1		STATE OF NEW MEXICO			
2		OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION			
3					
4	IN THE MATTER	OF PROPOSED			
5	AMENDMENTS TO	19.15.2, 19.15.5, Case No.			
6	19.15.8, 19.1	5.9, AND 19.15.25 24683			
7	NMAC				
8					
9		HEARING - DAY 2			
10	DATE:	Tuesday, October 21, 2025			
11	TIME:	9:00 a.m.			
12	BEFORE:	Hearing Officer Felicia Orth			
13	LOCATION:	LOCATION: Pecos Hall, Wendell Chino Building			
14		1220 South St. Francis Drive			
15		Santa Fe, NM 87505			
16	REPORTED BY:	Ryan Auten			
17	JOB NO.:	7626616			
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
		Page 320			
		1490 320			

1	APPEARANCES			
2	ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT WESTERN ENVIRONMENTAL LAW			
3	CENTER:			
4	KYLE TISDEL, ESQUIRE (by videoconference)			
5	TANNIS FOX, ESQUIRE (by videoconference)			
6	MORGAN O'GRADY, ESQUIRE (by videoconference)			
7	Western Environmental Law Center			
8	409 East Palace Avenue, Suite 2			
9	Santa Fe, NM 87501			
10	tisdel@westernlaw.org			
11	fox@westernlaw.org			
12	ogrady@westernlaw.org			
13	(575) 613-8050			
14	(505) 629-0732			
15				
16	MATTHEW NYKIEL, ESQUIRE (by videoconference)			
17	Western Environmental Law Center			
18	224 West Rainbow Boulevard, Suite 247			
19	Salida, CO 81201			
20	nykiel@westernlaw.org			
21	(720) 778-1902			
22				
23				
24				
25				
	Page 321			

1	APPEARANCES (Cont'd)			
2	ON BEHALF OF INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION OF NEW			
3	MEXICO:			
4	ANDREW CLOUTIER, ESQUIRE (by videoconference)			
5	ANN TRIPP, ESQUIRE (by videoconference)			
6	Hinkle Shanor LLP			
7	P.O. Box 10			
8	Roswell, NM 88202			
9	acloutier@hinklelawfirm.com			
10	atripp@hinklelawfirm.com			
11	(575) 622-6510			
12				
13	ON BEHALF OF OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION:			
14	JESSE TREMAINE, ESQUIRE (by videoconference)			
15	MICHAEL HALL, ESQUIRE (by videoconference)			
16	New Mexico Energy, Minerals, and Natural			
17	Resources Department			
18	1220 South St. Francis Drive			
19	Santa Fe, NM 87505			
20	jessek.tremaine@emnrd.nm.gov			
21	michael.hall@emnrd.nm.gov			
22	(505) 231-9312			
23	(505) 476-3310			
24				
25				
	Page 322			
	1 490 322			

1	APPEARANCES (Cont'd)
2	ON BEHALF OF EOG RESOURCES, INC.:
3	JENNIFER BRADFUTE, ESQUIRE (by videoconference)
4	MATTHIAS SAYER, ESQUIRE (by videoconference)
5	Bradfute Sayer P.C.
6	P.O. Box 90233
7	Albuquerque, NM 87199
8	jennifer@bradfutelaw.com
9	matthias@bradfutelaw.com
10	(505) 264-8740
11	
12	ON BEHALF OF OXY USA, INC.:
13	ADAM RANKIN, ESQUIRE (by videoconference)
14	Holland & Hart LLP
15	P.O. Box 2208
16	Santa Fe, NM 87504
17	agrankin@hollandhart.com
18	(505) 954-7294
19	
20	AARON TUCKER, ESQUIRE (by videoconference)
21	Holland & Hart LLP
22	555 17th Street, Suite 3200
23	Denver, CO 80202
24	abtucker@hollandhart.com
25	(303) 295-8369
	Page 323

1	APPEARANCES (Cont'd)
2	ON BEHALF OF NEW MEXICO STATE LAND OFFICE:
3	RICHARD MOORE, ESQUIRE (by videoconference)
4	New Mexico State Land Office
5	310 Old Santa Fe Trail
6	Santa Fe, NM 87501
7	rmoore@nmslo.gov
8	(505) 827-5752
9	
10	ON BEHALF OF NEW MEXICO OIL AND GAS ASSOCIATION:
11	MIGUEL SUAZO, ESQUIRE (by videoconference)
12	Beatty and Wozniak, P.C.
13	500 Don Gaspar Avenue
14	Santa Fe, NM 87505
15	msuazo@bwenergylaw.com
16	(505) 946-2090
17	
18	JACOB EVERHART, ESQUIRE (by videoconference)
19	Beatty and Wozniak, P.C.
20	1675 Broadway, Suite 600
21	Denver, CO 80202
22	jeverhart@bwenergylaw.com
23	(303) 407-4492
24	
25	
	Page 324

1		APPEARANCES (Cont'd)
2	ALSO	PRESENT:
3		Albert Chang, Oil Conservation Division Director
4		(by videoconference)
5		William Ampomah, Commission Member (by
6		videoconference)
7		Greg Bloom, Commission Member (by
8		videoconference)
9		Sheila Apodaca, Oil Conservation Commission Clerk
10		(by videoconference)
11		Allison Marks, State Land Office Witness (by
12		videoconference)
13		Anthony Harris, Energy, Minerals, and Natural
14		Resources Department (by videoconference)
15		Calder Ezzell, Independent Petroleum Association
16		of New Mexico Witness (by videoconference)
17		Clayton Sporich, New Mexico Oil and Gas
18		Association Witness(by videoconference)
19		Madai Corral, Energy, Minerals, and Natural
20		Resources Department (by videoconference)
21		Dan Arthur, New Mexico Oil and Gas Association
22		Witness (by videoconference)
23		Daniel Manus, Public Attendee (by
24		videoconference)
25		

1	APPEARANCES (Cont'd)
2	Loren Diede, Oil Conservation Division Witness
3	(by videoconference)
4	Douglas Emerick, New Mexico Oil and Gas
5	Association Witness (by videoconference)
6	Brandon Powell, Energy, Minerals, and Natural
7	Resources Department (by videoconference)
8	Phillip Goetze, Energy, Minerals, and Natural
9	Resources Department (by videoconference)
10	Brittany Hall, Energy, Minerals, and Natural
11	Resources Department (by videoconference)
12	Andrea Felix, New Mexico Oil and Gas
13	Association Witness (by videoconference)
14	Clay Arrington, Public Attendee (by
15	videoconference)
16	Kyrie Buffa, Public Attendee (by videoconference)
17	Gregory Chakalian, Energy, Minerals, and Natural
18	Resources Department (by videoconference)
19	Liz Kuehn, Public Attendee (by videoconference)
20	Gabrielle Gerholt, Public Attendee (by
21	videoconference)
22	Nicholas Gilmore, Public Attendee (by
23	videoconference)
24	Liliana Castillo, Public Attendee (by
25	videoconference)
	D 206
	Page 326

1	APPEARANCES (Cont'd)
2	Maegan McGowen, Public Attendee (by
3	videoconference)
4	Rachael Ketchledge, Public Attendee (by
5	videoconference)
6	Gerasimos Razatos, Energy, Minerals, and Natural
7	Resources Department (by videoconference)
8	Robert Arscott, Independent Petroleum Association
9	of New Mexico Witness (by videoconference)
10	Rosa Romero, Oil Conservation Division Witness
11	(by videoconference)
12	Benjamin Shelton, Public Attendee (by
13	videoconference)
14	Cory Smith, Public Attendee (by videoconference)
15	Gabriel Wade, Public Attendee (by
16	videoconference)
17	Tiffany Wallace, OXY USA, Inc. Witness (by
18	videoconference)
19	Matt Huchmala, Public Employee Labor Relations
20	Board (by videoconference)
21	Ryan Auten, Reporter (by videoconference)
22	Nicholas Maxwell, Sunshine Audit Inspector (by
23	videoconference)
24	Mikah Thomas, Public Attendee (by
25	videoconference)
	Page 327

1	APPEARANCES (Cont'd)
2	Mike Hanagan, Independent Petroleum Association
3	of New Mexico Witness (by videoconference)
4	Philana Thompson, Public Attendee (by
5	videoconference)
6	Stefi Weisburd, Public Attendee (by
7	videoconference)
8	Mark Murphy, Public Attendee (by videoconference)
9	Miya King-Flaherty, Sierra Club (by
10	videoconference)
11	William Grantham, Public Attendee (by
12	videoconference)
13	Lisa O'Grady, Interpreter (by videoconference)
14	Amanda Sackett, Earthworks (by videoconference)
15	Annie Cook, Public Attendee (by videoconference)
16	Freddie Lopez, Public Attendee (by
17	videoconference)
18	Jim Townsend, Senator (by videoconference)
19	Rod Montoya, House Representative (by
20	videoconference)
21	Paul Morrison, Public Attendee (by
22	videoconference)
23	Sherry Morrison, Public Attendee (by
24	videoconference)
25	

1	APPEARANCES (Cont'd)
2	Walter Gerstle, Public Attendee (by
3	videoconference)
4	Rebecca Haulenbeek, Public Attendee (by
5	videoconference)
6	Marlene Perrotte, Interfaith Power & Light (by
7	videoconference)
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
∠ ⊃	
	Page 329

1	INDEX				
2	WITNESSES:	DX	CX	RDX	RCX
3	DWAYNE PURVIS				
4	By Mr. Nykiel	347		469	
5	By Mr. Cloutier		373		
6	By Mr. Suazo		399		
7	By Mr. Rankin		417		
8	By Mr. Tremaine		457		
9	PETER MORGAN				
10	By Ms. M. O'Grady	523,			
11		609			
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
				Page 3	330

1		EXHIBITS	
2	NO.	DESCRIPTION	ID/EVD
3	Applicant:		
4	Exhibit 34	Total Decommissioning and	
5		Reclamation Cost of Upstream	
6		Oil and Gas Operations in New	
7		Mexico after Vertex 2021	408/
8	Exhibit 38	Cash Flow for Hypothetical	
9		Oil/Gas Project to	
10		Demonstrate the Economic	
11		Concepts of Payout/Holdback	357/
12	Exhibit 47	Binned Permian Basin	
13		Vertical Wells to Final	
14		Rates of Production	355/
15	Exhibit 52	Distribution of the	
16		Concentration of Marginal and	
17		Inactive Wells	390/
18	Exhibit 54	Economic Yardsticks for the	
19		End of Economic Life:	
20		Holdback and Its Adjuncts	411/
21	Exhibit 55	OCD Master Orphan Wells List	374/
22	Exhibit 77	Variance of Actual Downhole	
23		Plugging Costs to Estimates	373/
24	Exhibit 79	Cumulative Oil/Gas Production	,
25	1993 to Present 480/		480/
		Pa	ge 331

1		E X H I B I T S (Cont'd)	
2	NO.	DESCRIPTION	ID/EVD
3	Applicant:		
4	Exhibit 85	Prioritization Scheme and	
5		Application to Wells Orphaned	
6		by Ridgeway Arizona Oil	363/
7	Exhibit 86	Variance of Actual to	
8		Estimated Versus Time for	
9		Recently Plugged Orphan Wells	364/
10	Exhibit 87	Rig Count in Permian Basin of	
11		Texas and New Mexico from	
12		2013 to Present	371/
13	Exhibit 88	Categories and Amounts of	
14		Financial Assurance for Well	
15		Plugging	564/
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
		Da	ge 332
		10.	J

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 THE HEARING OFFICER: We are on day two 3 of the hearing and proposed amendments to the Oil and Conservation Commission regulations, docketed as 4 24683. 5 6 This is the second opportunity to offer 7 non-technical public comment. If you're in the room 8 or on the platform, just know a few things. We're 9 making a transcript, so I will ask you to spell your first and last name, and the Commission rules require 10 11 that all comment be offered under oath or affirmation. 12 I will ask you to just offer oral comment once, no 13 longer than three minutes. You may certainly submit 14 whatever you'd like in writing if there is more to say 15 than that. 16 I have on the sheet that Mandy Sackett 17 wants to comment during this time. Hello. Mr. Purvis, can I ask you to move? 18 19 Good morning. Would you spell your first and last name, please? Make sure that's on. 20 2.1 Say it again. 22 MS. SACKETT: A-M-A-N-D-A, Amanda; Sackett, S-A-C-K-E-T-T. 23 2.4 // 25 //

1	WHEREUPON,
2	AMANDA SACKETT,
3	called as a witness and having been first duly sworn
4	to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but
5	the truth, was examined and testified as follows:
6	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. I'll
7	start.
8	MS. SACKETT: Good morning,
9	Commissioners. My name is Mandy Sackett. I'm the New
LO	Mexico lead campaigner and a certified optical gas
L1	imaging thermographer for Earthworks. I'm trained to
L2	use a special infrared camera that allows me to
L3	visualize pollutants like methane from oil and gas
L4	facilities.
L5	As a new employee and thermographer for
L6	Earthworks, my first few trips have been really
L7	shocking. Last month I spent time in the declining
L8	field of the San Juan Basin. It's eye-opening to see
L9	what managing a declining field actually looks like.
20	These wells are broadly poorly maintained, and the
21	frequency with which I found hydrocarbon emissions at
22	the sites that we visited was really alarming. Many
23	of them were next door to schools and houses.
24	Over a few days, we visited 17 sites.
25	Fifteen of those were low producing wells. We found

1	emissions due to possible non-compliance with air
2	quality rules at ten of those sites, and I reported
3	them to NMED. We commonly saw thief hatch
4	malfunctions on tank batteries; improperly functioning
5	flares; repair issues with fittings in sump areas.
6	I'll tell you about a few examples of
7	what I saw. At one site near Counselor, I found three
8	sources of emissions, of continuous emissions, at just
9	one site: a vent stack on the battery, the sump area,
10	and a vent stack on the horizontal separator. This
11	site is just 900 feet from a K to 8 school that serves
12	exclusively Navajo students.
13	At another site in Kirtland, I found
14	two emissions from a tank battery. There was an
15	apparent thief hatch malfunction on the tank battery,
16	and it was continually leaking emissions about 300
17	feet from a new neighborhood. According to OCD's
18	database, that site had produced virtually no oil or
19	gas since 2019.
20	The thing is, as these sites become
21	less productive, they keep polluting but produce less
22	revenue, which makes it harder to self-fund cleanup
23	and maintenance or start saving for well plugging.
24	What we see in the field is proof that our current
25	system is not working as it should. We have a backlog

	of wells leaking methane and toxic gases, and the cost
2	of cleanup keeps falling on the public. Industry says
3	the system is fine, but if it were, New Mexico
4	wouldn't be sitting on thousands of inactive and
5	orphaned wells and hundreds of millions of dollars in
6	future plugging liability.
7	As experts will lay out, our current
8	bonding framework is not risk-based. It treats every
9	operator the same, whether they manage 3 wells or
10	3,000, and it ignores the actual probability that a
11	company a company will walk away. This rule
12	doesn't target small operators. It targets risky
13	behavior. Every operator, large or small, should obey
14	the law and cover the costs of cleaning up their own
15	mess. You can't say the system is working when you
16	can literally see methane pouring into the sky like I
17	can with my camera.
18	Please adopt this rule and protect
L9	taxpayers, public health, and the climate. Thank you.
20	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you very
21	much, Ms. Sackett.
22	The other person who wanted to speak
23	this morning, Freddie Lopez.
24	Mr. Lopez, are you in the room or on
25	the platform?

ĺ	
1	All right. He may join us later.
2	Annie? Let's see. Did I see Annie
3	Cook on the platform would like to offer comment? I
4	think you can unmute yourself. There you are. You're
5	not unmuted.
6	MS. COOK: How about now?
7	THE HEARING OFFICER: Oh, terrific.
8	Thank you. Would you spell your first and last name,
9	please?
10	MS. COOK: Yes. Annie, A-N-N-I-E;
11	Cook, C-O-O-K.
12	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.
13	WHEREUPON,
14	ANNIE COOK,
15	called as a witness and having been first duly sworn
16	to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but
17	the truth, was examined and testified as follows:
18	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you very
19	much. I'll start your time.
20	MS. COOK: My name is Annie Cook, and
21	I've been a resident of New Mexico since 1971 when I
22	moved here from Kansas. New Mexico's home to me, and
23	I've lived here longer than I've lived anywhere else.
24	Both of my sons were born here. My oldest graduated
25	from UNM, as I did, and my youngest graduated from the

School of Mining and Technology in Socorro.

2.1

2.4

I am a master's prepared nurse who retired in 2013 from the VA in Albuquerque after 30-plus years of service. My husband of 33 years and myself own a home on the west side of Albuquerque, and we're totally invested in the Land of Enchantment. As retirees, my husband and I love to camp and enjoy the beauty of the Land of Enchantment. Our love of nature makes us advocates for keeping the environment pristine so we and our fellow New Mexicans can enjoy the beauty of New Mexico for years to come.

Because of my commitment to the environment, I'm concerned about these regulations. I feel these regulations, especially increasing the assurance money required, will cripple the smaller producers of oil and gas, requiring them to cancel projects and possibly face bankruptcy. I know the regulations are meant to ensure that if a project is canceled, the site will be cleaned up.

But if a company is forced to cancel projects or declare bankruptcy due to the imposition of these onerous regulations, we'll create the very situation that we are trying to avoid. Abandoned projects will create a snowball effect, causing job losses in the communities where they're located, and

1	this will cause the loss of other businesses such as
2	grocers, gas stations, and other retailers, and it's
3	going to negatively affect employment and growth in
4	our smaller communities.
5	Additionally, the funding from the oil
6	and gas industry provides 51 percent of the state
7	budget for New Mexico, so losses in this industry will
8	affect our entire state and in particular our
9	educational system, which relies heavily on money from
10	the oil and gas industry.
11	So today, I'd like to urge you to
12	consider my comments when you're voting on these
13	regulations, and I want to thank you so much for
14	letting me speak today.
15	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you very
16	much, Ms. Cook.
17	I see an "FL." That might be
18	Mr. Lopez.
19	MR. LOPEZ: Hi. Can you hear me?
20	THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes, I can.
21	Thank you very much. Would you spell your first and
22	last name, please?
23	MR. LOPEZ: My name is Freddie Lopez.
24	My first name is spelled F-R-E-D-D-I-E, and my last
25	name Lopez is spelled L-O-P-E-Z.

1	WHEREUPON,
2	FREDDIE LOPEZ,
3	called as a witness and having been first duly sworn
4	to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but
5	the truth, was examined and testified as follows:
6	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you very
7	much. I'll start your time.
8	MR. LOPEZ: Thank you. My name is
9	Freddie Lopez. I am 24 years old, and I have lived in
10	New Mexico all my life. Raised here in Santa Fe. My
11	dad is a tinsmith with a prestigious art gallery in
12	downtown Santa Fe, and my mom is a stay-at-home mom.
13	I was homeschooled right up until community college,
14	and I graduated from the Santa Fe Community College
15	with a high school equivalency as well as an
16	associate's degree in business administration.
17	New Mexico is my home, Santa Fe is my
18	home, and this is a place that in the future when it's
19	my time to go, I'll be buried here and my kids will be
20	buried here. I know how important the oil and gas
21	industry is to our state. It is vital and essential
22	for our economy as it's 51 percent responsible for the
23	fruition of our economy.
24	And as a proud alumni of the Santa Fe
25	Community College, I have to say education opens the

door and brings up many opportunities for all for
all New Mexicans, especially folks in my generation,
and our schools are in trouble. We are ranked 50th
and 51st nationwide, and the oil and gas industry is
responsible for the funding of all of our educational
institutions. It is very important.
And to address the issues we have, we
have to act now. But if we implement these rules and
regulations in place, not only will it harm small oil
and gas producers on projects, but also it will harm
our children and their future because if our schools
are not funded, how can we address the issues that we
are facing in our education institutions?
So I urge you to please take my voice
into consideration when you vote on these rules and
regulations. If you believe in our children's future,
if you believe in New Mexico's future, I kindly urge
you to consider my voice when you make your final vote
on these rules and regulations. Thank you.
THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you,
Mr. Lopez.
I see another hand, "MP." By the way,
if you have dialed in using your phone, the way to
raise your hand on the platform is to press star 5.
Oh, it's Marlene Perrotte. Good
Page 341

1	morning. Can you unmute yourself? Sister? Sister
2	Marlene?
3	COMMISSIONER BLOOM: I think we heard
4	yesterday to use excuse me use Control, Shift, M
5	to unmute, if you're having trouble.
6	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you,
7	Commissioner Bloom.
8	Sister Marlene, it looks like you're
9	unmuted.
10	MS. PERROTTE: Oh, can you hear me?
11	THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes. Now we can.
12	Good morning.
13	MS. PERROTTE: Oh, thank you very much.
14	THE HEARING OFFICER: Would you spell
15	your first and last name, please?
16	MS. PERROTTE: M-A-R-L-E-N-E, Marlene;
17	Perrotte, P-E-R-R-O-T-T-E.
18	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.
19	WHEREUPON,
20	MARLENE PERROTTE,
21	called as a witness and having been first duly sworn
22	to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but
23	the truth, was examined and testified as follows:
24	THE HEARING OFFICER: I'll start your
25	time.

1	MS. PERROTTE: Okay. Good morning
2	Madam Madam Chairman and members of the New Mexico
3	Oil Conservancy Conservation Commission. I am
4	Marlene Perrotte, a Catholic Sisters of Mercy; a
5	member of New Mexico El Paso Interfaith Power & Light
6	and of the Partnership for Earth Spirituality.
7	As a woman of faith, I would offer the
8	moral imperatives of the oil and gas corporations,
9	that they must be held responsible for posting
10	realistic bonds before they drill. Caring for and
11	protecting Holy Mother Earth's community is a sacred
12	trust and an ethical imperative. Right now, oil and
13	gas corporations in New Mexico can drill as many wells
14	as they want, yet put up a tiny fraction of the money
15	needed to clean them up.
16	I personally have visited the Permian
17	Basin many, many times and experienced abandoned
18	wells, leaking oil pipes, leaking toxins such as
19	methane, et cetera. Letting wells leak to protect
20	profits today puts New Mexicans' health at risk. We
21	can't afford delay in cleanup. It is our moral
22	responsibility to ensure that corporations who drill
23	these wells must clean them up.
24	It is an outrage that these
25	corporations take their profits back to Houston and

1	Wall Street and leave us New Mexicans with the mess of
2	cleanup. The oil and gas corporation should cover the
3	full cost of cleaning up after itself, not New
4	Mexicans' families. We need modern rules to match the
5	reality of modern drilling. The bonding system is
6	vastly inadequate, covering only 2 to 10 percent of
7	total liability.
8	I support strong bonding rules to
9	protect New Mexico's water, land, and air; her health
10	and future. We need a responsible energy policy.
11	Better practices must include full accountability. We
12	cannot afford underfunded risks. It's time to fix the
13	rules so the corporations that drill are the ones who
14	must clean up. Thank you so very much for this
15	opportunity.
	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you,
16	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Sister.
16 17	
16 17 18	Sister.
16 17 18 19	Sister. Is there anyone else on the platform
16 17 18	Sister. Is there anyone else on the platform who would like to offer public comment during this
16 17 18 19 20	Sister. Is there anyone else on the platform who would like to offer public comment during this public comment session? Our next public comment
16 17 18 19 20 21	Sister. Is there anyone else on the platform who would like to offer public comment during this public comment session? Our next public comment session is at 4 p.m. today. That comment session is
16 17 18 19 20 21	Sister. Is there anyone else on the platform who would like to offer public comment during this public comment session? Our next public comment session is at 4 p.m. today. That comment session is one of several during which we will have an
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Sister. Is there anyone else on the platform who would like to offer public comment during this public comment session? Our next public comment session is at 4 p.m. today. That comment session is one of several during which we will have an interpreter between Spanish and English.

