering	82:21	16:17 28:21
analyses 36:3	68:14	applicant 15:24	51:10 73:21
analysis 39:1	answers 84:7	37:8 77:5	approval 7:7
40:25 41:3,4	antonio 2:19	applicants	approve 4:13
41:11 58:3	anybody 19:8	30:18	4:15,16 7:1
82:4,10,13	26:1	application	85:25 86:1,3,5
analyzed 35:11	anyway 20:12	7:10,12 11:24	approved 4:20
anders 44:17	apodaca 4:5,8	12:15 29:8,13	5:23 6:1 7:5
84:4	4:10 5:21,24	29:15 39:8,14	15:2 40:1
andres 11:9,17	47:16 53:10	41:2,17 43:24	42:12 69:8
11:21 19:23	85:24 86:2,4	50:21 69:9,11	86:6
23:5,12,17	apologize 4:23	69:17 70:10	approves 29:17
29:20 33:4,5	68:1	75:13 78:3	approximately
33:13,15,17	apparently	applications	73:1
34:25 35:5,8	27:9 71:2	29:18 56:12	aquifer 33:7
38:25 39:2,3	appeal 18:17	76:25 77:4	arbitrary 27:8
40:5 46:24,25	27:16 44:3	80:21	29:10 38:1
47:8 54:8	appear 50:13	applied 15:22	67:8,16 68:3,6
59:16 61:17	64:22	30:8,12,16	70:24 71:1
67:6 72:11	appearance	32:1 34:10	area 50:2
75:22 76:2,6	19:6	37:23,23	areas 68:22
77:13 78:9	appearances	applies 14:14	argue 13:12
79:3,10,18	8:14	28:11 55:5	17:8
80:4 81:6,7,20	appeared 74:11	apply 12:14	argued 12:8
announce 5:11	appearing 8:21	18:7 30:5	14:24
86:9,10	9:8 60:14	applying 59:23	arguing 44:14
announced	appears 8:7	appreciate 8:15	argument
10:3 22:21	49:12 56:25	26:11 45:7	12:25 17:9

[argument - best]

22:2 27:2	attended 55:10	73:22	basic 36:2
48:11,22,25	attention 47:10	awaiting 61:7	basis 17:10,13
49:15 66:4	47:12 53:18	b	22:1 33:17
arguments	73:25	b 65:7	35:13 45:4
16:20 17:2,21	attentive 45:6	back 4:25 5:9	67:20 84:4
26:15 27:6	attest 6:10,13	6:8,15,15	basura 48:14
40:9 44:7 45:7	6:14	15:21 16:14	baylen 1:20
46:4 63:22	audience 8:24	17:7 22:14	beatty 3:13 9:8
65:24 85:15	august 10:3	28:3 33:3 53:6	beck 3:10 9:13
asked 16:10	22:20	53:11,19 59:2	9:13 53:17
23:11 57:2	authority 13:22	67:15 70:14	beg 25:18
74:19,22 76:11	14:2 29:22	73:19 82:3,5	beginning 59:2
asking 19:16	31:22 32:25	86:21	begins 42:20
20:14 23:20	33:24 35:16	background	behalf 8:18,21
27:12	36:25 37:20	10:1	9:9,11,13
asks 32:14	55:6 56:14,20	baker 3:8	25:16,16 26:12
aspect 45:4	58:25 62:5	balance 61:18	47:10 60:15
48:8	65:13,16,19,21	balanced 18:24	66:18,22
aspects 67:4,4	66:1,6,21	banks 58:12,19	believe 9:16,17
67:5	68:15,17,19,21	barrels 23:14	24:16 34:6
assess 36:13	70:7 78:4	41:23	43:16 44:10,14
associated 42:1	80:22	barrier 15:15	57:25 60:11
assumptions	authorize	15:17,23 16:6	61:13 70:6
36:5	68:18	30:9 32:7	76:17 77:12,21
assurances	authorized	37:17 38:3	82:4,9 83:11
25:1	14:23 37:6	40:10,24 41:10	believed 40:15
assure 60:16	46:7,17,22	barriers 15:25	believes 53:1
asymmetrical	59:24	based 11:10,22	72:15
44:24	authorizing	16:18 18:22	believing 63:5
attached 16:4	33:6	29:21 35:11	belongs 33:7
attacked 55:7	available 28:17	36:5 39:6,7,22	benchmark
attacks 54:18	48:2	45:10 62:25	50:25
attempted 12:4	ave 2:18 3:13	77:19 79:22	benefit 19:24
attend 19:8	avoid 12:19	83:7	best 74:20
	29:9 41:12	05.7	88:10

[better - chang]

better 68:10	brought 49:1	carefully 17:11	cetera 48:17
beyond 31:22	64:25	18:24 84:25	chair 1:15,19
32:25	buchwalter's	carry 31:25	4:2,9,11,18,21
billion 72:25	11:10 38:25	34:8 36:16	5:18,24,25 6:2
73:1	building 1:5	76:25	6:7,14 7:4,7
bit 52:6	2:18	case 4:23 6:16	8:7,16,19,20
bite 13:9 16:3	bunch 49:14	6:17,19 7:8,9	9:6,7,10,15,20
bleeding 86:14	burden 18:13	7:11,12,13,17	26:16,22 27:1
bloom 26:24	30:16,17 32:1	7:24 8:2,13	28:7,22 29:2,4
47:17	34:9,11,12	16:1 17:23	47:14,18,20
board 9:2	36:17 37:9,14	19:5,11,20	48:3,4 53:7,12
47:11 84:9	37:21 39:10	21:15,15,19	53:14 60:1,6,8
borrowing	76:15,16,21,24	22:7 28:8 29:2	60:14 62:13,16
73:12	76:25 77:7	36:2 37:4	84:9,13,22
bothered 19:7	81:13,13,17	41:22 44:16	85:8,10,17,19
boundary 46:7	business 61:11	45:9 67:2	85:21 86:3,7
box 2:14 3:9	bwenergylaw	cases 8:9,11	86:17 87:1
brandon 49:3	3:15	30:22,23 31:12	chairman
break 76:23	c	catchall 64:16	47:24 53:17
brief 9:24 10:1	c 2:1 3:1 79:15	cause 59:11	challenge 27:16
15:19 60:16	79:25	causing 55:2	45:2
briefing 14:6	call 4:2,4 5:20	cautious 65:15	chance 17:19
14:12,17 15:15	8:8 84:16	cd 70:16	41:11 84:18
18:15,22 31:10	85:23	cemented 23:9	chang 1:15,19
45:6 56:5,7	capable 31:3,24	centre 2:18	4:2,8,9,11,18
briefs 74:1	34:14 35:18,19	certain 32:22	4:21 5:18,24
bring 21:21	35:25	64:1,4,15	5:25 6:2,7,14
26:8	capex 73:3	certainly 22:24	7:4,7 8:7,19,20
bringing 28:18	capital 9:3 42:3	26:14 28:17	9:6,10,15
53:19	42:25 57:19	48:19 64:22	26:16,22 27:1
brings 52:18,23	capricious 27:8	66:21 70:9,22	28:7,22 29:2,4
broad 14:2	29:11 38:1	86:11	47:14,18,20,24
31:15 65:21	carbon 55:17	certainty 25:19	48:3,4 53:7,12
68:17,21 70:7	careful 45:8	62:10	53:14,17 60:1
	47:12 64:6		60:6,8 62:13

[chang - commission]

	I	T T	
84:9,13,22	clarify 32:15	coincide 43:7	10:3,15 11:8
85:8,10,19,21	42:18 48:1	colleague 8:22	11:23 12:10,13
86:2,3,7,17	62:3	54:17	12:16,21,23
87:1	clarity 50:6,9	come 15:21	13:11,21 14:3
change 13:4	70:22 86:13,25	16:13 17:7	14:13,25 15:11
71:8	class 45:16	19:7 22:24	15:22 16:10,23
charge 21:14	classification	25:14 49:20	17:11 18:3,23
21:18	54:20	50:13 53:10	19:15 20:4,9
charged 55:14	clause 63:15	67:6 83:19	20:16,19 22:2
charles 9:3	clean 66:19	86:21	22:4,23 23:20
chief 9:1 44:9	cleaned 28:2	comes 23:3,5	23:24 24:8,11
chino 1:5	cleaning 27:14	24:15 36:20	25:6,11,18
choices 17:13	clear 13:6	55:4	26:12 27:7,20
chose 50:20	48:10,24 54:4	comfortable	28:4,19,24
chris 3:5 9:11	58:17,23 59:19	5:3	29:6,12,22
chris.moander	66:12 67:18	coming 6:8	30:5,6,16,24
3:5	68:22 70:3,19	21:12	31:13 32:1,6
circumstances	75:16 76:15	commence	32:11,24 33:2
13:8 30:6	80:6	10:17 11:5	33:24 34:10
36:22	clearly 10:14	25:10 43:4	35:16,24 36:7
citation 38:19	15:13 18:22	56:12	36:22,25 37:12
38:23	61:16	commenced	37:13 38:13
cited 27:13	clerk 7:25	75:9	39:3,7,17,21,25
28:9 80:12	close 26:17	commencem	40:8,20 41:9
claim 15:14,21	closed 4:25 5:4	69:3	41:13 42:15,17
36:12 48:24	5:13,16,22 6:3	commences	43:10,23,25
64:7	6:3,6,12,20	32:17 69:24	45:21 46:10,21
claims 13:10	87:3	comment 46:13	47:18 48:17,21
30:25 57:13	co2 10:17 11:5	comments	49:11,15,22
clarification	32:17,22 42:12	45:18	51:6 53:6,17
47:24 52:20	42:20 43:2,4,7	commercial	54:7,10,11
64:18 76:8	43:12 56:13	23:18	55:4,11,13
clarifications	58:21,24 63:17	commission 1:3	56:4,23 57:16
53:4 60:22	69:9 70:17	1:13,17,23 4:5	57:18,25 58:4
66:7		6:5,8,19 7:9,25	58:22 59:18