1	case.
2	Mr. Cloutier, I think you said you had
3	a preliminary matter to bring up?
4	MR. CLOUTIER: Yes, Madam Hearing
5	Officer.
6	MR. MAXWELL: Your Honor, this is
7	Mr. Maxwell on the platform. I can't hear him.
8	MR. CLOUTIER: I apologize,
9	Mr. Maxwell.
10	I was just saying that we're going
11	straight to surrebuttal with the second witness, which
12	we're not objecting to. We thought we were going to
13	be discussing that more before we did it. As long as
14	we're doing that with the technical witnesses, sauce
15	for the goose; sauce for the gander. No problem with
16	it.
17	I think Mr. Suazo and I probably have
18	to reevaluate witness times and make sure we're okay
19	with it. I would not anticipate for my purposes that
20	if I'm adding any time, it would be more than 10 or 15
21	minutes, but I just wanted to bring that up and get
22	your thoughts, please, Madam Hearing Officer.
23	THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes. You
24	probably noticed yesterday what Ms. Fox did with the
25	witness, which was to be very specific in her

1	identification of the precise rebuttal testimony the
2	witness was surrebutting.
3	MR. CLOUTIER: She did.
4	THE HEARING OFFICER: So long as you're
5	doing that.
6	MR. CLOUTIER: That's fine. We'll be
7	happy to do that.
8	THE HEARING OFFICER: All right. Thank
9	you.
10	Ms. Fox?
11	MS. FOX: Yeah. No objection. The
12	hearing scheduling order provided for having direct
13	rebuttal and surr all in one all in sequence, so
14	that was what was contemplated in the order.
15	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.
16	Anything else before we return to
17	Mr. Purvis? No? All right. Thank you so much.
18	Let's see, are you taking yourself this
19	morning questioning, Mr. Cloutier? Oh, I'm sorry. We
20	need to finish his surrebuttal first. That's right.
21	Thank you. Go ahead.
22	MR. NYKIEL: Thank you, Madam Hearing
23	Officer.
24	THE HEARING OFFICER: Yeah.
25	//
	Page 346
	i la companya di managantan di managantan di managantan di managantan di managantan di managantan di managanta

1	WHEREUPON,
2	DWAYNE PURVIS,
3	called as a witness and having been previously sworn
4	to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but
5	the truth, was examined and testified as follows:
6	DIRECT EXAMINATION
7	BY MR. NYKIEL:
8	MR. NYKIEL: Good morning, Mr. Purvis.
9	We'll continue with your surrebuttal testimony. What
10	are your high level observations of Industry's
11	rebuttal testimony?
12	MR. PURVIS: Thank you for the
13	question. And there are three primary high level
14	observations of what's there and one about what is
15	not. In the rebuttal testimony offered by other
16	witnesses about my testimony, there were objections to
17	the underlying data used in my work, objections to the
18	value of the the notion of a holdback, and
19	objections to perceived disrespect and bias. There
20	were not, however, substantive objections to my
21	calculations or the the conclusions from those
22	the conclusions that are built on those
23	quantifications.
24	Now, there were a number of other
25	arguments raised in this rebuttal testimony, which,
- 1	

1	like the direct testimony of other witnesses, I found
2	spurious and unhelpful, but I've not addressed those
3	here. So to the extent I've not addressed an issue
4	raised in rebuttal testimony, it should not be assumed
5	that I agree it's valid.
6	MR. NYKIEL: NMOGA witnesses Ms. Felix
7	and Mr. Arthur claim in their rebuttal testimony on
8	pages 8 and 9 respectively that you advised the New
9	Mexico Legislative Finance Committee during the
LO	creation of its report "Policy Spotlight: Orphaned
L1	Wells." Did you advise the LFC on its work, and how
L2	did their work affect your own?
L3	MR. PURVIS: I did not advise the LFC
L4	on their work, and I did not rely on their conclusions
L5	in the formation of my own. So there is no circular
L6	reference where I'm citing myself indirectly.
L7	MR. NYKIEL: NMOGA witnesses Ms. Felix,
L8	Mr. Arthur, and Mr. McGowen opine in their rebuttal
L9	testimony at pages 18 through 19, 17 through 20, and 3
20	respectively that the OCD's master orphaned wells
21	spreadsheet is foundational to your characterization
22	of the issue of with orphaned wells and that it
23	exaggerates the scope of the issue of orphaned wells.
24	What is your response?
25	MR. PURVIS: Of the 29 exhibits I

1 prepared, most of which are quantitative, the master 2 orphan wells spreadsheet or MOWS affects three in 3 part, and in none of those three is the master orphan wells spreadsheet used to justify the extent of the 4 5 orphaned well issue. 6 If I may share my screen now, this 7 slide and the three that follow show all of the 8 exhibits I prepared in my testimony. The rebuttal 9 testimony exhibits are outlined as the first and the 10 second row. On this page where I'm setting the stage 11 of the large scale issue, the master orphan wells 12 spreadsheet does provide the sole source of 13 information for the histogram on the first part of 14 Line 2. 15 The orphaned wells spreadsheet affects 16 one column of the two tables in the lower right, in 17 the exhibit in the lower right, and on the third page 18 back, the master orphan wells spreadsheet is part of the evidence of the nature of the companies that are 19 20 orphaned. So when I talk, however, about the nature 2.1 of the orphaned well issue, it's this group of slides, 22 where I quantify the application of the definition of

MR. NYKIEL: NMOGA witness Mr. McGowen

Page 349

marginal wells against empirical data on economic

23

2.4

25

limits.

1	argues in his rebuttal testimony at pages 23 through
2	24 that the Vertex report discussed in your testimony
3	is speculative and non-reproducible because
4	stakeholders cannot audit it. What is your response?
5	MR. PURVIS: So Mr sorry. The
6	Vertex report, which was just published in March of
7	2021, affects only one graphic. That's the upper
8	right, the second and the first line here, used to set
9	context. I was able to obtain the report from two
10	sources, one of which being the company itself and
11	I the company, when they delivered the report to
12	me, told me they had also given a report to IPANM
13	expert Dr. Arscott, but it's a matter of public
14	record.
14 15	record. The report runs 91 pages, 31 tables in
15	The report runs 91 pages, 31 tables in
15 16	The report runs 91 pages, 31 tables in the middle, in the context of the report, four
15 16 17	The report runs 91 pages, 31 tables in the middle, in the context of the report, four appendices. It is a comprehensive, quantitative,
15 16 17 18	The report runs 91 pages, 31 tables in the middle, in the context of the report, four appendices. It is a comprehensive, quantitative, detailed analysis. Now, the the idea that it's
15 16 17 18	The report runs 91 pages, 31 tables in the middle, in the context of the report, four appendices. It is a comprehensive, quantitative, detailed analysis. Now, the the idea that it's speculative is misplaced. It is a Class 5 category of
15 16 17 18 19 20	The report runs 91 pages, 31 tables in the middle, in the context of the report, four appendices. It is a comprehensive, quantitative, detailed analysis. Now, the the idea that it's speculative is misplaced. It is a Class 5 category of cost estimate.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	The report runs 91 pages, 31 tables in the middle, in the context of the report, four appendices. It is a comprehensive, quantitative, detailed analysis. Now, the the idea that it's speculative is misplaced. It is a Class 5 category of cost estimate. Now, there is a formal taxonomy for the
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	The report runs 91 pages, 31 tables in the middle, in the context of the report, four appendices. It is a comprehensive, quantitative, detailed analysis. Now, the the idea that it's speculative is misplaced. It is a Class 5 category of cost estimate. Now, there is a formal taxonomy for the quantification or the classification rather of cost

1 there's no evidence that it is inaccurate. 2 MR. NYKIEL: NMOGA witness Mr. McGowen 3 claims in his rebuttal testimony at pages 21 through 22 that WellDatabase, the data source you used to 4 5 provide analysis of Applicants' proposed rules, is a less reliable and less widely adopted data source in 6 the industry and therefore should be independently 8 validated and compared to Mr. McGowen's preferred data 9 source. What is your response? 10 MR. PURVIS: There are about eight 11 companies that offer the same fundamental service with 12 the same fundamental product. They obtain data from 13 the regulators in each state in digital form, and they 14 repackage it in a more accessible manner to 15 subscribers. 16 Now, there are three large companies 17 that offer enterprise level solutions. One of those he mentions, INVARIS. The other he mentions is IHS. 18 That company no longer exists. It's now called S&P 19 20 Global. But S&P Global will not allow their data to 2.1 be used in any way in public. The variety of 22 competitors in this market have different offerings 23 depending on the scope of data that they have 2.4 collected and the degree to which they add additional 25 analysis of their own.

1	In this case, WellDatabase is a mid-
2	tier offering. It uses the same core data downloaded
3	digitally from the Oklahoma Corporation Commission in
4	this corporation Oklahoma Conservation Division
5	in this case, and that core data is what I have relied
6	upon.
7	MR. NYKIEL: Mr. Purvis, you intended
8	to say New Mexico?
9	MR. PURVIS: Yep. Yes. I certainly
10	did not mean Oklahoma. I'm sorry. What's more, I
11	I used that was only part of the data I used. I
12	did access the OCD's application program interface
13	directly to get information directly from the state,
14	and I quality controlled information as I used it.
15	It WellDatabase is a widely accepted and used tool.
16	This I find perfectly acceptable for this, for the
17	way I've used it.
18	MR. NYKIEL: NMOGA witness Mr. McGowen
19	claims in his rebuttal testimony at page 21 that your
20	manual corrections to the data introduced substantial
21	subjectivity into the data sets. What is your
22	response?
23	MR. PURVIS: I give an example, the
24	example in my testimony, that operators had sometimes
25	reported 36 days of operations in a month. It's hard

to imagine that there's any way I could correct 36
days in a month and make it less accurate. But in
fact, I can tell you that when I made the corrections,
there were very little corrections that needed to be
made, and if memory serves, the change was a reduction
in the number of marginal wells affected by about a
10th of a percent. It's a trivial issue.
MR. NYKIEL: To which of your exhibits
did rebuttal testimony take issue with your
calculations or conclusions?
MR. PURVIS: On this slide of or in
these slides, I've arranged my my testimony in
order of key points. The the first points are that
it's a very large issue, decommissioning is, and it's
much larger than just downhole plugging. No
disagreement from them. The second line demonstrates
that there's a high side contingency element to the
cost of decommissioning. All agree on that. We all
agree that costs have increased and they continue
to to increase.
Some disagreement on the application of
holdback, but no disagreement that there are about
63,000 wells in the state currently as we continue to
drill that will need to be plugged. No disagreement
that production is, except for horizontal wells, well

1	past its peak. No disagreement that the majority of
2	wells are stripper. No disagreement that that the
3	definitions apply to a small fraction of wells that
4	are actually marginal. No doubt that the definitions
5	are conservative by comparison.
6	No questions about the distribution of
7	the the entities in the industry. No opposition
8	that there are three separate clusters, one of
9	companies, one of liabilities, and one of production.
10	No disagreement that the number of wells has
11	decreased, but of course that came out in rebuttal.
12	Wouldn't necessarily know that yet.
13	So the the key, the there is a
14	disagreement in a qualitative sense about the
15	significance of the call it the 90 bottom 90
16	percent of operating companies, but in term but in
17	terms of quantification and themes, no no
18	substantive disagreement.
19	MR. NYKIEL: NMOGA witnesses Mr. Arthur
20	and Mr. McGowen and IPANM witness Mr. Winchester
21	disagree in their rebuttal testimony at pages 20
22	through 21, 28, and 16 through 17 respectively with
23	your characterization of marginal wells. When you
24	talk about marginal wells as categorized by
25	Applicants' proposed rules, do you mean the same

1	thing?
2	MR. PURVIS: No, we don't. I do not
3	observe any location in the testimony of other
4	opposing experts that quantify the number of wells
5	under the definition of marginal as proposed.
6	Instead, the discussion is about the marginal wells
7	under the generic meaning of that term.
8	I'm showing now my Exhibit 47 with some
9	annotations on top of it. This these are the
10	22,000 vertical wells in the Permian Basin. The color
11	coding indicates whether or not they are defined as
12	marginal. The dark blue is defined as marginal. The
13	purple do not qualify as marginal, but will need some
14	sort of address. The red lines indicate the actual
15	historical economic limit of production.
16	(Applicant Exhibit 47 was marked for
17	identification.)
18	But what we see is that there are a
19	large number of wells, many more wells, that are
20	within the window of the end of their economic life,
21	are producing at low rates and low profit margins,
22	that do not qualify for the additional financial
23	assurance and therefore and are not defined
24	marginal.
25	So to the extent that other experts
	Page 355

1	refer to marginal wells in the generic sense, they're
2	talking about a much larger number of wells than are
3	affected by the defined term of marginal.
4	MR. NYKIEL: NMOGA witness Mr. Arthur
5	disagrees in his rebuttal testimony at pages 20
6	through 21 with your testimony that there is a
7	likelihood that marginal wells present a greater risk
8	of orphaning. What is your response?
9	MR. PURVIS: My testimony is not that
10	all marginal wells will be orphaned. My point is that
11	they are barely making any money by definition, and
12	the defined marginal are making even less money. And
13	therefore they contribute they represent more
14	liability than asset on an average and increase the
15	risk to the portfolio as a whole. Not that every one
16	is an orphan, not that every well past holdback will
17	be orphaned, but that the risk increases.
18	MR. NYKIEL: NMOGA witness Mr. Arthur
19	argues in his rebuttal testimony at pages 86 through
20	87 that your testimony conflates inactive wells with
21	problem wells. What is your response?
22	MR. PURVIS: I did don't believe I
23	said, and I certainly did not mean to imply, that all
24	inactive wells are problem wells. That would not be
25	an accurate thing to say. Instead what I tried to say

1	is that inactive wells have a higher incidence of
2	difficulties, and the longer a well stands idle, the
3	more likely it is to suffer some sort of mechanical
4	deterioration and failure. My point is not that as he
5	seems to think that all inactive wells are problem
6	wells. My point is that the average risk increases.
7	MR. NYKIEL: IPANM witness Mr. Arscott
8	and NMOGA witness Mr. McGowen claim in their rebuttal
9	testimony at pages 1 through 4 and 25 through 28
10	respectively that the holdback concept is not a
11	reliable measure of the value of oil and gas wells or
12	the likelihood that they will become orphaned. What
13	is your response?
14	MR. PURVIS: They they do argue that
	MR. PURVIS: They they do argue that holdback is not a measure of fair market value. Look,
14	
14 15	holdback is not a measure of fair market value. Look,
14 15 16	holdback is not a measure of fair market value. Look, I'm looking now at showing a demonstrative of my
14 15 16 17	holdback is not a measure of fair market value. Look, I'm looking now at showing a demonstrative of my Applicants' Exhibit 38, and as I intended to say
14 15 16 17	holdback is not a measure of fair market value. Look, I'm looking now at showing a demonstrative of my Applicants' Exhibit 38, and as I intended to say yesterday, if a a property between at the point
14 15 16 17 18	holdback is not a measure of fair market value. Look, I'm looking now at showing a demonstrative of my Applicants' Exhibit 38, and as I intended to say yesterday, if a a property between at the point of holdback forward, the operator's trading dollars.
14 15 16 17 18 19	holdback is not a measure of fair market value. Look, I'm looking now at showing a demonstrative of my Applicants' Exhibit 38, and as I intended to say yesterday, if a a property between at the point of holdback forward, the operator's trading dollars. If he makes a purchase, then the purchase price is
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	holdback is not a measure of fair market value. Look, I'm looking now at showing a demonstrative of my Applicants' Exhibit 38, and as I intended to say yesterday, if a a property between at the point of holdback forward, the operator's trading dollars. If he makes a purchase, then the purchase price is lost in a dollar to dollar basis.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	holdback is not a measure of fair market value. Look, I'm looking now at showing a demonstrative of my Applicants' Exhibit 38, and as I intended to say yesterday, if a a property between at the point of holdback forward, the operator's trading dollars. If he makes a purchase, then the purchase price is lost in a dollar to dollar basis. (Applicant Exhibit 38 was marked for
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	holdback is not a measure of fair market value. Look, I'm looking now at showing a demonstrative of my Applicants' Exhibit 38, and as I intended to say yesterday, if a a property between at the point of holdback forward, the operator's trading dollars. If he makes a purchase, then the purchase price is lost in a dollar to dollar basis. (Applicant Exhibit 38 was marked for identification.)

1 disagreement that profits are high in the beginning; 2 low at the end. No disagreement that when it stops producing, it's left as a liability except for some 3 contingent possibility of some improvement. There's 4 5 no disagreement that the point -- the point of 6 holdback as defined does exist. There is a point in time when the cash flow undiscounted is zero and at 8 the same time that present value is positive. 9 The argument goes that it's not a fair market value, and indeed it's not offered. Fair 10 11

market value, and indeed it's not offered. Fair
market holdback is not offered as an alternative fair
market value, and it's not offered as a prescribed
strategy. And what's more, it's not used in the rules
in any way. Instead it is offered as a yardstick to
characterize the -- the contours of the future cash
flow. It's offered as a planning tool, a baseline
from which to find -- to figure out how you will
accomplish what is required.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

If I tell you that -- by analogy, if I tell you that my cousin as a senior in high school had a 19-inch neck, you'd know he was a big boy, but you wouldn't know whether he's fat or strong. If I told you that he had a 36-inch waist and a 54-inch chest, then you would know that he is strong. That second yardstick provides a significant measure of the

1 character, the contours of -- and then it that gives 2. us a basis about what to expect. 3 You would not be surprised to know that my cousin was the strongest high school senior in the 4 5 state of Texas; that he was drafted to play for 6 Nebraska the year after they won the national championship. Holdback is a useful planning tool. 8 MR. NYKIEL: NMOGA witness Mr. McGowen 9 argues in his rebuttal testimony at page 25 that the holdback concept is not an accepted industry practice. 10 11 What is your response? 12 MR. PURVIS: So holdback is in fact a 13 variation of a well-established economic yardstick called return on investment and a variation of the 14 15 most basic economic yardstick called payout. But 16 defined and named as such, holdback is only a couple 17 of years old, and I am the one who assigned that name and pointed out its significance. 18 19 It is -- it is under discussion, has 20 been under discussion, with -- within the relevant professional societies as something to be officially 2.1 22 endorsed in the current revisions of the Petroleum --23 But in the meantime, the Society of Petroleum PRMS. 2.4 Engineers has published it in their Journal of 25 Petroleum Technology.

1	I've spoken to dozens of organizations,
2	including the an invitation to the National
3	Stripper Well Association, and last year the society
4	curated chose the topic for presentation in their
5	distinguished lecture tour where we presented it in
6	about half a dozen countries around the world.
7	MR. NYKIEL: IPANM witnesses
8	Mr. Cantrell and Mr. Hanagan refer in their rebuttal
9	testimony at pages 8 and 5 respectively to the
10	following statement in your direct testimony,
11	Applicants' Exhibit 30, at page 44, where you state
12	"At this point, I cannot say precisely how many
13	companies are not prepared for the increased
14	accountability, how each will exercise the range of
15	options available to them, or how many will go out of
16	business, but I can say that the companies at risk are
17	the ones whose loss will be missed the least."
18	What is your response? And I
19	apologize. IPANM witnesses refer to that statement
20	and claim that you have a bias and contempt for small
21	operators. What is your response?
22	MR. PURVIS: I am so sorry that my
23	testimony gave offense. The statement is harsh to the
24	frank to the point of being harsh, and I'm sorry
25	for that. Let me try again. Statistically speaking,

1	the small operators contribute a small amount to the
2	state as a whole, and my evidence substantiates those
3	figures.
4	MR. NYKIEL: IPANM witness
5	Mr. Winchester and NMOGA witness Mr. McGowen claim in
6	their rebuttal testimony at pages 16 and 13
7	respectively that your testimony shows that the aim of
8	this rulemaking is to drive small operators out of
9	business more than to provide financial assurances to
LO	New Mexico taxpayers. What is your response?
L1	MR. PURVIS: So I I can't testify as
L2	to motivations of individuals who crafted the
L3	proposal. What I can say is I feel no bias towards
L4	small operators any more than I feel biased towards
L5	large operators. What I'm concerned about is, as
L6	other people have testified, operators who solely the
L7	name of the industry and do not bear their legal
L8	longstanding, well-known responsibilities. I I
L9	don't have patience for that, but I'm not aware of any
20	bias.
21	MR. NYKIEL: IPANM witness Mr. Hanagan
22	identified in his rebuttal testimony at page 5 a quote
23	from your company's webpage that states, in part "I
24	believe the world needs less oil and gas, not more."
25	Mr. Hanagan claims that based on this quote, it proves

1	your perspective is fundamentally at odds with the
2	purpose of the OCC and the Oil and Gas Act. What is
3	your response?
4	MR. PURVIS: I have stated on my
5	website that our firm is committed to a net zero
6	policy, based on my personal understanding and
7	conviction about the social cost of burning
8	hydrocarbons. That same statement goes on to say that
9	I will continue to work with operators to maximize and
10	optimize ongoing existing sources of supply, which is
11	the the question here. The question before the
12	Commission is not about the social cost of carbon. It
13	is about how to deal with existing sources of supply.
14	MR. NYKIEL: NMOGA witnesses
15	Mr. McGowen and Mr. Arthur claim in their rebuttal
16	testimony at pages 22 and 73 respectively that your
17	testimony establishing the average cost for OCD to
18	decommission a well in New Mexico is wrong because
19	it's not based on randomized nor representative data.
20	Did you prepare an analysis of their claim?
21	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
22	MR. NYKIEL: Okay. I'm going to pass
23	out Ms. Fox will pass out and would you please
24	scroll to the relevant slide in your presentation
25	that's been marked Applicants' Exhibit 85. And I'll
	Page 362
	1456 302

1	note that Applicants uploaded this to the rulemaking
2	shared file folder on October 15th.
3	(Applicant Exhibit 85 was marked for
4	identification.)
5	MR. PURVIS: While she's passing that
6	out, let me first address the idea that randomized is
7	not the proper measure of representativeness.
8	Orphaning and well costs are not random. The question
9	is one of representativeness.
LO	And I see two dimensions to question
L1	the representativeness. Now, the first is the basins
L2	from which the sample comes. As I said in my direct,
L3	71 percent of the wells covered by the new rules exist
L 4	in the Permian Basin. The the OCD's experience
L5	covers includes about 90 percent wells from the
L6	Permian, so there and about 20 percent from from
L7	the San Juan Basin.
L8	But my my rebuttal testimony shows
L9	that by two separate measures, the difference in a
20	median central expected costs in the San Juan and the
21	Permian Basin differ only by 15 or 20 percent. So to
22	the extent that the sample is not representative, it's
23	unrepresented by 15 or 20 percent, and that difference
24	is in within that 15 or 20 percent is a difference
25	of 15 or 20 percent. By contrast, this is by far the

1	best available data to make the rule.
2	BY MR. NYKIEL:
3	MR. NYKIEL: Mr. Purvis, did you also
4	prepare an additional analysis to address Mr. McGowen
5	and Mr. Arthur's rebuttal testimony at pages 22 and 73
6	respectively where they disagree with your use of the
7	Division's average cost to decommission a well?
8	MR. PURVIS: Yes. I did write in my
9	direct testimony that
10	MR. NYKIEL: Pardon me, Mr. Purvis. I
11	just want to identify that. Would you please scroll
12	to the relevant slide?
13	And what we passed out includes
14	Applicants' Exhibit 86, which Applicants also uploaded
15	to the rulemaking shared file folder on October 15th.
16	(Applicant Exhibit 86 was marked for
17	identification.)
18	BY MR. NYKIEL:
19	MR. NYKIEL: And is this your analysis?
20	MR. PURVIS: Well, first let me talk
21	about 85 because I forgot to do that a minute ago.
22	MR. NYKIEL: Please.
23	MR. PURVIS: In my direct testimony, I
24	conceded that the selection of wells chosen to be
25	plugged by the OCC by the OCD may be biased towards
	Page 364
	J -

wells with a higher contingency. I said may, not was,
because I thought that was a possibility. And
surrebuttal, I have examined that question with two
analyses. The first is here.
The top part of Exhibit 85 summarizes
what the OCD has said publicly about their
prioritization scheme. It involves two layers of
prioritization: first, one on risk; and second, one
on efficiency. The bullet list identify many of the
30 variables that go into the priority.
Only a few of those pertain directly to
the cost of decommissioning the cost of downhole
plugging, rather. Instead, that's prioritized on
things like proximity to occupied structures,
proximity to agricultural areas, proximity to water
supply wells, and proximity to threatened or
endangered species, which have no bearing on downhole
costs. So between the nature of the priority scheme
and the overlay of efficiency, we would not
necessarily expect to see higher cost wells
prioritized.
Now, that theory can be tested with one
set of data that exists in the master orphan wells
spreadsheet, and that's what the bar chart shows. For
the nearly 300 wells orphaned by Ridgeway, Arizona,

Τ	the spreadsheet shows the priority number assigned by
2	the OCD. The lower the number on the left represents
3	lower priority, and the higher number on the right
4	represents higher priority.
5	The gray all of the bars represent
6	the full population of wells to which a priority is
7	assigned, and the average across 300 wells is a
8	priority score of 35.8. We call it 36. The wells or
9	the subset that are marked in shades of blue represent
L O	the first round of wells which were plugged by the
L1	OCD, and we see that the average priority score was
L2	33.74. There's practically no difference between the
L3	average of the full population and the initial wells,
L4	the first priority wells, plugged by the Commission.
L 5	Interestingly, we also see in this
L6	sample an average estimated cost of \$156,000, an
L7	actual cost of \$225,000, and an average overrun of
L8	\$44,000. All of that and which are consistent with
L9	the averages that are we've seen in other places.
20	So this one example suggests that there is no bias by
21	the prioritization scheme.
22	You asked me also about Exhibit 86?
23	MR. NYKIEL: And before we turn there,
24	just to clarify, would you repeat the average overrun?
25	I think you mentioned it was 44,000, but

1	MR. PURVIS: I should have taken a
2	Benadryl last night. The average overrun was 44
3	percent.
4	MR. NYKIEL: Okay. Thanks.
5	And yes. We had passed out and shared
6	Applicants' Exhibit 86, which had been uploaded on
7	October 15th, the shared file folder.
8	BY MR. NYKIEL:
9	MR. NYKIEL: Is that your analysis?
10	MR. PURVIS: Yes. This is another
11	analysis I prepared to test whether or not the
12	prioritization scheme of the OCD creates a bias
13	towards high contingency wells. The bottom line is
14	no. This represents that the wells plugged by the OCD
15	for which we have both by well estimates beforehand
16	and actual costs after over about the last three
17	years.
18	Now, during those three years, the cost
19	itself, the baseline cost, was increasing rapidly, so
20	I can't compare on the basis of cost alone. Instead
21	I've looked at the overrun. The solid black dashed
22	line represents no overrun. The costs came in at the
23	end of the day exactly as predicted, as estimated.
24	The red dashed line represents an overrun of a hundred
25	percent, double.