[commission - connect]

60:2 61:21	6:24 7:2 26:19	complains	conclusory
62:1 64:18	26:24 29:5,5	44:23	24:14
65:3,13,16,18	47:17 57:21	complete 52:10	concrete 43:14
65:22,23 68:15	60:4 62:16	completely	concurrent
68:17,21 70:5	65:5 66:15	25:9 44:20	65:1
70:7 71:11,24	70:13 71:9	67:7 71:11	conditions
72:4,23 73:16	72:8 73:24	72:25	63:21
73:20 74:5,17	74:7 75:10	completion	conduct 27:8,8
74:21,24 76:18	77:24 79:24	88:1	45:3 59:24
78:2,5,11 79:8	80:5,9,14 81:8	complexity	66:10
80:6,20,23	81:21 82:13	61:3	conference
81:11,15 82:10	83:11 84:6,11	compliance	88:6
83:10,12,16	85:17,20,24	66:2	confine 15:1
84:1 85:12,14	86:1,2,4,5	complies 50:8	36:18,24 37:9
87:2 88:5	commissioners	compounding	39:10 40:2
commission's	8:17 26:18	30:15	62:6 76:3 77:8
7:8 10:8,20	29:4 47:15,23	conceded 73:6	confined 14:22
12:5,19 13:1	53:8 60:13	concepts 23:3	37:7 40:7,17
19:17 22:11,19	62:14 84:9	concern 24:14	41:8 77:2,14
24:4 26:11	committed	43:21 50:14	77:19
30:20 31:21	27:21 57:19	53:1 64:12	confinement
32:3 36:20	communication	concerned 21:1	16:6 37:13
38:20 39:15	38:17,22,24	61:8	40:3
42:6 43:6	39:2,5 40:21	concerns 38:11	confining 15:25
44:18 53:23	45:22 46:1	50:20	41:6 45:23
54:3,20 55:25	61:19 79:9,14	conclude 45:17	confirm 68:14
56:11,23 57:1	79:20	concluded 78:2	confirmed 33:3
58:16 59:22	company 3:7	80:20	77:22
61:8 62:3,8	9:14 21:4	conclusion	confirms 33:11
67:21 71:21	23:11 26:1	35:14 45:5	41:5 75:21
72:19 79:22	57:19	74:9	conflict 66:13
80:3	compared 61:4	conclusive	conflicts 37:19
commissioner	compelling	11:20 71:19	54:15 75:17
4:6,7,8,11,16	39:23 40:20	73:8	connect 82:18
5:12,15,21,23	79:13		

[consent - currently]

consent 57:18	contesting	conventional	coterra's 7:11
consequences	12:11	82:22 83:2	counsel 1:23
38:5	context 49:4	conventionally	6:16 7:23 8:15
conservation	54:4 56:11	50:24 64:20	28:24 38:19
1:3 3:2 88:5	contingent	converse 83:6	47:18 53:9,12
consideration	51:20,22 52:16	conversely 77:5	55:17 60:6
45:8 47:12	59:23 63:14	copied 55:17	74:10 84:10
considerations	69:3 74:12	copy 7:23,25	counter 65:24
50:12	continue 20:1,5	core 11:16	couple 27:1
considered	40:6 42:19	corey 2:19 8:17	33:1 45:17
16:19 17:8,12	continued 4:22	coring 58:2	57:8,9 62:17
consistent 22:6	12:3,17 20:12	correct 13:1,6,6	76:7
23:21 25:21	20:21 23:5	15:2,13,23	course 5:5
67:14 73:5,13	32:4 42:11	18:24 27:13	11:13 14:15
consolidated	59:9	29:8 39:8 48:3	19:10 49:19
8:9	continues	48:4 50:19	77:11 81:23
constitute	10:11,18 23:13	60:20 80:2	82:17
17:17	56:21	88:9	coy 49:13 54:17
constitutes	continuous	corrections	creates 38:4
76:4	15:14,17,22	29:14	75:16
constitution	16:5 30:9 32:7	correctly 11:24	criteria 65:9
33:9 75:19	37:17 38:3	76:12	critical 11:3
constitutional	40:4,10,24	corrects 62:9	29:8 38:15
16:20 17:3	41:10	correlative	45:11
64:8 75:17	contradicts	11:12 13:2,23	criticisms 48:9
construe 52:13	12:25	14:4 15:5	50:15 53:23
construing	contrary 82:23	16:24 18:12	cross 61:19
14:8	contrast 27:6	33:23 34:16,24	crude 14:1
cont'd 3:1	42:2	36:15 39:20,21	curious 65:25
contain 38:14	contravention	54:25 59:11	current 44:20
containment	33:8 75:19	61:15 78:7	54:25 62:4
76:11	control 30:6	79:1,21 81:6	70:15 79:9
contains 42:9	controlling	costs 23:8	81:3
contend 49:9	13:4	coterra 2:2	currently 30:23
		4:22	39:22 41:23

[currently - died]

55.2 70.7 17	doodling 50.5	delegation	domita 10.10
55:3 78:7,17	deadline 50:5	delegation	despite 10:19
curtail 10:12	51:1 52:2	74:14	12:1 13:5 19:5
30:7 36:23,25	62:23	deliberated	21:12 61:2
curtailed 21:25	deadlines 49:24	6:19	72:1
22:3 43:12,13	50:25 52:9,12	deliberations	destined 20:6
curtailment	53:3 65:14	4:22 22:2	destroy 21:19
21:23 24:9	66:2 70:25	demonstrable	destroyed
71:23	decades 40:4	32:21	12:24
cwehmeyer	decide 25:2	demonstrate	detail 16:21
2:20	decided 13:13	42:4 43:3 50:4	31:18 51:7
d	13:17	77:1	64:16
d 80:18,19	decides 70:2	demonstrated	detailed 66:2
dallas 22:14	deciding 50:18	61:16 78:17	determination
dana 2:15 8:17	decision 5:10	demonstrating	16:6 64:1
darin 2:5,5	6:21 7:8 10:3	18:10 41:7	70:20 71:5
data 16:10,12	12:5,19 28:5	demonstration	determine
16:15 35:12	35:24 45:9	43:14 79:9	69:17
36:3,6 39:24	61:8,9 71:21	demonstratives	determined
40:19 41:1,4	72:1 73:17	84:15	37:15 39:7
41:12 77:20	74:5 86:23	denial 30:25	78:16
79:11,11,12	decisions 62:19	denied 7:11,14	determines
82:16,19 83:1	decks 84:15	11:24,25	43:10
83:8	declines 32:12	denying 10:4	develop 21:21
date 7:15,18	defer 65:2	departure	24:23
39:5 64:1 65:7	define 36:21	25:24	developed 67:9
65:10	definition 38:1	depending	development
dawson 12:1	42:10 59:5	16:25	19:22 23:17,18
58:11,19	delay 22:8,15	dept 3:3	67:2
day 7:22 22:8	22:16 23:22	depths 24:22	deviations
22:10 23:14	delayed 32:16	deputy 49:3	82:25
41:24 50:1	delegate 74:18	52:4,8	dhardy 2:16
	74:24 75:3	derek 28:8	dictate 69:13
86:9	delegated	description	70:5,11
days 7:15 51:1	74:15	71:12	died 36:12
51:9,16 63:25			

[different - empire]

different 18:7	disinclined	division's 14:18	easier 26:9
23:24 46:8	71:24 73:16	38:5 56:2	70:23 73:8
47:3 51:24	disingenuous	doing 19:12	economic 36:2
70:2 76:22	49:13 54:17	21:11,13,16	36:4 67:4,11
differently 82:8	disobey 10:11	42:23	economical
difficult 63:1	disposal 21:4	dollars 41:21	72:16
difficulty 50:17	24:6 26:1 31:7	73:3	effect 7:15
digest 26:9	32:18 33:20	don 3:13	20:11 66:8
diligence 13:6	35:23 36:19	doubt 23:4	effective 51:15
direct 36:22	38:6,10,17	downs 64:14	63:24 64:3
45:25	40:7 42:11,21	dr 1:21 11:10	effects 44:4
directive 55:25	43:6 44:5	38:25 57:2	56:9 64:12
directly 12:25	45:13 46:15,22	63:9 68:13	effectuated
36:20	47:4,6 76:2	70:19 82:24	63:20,21
director 49:3	77:9,14,23	draft 5:1	effort 21:20
52:4,8	79:10,14 84:4	dragging 4:23	26:8 50:2
disagree 31:6	disposition	drastic 25:24	either 25:4
82:12 83:5	88:14	draw 35:13	34:24 53:15
disagrees 32:12	dispositive	drew 9:2	60:9
discretion 30:7	30:22 31:1,12	drill 11:24	ejection 46:17
33:24 36:22	distillation	57:10	elected 45:2
64:24 66:22	61:12	drilling 58:2	electronically
75:5	distinction	drive 1:6 3:4	7:22
discuss 48:7	71:13	due 13:5 16:13	element 36:13
discussed 6:11	division 3:2	35:3	emergency
6:13 14:5	10:8 12:6,7,12	duties 48:17,19	55:20
15:19 18:14	13:21 14:20,25	duty 10:24 15:4	emnrd.nm.gov
72:10	15:7,11 16:23	50:8 77:10	3:5
discussion 9:22	19:15 24:3	e	empire 2:13 8:3
21:22 49:24	30:7 46:21	e 2:1,1 3:1,1	8:10,18 10:16
72:12 76:10	55:5,9,9,13,15	55:16	10:23 11:4
78:1 82:5	55:16,19 56:1	earlier 13:14	12:14,24 14:15
discussions	56:13 74:10,11	28:4,13	17:18 18:9
49:24	74:16,18,25	earth 21:9	19:16,21 20:14
	75:4,5 83:25	25:25 46:16	21:6,20 24:22