1	Now, the Ridgeway example is shown in a
2	hot pink on the right, and what we see is that the
3	the very first wells that they plugged did have higher
4	overruns, but the majority of the wells were
5	consistent with the overall theme, the overall
6	average. Similarly, Energy Acumen, shown in blue just
7	to the left, represents the first wells in the
8	priority scheme for decommissioning orphaned wells.
9	I I find the name ironic for a
LO	company that orphaned their wells. But they they
L1	do see the very first well is a is a high side, an
L2	overrun, and there is one or two other wells in the
L3	in the first batch. But most of the wells in that
L4	first batch are average, and the highest overrun that
L5	exists for that operator's orphaned wells is the last
L6	one that's plugged.
L7	In the case of M&M, Biya, Lease Holder,
L8	and Flare, small operators in all those the cases
L9	you see there, all their first wells that were chosen
20	to be plugged. Again, we don't see a high contingency
21	pervasively at the front. Blue Sky is a package of
22	wells done about the middle of the program of
23	decommissioning all their wells, and we do see some
24	high overruns there in the middle.
25	In the case of Canyon, this batch of

1	wells you see here represents towards the tail end of
2	the overall program of plugging their wells, and what
3	we see is that the highest overrun among the Canyon
4	wells was the last.
5	So this set of samples shows it does
6	not show a pattern of high contingency overrun, high
7	overruns, in the early wells. And those two are the
8	best pieces of evidence that I have to test the
9	theory, and both indicate a lack of bias towards high
10	contingency.
11	MR. NYKIEL: IPANM witness Mr. Hanagan
12	asserts in his rebuttal testimony at page 4 that
13	"Nothing in Mr. Purvis's Exhibit 35 reflects drilling
14	nor does well count or horizontal well percentage
15	correspond to company size." What is your response?
16	MR. PURVIS: He has not correctly read
17	my exhibits. I apologize. Scoot back here. In my
18	Exhibit 35 as well as 36, 37, and a rebuttal exhibit,
19	I look at multiple measures. But 35, 36, and 37 all
20	include a measure of new production, which is
21	described specifically as new drawing.
22	MR. NYKIEL: IPANM witnesses
23	Mr. Cantrell and Mr. Hanagan argue in their rebuttal
24	testimony at pages 8 and 5 respectively that your
25	testimony about the impact of Applicants' proposed

1	rules is limited to analysis of well count and
2	production levels and misses the indirect economic
3	effects of small operators. What is your response?
4	MR. PURVIS: So any sort of economic
5	activity does have a direct impact, an indirect
6	impact, and an imputed impact, where the echoes of the
7	economic activity are circulating through the economy.
8	The economic impact of oil and gas operations of all
9	sizes is in direct proportion to the revenue, which is
LO	the production, and in direct proportion to the costs
L1	as measured by number of wells.
L2	So to the extent that so I have not
L3	measured economic impact directly. I have measured
L4	the primary drivers of economic impact, and I've
L5	measured those for both large and medium and
L6	medium-small and small operators.
L7	MR. NYKIEL: More specifically, IPANM
L8	witness Mr. Hanagan asserts in his rebuttal testimony
L9	at page 4 that "Mr. Purvis ignores the wells drilled
20	by small operators like Manzano and Armstrong Energy.
21	In fact, the Permian Basin remains the nationwide
22	leader in vertical well rig counts, with 80 percent of
23	vertical rigs nationwide in 2024 and 50 percent of
24	vertical rigs in 2025 so far.
25	"Discounting the development of

1	potential" I'm sorry "discounting the
2	development potential by smaller operators drilling
3	vertical wells ignores a large percentage of the
4	population of operators in New Mexico."
5	Did you prepare an analysis of
6	Mr. Hanagan's assertion?
7	MR. PURVIS: Yes, I did.
8	MR. NYKIEL: Would you please scroll to
9	the relevant slide in your presentation?
10	We have already passed out Applicants'
11	Exhibit 87, which Applicants uploaded to the
12	rulemaking shared file folder on October 15th.
13	(Applicant Exhibit 87 was marked for
14	identification.)
15	BY MR. NYKIEL:
16	MR. NYKIEL: Is this your analysis?
17	MR. PURVIS: Yes, it is.
18	MR. NYKIEL: And what does it say?
19	MR. PURVIS: So I appreciate you asking
20	about this because it's emblematic of the noise and
21	hand waving without quantification that's systemic
22	through the opposition to the rules.
23	Mr. Hanagan says 80 percent of vertical
24	wells. The Permian is a concentration of vertical
25	wells, and that it's 80 percent and 50 percent, which
	Page 371

1	makes it sound like a lot. But his footnote shows
2	that 80 the 80 percent is out of 10 rigs nationally
3	and the 50 percent is out of 12 rigs nationally.
4	What I've tried to do on this exhibit
5	is show a more meaningful quantitative analysis. This
6	is the same source of data. It's the Baker Hughes rig
7	count, and it shows all of the rigs active in the
8	Permian Basin as a whole. On the left side of the
9	page is the Permian in Texas, and on the right side,
10	the Permian in New Mexico.
11	The three lines represent the rig count
12	drilling different kinds of wells. The black line is
13	horizontal; the light gray line is the least
14	important, least significant, directional; and the
15	purple line is vertical wells. And what we see first
16	is that there are many more rigs, both vertical and
17	horizontal, in Texas than there are in New Mexico, so
18	the citation to the Permian is misleading in that way.
19	But more to the point, over the last
20	two years in Texas, the proportion of rigs drilling
21	vertically has ranged from only 1.1 to 4.1 percent of
22	the rigs. And in New Mexico, the rig count drilling
23	for vertical wells over the last two years has
24	averaged between zero and 2.8 percent of the rigs. So
25	for all the ballyhoo about the significance and

1	importance in my all the ballyhoo about my
2	ignorance, a quantification of the data validates my
3	conclusion that vertical well drilling is very small.
4	MR. NYKIEL: Madam Hearing Officer,
5	this concludes Mr. Purvis's testimony. He stands
6	available for cross-examination and questions from the
7	Commission.
8	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you very
9	much.
10	Mr. Cloutier, are you beginning the
11	questioning?
12	MR. CLOUTIER: Thank you, Madam Hearing
13	Officer.
14	CROSS-EXAMINATION
15	BY MR. CLOUTIER:
16	MR. CLOUTIER: Good morning,
17	Mr. Purvis.
18	MR. PURVIS: Good morning, sir.
19	MR. CLOUTIER: I'd like to jump right
20	into the data, and let me screen share with you. I
21	believe in your surrebuttal, you identified Exhibit 77
22	as one of the exhibits which you used the master
23	orphan spreadsheet to prepare. Is that correct?
24	(Applicant Exhibit 77 was marked for
25	identification.)
	Page 373
	3

1	MR. PURVIS: One second.
2	MR. CLOUTIER: Let me share my screen
3	here. Sorry.
4	MR. PURVIS: I'm trying to double check
5	your number.
6	MR. CLOUTIER: Mr. Everhart, could I
7	ask you to share 77? I'm sorry. I'm having trouble
8	here. Okay. Thank you.
9	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
10	BY MR. CLOUTIER:
11	MR. CLOUTIER: Okay. And the master
12	orphan spreadsheet is Exhibit 55 in the logged
13	exhibits?
14	(Applicant Exhibit 55 was marked for
15	identification.)
16	MR. PURVIS: I'll take your word for
17	it.
18	MR. CLOUTIER: Okay. So there's about
19	1800 wells listed on the master orphan wells
20	spreadsheet. Is that correct?
21	MR. PURVIS: Yes, sir.
22	MR. CLOUTIER: And only about 300, 310
23	of them have plugging cost data. Correct?
24	MR. PURVIS: If memory serves, that's
25	about right.
	Page 374

1	MR. CLOUTIER: Yeah. And I'll confess
2	operator error. I got 303 one time and 312 the next
3	time, so I don't want to give you a precise figure.
4	And you used in the spreadsheet
5	MR. EVERHART: You're sharing now.
6	MR. CLOUTIER: I'm sharing now?
7	MR. EVERHART: Yeah.
8	MR. CLOUTIER: Okay. All right.
9	MR. EVERHART: I'll stop.
10	MR. CLOUTIER: Good. All right.
11	BY MR. CLOUTIER:
12	MR. CLOUTIER: The spreadsheet itself,
13	let me fully minimize. So the spreadsheet is columns.
14	You're using the data in Columns BI here, Estimated
15	Plugging Costs, and BK, Actual Plugging Costs, in
16	Exhibit
17	MR. PURVIS: No.
18	MR. CLOUTIER: No?
19	MR. PURVIS: No.
20	MR. CLOUTIER: Which ones are you using
21	to prepare Exhibit 77? I'll scroll over.
22	MR. PURVIS: If memory serves, it is
23	Estimated Plugging Costs and the column at the far
24	right called Total Plugging Costs.
25	MR. CLOUTIER: Okay. All right. And
	Page 375
	rage 373

1	so basically we have approximately 12, 13 percent of
2	the wells listed on the master orphan wells
3	spreadsheet with actual plugging costs and total
4	plugging costs in them. Correct? The 300
5	MR. PURVIS: I don't think that math is
6	either right or relevant.
7	
	MR. CLOUTIER: Okay.
8	MR. PURVIS: So assuming it is 300 out
9	of 1800, it would be about 16 percent.
10	MR. CLOUTIER: Sixteen percent. Okay.
11	MR. PURVIS: But more to the point, the
12	spreadsheet includes wells deep into the history of
13	the operations of the program whose experience are
14	much less relevant to the current rulemaking in 2025.
15	MR. CLOUTIER: All right. And that's
16	why you pared it down from the 300 or so to the number
17	on Exhibit 77, which was 182?
18	MR. PURVIS: That is not the reason I
19	pared it down.
20	MR. CLOUTIER: Okay.
21	MR. PURVIS: The footnote on Exhibit 77
22	explains the choice. So there were about 300 that had
23	cost estimates. I used a sample of I used 182 of
24	those because I excluded cost estimates that were
25	clearly not specific to individual wells. So when I

1	observed that the same estimate down to the dollar was
2	applied to multiple wells, I deemed that not to be a
3	reliable per well estimate.
4	MR. CLOUTIER: All right. So for
5	instance, if there were a bunch of ones that were
6	estimated \$150,000 and in a row I think I can find
7	that.
8	MR. EVERHART: Need me to share?
9	MR. CLOUTIER: Yeah. Please.
10	MR. EVERHART: All right.
11	MR. CLOUTIER: I'll stop sharing. I'm
12	having trouble. Just search the estimated column for
13	\$150,000. You should get around Line 200 estimated.
14	Just select a hundred and nope. All right. It's
15	not relevant.
16	BY MR. CLOUTIER:
17	MR. CLOUTIER: So we've got 182 wells
18	that you've selected. You'd agree and you've
19	testified that about 5 percent of the wells
20	historically have been plugged by the OCD and 95
21	percent by industry?
22	MR. PURVIS: I don't recall testifying
23	to that fact.
24	MR. CLOUTIER: Page 10 of your direct
25	"Historic, most wells to date have been plugged by

1	industry, not by public funds."
2	MR. PURVIS: Yes. I do agree with
3	that.
4	MR. CLOUTIER: And then page 34 of your
5	direct "Historically 5 percent of U.S. onshore wells
6	documented as plugged were orphaned wells plugged by
7	state agencies."
8	MR. PURVIS: Nationally? Yes. Five
9	percent.
10	MR. CLOUTIER: And you heard
11	Mr. Alexander testify yesterday about the LFC report
12	concluding the same thing in New Mexico, that about 5
13	percent was plugged?
14	MR. PURVIS: I did hear the testimony
15	yesterday.
16	MR. CLOUTIER: All right. And you
17	don't think that testimony was unreliable, do you?
18	MR. PURVIS: I will I'm happy to
19	accept for discussion that 5 percent are plugged by
20	the state.
21	MR. CLOUTIER: Okay. So we're taking a
22	percent of Exhibit 55, which is a small percent of
23	plugging costs in New Mexico historically, and coming
24	up with your figures for estimated plugging costs.
25	Correct?

1	MR. PURVIS: The data that's available
2	is a small percentage of what has been done. It
3	remains the best data by far.
4	MR. CLOUTIER: The best data you could
5	find?
6	MR. PURVIS: The best data that exists
7	in the public domain, including the disclosures of
8	my other experts in this case.
9	MR. CLOUTIER: All right. You testify
10	on page 5 of your direct "These rules are necessary
11	because the nature of oil and gas economics in concert
12	with New Mexico's existing rules create little
13	obligation that insures operators are planning for
14	decommissioning and because existing incentives favor
15	delaying, decommissioning, and ultimately increase the
16	risk of orphaning." That sound like your testimony?
17	MR. PURVIS: I have not verified it.
18	But yes. That does sound right.
19	MR. CLOUTIER: All right.
20	Mr. Alexander testified yesterday about his work at
21	Southwestern and how they would try to exceed
22	regulatory standards. Do you believe Southwestern is
23	some sort of outlier in the industry?
24	MR. PURVIS: I have not formed an
25	opinion on that.
- 1	

1	MR. CLOUTIER: All right. Would you
2	agree that operators face other incentives, not just
3	financial assurance, to plug wells?
4	MR. PURVIS: Some operators do. Some
5	operators do not.
6	MR. CLOUTIER: What about, for
7	instance, the threat of litigation? Is that an
8	incentive to plug wells?
9	MR. PURVIS: The threat of litigation
10	is more effective on some some companies than on
11	others. It can be a deterrent. It is more effective
12	on some than others.
13	MR. CLOUTIER: And what about the
14	threat of regulatory action, such as pulling your
15	ability to transport oil or gas in the state of New
16	Mexico? Is that an incentive to plug wells?
17	MR. PURVIS: You know, litigation I
18	think has been rare, but I don't know of any instance
19	where an a company has lost the right to operate on
20	account of of this. Maybe just I haven't looked,
21	but I don't in theory, I suppose it could be, but
22	in practice I don't know that it is.
23	MR. CLOUTIER: Do you know if the OCD
24	has authority in its toolbox of enforcement mechanisms
25	to pull an operator's ability to transport oil or gas?

1	MR. PURVIS: I do not know.
2	MR. CLOUTIER: Okay. Or its authority
3	to operate?
4	MR. PURVIS: I I couldn't say one
5	way or the other what this what the laws are.
6	MR. CLOUTIER: All right. You
7	criticized Mr. George Sharpe's testimony that most
8	companies were responsible and plugged their wells and
9	that it's hard to envision bad actors who let their
10	wells languish changing their behavior. On page 7 and
11	8 of your rebuttal testimony is, I quote "Pure opinion
12	subjective, anecdotal, and not a suitable basis for a
13	multi-billion dollar risk."
14	MR. PURVIS: And please remind me what
15	line you're reading on?
16	MR. CLOUTIER: I'm reading from
17	starting on Line 20 of page 7 to Line 3 of page 8.
18	MR. PURVIS: Okay. Thank you.
19	MR. CLOUTIER: I get that accurate?
20	MR. PURVIS: Yes. You did read it
21	correctly.
22	MR. CLOUTIER: Thank you. However,
23	your own testimony bears out, Mr. Sharpe, that 95
24	percent of wells are getting plugged by industry.
25	Responsible companies are plugging historically.
	Page 381
	1490 301

1	Correct?
2	MR. PURVIS: I don't think that's a
3	accurate characterization of the situation. Most
4	importantly is the fact that past is not prologue.
5	The company the industry in New Mexico has gone
6	through a lifecycle. And in particular in the last 20
7	years, while production has been declining, oil and
8	gas prices have tripled, quadrupled, and quintupled at
9	various points in time. And meanwhile, costs have
10	increased.
11	The point is that the current depleted
12	state of wells in New Mexico are not well reflected by
13	the historical operations. And his the 95 percent
14	certainly should be higher, but it's not
15	representative of what should be expected in the
16	future.
17	MR. CLOUTIER: Okay. But it's what's
18	happened. Correct?
19	MR. PURVIS: That is what's happened.
20	MR. CLOUTIER: And he indicates that he
21	doesn't expect bad actors to change their behavior
22	based on this rulemaking. Correct? And you indicate
23	that that's speculative or subjective. Correct?
24	MR. PURVIS: He does opine that he does
25	not expect bad actors to change their behavior.

MR. CLOUTIER: So I'm going to bear
with me if I can. I am not good at this, am I? Do we
have it? You familiar with Mr. Winchester's testimony
that on the OCD master orphan well list about 75
percent of the population is concentrated in 10
operators: the Canos, the Ridgeways, the Canyons; the
same people we just looked at in Exhibit 86?
MR. PURVIS: I do not recall that part
of his testimony. I did prepare a similar analysis in
my direct testimony to show that the concentration in
the large larger companies of hundreds of wells do
contribute a disproportionate number of the overall
orphaned wells.
MR. CLOUTIER: And you don't have any
reasonable basis to tell this Commission that any of
those companies are going to change their behavior
those companies are going to change their behavior based on this proposed rulemaking, do you? They're
based on this proposed rulemaking, do you? They're
based on this proposed rulemaking, do you? They're going to post bonds or start plugging wells?
based on this proposed rulemaking, do you? They're going to post bonds or start plugging wells? MR. PURVIS: For let's clarify for
based on this proposed rulemaking, do you? They're going to post bonds or start plugging wells? MR. PURVIS: For let's clarify for just a second for the sake of answering your question.
based on this proposed rulemaking, do you? They're going to post bonds or start plugging wells? MR. PURVIS: For let's clarify for just a second for the sake of answering your question. When you ask about bad actors, do you mean bad intent
based on this proposed rulemaking, do you? They're going to post bonds or start plugging wells? MR. PURVIS: For let's clarify for just a second for the sake of answering your question. When you ask about bad actors, do you mean bad intent with bad outcomes, bad bad outcomes with good

1	questions. I'm not Mr. Sharpe. So but how about you?
2	You talked about the people who sully the reputation
3	of the industry, the people who don't comply earlier
4	this morning.
5	MR. PURVIS: The there are certainly
6	a group of people who can be characterized as bad
7	actors based on their bad intentions. The Boomhower
8	article describes this as the judgment proof problem,
9	as it's known in economics, where a company does not
10	have to suffer the consequences of its bad choices.
11	They can go bankrupt, and the the owners can go on
12	just fine.
13	And as the rules now stand, there's a
14	moral hazard embedded. The financial incentives are
15	not aligned with the they are they create a
16	disincentive to do what's right. The CEO in Fort
17	Worth told me just a couple months ago, he said, "I
18	I'd love to do what's right, but it must make economic
19	sense."
20	The folks with bad intentions who own
21	wells will still be able to execute their bad
22	intentions because they already own the wells. Other
23	parts of the rules will create a layer of protection
24	against bad intentions. But there is a second
25	question here, and that's one of bad outcomes; good,

1	well-intended operators who, for one reason or
2	another, have not made adequate preparations for their
3	ultimate liability.
4	Now, to be clear, this rulemaking does
5	not change the ultimate liability, the ultimate
6	responsibility. Those are well-known, longstanding;
7	have been since decades before I entered the industry.
8	It does, however, change the accountability. And to
9	the extent a well-meaning operator has not made
10	adequate preparation, the rulemaking could change part
11	of the outcome for the per state from the
12	perspective of the state.
13	MR. CLOUTIER: It's a big could, isn't
14	it?
15	MR. PURVIS: I'm not trying to quantify
16	the answer to that that question.
17	MR. CLOUTIER: Doesn't the Commission
18	have to do that sitting here? We've got this promise
19	of a rulemaking of post bonding. This is a good
20	thing, and we'll ultimately protect the taxpayer. How
21	do we quantify how the taxpayer's going to be
22	protected by this rulemaking?
23	MR. PURVIS: The most direct evidence
24	that I've I've seen on this actually comes from
о F	
25	Dr. Arscott. In his Figure 9, Exhibit 9 to his direct

1	testimony, he quantifies what he believes the
2	incremental bonding will be. And his estimate,
3	multiply the number of companies by the average bond
4	is 1.9 billion. So one point, if he's right that the
5	incremental rulemaking will create \$1.9 billion worth
6	of financial security, then it's a great deal of
7	protection.
8	MR. CLOUTIER: So you think Dr. Arscott
9	is predicting what the response of industry is going
LO	to be the operators are going to be to this?
L1	That's how you understand his testimony?
L2	MR. PURVIS: I do not understand him to
L3	have opine on what each how each operator will
L4	elect among the four options that they have.
L5	MR. CLOUTIER: And those options would
L6	be plug
L7	MR. PURVIS: Plug is plug is the
L8	least attractive of the four options. So the an
L9	operator faced with a a dilemma of an increased
20	bonding responsibility could just get rid of the wells
21	to someone else in bankruptcy, or they can do one of
22	four things. They can improve production so that
23	it's they could continue as is, even if it's at a
24	loss. They can put the well in temporary abandonment,
25	or they could plug.

1	Of those four options, the least
2	attractive is plugging. All of the other options are
3	less costly in the best case scenario. The only time
4	that plugging becomes competitive with the other
5	options is when the third-party bonding agency decides
6	that the operator is a bad risk, and the third
7	party not the OCD the third party requires of
8	the operator a collateral.
9	Now, in that situation, the collateral
10	could be as much as \$150,000 of cash, but that is
11	weighed against the cost of plugging, removal,
12	remediation, and restoration, which we've didn't
13	plus the overhead costs, which are in most cases more.
14	So the among the options, plugging is the least
15	attractive in the large majority.
16	MR. CLOUTIER: But plugging is an
17	option. An operator who is sitting here on the
18	effective date of this regulation with a marginal
19	well ten marginal wells. Let's put it that way.
20	MR. PURVIS: Okay.
21	MR. CLOUTIER: They've got the option
22	to bond, whether they temporarily abandon or just
23	continue to produce. Correct? This is at the
24	rulemaking.
25	MR. PURVIS: And to be clear, when you
	Page 387

1	say marginal, you mean define marginal?
2	MR. CLOUTIER: Not I'm talking about
3	marginal under the rulemaking. We're living in a
4	universe where the rulemaking is here. They've got
5	the option bond those wells. They've got the option
6	to produce those wells, because they're already
7	qualified as marginal on the effective date of the
8	rulemaking, and bond and produce. They've got the
9	option to plug and abandon, or they've got the option
10	to do neither and put themselves in the regulatory
11	crosshairs of the OCD. Correct?
12	MR. PURVIS: Yes. It it they do
13	have the option of not attempting to meet their legal
14	obligations.
15	MR. CLOUTIER: Right. Become a bad
16	actor, essentially?
17	MR. PURVIS: Certainly bad outcome.
18	MR. CLOUTIER: Yes. So they have three
19	options. So how do you tell the Commission how much
20	bonding the state of New Mexico is going to get as a
21	result of this rulemaking?
22	MR. PURVIS: Mr. Winchester also opined
23	that he he believes that members of his
24	organization will walk away from their liabilities.
25	And that that and I wrote also that the
	Page 388

1 rulemaking will create pain for some companies because 2 companies have not systematically prepared. 3 So if a company has a hundred percent of their wells that qualifies as defined marginal, 4 5 then they're in the small minority, but they also have 6 not made allowances for what they know to be their obligation. And if they cannot put up financial 8 assurance, if a third party deems them unable to pay, 9 then the state is right to ask for financial assurance 10 and the orphaning would happen sooner, but it does not 11 change the outcome. 12 MR. CLOUTIER: And does it protect the 13 taxpayer? 14 MR. PURVIS: For that example, it 15 accelerates the -- the orphaning, but does not change 16 the outcome. But that is a small sample. We can look, for example, at my Exhibit 52, where I showed 17 18 the proportional number of companies that have a -- a 19 large percentage of more defined marginal. But what 20 the rulemaking also does is change the behavior of 21 wells and operators -- or I should say it 22 differently -- change the financial assurance that's available from companies that are not yet completely 23 24 hopeless. 25 //

1	(Applicant Exhibit 52 was marked for
2	identification.)
3	MR. CLOUTIER: So my question, though,
4	is, how do you tell the Commission how much bonding is
5	going to protect the taxpayers of the state of New
6	Mexico from this evil if they adopt this rulemaking?
7	I want to know how we're getting from A to B.
8	MR. PURVIS: I think I understand your
9	question, and you'll you'll correct me if I miss it
10	again. The question is relative cost and relative
11	benefit. I have not tried to predict the behavior of
12	every individual company, either their their
13	judgment or their ability to perform.
14	I do observe that it applies to a large
15	number of wells, and I have observed the ceiling of
16	cost that it would take from the state. Now, the
17	the ceiling is very small and the probability of
18	reaching that ceiling is zero. So the the most
19	likely is much, much less. Does that better answer
20	your question? Sorry.
21	MR. CLOUTIER: We'll leave it there.
22	Let's talk about your holdback theory. You have
23	this is I think you used it as a tool for
24	analyzing, but it's in addition to or as an
25	alternative to traditional measures of economic
	Page 390

1	measures on NPV to help measure the risk. Correct?
2	MR. PURVIS: It's no.
3	MR. CLOUTIER: Okay. Can you tell me
4	in a sentence why I'm wrong?
5	MR. PURVIS: It is not an alternative.
6	It is an additional measure of the contours, the
7	the nature of the cash flow.
8	MR. CLOUTIER: I apologize. I thought
9	I used the word additional or alternative, but if I
10	did
11	MR. PURVIS: Yes. Additional, yes.
12	Alternative, no.
13	MR. CLOUTIER: Okay. You're the sole
14	author of, and I quote, "Economic Yardsticks for the
15	End of the Economic Life: Holdback and its Adjuncts."
16	Correct?
17	MR. PURVIS: At a a wider scale, I'm
18	the sole author of the idea in all contexts.
19	MR. CLOUTIER: Okay.
20	MR. PURVIS: And I I should be clear
21	that the idea is labeling a point that exists. The
22	point does and always has exists.
23	MR. CLOUTIER: And has the article that
24	I mentioned or any other of your articles on this been
25	peer-reviewed?