[empire - evidence]

	T	T	<u> </u>
25:4,16,21	30:25 31:8	enhanced	erroneously
26:13 28:13	33:22 36:11	10:17 38:7	15:10,22 33:2
29:23 30:2,18	37:10 43:14,18	45:16	46:25 47:8
30:22 31:10,25	44:13 65:9,10	ensure 45:15	75:17
32:16,20 34:8	70:25 71:17	50:8 51:2	error 13:6
34:13,19,22	78:3,12,14	entails 50:10	29:10 30:15
35:1,5,10,21	80:21 85:1	61:13	33:2 37:3
36:1,8,16	employed	enter 44:1	errors 29:9
37:21 38:20	88:12	entered 10:6	escaped 15:12
39:9,16 40:1,3	emsu 20:10	entire 59:2	especially
42:2,12,19,23	23:13,17 29:20	72:10	35:23 60:23
43:19 44:13,23	30:13 31:9	entirely 36:5	68:22
45:2,19 46:5	33:15,22 35:12	81:10	esq 1:24
48:10,12 49:12	36:3,6 37:25	entry 29:10	essentially 12:8
49:16,20 50:14	40:5 61:4	enumerated	66:6
51:22 52:1,3	75:23 79:22	52:5	establish 15:24
52:10,13 53:2	82:17,19 83:8	environmental	57:18 58:21
54:19,22,23	emsu's 33:6	50:12	63:17
55:4,7 56:12	enabling 65:20	eor 23:12 30:13	established
56:17 57:2,5,9	encroachment	38:10 42:12,24	16:1 25:23
58:20,24 59:4	13:25	43:15 45:1,3	establishes
59:23 60:20	ends 23:22	49:21 51:23	11:11 83:6
61:14 63:16	energy 2:2 3:3	52:3,17,17	et 48:17
64:4 65:11,14	enforce 23:21	53:2 56:13	eunice 11:14
66:18 67:13	25:14,15 55:21	57:4,18 58:21	event 15:23
69:12,15,24	66:7	58:24 63:17	36:1 41:13
70:2,10,16	enforced 18:25	64:5 65:10	51:8 63:14
71:2,7,9 72:9	19:17,19 20:15	67:5 68:18,24	everybody 8:7
72:15,24 73:10	enforcement	69:4,7,25	evidence 11:20
74:12 76:14,24	18:1,2,6 48:23	70:17 74:6,13	11:23 13:4,13
77:6 78:5 82:1	49:4 64:21	75:8	16:5,19 17:5,6
82:17 83:13,18	engineering	equals 22:15	17:12 18:11,22
85:6	21:15,19 39:23	equipment	24:1 28:12,15
empire's 12:11	40:19 77:20	24:18	28:16,18,20
23:1 26:3	79:11 81:22		32:8 36:9

[evidence - fe]

		I	
39:16 40:6,11	excruciating	expected 64:16	49:25 82:24
40:21,25 41:19	51:7	expenditure	factor 52:21
42:13 45:20,25	execute 19:22	73:4	82:25 83:3
45:25 46:6	25:7 63:6	expenditures	factors 18:14
54:12 56:18	67:14 72:22	43:1	facts 34:7
57:13 61:14,19	73:4	experience 49:2	45:10
63:22 71:18	executed 22:23	experienced	factual 29:14
73:7 76:9	executing 73:9	52:9	33:17
77:19,22 78:6	executive 6:9	experiences	failed 13:10
80:23 81:1,9	9:1 44:9 85:14	49:10	30:5 31:25
81:10,14,16,18	86:22	expert 21:8,16	34:8 36:2,16
82:8,23 83:6	exemplified	23:11 25:9	37:10,15 46:16
83:19,20,23	56:18	experts 36:4	82:18
84:3 85:1	exercise 59:2	expires 50:5	fails 18:13
evidentiary	exercising	explaining	52:17
10:2 32:1 34:5	10:24	11:17	failure 14:22
34:9 35:13	exhibit 50:23	explanatory	15:1 20:6,8
39:10	exhibited 14:22	7:20	36:18,24 37:9
exactly 13:18	36:17 38:14	expressed 21:6	38:14 39:9
19:18 20:16	40:1 76:3 77:8	extension 12:13	40:2 44:3
21:24	exhibits 15:17	extensive 11:22	52:13,14 62:6
example 12:6	15:18 16:8,16	41:6	76:3 77:8
16:9 50:10	exist 13:8 71:2	extensively	fair 26:17
except 21:10	existence 37:17	14:6 18:23	71:12 85:10
exchange 57:5	40:23 41:5	extent 77:15	fairly 7:19
58:5	existing 10:15	extraordinarily	fall 69:10
exchanges 10:7	11:25 29:19	65:21	familiar 13:21
exclude 17:5	37:24 38:6	\mathbf{f}	49:5
excluded 38:23	41:23 47:5	f 2:19	far 38:5 70:18
exclusive 10:24	58:11,18 77:6	face 16:22 21:9	fashion 66:24
14:15 24:22	77:8 78:5	46:15	68:3
exclusively	80:22	facility 43:1	favor 7:9 31:13
33:8	exists 57:14	fact 16:18	fe 1:7 2:4,9,15
exclusivity 21:6	expect 83:2	35:10 38:22	2:23 3:4,14
		48:18 49:19,22	
		10.10 17.17,22	

[feasible - future]

federal 37:20 75:25 79:19 36 feels 26:16 80:3 81:3,5,5 37	5:18,24 37:5 5:7 38:15	39:21 40:20 50:23 52:4
feels 26:16 80:3 81:3,5,5 37	7:7 38:15	
feet 26:17 41:6 81:19 39	· (() / (() · ′)	78:5 79:8,13
		80:23 81:2,15
		undational
·		34:15
		ur 19:8,13
		24:1 26:13
69:9 85:1 33:22 39:8,15 follo	owed 61:6 2	27:9 28:5,18
files 69:12 39:19 56:23,24 follo	owing 61:22 3	31:15 41:21
70:11 62:4,6 74:8 force	ed 19:18	67:9 71:20
filing 12:7 79:7,23 83:10 42	2:7	72:4
17:20 49:24 finds 33:14 forc	ing 48:12 for	urth 32:6
67:7 fine 26:24 85:8 fore	going 88:9	88:18
filings 24:2 first 6:17,23 fore	seeable fra	actures 11:17
26:7,17 64:15 9:21 29:21 60):25	45:20 46:1
68:4 30:10 31:21 form	n 66:24 fra	ame 45:1
final 19:17 20:4 32:15,24 33:1 form	nation 23:8 fra	amework
22:12 27:11 41:19 44:13 form	national 6	52:23
44:2 65:3 48:8,11 63:9 61	:19 fra	ancis 1:6 3:4
66:14,24 67:12 65:10 67:7 fort	22:14 fr c	ont 4:14 6:25
88:14 69:8 82:2 fort	h 59:20 fro	ontline 27:22
finality 13:16 84:23 82	:5 83:16 fu l	II 24:11 41:11
finally 30:20 fits 66:10 88	:8	58:12 71:20
32:11 43:23 five 19:4,9 22:1 forv	vard 22:1 fu l	lly 74:18
financial 49:20 53:24 54:1 38	:11 56:19 fu ı	nny 68:1
64:9 flattery 49:14 63	:2 67:19 fu	rther 52:19
find 24:13,20 flipped 37:14 69	:8,16 73:9	82:20 88:7,12
31:22,23 35:17 flood 32:17 73	:21 74:12 fu t	ture 24:10
38:13 80:12 42:20 43:4,7 83	:19,19	34:4 37:16
finding 11:7,15 43:12 four	nd 11:9	38:6,21 48:2
31:3 34:5 floor 1:5 62:14 20	2:23 31:13	54:9 60:25
37:12 38:15,25 fluid 15:2,12 33	:19 34:3	63:12 79:7
39:25 42:7 61:17 35	:21 36:8	84:2
43:6 44:19	:16 39:6,17	

[gallegos - gross]

σ	58:20	37:15,22 39:11	62:23 67:18
g	going 4:24 5:1	39:12,16 40:10	70:1,21 74:4
gallegos 88:3	5:4,7 13:19	40:14,22 41:10	76:2,5,12 77:6
88:17	16:21 22:1	41:17,20 42:7	77:7,22 78:8
game 83:17	23:16 25:5	44:4,16,23,25	84:5
gas 13:2 34:17	27:15 37:5	45:11,23 46:3	gotcha 54:16
62:10 65:20	38:11 43:21	47:11 51:16	56:16
gaspar 3:13	48:6,9 50:16	54:13 55:2,7	gotten 26:7
generally 44:6	55:9 60:24	55:15,24 59:4	govern 36:21
genuinely	61:9 68:17	59:10,16 60:18	governing
65:24	71:1 72:5,21	69:23 71:12	37:19 77:17
geophysical	73:18 74:12	73:6,25 75:12	grant 9:1 17:10
41:4	77:2	76:17 77:12	29:12 30:1
getting 45:9	good 6:7 7:20	78:11 79:12	32:12 41:14,16
57:6 70:22	8:16,20 9:7	goodnight's	44:9 62:1 78:3
give 8:4 66:5	19:6 29:5	10:4,15 11:24	80:21
given 32:8	37:10 47:23	15:14 16:11	granted 7:10
41:11 42:6,9	60:13 68:11	17:12,17 18:4	18:19 22:9
52:14 66:12	goodnight 2:21	19:6 23:23	39:14 55:5
84:24 85:4,11	8:3,9,22,25 9:2	29:12,17,18,24	58:25 72:24
gives 10:23	10:7,10,11,18	29:25 30:3,19	granting 30:4
14:15	11:6 12:2,4,6	31:7,7,13,16	grateful 47:11
glaringly 33:1	12:11,17,22	32:4,18,19	grayburg 11:9
go 4:24 5:1,4	13:9,18 14:8	33:20,21 34:1	11:13,17,19,21
5:13,16,22 6:2	14:12,17 15:6	35:3,23 36:17	19:24 20:2
6:12 7:15	16:3 17:4,10	37:1,8 38:14	23:7 34:24
16:21 32:23	18:13,16,18	38:17 39:13,23	35:1,2,5,7
50:16 54:22	19:10 20:18	40:1,9 41:7,14	38:18,24 39:2
55:14,17 56:19	21:8 22:7,16	41:16 42:16,17	55:3 61:15
59:1 67:19	23:13,22 24:2	42:19,21 43:11	78:7 79:4,6,10
69:8,16 70:18	24:6,16 25:4	43:16,24 44:2	79:19,20 80:1
73:8,21 75:21	29:3,7 30:11	44:9,14,20	great 38:12
81:25 83:16	30:11,17,21	52:19 56:14,19	53:14
85:14	31:12 32:7,12	56:20 57:3	gross 72:25
goes 22:10 26:6 31:21 57:16	32:14 34:12	58:6,11,18	9
31.21 37.10		. ,	

[ground - impair]

ground 73:22	happy 5:8 26:5	heeded 55:15	hundreds 73:3
guadalupe 2:9	hard 7:23,25	heeding 55:25	hydrocarbon
2:23	66:4	help 62:18	47:2 81:7
guaranteed	hardy 2:15	helpful 85:5	hydrocarbons
52:23	8:16,17 9:20	herring 48:25	12:23 31:23
guarantees	37:2 66:19	high 11:18 13:3	33:4,12,14,20
25:1,13	68:9,11	higher 23:7	34:20 35:18
guardrails	harm 18:17,18	highly 49:10	44:19 75:22
49:23 53:3	23:2 25:20	highway 2:17	76:1 79:17
68:19	harmed 78:25	hindsight 16:18	81:20 83:9,24
guess 4:13	hart 2:8,22	hinkle 2:14	i
guidance 10:9	8:21	hinklelawfir	ibc 2:17
24:4 51:25	headings 54:6	2:16	idea 56:7,25
55:8 65:4 75:6	hear 27:2 59:4	historically	66:23 68:2,7
guys 57:17	65:25	68:5	identified 26:1
h	heard 18:3	history 19:12	46:19 83:1
half 19:9,13	20:24 22:25	20:20 21:3,7	identifies 39:4
26:13 27:9	23:10,15 47:25	46:14,16 67:25	identify 46:14
28:5,19 67:9	72:25	hoc 64:11	82:20
halfway 20:7	hearing 1:1 8:8	hold 50:3	identifying
hall 1:5	10:2 11:23	holds 84:2	45:24
handle 18:1	13:16 16:9,11	hole 72:6	immediate
handled 52:7	17:6,24 18:8	holland 2:8,22	63:12 65:8
handles 49:11	28:17 29:8	8:21	74:22
handling 18:5	31:11 32:10	hollandhart.c	immediately
handouts 85:5	40:14,25 41:3	2:10,11,24,25	42:8 43:3
hang 5:6,6	46:5 49:19	hominem 54:18	51:15 58:7
hanson 3:8	55:10 56:7	hope 67:22	67:18
happen 58:23	64:17 70:9	hopefully 6:21	immobile 59:7
69:7	72:10 75:11	7:19 53:20	59:12
happened	76:10,18,19	86:18	impact 61:9
55:21,22 68:5	77:11 80:15,24	horizontally	impacted 42:14
83:18	81:22,23 82:1	77:16	impacts 79:5
happens 54:2	82:17 83:20	hundred 15:16	impair 59:11
56:5 86:21	85:21 88:4		

[impaired - instance]

	I	T -	I
impaired 39:22	45:10 47:13	incorrectly	20:21 21:2,10
61:15 78:8,12	58:15 61:20	14:18	21:13,23 23:5
78:15	72:23 73:15	increase 12:1	23:19 24:15
impairing 31:8	importantly	incumbent	25:7,19 29:19
33:21 55:2	13:11 52:11	59:17	29:24 30:1,3,8
impairment	impose 65:13	indirect 45:25	30:12,19 31:8
31:23 33:23	68:15	industry 61:10	32:5,16 33:21
34:4,10,13,16	imposed 48:16	inevitable	34:1 35:3
34:23 36:15	improper 37:4	22:17	36:23,24 37:1
37:16 39:5,20	improperly	inform 49:10	37:5,6,7,9,24
44:20 54:25	30:16 34:11	67:3	38:8,9,15
62:4 78:21	37:14,21	information	39:10,23 40:4
79:1,7,18,21	inappropriate	63:6 70:24	40:6,17,17,19
81:5 84:3	18:20	82:3,6	41:7,16 42:1
impermissible	inches 26:6	infrastructure	42:19,25 43:2
76:4	include 41:3	42:1	43:11,13,16,17
implement 25:2	included 11:13	initial 41:3	44:2,15 50:10
25:7 32:22	15:10 16:9	initially 48:10	54:13 55:1
42:25 45:1	29:9 33:15,18	69:1	56:14,20,20
56:1 63:2	47:1,8 75:23	initiating 51:22	57:3 58:6,11
70:16 75:4	including 25:3	inject 10:19	58:19 59:9
implementati	30:13,23 38:6	12:3 15:20	62:5,24 65:10
68:2 74:15,25	44:8 45:16	20:13 23:13	67:19 68:24
75:3	inclusion 37:3	46:17 72:3	69:2,10,23,25
implemented	incompatibility	injected 14:20	70:4 74:6 75:4
32:20 69:20	23:6	21:5 36:18	75:7 77:2,3,6,8
74:10	incompatible	40:2 62:7 76:3	77:9,13,20,23
implementing	23:9	injecting 11:6	78:4,8 79:12
24:4 55:14	inconsistencies	20:5 26:2	80:22 84:5
implication	60:21 62:9	46:24 59:16	injustice 13:7
63:13	incorporates	70:1 76:13,19	instance 20:19
importance	29:14	injection 10:4	37:2 46:21
45:14	incorrect 32:2	10:12 12:1,20	65:2 67:24
important 11:7	34:6	14:19,21 15:1	68:16
14:7 22:25		15:11,24 16:22	

[insufficient - legal]

insufficient	introduce 46:6	:	knowing 20:10
29:25 30:1	introduction	j	knowledge
80:23 81:9,16	46:4,9	job 68:11	37:22
82:8	invalid 34:5	join 5:8,9,10	known 40:22
intended 48:7	invalidity 18:4	joinder 17:17	1
64:15 74:22	invested 41:21	joined 54:4	1
intending 68:1	41:24 42:3	joining 9:4	laborious 21:20
intends 19:24	investor 23:12	joseph 1:16	lack 16:21
intent 66:11	investors 73:14	jump 22:7	37:13 40:3
69:22 72:11	invite 29:3	jurisdiction	lacked 29:22
74:17,17,21,24	85:13	16:23 27:9,10	lacks 33:24
75:3	inviting 55:17	27:21 35:16	laid 9:18 79:15
intention 52:25	invoked 30:10	65:2 68:23	lake 82:24
interest 38:12	involved 10:22	justification	lamkin 1:20
44:6,15,17,21	50:6	34:2	29:5 84:11
76:5 88:14	involves 13:24	justified 43:20	85:20 86:4,5
interested	irreparable	k	language 14:8
75:20 84:1	18:17	keenly 61:7	28:2 66:13
interesting	issuance 63:24	kelli 88:3,17	largely 51:2
56:22 80:15	issue 24:21	key 30:20 31:14	larger 73:9
interests 64:8,9	29:13 41:22	43:8 69:25	laterally 41:5
interim 67:17	44:11 48:13,19	70:20	law 13:4 15:3
internal 60:21	66:22 70:20	kind 21:15	29:11 38:2
73:14	71:4 77:16	24:14,21 64:8	39:9 45:10
interpretation	issued 7:17	kinder 82:14	85:22
15:9 23:25	12:10,21 29:17	knew 20:11	lead 38:24 39:1
interpreting	74:19	know 9:25	lease 46:9
81:10	issues 13:12	17:23 22:8	leasehold 44:18
interval 11:14	16:18 17:25	53:22 57:6,13	71:17
14:16 15:10,11	18:5,21 30:21	59:5 60:23	leases 46:4,5
21:10 26:2	31:11,14 50:11	61:7,24 63:25	leave 25:18
29:20 33:6,18	item 1:14,18	66:3 69:7,21	73:17
40:18 42:21	62:21 65:7	70:16 71:10	leaving 77:13
43:8,9 70:2		72:23 76:9	left 48:1
77:3,15		77:25 80:12	legal 27:13 29:14 32:2
		81:23	27.14 32.2

[legal - mexico]