1	MR. PURVIS: No. They have not.
2	MR. CLOUTIER: You mentioned at page 3
3	of your direct that you've published on the holdback
4	concept in states such as California, Colorado, Ohio,
5	Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and parts of Wyoming.
6	Correct?
7	MR. PURVIS: Yes, sir. That's correct.
8	MR. CLOUTIER: Have any of those states
9	used the holdback concept to require single well
10	bonding as their policy?
11	MR. PURVIS: My analyses in all cases
12	post-state revisions to their financial assurance
13	requirements. So no. Those analyses were just in the
14	last couple years.
15	MR. CLOUTIER: Okay. On page 6 of your
16	direct, Lines 17 to 19, you state "I explained the
17	surprises of late life economics, the concept of
18	holdback, and how they demonstrate the need for
19	operators to have long lead plans for decommissioning
20	their whole portfolio." That correct?
21	MR. PURVIS: I I would trust that
22	you have read correctly. You said page 6?
23	MR. CLOUTIER: Page 6 of your direct,
24	Lines 17 through 19.
25	MR. PURVIS: Thank you. Yes, I see
	Page 392

1	that.
2	MR. CLOUTIER: All right. Are you
3	suggesting that operators are surprised by the late
4	life economics of oil and gas wells?
5	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
6	MR. CLOUTIER: Okay. And that they
7	don't plan for decommissioning?
8	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
9	MR. CLOUTIER: All right.
LO	MR. PURVIS: I I should be careful
L1	about the word operators. My point is not that all
L2	but systematically. In my presentation of this
L3	concept to dozens of organizations, I consistently
L4	find companies, individuals surprised. And as I
L5	discussed with those companies what plans they have
L6	made for decommissioning, I have heard firsthand
L7	account of one company and secondhand accounts of two
L8	others that saved money in advance to be able to meet
L9	their obligations when their production ends.
20	MR. CLOUTIER: You've talked in your
21	presentation before my cross-examination of the small
22	operators representing 0.2 percent of production and
23	only 0.05 percent of new production. Are you with me?
24	Page 50 of your rebuttal, operators with ten or fewer
25	wells?

1	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
2	MR. CLOUTIER: And you also indicate on
3	page 23 of your direct, Lines 16 through 18 "If 90
4	percent of the companies responsible for unplugged
5	wells in the state were to instantly disappear, the
6	state would only lose two and a half percent of its
7	current production and 0.3 percent of its production
8	growth." I quote you accurately?
9	MR. PURVIS: I believe you did.
10	MR. CLOUTIER: Okay. I'm trying not to
11	misquote you, so.
12	MR. PURVIS: That's easy to read.
13	MR. CLOUTIER: Do you know how many
14	barrels of oil were produced in New Mexico January 1
15	through July 31 this year?
16	MR. PURVIS: New Mexico is currently on
17	the pace for between 700 and 750 million barrels of
18	crude for this year.
19	MR. CLOUTIER: Right. Almost 2.2
20	million barrels a day or so, a little less than that;
21	sounds about right?
22	MR. PURVIS: Yeah. Sounds about right.
23	MR. CLOUTIER: So by my math
24	multiplying I think it's about 2.183 but that
25	gets us to 460 million barrels let's call it 450
	Page 394

1	million barrels January through July, which is the
2	last EIA data I looked at when I looked at this. With
3	me? Okay. So two and a half percent of that; 11.25
4	million sound accurate?
5	MR. PURVIS: Does two and a half
6	percent of 411 million sound accurate?
7	MR. CLOUTIER: 450 million?
8	MR. PURVIS: Those those are
9	you've taken two numbers and put them together, but
10	yeah.
11	MR. CLOUTIER: Yeah. That's I'm
12	just doing some math.
13	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
14	MR. CLOUTIER: I'm a simple guy,
15	Mr. Purvis. You got to sorry to slow you down, but
16	two and a half percent of 450 million?
17	MR. PURVIS: I calculate, as you
18	said 450?
19	MR. CLOUTIER: Yep.
20	MR. PURVIS: Eleven million barrels of
21	oil. Right?
22	MR. CLOUTIER: I had 11.25, but yeah.
23	MR. PURVIS: Approximately 11.25.
24	MR. CLOUTIER: All right. Time \$60 a
25	barrel? Again, sorry for the simple math.
	Daga 20E
	Page 395

1	MD DUDITG: 0675
1	MR. PURVIS: \$675 million.
2	MR. CLOUTIER: Right. Do you know what
3	the severance tax rate, combined severance tax rate,
4	in the state of New Mexico is for oil? 8.15 percent
5	sound pretty good?
6	MR. PURVIS: Yes. It sounds right in
7	the middle.
8	MR. CLOUTIER: All right. So that's
9	about \$55 million of severance tax revenue?
10	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
11	MR. CLOUTIER: Do you know that New
12	Mexico receives about 48 not about exactly 48
13	percent of federal oil and gas royalty paid under the
14	payment in lieu of taxes program?
15	MR. PURVIS: I'm familiar with the
16	concept, not the numbers.
17	MR. CLOUTIER: Okay. Do you know that
18	state royalty goes into the severance the permanent
19	fund?
20	MR. PURVIS: I'm not very familiar with
21	the use of the funds.
22	MR. CLOUTIER: Do you know that New
23	Mexico's about 70 percent state and federal minerals
24	combined?
25	MR. PURVIS: That's about right.
	Page 396

1	MR. CLOUTIER: Okay. Is it fair to say
2	that you think that \$55 million in tax revenues over
3	seven months is a "minute" contribution towards the
4	production and tax revenue for the state of New
5	Mexico?
6	MR. PURVIS: Yeah. If you were
7	offering me \$55 million, I would not call it minute.
8	But thethe report cited by both Mr. Arthur and
9	Mr. McGowen represent that the oil and gas
10	contribution to the state is on the is in the most
11	recent number \$14 billion. So we double it to a
12	hundred million dollars, and it is still by
13	comparison, either to the overall contribution or by
14	comparison to the value at risk, small.
15	MR. CLOUTIER: Do you think for a state
16	that, say, ranks dead last in public education, it's
17	more of a call for the legislature to decide whether
18	to forgo \$55 million then and with all due respect to
19	the three members of this Commission?
20	MR. PURVIS: I think that question is
21	one, beyond scope, but more importantly a false
22	alternative. There is a significant issue that needs
23	to be developed to needs to be addressed. I'll
24	leave it at that. Oh, and one other, if I just could
25	be clear, the 2.5 percent of the the 55 million is

1	a ceiling that is not a rational number. There's not
2	a scenario in which 2.5 percent disappears.
3	Dr. Boomhower addresses in his article
4	from a finance economic theory standpoint and from
5	the experience of Texas, what we see instead is that
6	the most productive out of that 2.5 percent continue
7	to exist and be produced by other people. And it's a
8	fraction of that that stops, the lowest producing of
9	the lowest producing that ends production. So it's
LO	not 55 million that's being lost. It's some small
L1	portion of that 55 million, which is a very small
L2	portion of 14 billion.
L3	MR. CLOUTIER: Okay. How small a
L 4	portion? Because I tried to get you to quantify this
L5	earlier and you didn't. With all due respect, you did
L6	give me answers, and I appreciate you trying, so. But
L 7	you're telling the Commission now it's a small
L8	proportion and a small portion of it. How small? How
L 9	much of
20	MR. NYKIEL: Madam Hearing Officer, I
21	think this is asked and answered.
22	THE HEARING OFFICER: Well, yes and no.
23	Listening earlier, he was not able to quantify. Now
24	Mr. Cloutier is coming back around in response to his
25	last answer, which is small portion.

1	If there's something he can add to what
2	he said earlier, go ahead and do that, Mr. Purvis.
3	MR. PURVIS: I cannot quantify what
4	portion of the two and a half percent will will go
5	away in short order. I do know by analogy and first
6	principles that it'll be a small portion.
7	MR. CLOUTIER: Okay. I'll pass the
8	witness.
9	THE HEARING OFFICER: All right. Thank
10	you very much. We need a break. Let's come back in
11	12 minutes. It'll be 10:40.
12	(Off the record.)
13	THE HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Everhart?
14	MR. SUAZO: Thank you, Madam Hearing
15	Officer.
16	CROSS-EXAMINATION
17	BY MR. SUAZO:
18	MR. SUAZO: Good morning, Mr. Purvis.
19	I'm Miguel Suazo. I'm with Beatty and Wozniak, and
20	I'm representing NMOGA in this proceeding. How are
21	you today?
22	MR. PURVIS: Thank you, Mr. Suazo, for
23	asking. I'm doing fine.
24	MR. SUAZO: Excellent. I want to ask
25	you a few questions about your background to start.

1	You've worked extensively with NGOs like Carbon
2	Tracker. Correct?
3	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
4	MR. SUAZO: And Carbon Tracker, as I
5	understand what they do, advocates for stronger
6	decommissioning rules. Is that accurate?
7	MR. PURVIS: That's a subset of their
8	mission.
9	MR. SUAZO: Okay. So that's a yes?
10	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
11	MR. SUAZO: Thank you. And you're an
12	advocate in general for stronger regulations for oil
13	and gas development. Is that correct?
14	MR. PURVIS: I personally believe in
15	stronger in the need for stronger financial
16	protections. Yes.
17	MR. SUAZO: Okay. Now, you disagree
18	with WELC and the OCD on the proposed definition of
19	marginal well. Is that right?
20	MR. PURVIS: I don't believe that I do.
21	MR. SUAZO: I believe in your direct
22	testimony, page 962, Lines 20 through 24, you said
23	that you believe the word marginal refers to a
24	financial condition, not a production rate. So you
25	disagree with the definition based upon that
	Page 400

1	statement, or am I misunderstanding?
2	MR. PURVIS: Yeah. No. You're
3	misunderstanding. There the generic term does mean
4	low profit. That concept has been codified in the
5	proposal, but I do believe the general concept
6	incorporates encompasses a lot more wells than the
7	definition as proposed.
8	MR. SUAZO: Okay. So to better
9	understand that, I guess you would agree that a well
10	by well analysis is more accurate for whether
11	determining a for determining whether a well is
12	marginal. Is that right? Versus a lease based
13	assessment for marginality?
14	MR. PURVIS: That logic doesn't follow.
15	I don't think I understand what you mean.
16	MR. SUAZO: Okay. I guess what I'm
17	trying to get at is you think marginal is an economic
18	concept, not a production concept. Is that a fair
19	assessment?
20	MR. PURVIS: Yes. In my understanding
21	of the term in general use, it is an economic concept.
22	MR. SUAZO: Okay. So you interpret
23	OCD
24	MR. PURVIS: Oh, I I just wanted to
25	clarify one one point. There are a lot of
	Page 401

1	regulations or tax incentives mostly that describe
2	marginal wells with a capital M as a defined term
3	based purely on rate. There are tax incentives at
4	state and national levels queued to rates of normally
5	10 or 15 barrel of oil equivalent per day. There
6	certainly are instances in which the word marginal is
7	strictly a production measure.
8	MR. SUAZO: Okay. And so you
9	interpret, just to follow up on that, OCD's and WELC's
10	proposed marginal well definition is as consistent of
11	two criteria, which are volume and time?
12	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
13	MR. SUAZO: Okay. And so you agree
14	that this definition is less effective than requiring
15	financial assurance earlier in the well's lifecycle.
16	Is that accurate?
17	MR. PURVIS: I think so. I would think
18	it would be more effective for the state to require
19	financial assurance earlier.
20	MR. SUAZO: Okay. Forgive me. I'm
21	trying to make sure I'm not asking you questions that
22	Mr. Cloutier might have already covered. So bear with
23	me as I'm going to kind of work through the topics I
24	want to touch on with you.
25	MR. PURVIS: Take your time.

1	MR. SUAZO: Let's talk a little bit
2	about your use of Vertex's cost estimates. You
3	estimated in your direct testimony that the total cost
4	for upstream oil and gas infrastructure
5	decommissioning in New Mexico to be approximately \$22
6	billion. Is that accurate?
7	MR. PURVIS: I cited the twenty the
8	nearly five-year-old report by Vertex for that number.
9	MR. SUAZO: Okay. And at the time that
10	Vertex commissioned the report, as I understand it,
11	there was a range in that value, minus-30 percent to
12	plus-50 percent. Is that correct?
13	MR. PURVIS: Yes. That is the accuracy
14	range that they assigned to their estimate.
15	MR. SUAZO: Okay. And you would agree
16	that that minus-30, plus-50 percent is a pretty
17	widely variable range. Right?
18	MR. PURVIS: Thirty percent and fifty
19	percent are too broad to sign a contract for that
20	number. It is not too broad for strategic planning.
21	They are broad numbers, but they're suitable for
22	purpose. And and I'll also point out it's
23	conservative if it's 50 percent probability is higher
24	for a five-year-old estimate.
25	MR. SUAZO: So in your surrebuttal, you
	Page 403

1	said that the Vertex data might be imprecise, but that
2	it is not inaccurate. As I understand what you said
3	imprecision is inherently at least a bit inaccurate.
4	Can you please further elaborate on what you meant?
5	MR. PURVIS: Sure. Precision and
6	accuracy are two different measures of quality.
7	Precision has to do with how exact it is, and accuracy
8	is how close it is to reality. The standards for cost
9	estimation, including the taxonomy, prescribes how
10	those parameters are defined. And Vertex is a company
11	active in remediation and plugging in the state of
12	New Mexico and familiar with cost estimation.
13	I have no reason to think that they
14	have not appropriately estimated those costs such that
15	if we did in March of 2021 estimate down to a bid
16	level that down to a Class 2 or 3 estimate, there
17	should be a 90 percent probability that it would fall
18	within the ranges of defined, in which case it is
19	accurate but not precise.
20	MR. SUAZO: Okay. So let's unpack that
21	a little bit because in your direct, you're using the
22	2021 Vertex cost estimates, and you're using that to
23	say that the total orphaned well costs across the
24	state can range from 15 billion on the low side and 33
25	billion on the higher side. Is that right?

1	MR. PURVIS: No. I'm saying that the
2	end of the life of the oil industry in New Mexico will
3	cost tens of billions of dollars and that needs to be
4	planned for. My testimony was not an attempt to
5	translate that number to specifically how much will
6	fall on the state; on the taxpayers of the state.
7	MR. SUAZO: Okay. So using the Vertex
8	estimates, are they I guess they're not
9	particularly current at this point since it's 2025,
LO	but and you're saying they're not precise, but
L1	they're useful as a planning tool?
L2	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
L3	MR. SUAZO: Okay. Go ahead.
L4	MR. PURVIS: Sorry. If I may, you saw
L5	on on my exhibit about the way costs have changed,
L6	that costs in fact have gone up significantly since
L7	2021. When they were preparing their report in early
L8	'21, it was close on the heels of a dramatic reduction
L9	in costs during COVID across industry as a whole. So
20	the I bring that forward five years to now, I would
21	expect the number to be significantly higher than the
22	22 billion.
23	MR. SUAZO: Okay. And the Vertex
24	figures that you use in your testimony provide
25	estimates for full pipeline removal, which is
- 1	

1	something that's separate from plugging and associated
2	costs. Correct?
3	MR. PURVIS: Yes. They provide
4	separately a cost estimate for decommissioning of the
5	current midstream industry in the state under two
6	scenarios.
7	MR. SUAZO: Okay. And the range
8	provided by Vertex for these costs is between 3.4 and
9	20.3 billion. Is that correct?
10	MR. PURVIS: No. I wouldn't
11	characterize it that way. They have two different
12	assessments, two alternative scenarios, each with
13	separate ranges of uncertainty. One scenario is the
14	pipelines are entirely removed; the other is that
15	they're abandoned in place. But in either event, it's
16	midstream and not relevant to upstream oil and gas
17	we're talking about today.
18	MR. SUAZO: Okay. But how are we to
19	know what costs are included with the 3.4 billion
20	compared to the 20.3 billion? I guess as I understand
21	it, the higher end includes removal of pipelines and
22	all associated infrastructure, and the 3.4 billion
23	includes what?
24	MR. PURVIS: Abandonment in place.
25	MR. SUAZO: Okay.

1	MR. PURVIS: Now, and I I know that
2	because I read it in the report, but abandonment of
3	midstream assets is not my strong suit.
4	MR. SUAZO: Okay. Understood. I just
5	want to make sure we're talking about these numbers
6	with some context and understanding so I
7	MR. PURVIS: Yes. We can agree on that
8	context.
9	MR. SUAZO: Now, I'd like to talk a
10	little bit about page 4 of your demonstrative exhibit.
11	And you say there that WELC's proposals would only
12	apply to 11 percent of the 22 billion upstream
13	estimate and only 24 percent of the 9.8 billion
14	decommissioning liability estimate. Is that accurate?
15	MR. PURVIS: I'm sorry. Which which
16	exhibit are you talking about?
17	MR. SUAZO: I'm sorry. Page 4 of your
18	demonstrative exhibits that were filed on
19	October 15th. We can pull it up for you. Sorry. I
20	thought it was up. My fault. I didn't tell you.
21	MR. PURVIS: It's the Vertex exhibit
22	originally submitted as Exhibit 34?
23	MR. SUAZO: I have it in my list as
24	Purvis demonstrative exhibit, page 4. I don't know if
25	that's how WELC labeled it in their submissions

1	elsewhere.
2	MR. NYKIEL: It's Applicants'
3	Exhibit 34.
4	(Applicant Exhibit 34 was marked for
5	identification.)
6	MR. PURVIS: I have it. Yes. Thank
7	you. Would you ask the question again?
8	BY MR. SUAZO:
9	MR. SUAZO: Sure. So this is a exhibit
10	states that WELC's proposals would only apply to 11
11	percent of the 22 billion upstream estimate. Is that
12	right?
13	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
14	MR. SUAZO: And only 24 percent of the
15	9.8 billion decommissioning liability estimate?
16	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
17	MR. SUAZO: Correct? Okay. And those
18	estimated costs are 1 billion and 1.4 billion
19	respectively. Is that right?
20	MR. PURVIS: One billion on private
21	lands and 1.4 billion on state lands as of March 2021.
22	Yes.
23	MR. SUAZO: Okay. So that just seems
24	broad to me. It you know, as a lay person that
25	doesn't traffic in these numbers as much as somebody
	Page 408
	rage 406

1	like yourself, it just kind of seems like those
2	numbers are essentially provided almost for shock
3	value as opposed to accuracy. Is that a fair
4	characterization?
5	MR. PURVIS: No.
6	MR. SUAZO: Well, I just think that
7	that seems like an especially high number based upon
8	the data that we're that you've said is, you know,
9	inaccurate; not inaccurate, but imprecise, which leads
10	to the broad range and costs that we're putting in
11	front of the Commission to think about as they
12	consider this problem.
13	MR. PURVIS: I'm sorry. I don't
14	understand the question, Mr. Suazo.
15	MR. SUAZO: I guess what I'm getting at
16	here is the assumptions behind these numbers. Are
17	they disclosed or explicitly broken down somewhere to
18	help us understand how Vertex calculated its costs?
19	MR. PURVIS: Yes. As I said in my
20	surrebuttal, the report's 91 pages long, has 131
21	tables of data, and 4 appendices. It's explained in
22	depth.
23	MR. SUAZO: But that's your
24	explanation, not Vertex's. Right?
25	MR. PURVIS: No. The Vertex report.

1	MR. SUAZO: Okay. I'm sorry. I
2	thought you were talking about your 91-page report.
3	MR. PURVIS: My report was long. But
4	no. The Vertex report is 91 pages long.
5	MR. SUAZO: Okay. And did you have any
6	insight into how Vertex actually, I think Drew I
7	think Mr. Cloutier covered that. Let me move on.
8	Okay. We're going to stay on Vertex. And Vertex is a
9	decommissioning contractor in the state of New Mexico.
10	Is that right?
11	MR. PURVIS: Among other things, yes.
12	MR. SUAZO: Okay. So they essentially
13	could stand a benefit from increased orphan well P&A
14	work in this state?
15	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
16	MR. SUAZO: Okay. Mr. Purvis, let's
17	talk a little bit about, I guess, what went into your
18	testimony. Do you know how many times you cited
19	yourself in your testimony?
20	MR. PURVIS: I do not know. Would you
21	please
22	MR. SUAZO: Ten sound about right in
23	your direct?
24	MR. PURVIS: Ten sounds about right.
25	MR. SUAZO: Okay.
	Page 410

1	MR. PURVIS: But thank you for that.
2	MR. SUAZO: Now, how many of the
3	self-cited sources listed in your testimony are peer
4	reviewed?
5	MR. PURVIS: Between my rebuttal
6	testimony and my direct testimony, I would I
7	estimate 10 or 15 papers are as peer-reviewed were
8	peer-reviewed.
9	MR. SUAZO: And are any of them
10	industry-reviewed?
11	MR. PURVIS: Besides my own? No. My
12	papers are not they're cited but not peer-reviewed.
13	And no. All of the papers that I've cited do not come
14	from the Society of Petroleum Engineers. They come
15	from economics and other kinds of journals.
16	MR. SUAZO: Okay. Mr. Purvis, could we
17	ask you to please turn to Exhibit 54, page 825. I'll
18	give your counsel and you time chance to get there.
19	(Applicant Exhibit 54 was marked for
20	identification.)
21	MR. PURVIS: Hold on just a second, or
22	you're welcome to display it.
23	MR. SUAZO: We can pull it up on the
24	screen if that's faster.
25	MR. PURVIS: Please do.
	Page 411
	raye 411

1	MR. SUAZO: And if I could trouble you
2	to read the first two sentences of the first paragraph
3	that is highlighted or will be highlighted in just a
4	second.
5	MR. PURVIS: Thank you. That's why I
6	couldn't find it. I was looking for a graphic. I
7	I do see the SPE paper that I wrote about holdback.
8	Which two sentences would you like for me to read?
9	MR. SUAZO: The first two, please?
10	MR. PURVIS: "Traditional economic
11	measures use chiefly net present value"
12	MR. SUAZO: Sorry. Above that?
13	MR. PURVIS: Ah. "This paper was
14	selected for presentation by an SPE program committee
15	following review of information contained in an
16	abstract submitted by the author. Contents of the
17	paper have not been reviewed by the Society of
18	Petroleum Engineers and are subject to correction by
19	the author. The material does not necessarily reflect
20	any position of the Society of Petroleum Engineers,
21	its officers, or members."
22	MR. SUAZO: Thank you. So this
23	particular paper that you relied upon is not reviewed
24	by SPE?
25	MR. PURVIS: Only so far as the program
	Page 412

1	committee reviewed the abstract in this first
2	publication.
3	MR. SUAZO: How many of the sources
4	that you use in your testimony are opinion pieces or
5	guest editorials or business development marketing
6	types of materials? You don't have to have a precise
7	number, just more or less.
8	MR. PURVIS: I don't know.
9	MR. SUAZO: And are any of the
10	materials that you use that you cite in your
11	testimony, are they used as materials to attract
12	customers to Purvis Energy Advisors?
13	MR. PURVIS: There is one that I've
14	cited, the white paper that I published on my website
15	before I published in the at the convention here,
16	and it was published on my website along with other
17	studies. I did not and do not expect it to win many
18	clients.
19	MR. SUAZO: So I guess by citing
20	yourself, are you essentially, you know, telling the
21	Commission that your testimony is credible because
22	you've previously said the same thing based upon your
23	own work?
24	MR. PURVIS: It would it would be
25	nice to to think that my name had that much