33:17 34:1	long 5:7 22:17	maintain 27:22	meaning 81:16
88:17	66:10	maintain 27.22 maintains 32:6	82:8
length 61:2	longer 51:8	40:9 41:9	means 7:10
licensing 16:13	look 56:13	major 50:25	14:24 23:25
lifted 7:17	58:13 67:3,4,5	make 5:2,13,15	56:5 71:22
43:18	68:20 69:11	6:25 16:7 25:1	72:2
light 27:12	70:10 72:9	25:12 34:19	meet 18:13
lightly 64:11	73:14 84:19	36:2 37:10,12	43:19 81:16,17
likelihood	looked 14:13	38:16 44:12	83:20
18:16	20:22	45:18 59:19	meeting 4:3
likely 83:4	looking 79:1	60:21 62:18	24:3 55:16
likes 64:13	looks 73:10	70:23 71:5	meetings 5:14
limited 18:9	lot 9:25 19:14	73:18	meets 32:21
40:12 60:20	53:22 54:4	makes 56:10	44:10
62:2	72:12 73:8	59:1	member 1:16
line 3:7 5:1,1	76:9,9,11	makeup 23:6	1:20,21
9:14 38:22	77:25 84:7	manage 38:10	members 1:13
lines 61:10	85:12	manifest 13:7	1:17 9:2
lingering 51:13	lower 15:25	marginal 61:4	mention 38:23
list 8:11	59:16	marsh 9:3	mentioning
listed 11:3	m	material 61:18	51:21
listen 26:20	m 2:11,25 3:10	matt 9:13	mere 71:13
litigate 13:15	made 11:4	matter 10:2	merely 13:9
16:17	13:11 28:5	19:23 47:13	20:14 21:18
litigated 18:4	33:3 36:4	65:4 88:13,15	86:22
litigation 17:13	37:18 39:8,25	matters 6:11,13	merit 16:22
little 26:9 75:2	45:19 48:10,11	49:13 84:25	met 18:15,16
living 60:24	48:22 49:7,14	matthew 3:10	mexico 1:2,7
llano 41:25	50:1,16 63:2	mbeck 3:10	2:4,9,13,15,23
llc 3:7,12 8:18	63:23 66:12	mcbeath 23:11	3:2,4,9,14 8:10
8:22 9:14	74:8 77:21	23:15 25:8,9	8:18 19:21
75:12	80:6 86:23	73:5,13	21:1,4 45:12
llp 2:14	mail 55:16	mckenzie 2:4	46:20 73:2
logs 41:5	main 63:18	mean 15:9	75:19 88:4,18
	1110111 UJ.1U	49:13 86:18	

[mexico's - new]

mexico's 19:25	minutes 6:17	mother 59:7,14	32:21 35:14
25:17 71:15	8:5	motion 4:16,19	36:13 37:12
microphone	misinterpreting	4:20 5:13,15	42:3,24,25
53:6	14:12	5:22 6:1,12,25	43:2,20 66:8
midstream	missed 43:16	7:5 13:12	need 5:17,19
2:21 8:10,25	52:12	16:16 17:18,20	6:17 13:6
9:2 47:11	mistakenly	25:14,15 27:3	35:24 36:10
75:12	37:14	27:4 28:13	52:15,19 69:23
migrating	moander 3:5	44:10 48:7	70:3 76:21,22
11:21	9:11,11 47:23	55:20,20,21	82:6 86:8
migration	48:5 63:8	85:14 86:6	needs 22:18
61:17	65:15 68:20	motions 7:14	35:17 53:3
miguel 3:14 9:8	70:18	8:9 17:16	69:9
60:14	moander's 68:4	50:21 60:18	negative 38:5
milestone	mobilized	61:25	neither 20:18
66:23 69:14,18	42:10	move 63:2 65:6	88:12
70:8	model 11:10	85:18	never 21:7
milestones	36:4 41:12	moved 4:18 7:2	33:13 37:22
32:21 43:14,15	modification	moving 11:8	39:11 58:8
43:20 67:16	31:17	msuazo 3:15	nevertheless
68:3 69:6,10	modifications	mullins 3:8	32:11 33:5
70:6,11 71:7	43:1		42:18 43:11
million 20:25	moment 71:3	n	new 1:2,7 2:4,9
21:2 41:25	80:11	n 2:1 3:1	2:13,15,23 3:2
millions 41:21	momentarily	narrow 27:5	3:4,9,14 8:10
73:3	50:7	40:12 70:9	8:18 10:5
mind 51:14	money 22:13	natural 3:3	11:24 13:4
58:22	22:15 73:12,12	73:23	15:16 16:4,5
minerals 3:3	months 22:20	nature 25:3	16:19 19:21,25
19:25 20:1	monument	56:16	21:1,4 25:17
25:17,18 71:16	11:14 46:19	nature's 59:7	28:12,15,16,18
71:16	morgan 82:14	59:14	28:20 30:9
minor 27:14	morning 4:24	necessarily	32:9 37:18
minute 8:4 49:8	6:20	65:17	38:4 40:9,12
	0.20	necessary	45:12 46:20
		24:18 25:15	13.12 10.20

[new - order]

56:18 71:15	obligations	70:14,19,23	86:14
73:2 75:19	48:16,20	70:14,17,23	operate 14:16
77:1,3 88:4,18	observed 22:20	ocd's 24:25	24:16,23 70:22
night 19:7	22:21	48:7 49:1,16	operating 2:2,7
nm 3:3	obtain 42:23	49:17 51:9,14	3:7 9:14 23:8
nonproductive	obtaining	51:17 52:5	operations 20:2
46:25	78:23	62:24 63:11	29:19 30:8,12
normally 82:2	occ 6:19 7:8	64:24 65:17	30:13 31:8
north 2:9,18,23	52:16 62:22	67:7 70:14	32:17 33:22
46:19	63:1 64:23,25	october 1:11	37:24 38:7
nose 22:9,11	65:1,7 66:5,22	88:4	43:4,7 44:5
noted 11:10	71:5 72:18	officer 9:1	51:1 79:19
number 6:20	occ's 66:1,24	offices 5:9	operator 21:5
51:4 62:22	67:12	official 19:9	55:24
65:6 78:15	occur 63:15	offsetting 44:4	operators 44:5
numbers 7:11	occurring	45:12	45:12,13 64:10
7:12,13	25:20	oil 1:3 3:2	opinion 54:5
numerous	occurs 21:24	10:17 13:2	opportunity
10:20	ocd 9:12 17:15	14:2 34:17	10:17 11:4
nutrition 28:8	17:22,22,25	38:7 41:23	26:12 32:8
	20:18 25:3,12	42:10 45:16	40:11 57:10
	47:22 48:10,12		58:21 63:16
0	48:13,16,20,24	59:3,5,6,12 62:10 65:20	
o'clock 4:2	49:5,9,25 50:5		opposite 38:16
object 12:12	50:8,16,17,22	82:15,22 88:4	opposition 44:13 60:19
objected 17:6	50:24 51:24	okay 5:21 26:20 47:2	
46:3,7,8,11		48:5 57:3	option 12:24 64:2 66:9
objection 4:19	52:6,13,22	78:23 79:3	
6:2 17:7 84:17	53:1,1,9 59:19	80:17	oral 49:15 order 4:3 6:22
84:20,21 85:21	62:19,22,22,25		
objections 9:17	63:1,4,5,9,9,19	once 23:2	6:25 7:15,16
objective 22:16	64:6,10,13,15	ongoing 54:13	7:19 8:3 9:18
obligated 14:3	64:17,19,20	online 5:8,9,10	9:19 10:6,8,12
obligation 13:1	65:1,2,8,17,25	86:10,15	10:14,19 11:2
13:24 15:5	66:5,9,17	open 5:14 6:15	11:11 12:2,9
67:18 83:18	67:23,25 68:1	57:5 62:14	12:22 17:24

[order - peiferlaw.com]

18:24 19:17,19	39:3 49:22	page 28:9	particularly
20:4,11,13,15	ordering 22:12	50:23 52:5	54:6
22:3,10,12,19	orderly 43:13	58:13 62:21	parties 13:14
23:21 24:5,8,9	69:18	65:6 75:13	18:3 26:20
24:23 25:2	orders 57:1	79:25 80:19	28:11 45:7
27:15 29:9,10	outcome 22:17	pages 15:16	56:8 60:23
29:13,17,22,22	61:7	16:4,4 84:19	62:15 66:16
31:17,21 32:15	outlined 29:15	84:20	73:14,14 84:14
33:10,12 34:3	31:18 44:7	paper 20:17	88:13
37:11 38:21	49:3 56:8	26:10 67:10	partners 73:11
41:15,17 42:18	outside 46:7	papers 24:20	party 13:11
43:6 44:1,18	outstanding	31:19 44:8	44:5 45:12
45:4 47:25	28:4	45:21 55:8	47:25 76:16
48:7,13 50:9	overarching	72:2	81:12
51:16,20 52:1	15:5 31:16	paragraph	pass 53:5 82:2
52:22 53:23	overlying 79:10	38:20 50:23	passed 83:17
54:3,20,21,22	79:15	56:25 58:13	passes 4:19
55:14,21 56:1	oversee 68:24	63:10 75:14	past 52:7
56:11,14,16	own 17:20 27:3	79:15 80:18,19	pathway 45:22
58:10,14,16,20	30:5 33:25	paragraphs	patient 28:19
58:23 59:22	36:20 76:16	52:5	patrick 9:4
60:22,24 61:13	owned 64:10	parameters	pattern 22:6
62:3 63:1,7,9	owner's 76:6	17:1	paula 2:11,25
63:16,25 66:12	owners 17:4	park 50:2,2	8:22
66:14,24 67:13	ownership 17:3	part 9:21,23	pause 8:6 84:7
67:21 68:25	17:5,8	13:24 14:19	paying 31:4,24
69:1,22 70:15	p	23:12 31:20	34:14,22 35:19
72:9 74:8,9,14	p 2:1,1 3:1,1	34:12 41:14	36:1,11,12
74:15,19 75:6	p.c. 2:3	58:8 66:24	39:18 76:1
75:16,21 76:4	p.m. 6:8 87:3	84:23 85:3,6	pc 2:17 3:13
77:25 79:6	p.o. 2:14 3:9	partial 30:2,4	pecos 1:5
80:3,6,19	pa 3:8	44:1	pedro 2:18
83:13	packet 28:9	particular 7:24	peifer 3:8
ordered 20:16	padding 23:23	50:3	peiferlaw.com
22:4 24:11			3:10