1	authority. I I do not believe that's the case.
2	The the credibility, I think the idea should be
3	evaluated on its own merits. The citations allow for
4	a fuller discussion of the ideas.
5	MR. SUAZO: Fair enough. So I guess
6	that takes us back to holdback, which I'd like to
7	better understand. Now, holdback, as I understand it,
8	it's an alternative to traditional economic measures.
9	I think you said NPV and ROI?
10	MR. PURVIS: Not an alternative, an
11	additional measure.
12	MR. SUAZO: Okay. And you're the sole
13	author of the article titled "Economic Yardsticks for
14	the End of Economic Life: Holdback and its Adjuncts."
15	Is that correct?
16	MR. PURVIS: You're talking about the
17	one where you still have on the screen, Exhibit 54?
18	Yes. I am the sole author.
19	MR. SUAZO: Okay. And so with regard
20	to the holdback approach, in your view on net
21	revenues, you state that by the time the net revenues
22	at normal prices are only twice as much as monthly
23	costs, a well is within striking distance of its
24	economic limit. Correct?
25	MR. PURVIS: That's a rule thumb I
	Page 414

1	described. Yes.
2	MR. SUAZO: Okay. And this is not a
3	formal or industry recognized threshold at this time.
4	Correct?
5	MR. PURVIS: No, no, no. That's
6	that's a personal rule of thumb based on doing
7	reserves since '95.
8	MR. SUAZO: Over decades of your own
9	evaluations? Okay.
10	MR. PURVIS: Just a rule of thumb.
11	MR. SUAZO: Have any so no states
12	have adopted this holdback theory. Is that the right
13	thing to call it?
14	MR. PURVIS: I don't think theory's the
15	right word, but the the concept of holdback has not
16	been endogenize in any formal sense that I know of
17	since it was published in the fall of '22.
18	MR. SUAZO: Did you use, in your
19	testimony and in the figures that you provided to the
20	Commission, any industry valuation data like ROI or
21	payout methods in addition to your holdback method
22	just for comparison?
23	MR. PURVIS: I'm sorry. I I don't
24	think I followed the question, Mr. Suazo. Again?
25	MR. SUAZO: Did you use did you not

1	use valid industry valuation data like return on
2	investment?
3	MR. PURVIS: So holdback is a variation
4	of return on investment, but I didn't do any economic
5	evaluation at all. I I showed in Exhibit the
6	holdback exhibit a sample cash flow.
7	MR. SUAZO: Okay. I just have one more
8	question because I think Mr. Cloutier covered most of
9	the topics. In your surrebuttal, you discussed how
10	Hanagan misconstrued his website.
11	MR. PURVIS: I I don't how he
12	misconstrued my website?
13	MR. SUAZO: No. Sorry. I'm trying to
14	understand this question myself.
15	All right. I think it's going to add
16	more confusion than clarity. No further questions for
17	NMOGA for Mr. Purvis on cross. Thank you.
18	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you,
19	Mr. Suazo.
20	Let's see. Ms. Bradfute or Mr. Sayer?
21	Questions? Okay. Mr. Sayer indicated no questions.
22	Mr. Rankin for OXY?
23	MR. RANKIN: Thank you, Madam Hearing
24	Officer.
25	

1	CROSS-EXAMINATION
2	BY MR. RANKIN:
3	MR. RANKIN: Can you hear me okay,
4	Mr. Purvis?
5	MR. PURVIS: I can. Thank you, Mister.
6	MR. RANKIN: Thank you. So yesterday,
7	Mr. Alexander identified you as the applicants'
8	witness who will be the expert testifying on the
9	financial assurance aspects of the proposed rule. Is
10	that correct?
11	MR. PURVIS: Yes. I heard that
12	testimony.
13	MR. RANKIN: You agree?
14	MR. PURVIS: Certainly a lot of topics
15	on yes.
16	MR. RANKIN: Okay. So you're going to
17	be the Applicant witness who's the expert on the
18	financial assurance aspects of this proposed rule?
19	MR. PURVIS: I'm not sure I'm the only
20	one, but that's certainly an emphasis of my testimony.
21	MR. RANKIN: Okay. So at page 5 of
22	your testimony, and I'll go ahead and pull this up.
23	Here on page 5 of your testimony where I've
24	highlighted, you explained how the proposed rules are
25	designed

1	MR. NYKIEL: Sorry. Is it rebuttal
2	or
3	MR. RANKIN: I'm sorry. This is direct
4	testimony.
5	MR. NYKIEL: Direct?
6	MR. RANKIN: Yeah.
7	BY MR. RANKIN:
8	MR. RANKIN: In your direct testimony
9	"Explain how the proposed rules are designed to
10	motivate operators to have and execute a plan for
11	decommissioning before the revenue from the well
12	production is insufficient to cover the cost."
13	Correct? That's the first sentence I've highlighted.
14	MR. PURVIS: Yes, sir.
15	MR. RANKIN: Okay. So the proposed
16	roles are set up to use financial assurance then to
17	help achieve that purpose. Correct?
18	MR. PURVIS: Yes, sir.
19	MR. RANKIN: Okay. And then you go on
20	to say in the next sentence here that I've highlighted
21	that the rules are necessary because the nature of oil
22	and gas economics, together with New Mexico's existing
23	rules, create little obligation to ensure operators
24	are planning for decommissioning. I'm paraphrasing
25	generally, but that's a correct reflection of your

1	testimony?
2	MR. PURVIS: Yes, sir.
3	MR. RANKIN: Okay. And then you go on
4	to say "And because the existing incentives favor
5	delaying decommissioning and ultimately increase the
6	risk of orphaning." Correct?
7	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
8	MR. RANKIN: Okay. So the proposed
9	rules are set up then to increase the obligations on
10	operators to ensure that the operators plan to
11	decommission their wells. Correct?
12	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
13	MR. RANKIN: Okay. And the increase
14	you referenced and the testimony I've highlighted are
15	the obligations rather the increase that you
16	referenced would be the increase in the financial
17	assurance obligations. Correct?
18	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
19	MR. RANKIN: Okay. And then the
20	proposal there, the same may be true of other things;
21	the same may be true of other provisions?
22	MR. PURVIS: Sure.
23	MR. RANKIN: I mean, at least part.
24	Right?
25	MR. PURVIS: Yes.

1	MR. RANKIN: Right. And maybe a
2	principle part of the rule. Right?
3	MR. PURVIS: Of I'm not sure I
4	understand the question. FA is certainly a principle
5	part of the of the proposal.
6	MR. RANKIN: Right. And the increased
7	incentives that you referenced also would be the
8	increased financial assurance. Correct?
9	MR. PURVIS: That's one of the
LO	incentives. Yes.
L1	MR. RANKIN: Right. Okay. All right.
L2	So in other words, just to be clear, what I understand
L3	from this testimony is that the financial assurance is
L4	a large part, a principle part of the rule's purpose
L5	to motivate operators to plan for decommissioning and
L6	then also to not delay decommissioning. Correct?
L7	MR. PURVIS: That's yes. That's the
L8	way I understand it.
L9	MR. RANKIN: Okay. And looking at your
20	Exhibit 38 from your PowerPoint Slide 10 from your
21	demonstratives, that discusses the holdback. My
22	understanding is then that this what you're what
23	the purpose here would be to encourage or motivate
24	operators to decommission within that holdback period.
25	Correct?

1	MR. PURVIS: No.
2	MR. RANKIN: No. Okay. When would
3	they when is when you or when is the what is the
4	purpose of urging them to decommissioning? At what
5	point? Is it up to them to decide?
6	MR. PURVIS: I yeah. I don't
7	believe there's anything in the design intended to
8	affect the timing of when it happens, merely that it
9	does happen at the operator's expense instead of the
10	public expense.
11	MR. RANKIN: Well, you just told me
12	that the intent is to have it be decommissioned
13	sooner. Correct?
14	MR. PURVIS: I don't remember saying
15	sooner, but it the sooner than has been the case
16	because of wells sitting in, for long periods of time,
17	inactive status.
18	MR. RANKIN: Okay. The testimony you
19	provided was that you wanted to incentivize operators
20	to not delay decommissioning. Correct?
21	MR. PURVIS: Yes. Not to delay.
22	MR. RANKIN: Right. And so the inverse
23	of that would be to do it sooner. Correct?
24	MR. PURVIS: No. No. Only to the
25	extent that companies are artificially artificially
	Page 421

1	delaying now.
2	MR. RANKIN: All right. So you're not
3	saying your testimony is not that the purpose of
4	this rule is to have operators plug their wells sooner
5	than they otherwise would?
6	MR. PURVIS: My testimony is that it
7	should be done in a timely manner without artificial
8	delay. To the extent that there is artificial delay,
9	yes. Sooner.
10	MR. RANKIN: Okay. And the financial
11	assurance that's proposed on this rule is designed to
12	make that happen. Correct?
13	MR. PURVIS: That's the hope. Yeah.
14	MR. RANKIN: Okay. So the last part
15	here I wanted to point out is at the bottom of this
16	same page, I've highlighted this sentence here. You
17	say that the applicants offer a conservative but
18	effective approach to limit the state's financial
19	exposure in a way that will have little impact on
20	overall oil and gas production in the state. Correct?
21	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
22	MR. RANKIN: I've read it correctly and
23	that's still your position. Correct?
24	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
25	MR. RANKIN: Okay. I'm going to jump
	Page 422

1	in and discuss the financial assurance issue. I'm
2	first going to go to the changes, proposed changes, to
3	the active wells provision in the rules. I've got up
4	here on the Slide 12 of your demonstrative proposed
5	modifications to 19.15.8.9.C, and just here looking at
6	the first portion of the modifications of the rule
7	here is that you're proposing to increase the one well
8	plugging bond to \$150,000. Correct?
9	MR. PURVIS: I'm not proposing, but the
10	proposal is to increase to 150.
11	MR. RANKIN: The applicants' proposal
12	is to increase that; make that change. Correct?
13	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
14	MR. RANKIN: Okay. And then the next
15	modification here is to the statewide blanket bond,
16	modifying it from a tiered approach to essentially no
17	tiering where all operators with two or more active
18	wells can elect to pay a blanket bond of \$250,000.
19	Correct?
20	MR. PURVIS: I don't think they can
21	elect. I think they're obligated. But otherwise,
22	yes.
23	MR. RANKIN: I guess it wouldn't
24	make no sense, but if they wanted to, they could go
25	out and have single well bonds for all their wells.

1	Correct?
2	MR. PURVIS: I I guess you could do
3	anything above the minimum that's required.
4	MR. RANKIN: Right. So it's really at
5	their election to get a blanket bond. Correct?
6	MR. PURVIS: No. I I think the
7	provision requires them to have a blanket bond as a
8	minimum and leaves open the option for more assurance
9	if they want it.
LO	MR. RANKIN: And then it's on the
L1	operator a rational operator would elect to choose
L2	the blanket bond. Correct?
L3	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
L4	MR. RANKIN: Okay. So and referring
L5	back to your testimony on this topic?
L6	MR. PURVIS: Okay.
L7	MR. RANKIN: In your direct, this is
L8	page 38 of your direct where you review these changes.
L9	Okay? At the bottom of this page, you note that in
20	discussing the effect of this change and the
21	implications of it, you state that "However, the Oil
22	and Gas Act statutory cap of \$250,000 for blanket
23	binding means that the single well financial assurance
24	requirement will not have wide effect as most wells
25	reside in large company portfolios of 400 wells or

1	more, thus qualifying for the blanket bond." Did I
2	read that correctly?
3	MR. PURVIS: You have read it
4	correctly, and I think that I wrote it imprecisely.
5	What it what I was trying to say was that most
6	companies are going to fall under the the blanket
7	bond.
8	MR. RANKIN: Simply because they have
9	multiple wells. Right?
10	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
11	MR. RANKIN: And multiple active wells,
12	that's allowing them to elect rather than pay single
13	well bonds for each of those wells to be covered by
14	the blanket bond. Correct?
15	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
16	MR. RANKIN: Okay. And the issue here
17	is that the statute caps that at \$250,000. Correct?
18	MR. PURVIS: As I understand the the
19	law, yes.
20	MR. RANKIN: No matter how many active
21	wells they have. Right?
22	MR. PURVIS: As I understand the law,
23	but but I I haven't studied the law as such.
24	MR. RANKIN: But that's the issue.
25	Right? No matter how many active wells they have,
	Page 425

1	they only have to pay \$250,000 to get financial
2	assurance. Correct? To cover all those wells?
3	MR. PURVIS: That's the way I
4	understand it with the caveat that I'm I'm not sure
5	how it applies differently to active or inactive
6	wells.
7	MR. RANKIN: Very well. So I'm just
8	talking about active wells. So for operators that
9	have multiple active wells, they only have to pay
10	\$250,000 to obtain financial assurance for all those
11	wells. Correct?
12	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
13	MR. RANKIN: Okay. So
14	MR. PURVIS: Under this provision
15	alone.
16	MR. RANKIN: Very well. And the
17	statute that you're referencing is this statute,
18	70-2-14. Correct? And I've highlighted here the
19	language that provides for the blanket bond in green.
20	Have you reviewed that statute?
21	MR. PURVIS: I have not, Mr. Rankin.
22	MR. RANKIN: Okay. So you don't
23	you're not familiar with what the exist I mean,
24	when you, in your testimony in your direct
25	testimony, second sentence here that I've highlighted

1	"These rules are necessary because the nature of oil
2	and gas economics in concert with New Mexico's
3	existing rules create little obligation that assurance
4	operators are planning for decommissioning and so on."
5	So you cite to what the existing rules
6	are, but you're not you didn't familiarize yourself
7	with what the existing statutory regulatory framework
8	was that create those rules?
9	MR. PURVIS: Enough to draw that
10	conclusion, but not enough to interpret the law.
11	MR. RANKIN: Okay. So you didn't
12	review what the statute is or what it provides for as
13	part of your preparation or review or recommendations
14	to the Commission on what should be done?
15	MR. PURVIS: No. What I I did I
16	mean, no analysis of the legal language. I did
17	observe that the current bonding is a very small
18	proportion and does not address the judgment proof
19	problem.
20	MR. RANKIN: Okay. Going back to your
21	testimony this is back to page 38 of your direct
22	you wanted to say that the effect of the \$250,000
23	blanket bond means that the single well financial
24	assurance rule, which requires 150,000
25	MR. PURVIS: On page 38? Please remind
	Page 427

1	me what line you're reading at?
2	MR. RANKIN: I'm summarizing.
3	MR. PURVIS: Oh, okay.
4	MR. RANKIN: I'm summarizing.
5	MR. PURVIS: Okay.
6	MR. RANKIN: In your testimony in this
7	section, you testify that you state that the effect of
8	the \$250,000 blanket bond means that the single well
9	financial assurance in the proposed rule, which would
10	require \$150,000 for every one well plugging bond,
11	will not have wide effect. Correct?
12	MR. PURVIS: I think my testimony is
13	that 19.15.8.C does not have much effect.
14	MR. RANKIN: Yeah. I mean, the
15	issue and the issue there is, as we were just
16	discussing right it's because operators have the
17	option to elect when they have multiple active wells
18	to obtain financial assurance under the blanket bond
19	provision right of \$250,000. Correct?
20	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
21	MR. RANKIN: And that's why it won't
22	have wide effect. Right? Because that \$250,000 isn't
23	going to cover the multiple wells that they may have
24	if they don't
25	MR. PURVIS: Yes. \$250,000 is not much
	Page 428

1	money considering the size of the portfolios.
2	MR. RANKIN: Okay. And so the point
3	being that \$250,000 based on your cost estimates is
4	not going to even going to cover two wells. Right?
5	MR. PURVIS: Based on my analysis of
6	other people's actual costs, it's not going to cover
7	any.
8	MR. RANKIN: Right. But there's
9	another way right to get more financial
10	assurance that targets more wells and more operators
11	across the state, and that's to create a new category
12	of wells that targets marginal wells. Correct?
13	MR. PURVIS: There are three other
14	provisions that trigger single well, and a fourth that
15	triggers portfolio level.
16	MR. RANKIN: And I'm talking now here
17	about that the proposal under the rule is to create
18	this new category of marginal wells. Correct?
19	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
20	MR. RANKIN: And that proposal is
21	intended to target, to broaden the scope of wells that
22	are required to get additional financial assurance
23	under the rule. Correct?
24	MR. PURVIS: Yes, it does do that.
25	MR. RANKIN: Okay. And that's the
	Page 429

1	intent. Right?
2	MR. PURVIS: I believe so.
3	MR. RANKIN: Yeah. I mean, otherwise
4	you're stuck with \$250,000 short blanket bond or
5	single well bonds of 150. Right?
6	MR. PURVIS: Right.
7	MR. RANKIN: And that's not addressing
8	the problem that you've identified?
9	MR. PURVIS: The yes.
10	MR. RANKIN: So then I'm going to go to
11	Slide 13 in your PowerPoint, which is the overview of
12	the proposal to create this marginal well and the
13	inactive well financial assurance category. Correct?
14	MR. PURVIS: One second. I'm getting
15	there.
16	MR. RANKIN: I've got it on the screen
17	too so you can see it.
18	MR. PURVIS: Yeah. Yes. Thank you.
19	MR. RANKIN: Yeah. Yeah. I'm going to
20	be real I'm going to direct you real so we get
21	to it real fast.
22	MR. PURVIS: Okay. Thank you.
23	MR. RANKIN: So here on Slide 13 of
24	your demonstrative, this outlines your proposal to
25	amend the financial assurance provisions to include

1	this new category of marginal wells and inactive
2	wells. Correct?
3	MR. PURVIS: Inactive preexists.
4	MR. RANKIN: Financial assurance, I
5	mean yeah. Okay. But very well. It does exist.
6	You're right. But this is a new provision in the
7	rule. Correct?
8	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
9	MR. RANKIN: Okay. And the first thing
10	here is the definition of the marginal well that the
11	applicants are proposing. Right?
12	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
13	MR. RANKIN: And then the very next
14	aspect of the financial assurance provision provides
15	that a transferee, the one receiving wells, has to
16	provide a one well financial assurance of \$150,000 for
17	each marginal well prior to transfer. Correct?
18	That's under subpart 1. Right?
19	MR. PURVIS: Yes. Yes.
20	MR. RANKIN: Okay. So that's one way
21	of addressing the issues to make sure that operators,
22	if they're going to transfer these wells, that the
23	recipient actually is bonded and has the economic
24	financial assurance in place to protect the state.
25	Right?

1	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
2	MR. RANKIN: Okay. Next provision
3	starting in January 2028 and this is under
4	subparagraph 2 operators then are required to
5	provide a one well plugging bond for each marginal
6	well. Correct?
7	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
8	MR. RANKIN: Okay. And even though
9	marginal wells are active wells, operators would not
10	be able to then rely on or elect a blanket bond to
11	cover any marginal wells anymore. Correct?
12	MR. PURVIS: Oh. I'm not sure I
13	understand the question, and I'm not sure how to
14	answer it. It sounds like an interpretation, a
15	interpretation of the way the rules work together.
16	MR. RANKIN: Well, isn't the purpose to
17	prevent operators from relying on a blanket bond so
18	they actually are they have more financial
19	assurance to cover all their wells?
20	MR. PURVIS: The purpose is to protect
21	the state; to provide financial assurance to protect
22	the state.
23	MR. RANKIN: But you can't tell me
24	whether operators are going to be prohibited from
25	electing to obtain a blanket bond under this new

1	provision?
2	MR. PURVIS: I have given that no
3	thought, Mr. Rankin.
4	MR. RANKIN: Really? So if I'm an
5	operator, and I have more than let me ask you this,
6	then. If I'm an operator, I have more than 15 percent
7	wells that are marginal. Okay? And I have a
8	portfolio of 400 wells, and I got 15 percent that are
9	marginal, can I still elect to put my active
10	non-marginal wells under a blanket bond?
11	MR. NYKIEL: Madam
12	MR. PURVIS: No.
13	MR. NYKIEL: Madam Hearing Officer, I'm
14	object. It calls for a legal conclusion.
15	THE HEARING OFFICER: Yeah.
16	Mr. Rankin, would you ask it in a way
17	that doesn't call for a legal
18	MR. RANKIN: I'm sorry. This is his
19	slide, and he's proposing these rules. I'm trying to
20	understand what the effect of them are going to be.
21	He's the witness.
22	THE HEARING OFFICER: Right. I
23	understand. Writing testimony about mostly financial
24	matters.
25	Mr. Purvis, can you answer the question
	Page 433

1	without answering it as a legal conclusion?
2	MR. PURVIS: Well, the only thing I
3	would clarify is that the rules are not as written
4	are not mine. I did not write them. I have said that
5	they would be effective and should be adopted.
6	BY MR. RANKIN:
7	MR. RANKIN: Okay. So you can't tell
8	me as you're sitting here what the effect of this rule
9	would be on operators who have more than 15 percent
10	marginal wells in their portfolio, whether they would
11	be obligated to or no longer able to elect a blanket
12	bond for their remaining active wells?
13	MR. PURVIS: I do not know the
14	interaction between the two provisions that you're
15	talking about.
16	MR. RANKIN: Who among WELC's witnesses
17	would be able to answer that question?
18	MR. PURVIS: I do not know.
19	MR. RANKIN: Okay. So if I'm just
20	looking and I'm just going to read the plain
21	language of the rule. Okay? I'm going to look at
22	this subparagraph 3, and I'll read it out loud.
23	"An operator with 15 percent or more of
24	their wells in marginal or inactive well status or a
25	combination thereof shall" not at discretion, but

1	shall "provide a one well plugging financial
2	assurance in the amount of \$150,000 for each well
3	registered to the operator until the percentage of the
4	operator's marginal and inactive wells is decreased
5	below 15 percent."
6	Did I read that correctly?
7	MR. PURVIS: Yes, sir.
8	MR. RANKIN: So just understanding the
9	plain language of that provision that Applicants are
10	proposing that's part of your testimony, what's your
11	understanding of what the effect of that provision
12	would be on whether an operator would have the ability
13	to elect, after this is adopted, a blanket bond for
14	its remaining active wells that are not marginal?
15	MR. NYKIEL: Madam Hearing Officer, I
16	believe that was asked and answered.
17	THE HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Purvis, have
18	you answered that already?
19	MR. PURVIS: I believe I have.
20	MR. RANKIN: Well, I've asking him now
21	specifically about this provision to help me
22	understand what it means. As the witness who's
23	testifying to it, who's proposed this or presenting
24	this as part of the applicants' proposal, I'm trying
25	to understand what it means for the industry.

1	THE HEARING OFFICER: Do you have
2	anything to add to your earlier answer?
3	MR. PURVIS: The only thing I could say
4	is that I assume that the operator could have both,
5	but I do not know the way that the legal that the
6	statutes or the the regulations rather would
7	interact.
8	MR. NYKIEL: Madam Hearing Officer, we
9	have a legal expert to follow who is in a better
10	position to answer some of these questions.
11	THE HEARING OFFICER: All right. Thank
12	you. Is that Mr. Morgan?
13	MR. NYKIEL: Yes.
14	THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Thank you.
15	MR. RANKIN: Who was it? Mr. Morgan.
16	Okay.
17	BY MR. RANKIN:
18	MR. RANKIN: Mr. Purvis, because you're
19	not familiar with how this rule would actually
20	operate, I'm going to be able to eliminate a
21	substantial portion of my questions for you.
22	MR. PURVIS: It's a win-win.
23	MR. RANKIN: No. It's not a win-win.
24	It's not a win-win. However, you'll have a shorter
25	cross-examination from me.

1	All right. I'm going to talk about
2	impacts. Mr. Cloutier did address some of this with
3	you, but I want to dig in a little bit deeper. Going
4	back to your testimony in direct, we talked about this
5	briefly at the outset, and he buried you on this. In
6	short here, your belief is that in proportion to the
7	risk of mitigation of the risk that the impact on
8	oil and gas production is going to be small. Correct?
9	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
10	MR. RANKIN: Okay. And this slide here
11	in your demonstrative, Slide 28 from your Exhibit 52,
12	shows that at the 15 percent threshold that we were
13	just discussing. Right?
14	MR. PURVIS: Mm-hmm.
15	MR. RANKIN: About, you know, there's a
16	threshold once you reach 15 percent, then operators
17	are going to have to do something and you can't tell
18	me what that is or whether they can continue to use a
19	blanket bond or what. But at 15 percent, if once they
20	have 15 percent marginal wells in the portfolio,
21	something happens in the rule, and this is intended to
22	show what the effect of that is. Right?
23	MR. PURVIS: Yes. The ceiling effect.
24	MR. RANKIN: The ceiling effect. Okay.
25	And looking at this, you see a big drop off. Right?

1	Once for companies that have portfolios of 15 percent
2	or more marginal wells, that sort of drops off.
3	Right? There's fewer companies that generally,
4	fewer companies that have 15 percent or more marginal
5	walls in their portfolio. Right?
6	MR. PURVIS: I I think what you're
7	saying is the same thing I observed. Between the
8	third and fourth bin, there's a step change down.
9	Yes.
10	MR. RANKIN: Okay. But nevertheless,
11	when I look at your table at 15 percent, that's still
12	51 percent of all the operators in the state would be
13	impacted by that threshold. Correct?
14	MR. PURVIS: Fifty-one percent of the
15	legal entities, no. Fifty-one percent of the
16	operating companies, yes.
17	MR. RANKIN: Do you know how many that
18	would be?
19	MR. PURVIS: Hundreds.
20	MR. RANKIN: Hundreds. Okay. And at
21	that 15 percent, it's about a little less than 20
22	percent of the total wells in the state. Correct?
23	MR. PURVIS: Correct.
24	MR. RANKIN: And then on the far right
25	column, you've got 2.3 percent BOE, which I understand
	Page 438

1	to be barrels of oil equivalent. Right?
2	MR. PURVIS: Correct.
3	MR. RANKIN: And just to be clear, I
4	mean, I think there's two places on the slide where
5	you use the number 2.5 percent. So I don't know if
6	it's 2.3 or 2.5. That's the difference between
7	precision and accuracy. Right? Either way it's
8	accurate, but it's not quite precise. Right?
9	MR. PURVIS: That's a typo, and I
10	apologize.
11	MR. RANKIN: That's okay. So I'll just
12	use 2.3 percent.
13	MR. PURVIS: Thank you.
14	MR. RANKIN: Okay. So now these
15	charts, this chart right here is based off of 2024
16	production in New Mexico. Correct?
17	MR. PURVIS: Correct.
18	MR. RANKIN: That's my understanding.
19	Right? And so we see that the 15 percent threshold
20	will have an impact on 51 percent of the companies
21	that operate in the state. Hundreds. Right?
22	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
23	MR. RANKIN: Just out of curiosity, do
24	you know I mean, how many Mr. Cloutier was
25	asking you about the master orphaned wells spreadsheet

1	that was part of your analysis. How many operators,
2	different entities, legal entities, are on that master
3	orphaned wells spreadsheet?
4	MR. PURVIS: I don't recall.
5	MR. RANKIN: Is it hundreds?
6	MR. PURVIS: No.
7	MR. RANKIN: Is it dozens?
8	MR. PURVIS: It's closer to dozens than
9	hundreds, but I don't remember the number.
10	MR. RANKIN: But if I were to pull that
11	up, I could look at it and see how many operators are
12	actually implicated in that master orphaned well
13	spreadsheet?
14	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
15	MR. RANKIN: But it's not hundreds.
16	Right?
17	MR. PURVIS: It's not hundreds.
18	MR. RANKIN: It's not 51 percent of the
19	operators in the state. Right?
20	MR. PURVIS: Correct.
21	MR. RANKIN: Okay. So now, we talked
22	about this at the outset. The proposed rules were set
23	up to increase the incentives, not to delay
24	commissioning wells, decommissioning wells, during the
25	operating life. Correct?

1	MR. PURVIS: I I believe that's what
2	we read before.
3	MR. RANKIN: Right. And that's your
4	testimony. Right?
5	MR. PURVIS: Not not to artificially
6	delay.
7	MR. RANKIN: Right. So you but and
8	then on the far right, we talked about these 2.3
9	percent, but you don't tell us what those volumes are.
10	Right? You just say it's a small percentage of the
11	total production.
12	MR. PURVIS: That's correct.
13	MR. RANKIN: So Mr. Cloutier was asking
14	about 2025 production. I'm going to pull up I
15	pulled this down last night. I went to the OCD's
16	website, and I pulled down the most recent production
17	values for total production in the state. You see
18	there's a Column H that has total gas. Okay? There's
19	a Column N that has total oil. Okay?
20	And I'm going to just I'm going to
21	scroll down to the almost to the bottom because I'm
22	going to look at 2024 because that's what's on your
23	chart. Okay? Oh, that was 1994. What was I doing?
24	2004. Man, I'm 20 years off. Sorry. Okay. Here we
25	go.

1	So Column H again is the gas column.
2	Okay? And Column N is the oil column. I'm not going
3	to bother doing the conversion of barrels of oil
4	equivalent for gas, but I think it's about 6,000 cubic
5	feet, something like that, is the conversion.
6	MR. PURVIS: That's the standard
7	conversion. Yeah.
8	MR. RANKIN: Okay. So I'm not going to
9	bother with that. Okay? But I'm just going to focus
10	on oil like Mr. Cloutier did. Okay? So if I go over
11	to the oil column and I look at the total production
12	for the state for 2024, that was 740 million barrels.
13	Right?
14	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
15	MR. RANKIN: And that matches with what
16	the LFC reported, and it's on track within the range
17	of what you predict for 2025. Right?
18	MR. PURVIS: Yeah. I I estimated
19	700, 750 million.
20	MR. RANKIN: Okay. And again, just to
21	get these numbers out there, I ran you can see my
22	calculation. I took that value, I multiplied it at
23	times 2.3 percent, and I get 17 million barrels.
24	Right?
25	MR. PURVIS: Yes.

1	MR. RANKIN: And that's nothing to
2	sniff at. Right?
3	MR. PURVIS: Again, I would not object
4	if someone gave me 17 million barrels.
5	MR. RANKIN: Right. And I'm not even
6	including the barrel of oil equivalent for the gas
7	right to get what the total impact of your proposed
8	well of the applicants' proposed rule will have.
9	Right?
10	MR. PURVIS: Correct.
11	MR. RANKIN: I'm just looking at oil
12	here. And so 2.3 percent of the oil portion of this
13	production is 17 million barrels. Right?
14	MR. PURVIS: That's the math.
15	MR. RANKIN: Okay. And then if I
16	and I did I actually picked the same number that
17	Mr. Cloutier did because I looked at the current price
18	of oil, and it's around 60 it's a little below this
19	now, but around 60 bucks a barrel. So the value of
20	that oil from last year that would be impacted under
21	your analysis is over a billion bucks. Right?
22	MR. PURVIS: That's the math.
23	MR. RANKIN: That's the math. It's a
24	big number. Okay? So and that's not even including
25	the value of the natural gas, which, you know, as we

1	all know, is not as valuable as the oil.
2	Nevertheless, that's just the oil portion. Correct?
3	MR. PURVIS: Correct.
4	MR. RANKIN: Okay. Now, as you
5	testified to Mr. Cloutier, you know, that's the high
6	end. Right? You're saying that that 2.3 percent, 2.5
7	percent, that \$1 billion is not going to just go away.
8	Right?
9	MR. PURVIS: Correct.
10	MR. RANKIN: But some fraction of it
11	is?
12	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
13	MR. RANKIN: And you don't know what it
14	is. Right?
15	MR. PURVIS: Correct.
16	MR. RANKIN: You haven't done an
17	analysis to determine what portion of that 2.3 percent
18	that's going to be impacted by this rule is going to
19	no longer be in existence. Right?
20	MR. PURVIS: I have not quantified it.
21	I have made a directional analysis.
22	MR. RANKIN: Okay. It's going to be
23	down right? Up or down? Down. Right?
24	MR. PURVIS: Right. Exactly.
25	MR. RANKIN: Okay. So no so you
	Page 444

haven't done any kind of study to determine whether
the proposal will ultimately result in a reduction in
ultimate recovery across the state, have you? Other
than it's going to go down. Right?
MR. PURVIS: There are competing
factors that some of which may drive production up
and some of which may drive production down. I have
made an analysis of the effect of this standard
economic model of economic limit on how that would
change the economic life of of wells under the
rules.
Please excuse me for just a second. I
can't see Mr. Rankin.
can't see Mr. Rankin.
can't see Mr. Rankin. MR. RANKIN: I'm sorry. Yeah.
can't see Mr. Rankin. MR. RANKIN: I'm sorry. Yeah. MR. PURVIS: Thank you.
can't see Mr. Rankin. MR. RANKIN: I'm sorry. Yeah. MR. PURVIS: Thank you. MR. RANKIN: I'm in the back row.
can't see Mr. Rankin. MR. RANKIN: I'm sorry. Yeah. MR. PURVIS: Thank you. MR. RANKIN: I'm in the back row. So but you haven't done a study to
can't see Mr. Rankin. MR. RANKIN: I'm sorry. Yeah. MR. PURVIS: Thank you. MR. RANKIN: I'm in the back row. So but you haven't done a study to determine what the volumes of reduction in ultimate
can't see Mr. Rankin. MR. RANKIN: I'm sorry. Yeah. MR. PURVIS: Thank you. MR. RANKIN: I'm in the back row. So but you haven't done a study to determine what the volumes of reduction in ultimate recovery would be from adoption of this rule, have
can't see Mr. Rankin. MR. RANKIN: I'm sorry. Yeah. MR. PURVIS: Thank you. MR. RANKIN: I'm in the back row. So but you haven't done a study to determine what the volumes of reduction in ultimate recovery would be from adoption of this rule, have you?
can't see Mr. Rankin. MR. RANKIN: I'm sorry. Yeah. MR. PURVIS: Thank you. MR. RANKIN: I'm in the back row. So but you haven't done a study to determine what the volumes of reduction in ultimate recovery would be from adoption of this rule, have you? MR. PURVIS: I have not done any
can't see Mr. Rankin. MR. RANKIN: I'm sorry. Yeah. MR. PURVIS: Thank you. MR. RANKIN: I'm in the back row. So but you haven't done a study to determine what the volumes of reduction in ultimate recovery would be from adoption of this rule, have you? MR. PURVIS: I have not done any analysis consistent with with the type of work on

1	MR. RANKIN: And what's your answer on
2	that?
3	MR. PURVIS: It will change the
4	economic limit for most wells between about one and
5	three months in the idealized model that we use.
6	MR. RANKIN: Okay. So then you also
7	haven't conducted an analysis to determine what the
8	financial impact would be on operators or wells that
9	generate that 2.3 percent of the statewide production.
10	Right?
11	MR. PURVIS: I'm sorry. I don't
12	understand the question.
13	MR. RANKIN: Sure. In other words, as
14	a result of imposing additional financial assurance on
15	companies right there's going to be some
16	financial impact on those operators who produced that
17	2.3 percent of the volumes of the state that we're
18	just looking at. Right?
19	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
20	MR. RANKIN: And you have not conducted
21	any sort of analysis of the financial impact on those
22	companies to determine how it would affect their
23	ability to continue to produce that 2.3 percent of oil
24	in the state, have you?
25	MR. PURVIS: I believe that's fair.
	Page 446

1	MR. RANKIN: Right. Okay. Now,
2	you've on this Slide 35 in your demonstratives, you
3	showed us sort of this concept about weighing costs
4	and benefits. Right?
5	MR. PURVIS: Yes, I did.
6	MR. RANKIN: And but you didn't do any
7	kind of study to determine whether any potential
8	reduction in ultimate recovery or financial impacts on
9	operators would be offset by any potential economic
10	benefits derived from the increased financial
11	assurance, did you?
12	MR. PURVIS: I did not make a
13	prediction of what the net gain is. I did observe
14	that the cost is minimal and the protection the
15	issue being protected is much larger.
16	MR. RANKIN: Or even that there is a
17	net gain. Did you do an analysis to show us that
18	there's a net gain?
19	MR. PURVIS: I did not predict what the
20	new bonding level would be.
21	MR. RANKIN: Because we don't even know
22	what the net loss would be. Right? So we can't say
23	what the net if there is even a net gain. Right?
24	MR. PURVIS: I don't think that's a
25	fair statement.

_	
1	MR. RANKIN: Okay. So you feel like
2	there you, in your opinion that there is a net
3	gain?
4	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
5	MR. RANKIN: But you can't tell me what
6	it is?
7	MR. PURVIS: I can't. I have not
8	quantified it.
9	MR. RANKIN: Okay. So why so
10	sitting as the Commission's before you or even the
11	operators, the public and I have no way of knowing
12	whether there's a net gain or not because it's just
13	your opinion. Right?
14	MR. PURVIS: No. I've I've
15	quantified the magnitude of both, and there are
16	different orders of magnitude.
17	MR. RANKIN: Okay. But we just looked
18	at the \$1 billion that is the value of the 2.3 percent
19	from 2024, and you can't tell me what percentage of
20	that is going to be impacted. Right?
21	MR. PURVIS: Correct.
22	MR. RANKIN: And so that's a value, and
23	I don't know how much of that value is going to be
24	impacted, do I?
25	MR. PURVIS: We I have not specified
	Page 448

1	and not quantified that.
2	MR. RANKIN: Okay. So I can't know
3	whether your opinion about that there's a net benefit
4	is accurate or not. Right?
5	MR. PURVIS: I I continue to
6	disagree. I believe that the analysis of the
7	magnitude of the issue being addressed, the magnitude
8	of assurance that would be created by comparison to
9	the loss, is a net gain to the public.
10	MR. RANKIN: So because you haven't
11	done an analysis to determine whether there's going to
12	be, or as I understand it, actually there's probably
13	going to be a net reduction in ultimate recovery, you
14	can't you're not able to testify today that this
15	proposed rule will prevent waste?
16	MR. PURVIS: I have not drawn a I
17	have not drawn an opinion about the effect on waste,
18	as I understand waste is a legal concept.
19	MR. RANKIN: Okay. So but it's also an
20	engineering concept. Right? I mean, isn't it an
21	engineered one of the engineering purposes out
22	there is to not waste right is to maximize
23	recovery. Do it in an economic way. Right? It's
24	also an economic it's an industry term. Right?
25	MR. PURVIS: It it is a term that we

1	talk about, although it has like marginal has both
2	legal and industry application, although the majority
3	of the application is legal.
4	MR. RANKIN: Okay. But just to
5	confirm, you didn't do an analysis to say one way or
6	the other whether this rule would be able to prevent
7	waste. Right?
8	MR. PURVIS: I I did draw a couple
9	of opinions I think are relevant. First is that waste
10	is not an economic concept. It's a volumetric
11	concept.
12	MR. RANKIN: Oh, okay. So in the
13	engineering
14	MR. PURVIS: Use on the engineering
15	side. Thank you, Mr. Rankin. Yes.
16	MR. RANKIN: So you're not commenting
17	on that, on the legal side, under New Mexico law, what
18	the Commission's rules, how the Commission rules guide
19	the Commission to consider waste. Right?
20	MR. PURVIS: Right.
21	MR. RANKIN: But you're just saying
22	MR. PURVIS: That's correct. And I
23	also did opine that the as I said a minute ago, the
24	change in ultimate recovery would be minute and that
25	there are competing forces that might cause ultimate

recovery to be higher. I opined that the change does
not make premature end of production because the
value this the word premature as a is a value
judgment. And and it seems to me that fully
more secure financially responsible operations is
does not make it premature.
MR. RANKIN: Okay. But the challenge
here is putting consideration of risk of taking on
orphaned wells and the economic liability of orphaned
wells versus the commission's obligation to prevent
waste. Right? There's some balancing that has to
occur between those two competing interests. Right?
MR. PURVIS: Yeah. And as I understand
the charge of the Commission, it is to balance
correlative rights, waste, and environmental and
public interest.
MR. RANKIN: To balance or to prevent
waste? That's you don't know. That's not your
expertise, is it?
MR. NYKIEL: Yeah. I'm going to just
object to the speculation and the legal nature of the
question.
BY MR. RANKIN:
MR. RANKIN: Okay. So I'll move on to
my last couple questions then. Okay? So we've
Page 451

1	discussed a fair bit about whether or not you can
2	actually quantify what the impact is and whether it's
3	a net benefit or not. Okay? And you continue to take
4	the position that you believe it is a net benefit, but
5	with the values here and being un unable to quantify
6	them, I remain unconvinced. Okay? So we'll move on
7	from that.
8	I'm going to go back to your Slide 28,
9	and I'm going to look at this again. And you provided
10	some helpful additional other brackets okay to
11	consider impacts of other portfolio mixes.
12	MR. PURVIS: Okay.
13	MR. RANKIN: If I were to look at this
14	table in your exhibit here, so the rule is focused on
15	15 percent right of a portfolio mix of marginal
16	wells and other active wells. Right?
17	MR. PURVIS: The rule says 15 percent
18	marginal and and inactive.
19	MR. RANKIN: Yes. Right. But you've
20	also provided a sort of overview of what the impact
21	might look like if we looked at different percentages
22	of those two wells. Right?
23	MR. PURVIS: Yes. That's correct.
24	MR. RANKIN: And when we get up to a
25	higher mix, like 30 percent or more, all of a sudden
	Page 452

1	you're dropping down below 1 percent. Correct?
2	MR. PURVIS: That's correct.
3	MR. RANKIN: One percent of the barrels
4	of oil equivalent production impacted. Right?
5	MR. PURVIS: The table on my Exhibit 52
6	reads that a threshold of 30 percent marginal in an
7	an inactive instead of a threshold of 15 percent
8	impacts the extreme limit of 0.6 percent.
9	MR. RANKIN: And as well, it's a
10	smaller number or smaller fraction of operators in the
11	state. Correct?
12	MR. PURVIS: Yes, sir.
13	MR. RANKIN: Thirty-three percent
14	instead of fifty-one percent. What is the do you
15	have any idea how many operators 33 percent
16	represents?
17	MR. PURVIS: Around a hundred, maybe a
18	little bit more.
19	MR. RANKIN: So not hundreds, but a
20	hundred. Right?
21	MR. PURVIS: Legal entities, yes.
22	MR. RANKIN: Smaller impact and a much
23	smaller impact on the barrels of oil equivalent.
24	You're reading that correctly?
25	MR. PURVIS: Yeah.

1	MR. RANKIN: Okay.
2	THE HEARING EXAMINER: Mr. Rankin, you
3	have about five minutes.
4	MR. RANKIN: Perfect.
5	BY MR. RANKIN:
6	MR. RANKIN: Oh, okay. I'm not going
7	to be able to pull it up right now to go through it,
8	but if I told you that my understanding is that for
9	your spreadsheet, for the master orphaned wells
10	spreadsheet, it's fewer than 20 operators. Would that
11	surprise you?
12	MR. PURVIS: I thought it I would've
13	expected a little bit more, but I I would accept
14	your representation.
15	MR. RANKIN: Okay. And that's a lot
16	fewer than the hundreds under the 15 percent that are
17	going to be impacted under the proposed rule. Right?
18	MR. PURVIS: The historical pace of
19	orphaning is less than can be expected in the future.
20	MR. RANKIN: So your view is that it's
21	going to be an there's going to be more of these
22	folks on that list?
23	MR. PURVIS: I believe all the evidence
24	points to that, yes.
25	MR. RANKIN: Okay. But you but that
	Page 454

1	hasn't been the case. Right? I mean, it still I
2	mean, remains to be seen. There's only 14 operators
3	or fewer than 20 on that list right of orphaned
4	wells?
5	MR. PURVIS: The orphaned the master
6	orphan wells spreadsheet includes only those operators
7	who have already endured enforcement action, and it
8	includes 1800 wells. The list of wells already
9	prepared, ready for enforcement action, but not yet
10	enforced because of lack of resources is approximately
11	double that currently.
12	Well, what it appears to be here, and I
13	know nationally, is that the population of orphaned
14	wells today is larger than the population of all wells
15	that have ever been plugged by orphan well programs
16	over the decades that they have existed.
17	Meanwhile, as my my work shows, the
18	pace of well, haven't been pace of decommission
19	here, but the the very large population, tens of
20	thousands of wells, are standing on the edge of
21	economic viability as it stands.
22	MR. RANKIN: Well, no further
23	questions.
24	Thank you very much, Madam Hearing
25	Officer.

1	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you,
2	Mr. Rankin.
3	Mr. Maxwell, do you have questions of
4	Mr. Purvis?
5	MR. MAXWELL: No questions. Thank you.
6	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.
7	I'm not sure if Ms. Nanasi is on the
8	platform, but I'll ask. No.
9	All right. Mr. Moore for State Land
10	Office?
11	Mr. Tremaine, do you have questions?
12	MR. TREMAINE: I do have a couple
13	questions, Madam Hearing Officer, thank you.
14	MR. PURVIS: If if I may, if we're
15	going to be more than just a couple of minutes, I
16	could sure sure use a break now rather than later.
17	MR. TREMAINE: Yeah. I think I'm going
18	to be about ten minutes, but I think we should take a
19	break.
20	THE HEARING OFFICER: All right. Well,
21	it is lunchtime then now, so let's break for lunch and
22	come back a little bit before one.
23	MR. PURVIS: Thank you.
24	(Off the record.)
25	THE HEARING OFFICER: All righty. When
	Daga 456
	Page 456

1	we broke for lunch we're back after our lunch
2	break. When we broke for lunch, Mr. Tremaine was
3	about to ask his questions of Mr. Purvis.
4	Go ahead, Mr. Tremaine.
5	MR. TREMAINE: Thank you, Madam Hearing
6	Officer. I'm just getting booted back up into I
7	wanted to screen share, so okay.
8	CROSS-EXAMINATION
9	BY MR. TREMAINE:
10	MR. TREMAINE: Good afternoon,
11	Mr. Purvis.
12	MR. PURVIS: Good afternoon.
13	MR. TREMAINE: Thank you for being
14	here. I hope you had a good lunch. I'd like to if
15	I can please share, I'd like to screen share well,
16	doing a very poor job of it.
17	MR. PURVIS: Oh, good drawing.
18	MR. TREMAINE: Yeah. That's yeah.
19	The while I'm floundering at this, this is amazing
20	because I've done this in any number of hearings and
21	this is not how it goes. Well, let's try this another
22	way while I reboot here.
23	So, Mr. Purvis, do you recall your
24	Exhibit 52 discussing the breakdown of operators and
25	wells and production that would be impacted by the

1	cutoff disqualifying operators from blanket bonding?
2	MR. PURVIS: Yes, I do.
3	MR. TREMAINE: Okay. And the current
4	proposed rule, do you agree that it disqualifies
5	operators from blanket bonds if more than 15 percent
6	of their wells included in their portfolio fit the
7	proposed definition of marginal wells?
8	MR. PURVIS: As I told Mr. Rankin, I'm
9	not sure I understand the interaction between the
10	blanket bond rules and the by well rules.
11	MR. TREMAINE: Thank you. I didn't
12	mean to belabor that point, but the cutoff proposed in
13	a rule is 15 percent. Right?
14	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
15	MR. TREMAINE: Okay. And would you
16	agree that that 15 percent cutoff came out of
17	discussions that the petitioner had with OCD and in
18	response to edits proposed by OCD in response to the
19	original petition?
20	MR. PURVIS: I have no knowledge of
21	where it came from.
22	MR. TREMAINE: Okay. To your
23	knowledge, did WELC or any other party solicit
24	feedback on this part of the rule from Industry?
25	MR. PURVIS: I have no independent

1	knowledge.
2	MR. TREMAINE: Okay. Are you aware of
3	any feedback or counterproposals or red lines related
4	to this subsection for marginal well portfolios that
5	have been provided by Industry?
6	MR. PURVIS: What I know about the
7	origins of the proposal is just what's been covered in
8	the hearing the last couple days.
9	MR. TREMAINE: Thank you.
10	MR. PURVIS: For that part.
11	MR. TREMAINE: Okay. So do I
12	understand your testimony to generally stand for the
13	proposition that setting that threshold for marginal
14	well portfolios at 15 percent represents a logical
15	breakpoint?
16	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
17	MR. TREMAINE: Okay. Included and
18	this is why I was trying to share the slide.
19	Apologies. But on your Slide 52, you listed several
20	other break points with breakdowns.
21	MR. PURVIS: Yes, I did.
22	MR. TREMAINE: Including, I believe 25
23	percent, 30 percent, et cetera.
24	MR. PURVIS: Yes, that's correct. I
25	did.