[pending - practicably]

		(2.17 (7.10	
pending 7:14	permits 10:4,5	63:17 67:19	pointed 20:19
8:8 12:15	10:10 16:2,22	72:22 83:14	points 26:8
30:23 41:16	16:25 18:5,10	pipeline 41:25	27:20 44:12
people 73:13	20:3,15 22:12	place 21:9	45:17 61:21
perceive 21:14	24:9,11 29:24	25:25	63:8
perceived	30:1 42:24	placed 48:20	pool 14:2
21:17	44:15 49:5	places 27:17	pore 44:17,21
percent 82:15	52:19 55:12	plan 49:17	76:6
82:18,24 83:4	57:4 62:24	planet 21:9	posed 66:17
perform 61:10	64:7 66:25	23:16 25:25	posit 15:16
performance	70:21 71:6,20	planning 9:24	posited 15:19
52:10 70:25	72:4	69:12	position 27:22
71:7 74:6	permitted	platform 86:10	32:4 70:14
performing	49:21	play 50:13	85:2
57:21	permitting	64:25	possibility
period 22:4	45:15 67:5	please 4:4 5:12	86:14
24:5,12 58:1	person 19:8	7:6 9:19 29:6	possible 26:19
72:14 81:25	perspective	53:16	54:7,11
permanent	51:10 63:11	plenary 13:22	possibly 22:17
73:20	65:17 67:12	66:6	potential 34:4
permanently	petroleum 14:1	pmvance 2:11	37:15 38:21
18:11 71:15,25	physical 85:4	2:25	51:11 52:24
73:7 78:4	physically	pocket 22:13	63:13 79:5,7
80:21	86:16	point 9:16	79:18 81:7
permian 2:7	pick 7:24	10:13 21:8	83:24
3:7 4:23 7:9	picking 21:18	31:5,18 32:23	potentially
8:22 9:14	pieces 72:20	47:15,17,21,24	39:1 74:12
60:19	pilot 3:12 9:9	48:24 49:12	84:1
permian's 7:10	23:18 25:5,10	51:25 52:14,15	powell 49:3
permit 12:15	52:7 54:23	53:9,12 54:9	52:8
20:20 21:24	55:3 56:12	63:10 67:24	powell's 52:4
23:25 27:25	57:22,24 58:21	68:4 72:15	powerpoint
50:24 64:11	58:24 59:24	73:20 80:9	9:23
72:3,6	60:5,11,15,17	81:22 84:14	practicably
	61:1,6,8,24	85:13	35:7

[practical - project]

practical 67:11	80:24 81:10	problems 49:20	producible
pre 47:5 75:11	82:1,10,23	procedural	57:23
precedent 38:4	85:16	62:9 84:13	producing
precisely 20:4	presenting	procedures	15:10 31:3
25:21 64:19	16:15 19:4	63:3	34:14 35:18,25
preference 85:7	pressure 14:21	proceed 7:6 8:5	47:2
prefers 65:2	23:3,4 39:24	9:17,19 25:21	product 5:3
prehearing 8:3	79:11	47:22 49:21,23	production
9:18 62:20	presume 8:12	52:3 53:3,16	33:14 34:18
prejudice	28:10	58:7 83:13	35:4 41:24
41:12	pretty 52:8	proceeded	44:4 78:21
premature	61:1,4,16,20	20:12	proffering
80:20	78:2	proceeding	28:13
premised 34:5	prevail 18:17	12:9 18:2	program 25:5
prepared 43:3	prevailed 12:8	48:23 56:17	25:10 38:6,9
67:14	prevent 13:1,23	61:2,23 84:25	45:15 73:9
preponderance	14:3 15:4	proceedings	progress 49:25
36:9 81:14,18	16:24 51:11	1:10 4:1 8:6	72:16
present 4:7,9	preventing	12:5 13:15	progressed
8:8 9:21,22	78:22	18:1,6 19:10	84:25
11:23 26:14	prevention	45:6 49:4 61:6	prohibition
32:8 35:10	13:25 50:11	64:22 88:8,10	65:25
40:11 41:11	previously 7:17	proceeds 51:7	project 10:18
58:3 72:4,6	13:5,10 46:10	process 49:6	11:5 23:18
78:3 80:20	primacy 37:20	68:19	42:12 43:15,18
81:3 83:7	primarily 52:6	processes 12:18	45:1 49:21,23
presentation	79:5	63:5 71:1	50:3 51:23
9:23 26:6,7	primary 33:14	procure 43:1	52:3,10,14,17
29:3	49:1 78:15	produce 36:11	52:17,24,25
presented	prior 11:19	38:10 54:14	53:2 54:23
11:20 13:14,17	62:8	produced	55:4 56:12
16:8 18:11,23	privilege 10:24	11:18 31:24	57:4,19,24
28:12 40:24	probably 4:24	33:13 34:22	58:21,24 59:15
45:7,21 46:10	26:6,20 72:18	35:7,19 42:11	59:24 63:17
59:18 79:12		54:9	65:10 67:6

[project - reading]

	I		I
68:18 69:4,7	prove 34:12,20	purpose 44:22	quick 39:17
69:25 70:17	35:21,22 36:8	62:2	quite 5:7 8:11
72:15,17 73:4	37:9,16 39:9	purposes 66:11	quorum 4:10
73:15 74:13	40:3,23 76:22	pursuant 5:13	quote 54:20
75:8 81:24	77:10 80:24	75:5	r
83:14,17	82:11 83:14	pursue 70:2	r 2:1 3:1
projects 14:21	proven 14:10	push 66:4	raise 17:2,25
38:10 52:7	39:19 52:23	put 22:13 50:15	raised 15:15,17
68:24	provide 16:12	68:19 70:24	16:20 23:4
proof 30:17	21:14 32:19	putting 24:21	raises 38:11
36:12,14,23	41:18 58:20	q	raising 23:3
57:12 76:15,16	62:22 63:16	qualified 58:6	73:11
77:7 81:13,14	65:4 66:1,16	quantities 31:4	range 83:4
81:17 83:21	70:15	31:24 34:14,22	rankin 2:10,24
proofs 49:25	provided 10:9	35:20 36:1,11	8:20,21 29:4
proper 17:18	49:2,25 63:22	36:12 39:18	68:13 74:7
44:21 55:23	75:6 84:14	76:2	76:20 78:13
56:3 60:22	provides 52:2	question 28:7	80:2,8,11,17
properly 12:21	54:22 65:21	36:10 37:5,6	81:12 82:12
21:20 29:23	provision 14:18	51:13 52:12,18	83:15 84:18
36:7 51:3,16	15:7 78:10	52:24 57:21	85:9
property 25:22	79:25	62:25 63:19	rather 42:16
44:15,16,21	provisions	65:12 67:23	75:7
76:5	44:25 62:3	68:14 69:5	reach 35:24
proposal 49:17	prudent 55:24	70:8 72:9,13	36:10 45:23
proposals 49:7	public 1:1 33:8	74:23 75:1	reached 23:23
proposed 32:13	38:12 44:6	76:20,21 77:18	54:7
43:7,25 50:22	75:18	84:10,13,23	reaching 38:5
77:2	pump 24:18	questions 26:5	read 2:7 8:10
proposing	purchased	26:18,23 27:2	15:7 54:6
50:17	25:22	28:22,25 47:14	68:25 69:1,21
protect 13:23	pure 48:14	47:16,21 53:8	74:1 78:1
14:3 15:4	purported 31:2	53:15 60:2,9	reading 19:14
16:24 34:18	34:13 42:4	62:14,17 66:17	63:9 75:11,13
35:17	78:16	74:20 84:12	82:7
		74.20 04.12	04.1

[reads - report]

reads 52:22	reconsidering	red 48:25	18:10 27:3,4
ready 9:17	62:2	reduce 14:1,7,9	28:11,14 31:17
19:21 69:15	reconvened	reduction 14:9	39:14 40:12
reaffirm 62:5	64:17	35:4	42:17 43:24
reaffirmed	record 6:11,15	reevaluated	50:18,21 60:18
33:2	35:13 46:11	61:21	60:20 61:25
real 39:17	61:16 83:6	reference 57:20	62:1 71:10
57:13	84:17,23 85:3	referenced 37:2	72:2,24 75:13
really 14:9 15:6	85:6	38:20	80:13
17:17 63:20	recoverability	referencing	reject 43:24
65:13 71:4	35:11 36:8	38:21	rejects 40:8
82:6	39:18 52:22	refers 14:6	related 88:13
reason 15:16	78:18,24	reflect 51:21	relevant 18:6
15:20 39:13	recoverable	refuse 29:23	49:10
40:19 46:3,8	31:2 33:4,12	43:23	reliability 38:8
47:3 48:25	33:20 34:17,21	refuses 41:13	reliable 45:15
83:12	35:22 36:14	42:15,17	83:7
reasonable	42:5 44:19	refute 37:15	relied 36:3
51:10 59:20	57:14 75:22	39:12	40:18
83:2	76:1 78:17	regarding 1:13	relief 29:23
reasonably	79:17 80:4,7	1:17 15:14	30:2,4,25
6:21 40:15	80:25 81:2,2,4	17:2,25 18:5	31:19 32:13,13
reasoning	81:19 83:24	24:4 38:25	32:14,24 41:15
72:20	recovered 35:3	regards 64:4	41:18 43:5,25
reasons 31:16	35:8 78:19,19	regulations	rely 14:18
61:24 78:13	78:20 82:11	16:2 30:5	remain 33:5
recall 19:5	recovering	33:25 36:19,21	41:8 64:9
76:12 81:23	12:24	37:19 77:16,17	remaining 48:1
recent 24:2	recovery 10:18	regulatory	remember
recently 12:6	14:1 38:7 42:3	42:24 44:22	10:21 20:9
recommendat	45:16 55:2	76:4	82:14
52:4	56:13 59:15	rehash 13:10	removes 29:19
recommends	82:16,18,25	rehearing 13:3	reorganize 8:4
65:8	83:3,9	13:12 16:16	report 88:7
		17:14,16,20	