1	MR. TREMAINE: Do you believe after
2	performing your analysis that those other thresholds
3	for margin well portfolios would constitute other also
4	logical break points that could be included in this
5	rule?
6	MR. PURVIS: Yes. And not all the
7	points. The higher you go, I believe the the less
8	reasonable it becomes, but I do believe that something
9	between 15 and 25 percent would be a reasonable number
10	based on my experience and knowledge of operations in
11	the industry.
12	MR. TREMAINE: Okay. Do you have any
13	views on the breakpoint at 30 percent? Would that be
14	a logical breakpoint, or do you draw the line at 25?
15	MR. PURVIS: There is not as much
16	evidence to suggest the 30 percent, and I I think
17	in my qualitative experience, it's a high number.
18	MR. TREMAINE: Okay. Thank you.
19	Earlier today, Mr. Purvis, you shared Applicants'
20	Exhibit Number 86, variance of actual estimated versus
21	time for recently plugged orphan wells. Do you recall
22	that exhibit?
23	MR. PURVIS: Yes, sir.
24	MR. TREMAINE: Okay. And I think as
25	part of that discussion, there was some questions and
	Page 460

1	answers regarding \$150,000 representing a reasonable
2	average for wellbore plugging costs across the
3	industry. Is that fair?
4	MR. PURVIS: Would you ask again?
5	MR. TREMAINE: Yeah. So based on your
6	analysis that's represented in Exhibit Number 86,
7	would you agree that \$150,000 as kind of like a
8	placeholder for the average plugging cost, that that's
9	a reasonable estimate of average plugging costs for
10	wellbore plugging across the industry in New Mexico?
11	MR. PURVIS: It's a reasonable estimate
12	of the average across New Mexico, but 86 doesn't
13	support that directly.
14	MR. TREMAINE: Okay. How would you
15	clarify in response to my question?
16	MR. PURVIS: Exhibit 86 pertains to the
17	nature of the overruns, not so much the qualitative
18	
	average. But as I've said other times the we have
19	average. But as I've said other times the we have a sample of several hundred wells of actual experience
19 20	
	a sample of several hundred wells of actual experience
20	a sample of several hundred wells of actual experience from the OCD's experience, and that is broadly
20 21	a sample of several hundred wells of actual experience from the OCD's experience, and that is broadly representative and easily by far the the most
20 21 22	a sample of several hundred wells of actual experience from the OCD's experience, and that is broadly representative and easily by far the the most representative data available.
20 21 22 23	a sample of several hundred wells of actual experience from the OCD's experience, and that is broadly representative and easily by far the the most representative data available. MR. TREMAINE: Okay. So do I

1	reasonable average, but I wasn't I shouldn't have
2	attributed that to Slide 86?
3	MR. PURVIS: Correct.
4	MR. TREMAINE: Okay. Thank you. When
5	you break down and perform this analysis and looking
6	at specific operators like you have broken out in
7	Slide 86, is \$150,000 as a rough average for wellbore
8	plugging costs representative of an average for
9	individual operators? Do you understand the question?
10	MR. PURVIS: I'm not sure I do. Please
11	ask again.
12	MR. TREMAINE: Okay. So you have Slide
13	86 broken down with the overruns plotted. They're
14	broken up by operator. And I was reading this along
15	with your other testimony to say that 150,000 is a
16	good average across all of these wells plugged, but
17	they were plugged the wells were registered to
18	various different operators.
19	So I want to say on a more granular
20	level, can you make that same finding or determination
21	if you look at in wells that were registered and
22	operated by specific operators?
23	MR. PURVIS: I think I understand your
24	question. We do have data on cost and cost overruns
25	from a number of different operators. I have not

1	specifically examined that data for variations,
2	whether some operators are systematically higher or
3	others systematically lower. But I also have not
4	observed any sort of trend on 86 or other places that
5	would suggest that that some operators would be
6	systematically higher or lower.
7	That said, one caveat in my direct
8	testimony, I said that there will be some variations
9	from place to place, and I noted in particular the
10	Raton Basin might be significantly cheaper, and then
11	a an operator that's only in the Raton Basin, which
12	be some for those 700-ish wells, it would be
13	different.
14	MR. TREMAINE: Thank you for that,
14 15	MR. TREMAINE: Thank you for that, Mr. Purvis. Earlier today, Mr. Cloutier asked you
	_
15	Mr. Purvis. Earlier today, Mr. Cloutier asked you
15 16	Mr. Purvis. Earlier today, Mr. Cloutier asked you some questions about your reliance on the master
15 16 17	Mr. Purvis. Earlier today, Mr. Cloutier asked you some questions about your reliance on the master orphan spreadsheet. Do you recall those questions?
15 16 17 18	Mr. Purvis. Earlier today, Mr. Cloutier asked you some questions about your reliance on the master orphan spreadsheet. Do you recall those questions? MR. PURVIS: I do.
15 16 17 18	Mr. Purvis. Earlier today, Mr. Cloutier asked you some questions about your reliance on the master orphan spreadsheet. Do you recall those questions? MR. PURVIS: I do. MR. TREMAINE: Do you recall a question
15 16 17 18 19	Mr. Purvis. Earlier today, Mr. Cloutier asked you some questions about your reliance on the master orphan spreadsheet. Do you recall those questions? MR. PURVIS: I do. MR. TREMAINE: Do you recall a question about 75 percent of wells on the MOWS are clustered
15 16 17 18 19 20	Mr. Purvis. Earlier today, Mr. Cloutier asked you some questions about your reliance on the master orphan spreadsheet. Do you recall those questions? MR. PURVIS: I do. MR. TREMAINE: Do you recall a question about 75 percent of wells on the MOWS are clustered within ten operators?
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Mr. Purvis. Earlier today, Mr. Cloutier asked you some questions about your reliance on the master orphan spreadsheet. Do you recall those questions? MR. PURVIS: I do. MR. TREMAINE: Do you recall a question about 75 percent of wells on the MOWS are clustered within ten operators? MR. PURVIS: I remember some numbers
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Mr. Purvis. Earlier today, Mr. Cloutier asked you some questions about your reliance on the master orphan spreadsheet. Do you recall those questions? MR. PURVIS: I do. MR. TREMAINE: Do you recall a question about 75 percent of wells on the MOWS are clustered within ten operators? MR. PURVIS: I remember some numbers like that, yes.

1	inclusion on MOWS, OCD must have pursued and resolved
2	a specific enforcement action?
3	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
4	MR. TREMAINE: Does it follow that all
5	wells on the MOWS would be associated with the limited
6	number of operators for which OCD has brought an
7	enforcement action against?
8	MR. PURVIS: Yes. That's necessarily
9	the case.
10	MR. TREMAINE: Okay. Would you be
11	surprised to hear that there are currently over 100
12	operators with registered wells in New Mexico that
13	have not reported any production in the last 12
14	months?
15	MR. PURVIS: I I believe I testified
16	to that fact. No. It would not surprise me at all.
17	MR. TREMAINE: Okay. I want I'm
18	going to apologize in advance because we've done
19	some having witnesses please fact check lawyer
20	math, and I'm going to ask you some more questions
21	about that here. Do you recall questions earlier
22	about the potential for loss of tax revenue in the
23	order of \$55 million?
24	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
25	MR. TREMAINE: Okay. Following up on
	Page 464

1	that, I believe you had found in your analysis that,
2	and from the information available through OCD, that
3	there's approximately 63,000 wells currently in New
4	Mexico?
5	MR. PURVIS: That's correct.
6	MR. TREMAINE: Okay. And
7	MR. PURVIS: Unplugged wells.
8	MR. TREMAINE: Sorry?
9	MR. PURVIS: Unplugged wells for a
10	total of about a hundred over 110,000.
11	MR. TREMAINE: Okay. Thank you. I'm
12	speaking about unplugged wells. So roughly 63,000
13	unplugged wells, and we've heard a lot of testimony or
14	presentation about Industry plugging approximately 95
15	percent of wells over time, historically and on the
16	national average. Do you recall that?
17	MR. PURVIS: I do recall that.
18	MR. TREMAINE: Okay. And it's
19	consistent with your findings that on a national
20	basis, approximately 5 percent of wells are orphaned
21	and have been plugged by orphan well plugging
22	programs?
23	MR. PURVIS: Correct.
24	MR. TREMAINE: Okay. Would you agree
25	that 5 percent of 63,000 wells is approximately 3,150

1	wells?
2	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
3	MR. TREMAINE: That sounds about right?
4	MR. PURVIS: That's about right.
5	MR. TREMAINE: All right. And so if we
6	assume that the previous trends of about 5 percent
7	orphan plugging rate applies to currently unplugged
8	wells in New Mexico, it would be logical to conclude
9	that a little over 3000 wells will be plugged as
10	orphans in New Mexico?
11	MR. PURVIS: That's the math under
12	those assumptions.
13	MR. TREMAINE: Okay. And we previously
14	discussed average plugging costs, and I think we got
15	to a point where we agree that 150,000 is
16	representative of those average wellbore plugging
17	costs. If we agree to assume that we're not
18	incorporating other, like, surface reclamation,
19	environmental remediation, and that, we're starting
20	with that number sorry. Strike that.
21	That number being based on wellbore
22	plugging costs, if you were to factor in any other
23	additional surface reclamation, environmental
24	remediation, would you agree that \$150,000 as an
25	assumed average plugging cost is a conservative
	Page 466

1	estimate of plugging costs, factoring in all the other
2	costs associated?
3	MR. PURVIS: I would characterize it a
4	little differently. It would be a very it is much
5	less than average decommissioning cost for full scope
6	of decommission. So the the testimony from OCD was
7	most recently in their experience that a surface
8	reclamation and remediation with no difficulties runs
9	30 to 50,000 dollars, but the average was \$225,000 if
10	memory serves and that the high side run was in the
11	millions; plus, of course, their time and effort to do
12	the work.
13	MR. TREMAINE: So 150 is a reasonable
14	average for wellbore plugging costs, but it is very
15	conservative if it were to be attached to
16	decommissioning costs?
17	MR. PURVIS: Correct.
18	MR. TREMAINE: Thank you. We talked
19	about there being over 3,000 wells based on these
20	assumptions that I've laid out that are likely to be
21	plugged as orphans in New Mexico. Would you agree
22	that that number's consistent with or approximates the
23	numbers in the LFC report?
24	MR. PURVIS: As I recall the LFC
25	report. I I can double check that if you like.

1	MR. TREMAINE: That's fine. I can move
2	on. So let's just assume that number I came up with,
3	3150. If we assume as we discussed wellbore plugging
4	costs of approximately 150,000, my lawyer math comes
5	out to \$472.5 million. Does that check for you?
6	MR. PURVIS: Yes. I did that math a
7	minute ago, 472 million.
8	MR. TREMAINE: Okay. Do you have any
9	knowledge of how much money is appropriated for OCD to
10	use on an annual basis for plugging an abandonment
11	through the Reclamation Fund?
12	MR. PURVIS: I do not recall.
13	MR. TREMAINE: If you assumed that that
14	would be going forward at approximately \$16 million,
15	would you agree that based on these assumptions we've
16	outlined, plugging the orphan wells expected to be
17	plugged under state plugging program would take more
18	than 29 years?
19	MR. PURVIS: Yes. Also assuming
20	nothing else is orphaned besides what is line of sight
21	right now.
22	MR. TREMAINE: Thank you. Do you
23	recall a question earlier where Mr. Rankin was asking
24	you about the value of the lost oil production if we
25	lost that two point something percent of production?

1	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
2	MR. TREMAINE: Okay. That total worth?
3	The total oil production on that slide I believe
4	represented about 740 million barrels from that fiscal
5	year. Is that consistent with your understanding?
6	MR. PURVIS: That's my recollection.
7	Yes.
8	MR. TREMAINE: And using those same
9	assumptions of \$60 per barrel, the total value of that
10	oil production would you agree is approximately \$44
11	billion?
12	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
13	MR. TREMAINE: Okay. One moment.
14	Nothing further for Mr. Purvis. Thank you.
15	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.
16	Ms. Fox, do you have any redirect?
17	I'm sorry. Mr. Nykiel?
18	MR. NYKIEL: Yeah.
19	THE HEARING OFFICER: Very sorry.
20	MR. NYKIEL: No worries. Just briefly.
21	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
22	BY MR. NYKIEL:
23	MR. NYKIEL: Mr. Purvis, Mr. Rankin had
24	some questions for you about the financial impact of
25	the proposed rules. Had a couple questions for you to
	Page 469

1	clarify. Have any industry party experts quantified
2	the financial impact of the rules on operators?
3	MR. PURVIS: No.
4	MR. NYKIEL: And have any industry
5	party experts quantified the financial impact of the
6	rules on production?
7	MR. PURVIS: No.
8	MR. NYKIEL: And have any industry
9	party experts quantified the financial impact of the
10	rules on state revenue?
11	MR. PURVIS: No.
12	MR. NYKIEL: What information would you
13	need of individual operators' financial records to
14	determine the effect of the proposed rules on
15	operator-level economics?
16	MR. PURVIS: If one were going to try
17	to determine operator-level economics, you'd have to
18	understand the nature of the whole corporate entity.
19	Some of the information about the companies is
20	publicly available. Their historical production,
21	royalty interest, price differentials, and such can be
22	had from public data.
23	However, the other information that
24	would be necessary would be things like how much debt
25	they already have; what assets and obligations they

1	have in other states. The information that would be
2	necessary to make a by well by company analysis is the
3	kind of information suggested as possible information
4	in the transfer provision.
5	MR. NYKIEL: Okay. And in your
6	experience, are individual non-public operators
7	typically forthcoming with this sort of financial
8	information?
9	MR. PURVIS: No.
10	MR. NYKIEL: Finally, you began to
11	respond to Mr. Rankin about your projection of the
12	change to recovery based on the proposed rules. Did
13	you have anything to add or clarify in that?
14	MR. PURVIS: Thank you for asking. I
15	would like to just unpack that answer. Dr. Arscott's
16	Exhibit 9 presents a range of possible effects of the
17	increased cost of the bonding premiums on operating
18	costs, but it covers an almost irrelevant range of the
19	scenarios. So he's very clear that Exhibit 9 pertains
20	to only 61 companies. Those 61 companies that have
21	only 60 only one well each. So the table as a
22	whole pertains to 61 wells out of 63,000.
23	Second, the rows in the table range
24	from a 1 percent premium to a 10 percent premium. The
25	10 percent appears to come from the Raimi study, the

1	least reliable of the sources. The consensus on the
2	premium value concentrate around 2 to 3 percent. So
3	to be on the the high side, the conservative side
4	of a central estimate, the relevant line is that third
5	to bottom line. Now, in that situation, he applies
6	the cost of \$275 per month to base preexisting
7	operating costs of 15-, 2500 and 5,000 dollars.
8	Earlier in his testimony, he explains
9	that flowing conventional gas wells, presumably dry,
10	range from 1200 to 2,000 dollars per well per month.
11	That is going to be a very small number of wells.
12	Probably applies to the Raton Basin, although the
13	Raton may also include the dry gas, presumably dry gas
14	with a compressor, which ranges up to \$4,000.
15	Coal bed methane he says ranges from
16	3500 to 5,000, so now we're beginning to get into
17	the the range of operating costs that are common in
18	the state. But in the he makes no draws no
19	opinion about the operating cost of wet gas wells.
20	But for oil, he states only a high side of 14,800.
21	By comparison of the high side to the
22	low side, then the number should be around \$10,000,
23	which means a median estimate by Dr. Arscott's work of
24	the monthly operating costs for an oil well, vertical
25	oil well in the state of New Mexico, is on the order

1 of \$12,000 per well per month, to which, if you only 2 operate one well, you add two point -- \$275,000. 3 So the -- the 6 percent as shown in the table applies to a small -- a modest set of the wells. 4 5 But if you increase the operating cost to reflect the 71 percent of the wells in the Permian as a proxy for 6 oil wells, well, then that same \$275 becomes 2.3 8 percent. But remember this is still for a company 9 that has only one well. His other related table close by 10 11 Exhibit 9 shows the range of incremental per well 12 costs that different companies suffer. And most of 13 them are not \$110,000. Most of them are on the order of \$50,000, 39 to 53 or so thousand dollars. So if 14 15 the bond is 200 -- is incremental cost is -- for 16 \$50,000 is up 110, then the incremental cost to the 17 average oil well is 1 percent operating costs. And that -- that means that if a well 18 19 is declining at a 12 percent decline rate, it will 20 decline 1 percent more or less per month. So the 2.1 incremental cost for most operators on most wells is on the order of 1 to 2, maybe 3 percent, three months 22 of production of the lowest rate of production ever in 23 24 the history of the life of a well. 25 Now, according to this -- the -- the Page 473

1	standard theoretical model we use, setting aside
2	its its accuracy and setting aside the additional
3	motivation to keep wells on beyond the economic limit,
4	the direct effect on economic limit is trivial.
5	MR. NYKIEL: Thank you. We have no
6	further questions. He's available for questions from
7	the Commission.
8	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you,
9	Mr. Nykiel.
10	Commissioner Ampomah, do you have
11	questions of Mr. Purvis?
12	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Yes, I do.
13	I do have quite a number of questions
14	for you. Thank you for your testimony. So I'm
15	looking at your PowerPoint presentation, and I do have
16	from page 1 to page 59, so I just want to make sure
17	that we are all talking about the same document. So
18	I'll start with page number 5. That will be the
19	Exhibit 39, Historical Cost of Downhole Plugging for
20	Orphan Wells in New Mexico.
21	MR. PURVIS: Yes, sir.
22	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: So my first
23	question for you is that, you know, based on all these
24	proceedings and then the testimony from NMOGA and
25	IPANM, do you have a fair idea as to how much the

1	industry is saying it'll cost to plug a well in our
2	state?
3	MR. PURVIS: There's very little I
4	found very little information, Commissioner, in the
5	testimony about what it would cost on average. My
6	rebuttal testimony summarizes all the incremental
7	information that I have from Industry in this setting
8	about costs.
9	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Yeah. And sorry
10	about that. You know, I did not see your actual
11	you know, I was focusing on the PowerPoint and
12	little I got to know that you've really detailed
13	your responses. So some of my questions might be that
14	I've not really spent a lot of effort on that, so just
15	forgive me on that.
16	MR. PURVIS: No problem.
17	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Okay.
18	Appreciate that. Now, my question to you again still
19	on that same Exhibit 39 is, is there any correlation
20	with depth with regards to these estimates?
21	MR. PURVIS: I have not examined the
22	relationship of the cost with depth. We know from the
23	literature that there is some relationship and from
24	first principles, but it's a weak relationship.
25	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: When you say

1	it's a weak relationship so let's focus on San Juan
2	Basin, for instance. Are you familiar with the
3	formations that oil and gas is being produced from?
4	MR. PURVIS: The Pictured Cliffs, Mesa
5	Verde, Fruitland Coal; I am.
6	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: So Fruitland
7	Coal is about the depth, do you know?
8	MR. PURVIS: It varies. If memory
9	serves, it's on the order of 5- to 7,000 feet deep.
10	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Fruitland Coal?
11	MR. PURVIS: Please correct me.
12	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: No way. I
13	mean
14	MR. PURVIS: I'm sorry. The last time
15	I worked Fruitland Coal was 1992. I apologize.
16	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Okay. So let's
17	say that the Fruitland Coal is much shallower.
18	MR. PURVIS: Okay.
19	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: You know, I
20	remember when we do our well, probably 1500, 2,000
21	thereabout, and then Dakota, that one is much deeper,
22	which is about 7,000 thereabout. So is it your
23	testimony to the Commission that the cost to let's say
24	plug a well in Fruitland Coal is going to be more or
25	less average costs the same as more or less 8,000
	Page 476

1	feet, Dakota?
2	MR. PURVIS: No. There is a
3	correlation. The greater depths require more plugs in
4	general and it requires longer trip time to set the
5	plugs. There is a correlation, but the other
6	drivers there are many other drivers of the cost,
7	and so it's not a strong correlation.
8	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Okay. Then I
9	get your point, and we will dig deeper into that
LO	question when we get into the actual proposed rule.
11	So still on Exhibit 39, so is it your testimony that
12	the applicants more or less used this analysis to set
13	the 150,000 bond per one well or per marginal well?
14	MR. PURVIS: The 150,000 was set before
15	I created this exhibit, but I believe they did rely on
16	the same original source material that I relied on.
17	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: So then can you
L8	tell the Commission where the source of the 150,000,
L9	where it came from?
20	MR. PURVIS: Yeah. It's it's in
21	the my work come is cites the reports of the
22	OCD, the annual reports of EMNRD, and the
23	presentations given by OCD to the legislature as
24	and some of the lesser data has to do with OCD reports
25	to the IOGCC.

1	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: You touched on
2	the fact that the depth is a weak correlation, so what
3	other parameter really contributes to the cost of the
4	plugging?
5	MR. PURVIS: The nature of the fluids
6	that have been produced; the age of the well; the
7	construction of the well, which is strongly correlated
8	to the company that drilled the well; the nature of
9	the formations behind pipe, above the producing
10	formation, below the surface; and the nature of the
11	access can be an issue, access to the site.
12	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Okay. Let's go
13	to Slide Number 6, Exhibit 33, History of Daily
14	Production in New Mexico in Six Categories for Major
15	Divisions among Basins and Types of Wells Shown on
16	Four Vertical Scales.
17	MR. PURVIS: Yes, sir.
18	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Okay.
19	MR. CHANG: So I apologize. Just so
20	that I can follow along with your questions?
21	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Exhibit 33.
22	Yeah. Right.
23	MR. CHANG: Got it. Thank you.
24	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Okay. So you do
25	have Permian on the left and then San Juan on the
	Page 478

1	right, just to confirm that?
2	MR. PURVIS: On the right side includes
3	both San Juan and Permian.
4	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Okay.
5	MR. PURVIS: Actually all six graphs
6	all six groups are on all six graphs. But on the
7	upper right corner, the focus is on the vertical wells
8	in the San Juan Basin and the vertical wells in the
9	Permian Basin. If you'd like, I can share my screen
10	and zoom in.
11	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: No. I can see.
12	Yeah. I appreciate that clarification on that. Thank
13	you. So my first question to you is that looking at
14	let's say these production profiles, did you do any
15	analysis to see if let's say the impact on these
16	production profiles that we seen here, if these rules
17	were enacted ten years ago?
18	MR. PURVIS: No, sir, I have not.
19	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Now, would these
20	proposed rules, new rules, based on your analysis
21	increase or decrease oil production in the state?
22	MR. PURVIS: There are competing
23	dynamics, and I have not quantified those.
24	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: When you say
25	there are competing dynamics, can you expand on that?

1	MR. PURVIS: On the one hand, it does
2	create an incremental operating cost. On the other
3	hand, it also creates an incentive to keep wells
4	operating below their economic limit. So on the one
5	hand there may be more production and on the other
6	hand there may be less. The one the volume that is
7	affected is de minimis. But and so the the effects
8	one way or the other will be small.
9	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Now another
10	question for you still on this. Did you compare the
11	production contribution from major operators and also
12	from small operators?
13	MR. PURVIS: Yes, I did. To the extent
14	that I show on Exhibits 37 and if memory serves oh,
15	no; not memory 79, the relative contributions by
16	rank size. Applicants' Exhibit 79 also shows the
17	relative contributions historically by absolute size
18	of companies.
19	(Applicant Exhibit 79 was marked for
20	identification.)
21	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Yeah. So can
22	you just help me understand what was the contribution
23	from the small companies?
24	MR. PURVIS: The over the last 30
25	years, the bottom 90 percent of companies by
	Page 480

1	cumulative production have contributed 3.5 percent of
2	cumulative production in the state. That number is
3	less in 2024, when the bottom 90 percent of companies
4	contributed 2.5 percent.
5	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Okay.
6	MR. PURVIS: Companies is really not a
7	relevant measure of significance.
8	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Well, when you
9	say company is not a significant measure of relevance,
10	well, don't you believe that let's say if the
11	Commission enact this rule, the small companies are
12	really the ones going to suffer?
13	MR. PURVIS: The small companies do
14	preferentially own the kinds of wells and the kinds of
15	portfolios that are affected by the rules. They're
16	not the ones I would say who suffer. I'd say they're
17	the ones who are being held accountable. If to the
18	extent that a company has made adequate provision to
19	meet their legal liability that's longstanding well
20	known, then it would not create suffering.
21	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Okay. We will
22	dive deeper into that. Let's go to Slide Number 10,
23	Exhibit 38, Schematic of Cash Flow for Hypothetical
24	Oil and Gas Project to Demonstrate the Economic
25	Concepts of Payout and Holdback. And, you know, one

1	thing that I really want to clarify, you know, so
2	there was a back and forth about the SPE paper?
3	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
4	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Yeah. I want to
5	clarify this, that are you aware that after the
6	abstract has been reviewed and then we put in the full
7	paper, there is an actual review by the committee
8	before they allow you to come and present? Are you
9	aware of that?
10	MR. PURVIS: Yes. I have served on
11	that committee and that is true.
12	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Okay.
13	MR. PURVIS: It is it is rare for a
14	paper to be rejected. It is also rare, but I have
15	seen instances where a paper was forcibly withdrawn
16	for its quality.
17	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: And I do know
18	that, you know, they provide extensive feedback and
19	you need to respond to those feedback.
20	MR. PURVIS: That's true. I've served
21	on the committee a number of times, and I have
22	provided robust feedback.
23	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Okay. Let's get
24	back to your Slide Number 10. So is it that the
25	applicant is actually advocating for single well bond
	Page 482

1	and not necessarily the blanket bond requirement?
2	MR. PURVIS: I'm not sure I understand
3	the question. Certainly the the larger part the
4	largest part of the proposal pertains to single well
5	bonding.
6	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: So, you know,
7	the reason why I'm asking that is that, you know, for
8	active wells, you still put a 250,000 blanket.
9	MR. PURVIS: Yes, sir.
10	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: But for let's
11	say the marginal wells, you are going one after
12	let's say each well. So I'm just asking that is it
13	the applicant main objective here is to more or less
14	do away with the blanket bonding and then just focus
15	more on single well bonding, especially for the
16	marginal wells?
17	MR. PURVIS: I'm I'm not sure I want
18	to opine on what the intent of the focus and
19	motivation is in that way, but I will say that what
20	the rules as written have much larger impact, the
21	the final well provisions are much more significant
22	than the blanket provisions. Does that answer your
23	question?
24	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Yeah. There was
25	a slide that I think will be much helpful, you know,