[representative - ruled]

representative	residual 59:3,5	resumes 43:17	18:12 22:9
21:8	resolution 44:2	retain 16:23	25:22 26:3
representatives	resources 2:7	revenue 73:1	33:23 34:16,24
8:25	3:3 73:23	reverse 48:6	36:15 39:20,22
request 18:9	78:12,14	revisit 73:17	43:2 55:1
30:2 42:17	respect 10:25	revocable	59:11 61:15
62:22 68:18	17:16,22 71:20	16:25	78:7 79:1,22
requested	72:1	revocation	81:6
29:23 30:25	respectfully	73:21	risking 38:8
31:16,19 32:13	29:7,12 61:25	revoke 12:14	rocket 12:12
32:24 41:14,18	82:12	29:23,25 71:25	rocks 21:18
54:23 55:10	respects 62:8	72:25 77:6	role 48:12 61:1
requesting	respond 17:19	78:4 80:21	65:17
55:16 70:23	50:20	revoked 27:25	roll 4:4,5 5:20
71:11 72:14	response 17:18	71:15,20 73:7	85:23
requests 41:17	17:21 24:25	73:15	room 70:15
57:25	44:13 45:18	revoking 28:1	route 56:3
require 25:4	52:5 56:2	rhino 58:12,19	royalty 73:1
42:23	64:15 66:5,16	63:15	roz 19:22 23:17
required 14:10	74:23 76:12	rice 3:7 9:13	27:23,24,25
16:7 24:6	responses	14:17 15:6	31:2,6 34:13
40:16,23	17:15	17:15,17 53:16	34:20 35:6,11
requirements	rest 50:15 62:6	74:10	35:22,25 36:10
44:11	86:8	rice's 63:10	36:11,14 39:18
requires 13:4	restores 62:10	right 8:12	42:4,9,13 54:8
50:9 62:11	restrict 14:20	14:15 19:13	54:14 57:13,22
73:3 85:22	15:8	24:23 29:2	59:3,10 69:16
requiring	restriction	45:10 53:2	78:16 79:2
43:19	65:22 66:1	69:16 71:19	80:4,6,24
rescind 41:15	restrictions	72:24 78:22	82:11,22 83:24
reserve 26:22	16:13	85:10	rule 14:19
47:16,25 53:10	result 16:14	rights 10:24,25	ruled 7:9 12:14
60:3,4	18:19	11:12 13:2,23	
reservoir 35:15	resume 49:3	14:4 15:5	
61:18		16:25 17:3	

[s - show]

	savage 2:5	54:19 56:2	session 4:25 5:4
S	saw 80:15	57:12 65:18,25	5:13,16,22 6:3
s 1:6 2:1,15 3:1	saying 55:9	69:16 77:25	6:4,6,9,12,16
safe 51:10	78:11,14 80:5	seeing 84:1	6:20 85:15
safely 51:3	says 15:8 20:4	seek 51:15	86:22 87:3
safest 85:2	57:5 58:10,14	seeking 27:3	set 59:20 88:8
safety 24:14,21	58:15,18 78:11	30:18 46:5	sets 52:9
50:11	scenario 51:24	55:8 64:18	several 15:16
saint 1:6	schedule 24:3	77:5	29:8 80:12
saltwater 21:4	43:13	seeks 17:11	82:25
46:15,22 47:4	scheduled	44:24 50:6	shallower
47:6 72:5	69:19	56:12 59:15	32:19 42:21
san 2:18,19	schill 2:3	65:7	shandler 1:24
11:9,17,21	science 21:15	seem 51:20	5:12,17,19
19:23 23:5,12	21:19	seemed 10:9	6:10,23 7:3,6
23:17 29:20	scooping 81:25	seems 44:13	29:1 47:19
33:4,5,13,15,17	scope 31:11	54:5,10,11,12	53:13 60:7
34:25 35:5,8	scoping 82:2,10	54:16	85:22
38:25 39:2,3	82:13,21	seen 20:17 27:6	shanor 2:14
40:5 44:17	screening	sees 66:10	shape 66:24
46:24,25 47:8	82:15	seismic 16:10	shape 00.24 share 9:24
54:8 59:16	second 4:18,19	16:11,15 41:1	34:18 78:21
61:17 67:6	5:17,18 6:16	41:4	shed 42:8
72:11 75:22	7:3,4 9:22 13:9	self 7:20 44:8	sheila 4:4 7:22
76:2,6 77:13	16:3 30:4	send 22:13	7:25
78:9 79:3,10	31:25 34:8	sense 56:10	shifted 30:16
79:18 80:4	41:20 44:23	59:1	34:11 37:21
81:6,7,20 84:4	48:22 64:2	sent 55:15	39:11
santa 1:7 2:4,9	75:15 85:19,20		
2:15,23 3:4,14	secondary 48:8	september 10:6 22:21 55:10	shocking 25:14 short 45:24
santoyo 2:17	secondly 67:1	71:14	shorthand 88:8
satisfaction	section 10:23	series 74:19	shot 66:19
51:18	79:5	served 7:16,21	show 28:4
saturations	see 6:16 19:8	service 3:7 9:14	34:13,23 35:2
11:16	53:19 54:11,18	17:4	35:6 36:17
	JJ.17 J4.11,10	1 / .4	33.0 30.17

[show - stevens]

	I	I	
40:16 46:6	site 82:6	specify 63:11	state's 33:9
73:19 76:17	sitting 65:3	spend 7:20	38:9 73:23
77:7 78:18	situation 18:7,8	spent 19:4,14	stated 10:14
79:13	20:22 46:23	27:9	74:11
showed 11:16	six 40:4	st 2:9,23 3:4	statement 44:9
77:12	slide 84:15	stability 38:8	62:20 75:12
showing 34:15	slides 26:8	stable 45:15	statements
34:19 37:11	slightly 48:6	staged 67:3,25	45:19 53:16
77:21 84:3	small 57:24,24	68:2	states 14:19
shown 10:22	61:1	stand 73:6	20:1 25:18
shut 14:21 24:6	solely 33:15	standard 13:3	71:16 73:2
30:7,18 33:25	37:10	28:8,10,16	status 42:6
36:23,25 37:8	solutions 3:12	30:9 32:2,7,9	52:18
51:17 63:4	60:12,15 88:17	34:6,11 36:20	statute 14:5,11
69:19 71:11	someday 24:10	37:18,22 38:4	33:25 68:23
74:22 84:5	sorry 80:17	40:10,13,16	statutes 13:20
shutdown 51:9	sort 12:18 64:9	41:10 81:15,18	14:11
shutting 50:10	64:11 85:12	82:25 83:21	statutory 14:14
sides 85:4	sosa 58:12,19	standards	14:16 33:11
sift 85:15	sought 17:4	27:13 56:9	75:24
signature 88:16	58:24	59:20	stay 18:14,19
signed 7:21	source 33:16	standing 12:12	18:19 44:1,11
22:22	75:23	12:14	44:24 45:4
similar 46:23	south 3:4 11:14	start 22:16	55:21 86:12
simply 5:8	space 44:17,21	62:19 70:23	stayed 30:24
33:16 64:23	54:15 76:6	75:14	staying 44:1,24
69:11 70:10	speaking 57:17	starting 4:21	77:23
single 19:6	specific 28:7	51:22	stays 7:17
20:19 21:8	52:6 56:24	starts 25:8	ste 2:9,18,23
22:8,10 23:14	62:6 65:9 82:6	75:14	stenographic
35:10 37:17	specifically	state 1:2 16:22	88:8
sir 6:10 57:11	10:23 17:16	19:20,25 25:17	step 23:21
57:15 65:5	29:16 79:2,25	30:13 37:25	steps 42:2
sit 12:23 83:22	specified 83:13	44:6,18 45:11	stevens 2:7
		49:14 73:2	

[stick - take]

		0.4.10	11110
stick 86:8	substantiated	suppose 84:19	44:1 49:5
stop 21:24	11:15 39:15	sure 5:2,7	51:14,19 52:18
22:18,24 24:12	subsurface	10:21 65:23	54:21 55:11
24:21 25:10	41:12	67:22 78:3	56:5,6,9 58:10
58:12 71:20	subvert 12:5,18	86:10,18,18,20	59:22 62:2,5
stopped 23:19	success 19:20	surface 17:2,5	62:23 63:12,12
58:6	52:24 73:18	17:8 46:9 76:6	63:14,19 64:3
stopping 12:19	successfully	suspend 30:8	65:7,8 66:8
24:15	77:12	36:23 37:1	67:21 69:19
stops 25:20	suck 24:17	64:11 67:18	70:4,21 71:22
straight 23:1	suffice 53:25	72:18 74:5	71:22,22 72:2
23:10,15 27:25	54:2	suspended	75:4,7
strata 41:6	sufficient 71:18	10:11 11:25	suspensions
street 2:4 88:18	86:11	18:11 20:3,5	49:11 52:16
strenuously	suggest 69:1	20:16,20,21	64:21
31:6	suggesting	21:24 22:5	suspicion 49:16
strict 65:14	28:20	23:25 24:10	sustained 17:7
stringent 30:9	suggestion	43:12 56:15	swd 3:12 12:13
suazo 3:14 9:7	62:24	66:25 69:2,3	60:15
9:8 60:13,14	suggestions	69:23 71:14	swd's 62:24
sub 50:25	10:8 63:3	72:2,3,5,7	63:4
subject 48:13	suite 88:18	73:17 75:8	swds 71:12
submit 13:13	summarized	suspending	sweeping 66:21
submitted 12:7	14:11	10:4 41:15	swenergylaw
17:15,21 18:9	summary 11:22	57:3 64:6	2:20
60:18,19 84:21	supervise 64:14	suspends 10:15	system 41:25
subsequently	supply 33:16	50:24 58:10,18	t
39:4	75:23	suspension	tactic 23:22
substances	support 28:13	10:14 11:11	tailwater 9:3
11:1	30:24 31:19	12:22 18:25	take 5:7 13:9
substantial	32:4 39:16	19:17,19 20:13	13:22 50:19
18:18 38:11	41:22 44:8	20:15 22:3,12	56:3 64:10
40:5 44:3	60:17 72:17	24:11 28:2	66:19 72:20
61:14 78:6	supports 41:20	29:18 30:3	80:11
	61:25	32:16,20 43:18	00.11

[taken - today]

	I		I
taken 42:2 61:1	testified 20:11	57:20 58:16	threshold
88:5	testimony	59:17,19,21	63:18 70:20
takes 51:8	15:18 19:9,15	60:20 61:16,20	71:4
talk 32:23	22:1 23:1 28:6	62:8,17 65:22	throwing 21:18
talked 18:21	46:12,18 49:19	66:7,9 68:16	thumb 22:9,11
76:14	51:5 67:2,8,14	68:20,20 70:7	tie 73:25
talking 57:16	68:7 83:3,7	70:19 71:18	tied 43:14 65:9
58:2	texas 2:19	72:20 73:7	71:7 83:8
target 32:19	22:14,14	76:21 82:5	ties 41:4
targeted 48:9	text 67:20	84:7,24 85:11	time 7:20 9:25
54:14	thank 6:3,14	85:12 86:8,17	19:14 20:20
targets 32:18	8:19 9:4,6,10	thinking 61:22	21:3,7 22:4
42:20	9:15,20 19:3	third 30:15	24:5 25:13
technical 67:1	26:12,16,21	32:3 39:13	26:4,13,14
67:4,8,11 68:7	47:13,20 48:5	44:5 45:12	28:17,23,25
tell 21:3	53:7,11,14,17	73:14	30:10 32:20
temporarily	53:18,18 59:25	thompson 1:16	45:1 48:1
41:15	60:1,5,8,9	4:6,7,16 5:12	52:14 53:21
temporary 30:3	62:12,13,16	5:15,21,23	56:15 60:3,9
ten 53:24 54:1	65:5 68:11	6:24 7:2	64:23 67:7,25
tend 68:25	70:13 73:24	thorough 6:21	68:5 73:20
tends 13:25	75:10 84:6,8	thoroughly	74:19 82:5
14:7 49:6	86:7,24 87:1	51:3	83:17,22
tenneco 18:14	theory 15:18,23	thought 76:9	timeline 45:3
tens 23:13	16:6	76:15	55:11 57:20
tense 72:4,6	thick 41:6	thousands	times 80:12
terminated	thing 55:23	23:14	timing 25:3
43:18	things 35:17	three 9:2 25:6	today 4:12 8:24
terms 21:6	48:8 69:7	26:6 28:3 45:1	9:4,9 19:6
27:14 67:16	76:22	45:3 50:3,5	22:24 25:19,20
73:9,12	think 4:14 8:1	52:2 67:13,15	26:14 60:15,17
terribly 66:4	13:20 16:21	70:17 71:14,21	62:21 78:1
tertiary 67:5	27:17 51:5,21	72:14,22 73:18	83:23 85:16
test 54:15,22	54:3,18,19	73:19	86:14,20
	56:1,17 57:7		

[told - vested]

told 21:12,17	84:14	79:15 81:15	urge 62:1
55:13 72:21	tying 65:8 74:5	understand 5:2	use 12:17 13:12
tomorrow	type 81:24	67:12 69:22	27:11 36:3
86:15,16	typically 18:1	71:25 72:19	81:8 82:3
took 55:19	u	74:20 78:14	used 23:7 82:15
tool 82:15,21	uic 37:20 38:6	79:6,13 83:10	85:5
total 14:1	45:16	83:15,25	useful 51:6
touch 23:12,17	ultimate 14:1	understanding	utilization
49:17	ultimately 25:2	61:12 74:4	75:18
touched 62:21	50:20 51:8	75:2	utmost 45:14
towards 43:15	unable 34:23	understood	utterly 68:6
48:9,12	35:1,6 40:3	40:15	V
transcript 1:10	46:14	undone 23:2	vacuum 24:17
4:1 88:1,10	unanimous	unit 10:22,25	
transcripts	6:22 7:7	11:14 21:5	24:19 76:13 valid 34:1
19:14		46:18,20,22	
trash 21:4	unanimously	47:1,5,5,7,7	validity 18:4
trespass 46:6	22:23	72:11	valuable 27:23
46:12	unattached	united 19:25	27:24
triggered 64:4	82:16	25:17 71:16	value 73:22
trouble 57:6	unavailable	73:2	vance 2:11,25
true 46:18	13:5	unitization	8:23
48:15 88:9	unaware 71:2	14:14 20:10	vast 24:17
try 12:18	uncertain	22:10 33:7,11	vastly 23:24
trying 15:6	43:21	75:24	vector 50:19
21:19	unclear 10:9	unitized 10:25	veiled 50:2
turn 8:2 19:1	74:16 75:2	11:14 14:16	verbiage 27:15
50:16 77:24	uncontroverted	21:10 26:2	27:17
turning 52:1	83:3	29:20 33:6,18	verify 57:22
two 20:6,18	under 13:2	unsubstantiat	veritext 88:17
30:21 31:11,14	15:3 30:6	34:7	versus 8:3 28:8
35:17 44:12	33:24 36:19,21	unsupported	71:15
46:2 58:1	45:15 50:25	36:5	vertical 11:16
63:21 75:16	60:24 62:7	upper 15:25	vested 44:14,16
76:22 78:13	63:21 64:21	upper 13.23	71:17
10.22 /0.13	68:23 77:17		

[vestige - work]

vestige 85:22	warranted	ways 20:7 33:1	wendell 1:5
viability 43:21	31:17	51:4	went 6:20
video 88:5	washed 59:6,13	we've 14:5,11	20:10 21:20
view 75:5 81:22	waste 11:12	15:19 18:8,21	77:15 82:5
violates 33:10	13:1,20,23	20:22 27:6,13	west 57:7
75:24	14:3,6 15:4	29:15 44:7	whatsoever
violation 11:12	16:24 18:12	77:25 85:11	50:14
18:12 20:13	24:22 25:19	week 10:2 18:8	wheeler 57:17
26:2	33:23 34:4,9	weeks 19:4,9	william 1:21
volume 14:20	34:12,16,17	19:13 20:18	willing 19:22
volumes 11:18	36:14 37:16	22:1 26:14	69:15
21:23,25 35:2	39:20 50:12	27:10 28:5,19	wind 51:2,16
voluminous	51:11 54:25	67:9	64:14
17:12	55:2 59:11	wehmeyer 2:17	winding 51:1
vote 4:20 6:1	62:4 73:23	2:19 8:17 9:22	winston 9:3
6:22 7:5 86:6	78:20 79:1	19:2,3 27:5	wipes 44:20
W	81:5 84:3	28:15 58:9	wish 84:16
wait 13:16	wastewater	66:18 70:24	86:12
waived 17:9	23:14	71:13 72:19	wishes 66:5
walk 31:18	watching 19:12	84:24 86:13,24	withdrawn
walker 9:4	water 3:12 9:9	wehmeyer's	17:23
wallet 23:23	11:8,18,20	46:13	withdraws
want 20:9	13:25 23:6,6,9	welcome 5:6	29:18
21:22,23,25	24:17 33:16	7:24 86:11	witness 16:11
25:13 48:1	38:10 42:11,11	wells 10:5,15	19:7 20:24,25
51:24 54:10,14	59:8,12 60:11	11:25,25 14:21	20:25 35:11
72:16 74:3	60:15 75:23	24:1,7,16	witnesses 19:4
84:15,22	waterflood	36:17 38:14	21:17 23:1
wanted 16:15	11:19 20:1	40:1 41:21	27:24
24:16 76:8	37:24 59:7,14	42:8 50:10	wonderful
83:16	waters 75:18	51:17 57:10	19:20 53:19
wanting 71:6	way 8:1 10:1	58:2,11,19	words 53:24,24
wants 13:9	27:16 43:2	61:5 64:14	54:1,1
16:3 64:19	64:7 69:21,22	77:1 78:5 80:22	work 5:2 27:7
70:19 72:23	74:4,7	00.22	62:9 70:16

[working - zones]

working 4:25	35:23 36:19
world 46:15	37:4,6 38:17
worth 22:14	40:7 42:22
51:21	45:23 47:2
wozniak 3:13	54:14 59:3,6
9:8	70:1 76:2,6
wrap 6:17	77:9,14,23
writing 22:22	79:10,14 84:4
53:24 54:1	zones 46:2
written 19:18	79:15
74:8	
wrong 34:11	
wrote 58:10	
y	
yeah 26:24	
60:4,5 80:14	
84:24 86:18	
year 45:1,3	
50:5 52:2 58:1	
71:21 72:14	
years 19:16	
25:6 28:3	
43:22 50:3	
57:8,9 67:13	
67:15 70:17	
71:14 72:22	
73:18,19	
Z	
zachary 1:24	
zero 67:1,8,20	
68:4,7	
zone 14:23 15:2	
15:13,25 31:7	
32:18 33:20	