1	for us to go through that, so I'm not going to push
2	much on that one. Yeah. But on that one, just on
3	what we are just discussing, why is the applicant not
4	advocating for the correct bond right from the onset?
5	MR. PURVIS: I I do not know. I
6	have studied this issue in other places and
7	recommended that a full cost bond from the point of
8	drilling is a natural and reasonable solution.
9	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: So if let's say
10	the applicant went for that, don't you believe that
11	small operators will not necessarily say you are
12	coming after us?
13	MR. PURVIS: Yes. That would follow.
14	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: But why is the
15	applicant not pushing for that, though? Do you know?
16	MR. PURVIS: I do not know. As I said
17	before, I was not involved in the original creation or
18	most of the terms.
19	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Okay.
20	MR. PURVIS: I will say one other thing
21	though, Commissioner. That provision would not affect
22	the 63,000 existing wells. There are hundreds of
23	wells being drilled each year. And if you if a
24	full cost bond was placed in escrow and then could
25	transfer from operator to operator full not full
	Page 484

1	cost bond, but a full cost provision and could
2	transfer to operator to operator, it would only apply
3	to the wells newly drilled each year.
4	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Exactly. So ten
5	years from now, I mean, we would have solved that
6	issue right from the onset. Right?
7	MR. PURVIS: Well, it it would have
8	solved the issue for the wells that continue to be
9	drilled, but we drill on the order of hundreds I
10	believe maybe a thousand wells a year in New Mexico,
11	but there are 63,000 for which there's not the
12	opportunity to get the same money at completion.
13	There's already this backlog.
14	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Yeah. It's
15	backlogged. So what you are proposing now more or
16	less solves the backlog. Right? What the applicant
17	is proposing now will more or less solve the backlog?
18	MR. PURVIS: It's a it is an attempt
19	to solve the backlog.
20	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Yeah. But
21	still, you know, I'm trying to make a distinction here
22	with regards to why are we pushing this on the smaller
23	operators while the big guns who can pay this don't
24	pay it right upfront.
25	MR. PURVIS: I would I would

1	personally support a full cost savings fund, a escrow
2	fund, for a well at the point of completion. And I
3	wrote a paper published earlier this year that dealt
4	with the issue of impecunious wells in Northern
5	Appalachia and proposed a solution there, which you
6	can read about later. But that is that is beyond
7	the scope of what we have to deal with today.
8	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Yeah. Let's go
9	to Slide Number 11. Now, the 180 days and 1,000 BO
10	within consecutive 12 months determined once per year,
11	I believe this is OCD's definition or is it the
12	applicants' definition?
13	MR. PURVIS: It's the definition in the
14	proposal. I don't recall its origin. I believe that
15	that did I seem to recall it came originally from
16	the OCD.
17	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Okay. Is this
18	acceptable by the industry? You know?
19	MR. PURVIS: I I do not know.
20	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: As I researched
21	on it, it sounds to me that the definition is a little
22	bit generous compared to EPA. Is that a fair
23	statement?
24	MR. PURVIS: I do believe that the
25	definition of marginal wells is quite generous. If I
	Page 486

1	could point you to Exhibit 40 here we go. I don't
2	believe I'm I'm on the share anymore. This is the
3	cross plot of the two criteria for wells as they
4	produced in 2024, and the black dots are all wells.
5	Each dot is a well, and the the ones shown in black
6	are ones that are not captured by the current
7	definition of marginal.
8	So what we see is that there are a
9	large number of wells that produce very small volumes
10	but are reportedly active for more than 180 days, and
11	they do not qualify as marginal. In my direct
12	testimony, I point out a particular well on the far
13	right on the side that produced for 365 days and
14	produced three barrels of oil reportedly and does not
15	qualify as marginal or no beneficial use.
16	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: So is it your
17	testimony that the applicant really did a lot of due
18	diligence to make sure that they minimize the impact
19	on the industry?
20	MR. PURVIS: I can't speak to their due
21	diligence. I can say that it does look to me like it
22	minimizes the impact. It's a it's quite a
23	conservative definition for financial risk.
24	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Let's go to
25	Slide Number 12, Proposed Systems of Financial

1	Assurance and Safeguards. You know, I want to
2	understand a little bit more, let's say, under the
3	active wells, Section 1 or Number 1. So the ones that
4	have already been crossed out, do you know how that
5	rule was developed? You know, what was the thoughts
6	behind the one, the existing rule that we're trying to
7	correct? Do you know?
8	MR. PURVIS: I do not know the thoughts
9	behind the existing rule. I I will note that if
LO	if you did like the existing rule, you could set a
L1	base cost of \$135,000 a well and \$2 per foot and/or
L2	140,000 or \$145,000 and \$2 per foot and get to about
L3	the same point.
L4	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: So don't you
L5	believe that, you know, the original intent of the
L6	rule also took into consideration the depth
L7	disparities in the plugging of the well?
L8	MR. PURVIS: I do not know about the
L9	intent, but the wording absolutely does take into
20	effect that first that variable, which we know does
21	have some effect on cost.
22	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: So why did the
23	applicant not actually try to because I'm a little
24	bit concerned about let's say a well in Fruitland
25	Coal 1500 feet. You don't need to put the same bond

1	compared to 10,000-feet well. I mean, and if you look
2	at a small producer, smallers take the shallower zones
3	formations.
4	So I'm a little bit concerned about
5	putting this blanket bond, which definitely is going
6	to the small producer are the ones really going to
7	suffer. So don't you I mean, why did the applicant
8	not necessarily look at the original description and
9	then try to at least work through it to more or less
LO	cover, you know, the small producers?
L1	MR. PURVIS: The the intent and
L2	reasoning, I can't speak to. The effect I can tell
L3	you is simplicity. In one of the papers in particular
L4	that I cited, the author concluded that efforts by the
L5	regulatory agency to fine tune the bonding costs were
L6	likely a waste, a loss of social benefit. And that
L7	that paper, by the way, did not consider whatever the
L8	statute may be in New Mexico. But I'm saying that the
L9	advantage of it as it's written is simplicity.
20	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: So is there any
21	state with merge oil production? I mean, New Mexico,
22	we are probably number two, Texas number one, North
23	Dakota. So is there any other state with merge oil
24	production that do have this 150,000 more or less
25	financial assurance that you know?

1	MR. PURVIS: The state of Colorado
2	adopted a really complex set of rules, the baseline of
3	which and that that was adopted in one 2001 or
4	'2, and the baseline cost assurance was \$130,000 per
5	well.
6	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: You know, do you
7	know if the applicant more or less did a survey of
8	virtual producers, you know, and also helping to come
9	up with the 150,000? I do know you've talked about
10	Vertex. Was that the one or do you know if other
11	survey was done?
12	MR. PURVIS: I I do not know what
13	other experts did or did not do, Commissioner, but I
14	can tell you that I looked in every way I could. The
15	Vertex report was one that I found. I also tried to
16	extract from annual reports of oil companies operating
17	New Mexico and implied cost. I scoured the reports of
18	operators in the direct testimony.
19	But more importantly, I I don't
20	believe the cost to the operators is the relevant
21	measure because the financial assurance is meant to
22	protect the state. So what the relevant measure is,
23	the harm to the state or the potential harm to the
24	state.
25	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Yeah. Potential
	Page 490

1	harm; potential harm to the state. But, you know,
2	these was already been drilled. You know, there is a
3	producers ongoing. So what you are coming in right in
4	the middle is more or less going to put that as in out
5	of business. And I don't know if let's say to the
6	state, but have you also looked at these companies
7	that are going to be affected, their contribution to
8	the community, and then also to the state at large?
9	MR. PURVIS: As I said before, what I
10	have examined is the production and the wells that
11	they operate because those are direct indicators of
12	the financial financial economic contributions.
13	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: So with regards
14	to the 150,000, I think we can all agree that based on
15	OCD's experience plugging orphan wells, so and then
16	even the chart that you showed earlier on, we can
17	agree on that. What about the number two, the blanket
18	bond of the 250,000? How was that number how did
19	the applicant come up with that number?
20	MR. PURVIS: As I understand, that
21	number is constrained by statute.
22	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: So that number
23	is taken from the D, which has been crossed out. Is
24	that one like 250,000 for more than a hundred wells?
25	MR. PURVIS: The the same number

1	does appear in the previous version under D. I'm not
2	sure I understand the question.
3	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: So I'm just
4	asking, you said that one is based on statute?
5	MR. PURVIS: Yes. As I understand it.
6	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: So you cannot go
7	above that?
8	MR. PURVIS: For blanket bonding.
9	That's what
10	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: For blanket
11	bonding, you cannot go above that. And I'm just
12	trying to look at it and say is does it have any
13	relationship with D?
14	MR. PURVIS: I imagine I'm
15	speculating that D was set for the same reason, but
16	this the the origin, the statute is beyond my
17	my real expertise.
18	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Okay. On Slide
19	Number 13, Proposed System of Financial Assurance and
20	Safeguards, so I'm looking at Number 3 "An operator
21	with 15 percent or more of their wells in marginal or
22	inactive well status or a combination thereof shall
23	provide a well plugging financial assurance in the
24	amount of 150,000 for each well registered to the
25	operator until the percentage of the operator marginal

1	and inactive wells is decreased below 15 percent."
2	So there was a back and forth with you
3	and Mr. Tremaine, so he suggested 25 percent. Do you
4	agree to that? Was that something that you agreed to?
5	MR. PURVIS: What I what I said
6	before or tried to say was that I think a number
7	between 15 and 25 percent is a reasonable number.
8	The the higher it goes, the the bigger stretch,
9	the less reasonable it is. But the the I
LO	certainly would not go below 15 percent. And what I
L1	can say empirically is that most companies, and what I
L2	know from experience anecdotally, is that 10 percent
L3	or less wells that are truly idle is is pretty
L4	strict.
L5	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Okay. So let's
L6	go to Slide Number 14, the beneficial purposes. And
L7	so we've talked a little bit more about the
L8	speculative purposes, and I saw that you're trying to
L9	link the speculative purposes to the PRMS that is more
20	or less acceptable to the Petroleum Engineering
21	Society. I still could not get the linkage between
22	that.
23	MR. PURVIS: So the Petroleum Resource
24	Management System is designed for application to oil
25	and gas volumes that will be produced in the future.
- 1	

And what we're talking about here is a broader scope
of use is beyond just production. But the set of
thoughts that they created about the criteria and the
taxonomy for a project in general is transferrable.
So you could take the definitions, either the the
issues that they conceived of or the definitions
directly, and apply those to geothermal or gravity
energy storage.

2.1

2.4

For example, the -- the -- in the construction of the PRMS, they decided that a project needs to be justified, both -- both technically and financially. There must be an intent and there must be the ability to execute. When you have those, then you have a project. And as a project is being developed, you may have one or not the other. And -- and one issue may be -- be met and then -- then lost.

But if you use that construct to think about speculative use, you could define a criteria. It is, in my opinion, definitely speculative if it has no technical justification, no economic justification, no attempt, and no feasibility. So there's -- there's a gray area. If you have all of them, you clearly have beneficial use. If you have none of them, I think it's clearly speculative. My proposal was that the -- you could consider those criteria in defining

1	a a more clearly a line.
2	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Okay. Then why
3	did the applicant not use that to more or less define
4	the speculative purposes, you know, for the benefit of
5	the Commission?
6	MR. PURVIS: I first brought that idea
7	after we received after we submitted direct
8	testimony. I I didn't have a problem when I read
9	the original proposal with the idea of speculative
10	because I I was satisfied that the term is clear
11	enough. But then with further discussion, we I was
12	able to offer the idea.
13	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Okay. On Slide
14	Number 15, so there was a discussion about this with
15	Mr. Alexander, and I want to get your thoughts on
16	that. So under D, Number 1 "Documentation
17	demonstrating that the well is reasonably projected to
18	produce in paying quantities." So I mean, how do we
L9	quantify this, especially if we are dealing with,
20	like, let's say an injection well?
21	MR. PURVIS: So the the economics of
22	an injection well, of a commercial injection well, are
23	a little different, but there's still a matter of what
24	they get paid and what the expenses they incur. If
25	you're talking about an injection well that's owned by

1	the operator who's using it to dispose of its own
2	waste, there is a a straightforward way to handle
3	this. It's a group economics.
4	We often do analysis of economic limit
5	on an individual well by well basis, and that
6	simplification works in a large majority of cases, but
7	it's not complex. The most common software for this
8	kind of analysis in the industry does perform group
9	economics.
10	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: And then there
11	was a definition somewhere too in the rule that
12	specifically targets DSWD, where they cannot give the
13	annual injecting like a hundred barrels or
14	something like that. Do you recall that?
15	MR. PURVIS: Vaguely.
16	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Okay. So would
17	that more or less cover DSWD's side and this one, this
18	provision specifically is for production well. Is
19	that your understanding too?
20	MR. PURVIS: I don't know how the two
21	interact. I could look at it some more and give you
22	an answer, but I I haven't considered how those two
23	interact.
24	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: So yesterday I
25	had a back-and-forth discussion with Mr. Alexander

1	about the exceptions that needs to be made, you know,
2	going through these let's say continuous production
3	cycle in a typical field. He agreed to some
4	exceptions. I don't know if you recall that
5	discussion.
6	MR. PURVIS: I think I recall talking
7	about extending temporary abandonment beyond eight
8	years, beyond the the five-year extension and then
9	the two-year extension.
10	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: So then let's go
11	to Slide Number 16 and let's discuss that in more
12	detail. So that'll be 19.15.8.9.E?
13	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
14	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Inactive wells
15	and wells in approved and expired temporary abandoned
16	status. So which of these categories will the
17	exception if you agree to the exception, which of
18	these categories of wells will these exception fall
19	under?
20	MR. PURVIS: So it it's not my
21	proposal and not my job to make a compromise. I will
22	say that, oh, I understood the exception to apply to
23	wells in temporary abandonment status, not wells that
24	are inactive in contravention of the law.
25	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: So when I look
	Page 497

1	at let's say this provision E, and then I try to put
2	in the exception, it doesn't seem to line up. So the
3	reason why I'm saying that is that is a well that we
4	agree that needs to be exempted from let's say this
5	provision, would that well still need to put up, like,
6	150 or 150,000 per well bond?
7	MR. PURVIS: Are you asking my opinion
8	on what it should be?
9	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Yeah. I'm
10	asking your opinion.
11	MR. PURVIS: Yes. If you're going to
12	leave a well unplugged for more than eight years,
13	that's extraordinary, and it certainly should have
14	financial assurance. Because the the longer it
15	sits there, the lower probability it will be used and
16	the higher probability of a cost overruns for its
17	plugging. If you want to keep the the option open,
18	than it only makes sense to me that there's some
19	security associated with keeping that option.
20	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Yeah. So that
21	exception that we discussed, when you say that you're
22	keeping a well let's say a TA well for more than
23	eight years, it's extraordinary. Let's think about it
24	from production. You know, let's say an operator
25	would draw like 60 wells to go for production. A

1	subset of that will go for secondary. Are you
2	following me? Or more or less some of the producers
3	will be converted to injections.
4	MR. PURVIS: Historically in a
5	conventional field, some fields have been water
6	flooded and water preventing water flood does
7	convert some well to injection.
8	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Exactly. And
9	then not all of them normally, you know, even they do
10	it pattern based where they look at the performance
11	and then they move to another line and they move to
12	another line.
13	MR. PURVIS: Sometimes that's true.
14	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Exactly. So
15	more or less planned.
16	MR. PURVIS: Sure.
17	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: And even you add
18	CO2 to it. So I would say that eight years is
19	probably not extraordinary as you are describing it
20	because you will see that some of these wells will
21	have more usage into the future depending on the
22	pattern sizes that the operators like to operate.
23	MR. PURVIS: I think I understand your
24	concept. What I observe is a a couple of things
25	there on that matter. First, it's better to implement

a water flood earlier in life rather than later. And you wouldn't want -- you're talking about a -- an eight year time frame that begins after the well has been dead eight years; talking about extending it after well has been dead eight years, which puts it deep into the life.

Second, at a -- at a larger scale, I'd observed that there has been very little exploration

2.1

2.4

observed that there has been very little exploration and very little new fields in -- very few water floods, very few CO2 floods in the -- in recent decades. Now, reserve -- shale reservoirs are a slightly different matter. But the last time I saw a CO2 flood possibility was 20 years ago, when OXY hired my firm to investigate a possible water flood in the Delaware basin.

Now, the -- what I do see as potential use in the future are genuine repurposing, not reusing from different kinds of production, but genuine repurposing. For example, the gravity energy storage is at a point in life where it -- we understand the technology, but it's not proven to be commercial yet. It could be eight years before low temperature generation or gravity energy storage is clearly understood and its -- and its viability clearly decided.

1	But that's where the ideas of the PRMS
2	come in. If the if the project is in process as
3	your example, you're in the process of piloting and
4	testing and moving through, then that's clearly a
5	project that's in process and it it's at the high
6	end of the contingent resources and much closer. But
7	if it's something like gravity energy storage, where
8	they have not yet proved of an an economically
9	viable commercial model, that's on the low end.
10	So I I have more concern about the
11	possible use of the wells for novel purposes that
12	remain unapproved than for CO2 and water flood.
13	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Yeah. So
14	definitely the wealth that could benefit the state,
15	you know, from more oil, primary you know, let's
16	say the secondary and the tertiary, I don't know how
17	you're going to describe that in terms of, let's say
18	your the provision under E. Is it inactive wells
19	or is it wells in approved TA or expired?
20	MR. PURVIS: So I'll I'll tell you
21	what I understand, subject to the folks who understand
22	the law better. My understanding based on what I did
23	review is that a well that's inactive is in violation
24	of the current existing statutes; is not allowed to
25	exist in that status more than 15 months or or not

1	allowed to stand without doing anything for 15 months.
2	So if there shouldn't be anything in
3	that category. Everything that's being preserved
4	should be preserved under existing statute as a
5	temporary abandonment.
6	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: So then what
7	we're discussing will probably be part of the wells in
8	approved TA status?
9	MR. PURVIS: What I was discussing
10	about extensions?
11	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Yeah. I'm
12	talking about let's say the wells. That production
13	wells probably they are not producing a lot, you know,
14	beyond the primary. So they are produced let's say
15	the cut, the water cut, is about 99. So operator will
16	shut that one in more or less TA, they're temporary,
17	until they move to water flood, you know. So that one
18	will fall under the was an approved abandonment
19	status.
20	MR. PURVIS: Yes. And especially in a
21	water flood where there's increased mechanical risk,
22	it would be appropriate to put it in TA status, and it
23	would be appropriate to provide financial security, in
24	my opinion.
25	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Exactly. So
	Page 502

1	that financial security, if you look at this provision
2	that we have here, it sounds like they will also be
3	subjected to the 150,000 per well. Why not the
4	blanket 250,000?
5	MR. PURVIS: I'm sorry. I I can't
6	answer that. I do not I do not know the
7	interaction between the the TA status and the
8	the blanket bonds for active status.
9	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Yeah. Because,
10	like, let's say you have wells in approved TA status,
11	meaning they had they do have they've been able
12	to prove to OCD that they do have beneficiary use.
13	MR. PURVIS: I see. Are you asking a
14	hypothetical?
15	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Yeah.
16	MR. PURVIS: Okay.
17	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Well, not
18	necessarily because Mr. Alexander agreed with the
19	Commission that at least there has to be some
20	exceptions. Right? And if there has to be some
21	exceptions, and we do not have any full description we
22	do have for active wells where you have the blanket to
23	be 250,000 bond.
24	But I feel like this one has to go more
25	or less for the folks that are not really in

1	compliance, you know, in terms of the e-provision
2	because you do have wells in approved status. Why
3	should there be a bond then for these wells 150 each
4	one?
5	MR. PURVIS: So some well, I'll tell
6	you what what I think you're asking. I think what
7	you're saying is if the well is secured in a temporary
8	abandonment status, why does it require an incremental
9	single well bond rather than why would it; what's
10	conceptually.
11	Okay. A well that is in TA status has
12	expended a significant portion of the funds that would
13	need to be required for permanent plugging. They've
14	pulled pulled the string out of the well, set a
15	temporary plug as I understand the the rules, and
16	removed from the site all of the equipment. So
17	there it is a significant expense.
18	On the other hand, its future use is of
19	varying certainty. It's not a PDP. It's not
20	approved, developed, producing well with cashflow.
21	It's a well about which we have belief that we will
22	eventually make money. And given the lack of
23	confidence, I do believe it appropriate to have
24	initial financial security specifically for that well,
25	separate from the de minimis \$250,000 blanket bond.

1	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Yeah. I mean
2	that one, don't you believe that we are going to force
3	operators to really plug these wells prematurely?
4	Because think about how much oil we've been able to
5	recover from a handful of oil recovery projects, you
6	know.
7	So let's say assuming all these wells
8	because of the 150,000 bond, they decide to plug it.
9	I mean, think about how much oil that we are going to
10	lose, you know, especially from the Permian. I mean,
11	how much oil are we going to really lose if these
12	companies has to rush and then plug the well because
13	it becomes cheaper to plug the well than to probably
14	go after that oil in the future?
15	MR. PURVIS: I I don't believe
16	that's the case, Commissioner, when the new provisions
17	provide new break points where additional financial
18	assurance is required. And to be clear, the rules
19	require a a third-party guarantee. The rules do
20	not require \$150,000 collateral. The \$150,000
21	collateral is a judgment made by an independent third
22	party about the financial risk of the operator.
23	What the rule does require is a premium
24	on a bond. That does increase the cost of maintaining
25	the well, but the alternative is always still

1	plugging. In in almost all cases, the full the
2	full scope of decommissioning will be less than the
3	cost of bonding, even with collateral. Bear in mind
4	that the for example, if my well is losing money
5	and I'm paying \$4,000 a year for a bond to keep it
6	active, the alternative is hundreds of thousands of
7	dollars for plugging for full scope of
8	decommissioning. The 4,000 is an easy choice.
9	If I expand that analysis and consider
10	a \$4,000 annuity in perpetuity, at a 10 percent
11	discount rate, the present value is \$40,000. It is by
12	far more economical for a company to keep a single
13	well bonded at \$4,000 a year than it is to pay for the
14	decommissioning.
15	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: You know, you
16	brought up a good important point, where let's say
17	this 150,000 is not actually cash that is in the bank.
18	You know, that operator has to say: "No. This is my
19	capital." But is that not increasing the cost to get
20	the surety bond? And even some of these wells or
21	companies will get to a point where these companies
22	are saying; "No. I cannot assure you because it's so
23	high. The risk is so high."
24	MD DIDITO: Co the the year that the
	MR. PURVIS: So the the way that the
25	bonding there are other experts on the bonding

1	market. In my experience in the bonding market,
2	they're going to they and what I've read from
3	the testimony is that all right if I speak to
4	that is that the they charge a premium and then
5	when the risk is high a collateral.
6	So if they're if the bonding company
7	is providing a a guarantee of \$150,000, they can
8	ask for and require up to \$150,000, in which case they
9	suffer no risk. They collect the premiums, but they
10	have in the bank earning someone's earning
11	interest. They have in the bank all the money
12	necessary to fulfill the obligation.
13	So the the question of the
14	difficulty on an operator is primarily the question of
15	how much collateral the third party will require of
16	them. To the extent that this party looks at their
17	finances and their assets and the whole company and
18	decides that they're at bad risk, they will require
19	more capital.
20	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: So on the 2,
21	blanket plugging financial assurance equal to an
22	average of 150,000 per well, is this really a blanket
23	financial assurance? Is it really a blanket financial
24	assurance?
25	MR. PURVIS: I'm sorry. I don't

1	understand the question.
2	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: So the Number 2,
3	a blanket plugging I'm still on Slide Number 16. A
4	blanket plugging financial assurance equal to an
5	average of 150,000 per well covering all of the wells
6	of the operator. So I'm asking, is that really a
7	blanket?
8	MR. PURVIS: Ah. I would not use the
9	word blanket to describe that, but I would defer to
10	someone else if they told me that was an appropriate
11	label to put on that kind of bond.
12	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Yeah. So
13	definitely you will not use blanket, but it is blanket
14	right here and when I look at it, it doesn't seem like
15	a blanket to me. And it sounds like you agree to
16	me you agree with me.
17	MR. PURVIS: I would not characterize
18	it as a blanket, but I would defer to someone else who
19	has deeper involvement in those policies.
20	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: So is there
21	someone who can speak to what should be the right
22	language there?
23	MR. PURVIS: I I believe there are
24	people who can speak to the proper term for that kind
25	of bond.

1	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Don't you
2	believe that this one is quite overstretched compared
3	to the existing rule where they have A, B, C, and D,
4	you know, specifying the number of wells here and
5	there? Don't you believe that the 150,000 per well is
6	really a stretch?
7	MR. PURVIS: No. I believe I've said a
8	number of times, I believe that the proposal as it
9	stands is quite conservative. Perhaps this is the
LO	disconnect. The it is a a significant increase
L1	from what it was before, but it remains a significant
L2	deficit to what is needed. My focus is on the the
L3	comparison to what is needed.
L4	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: So I think the
L5	whole objective here is to make sure that we are
L6	successfully plugging these wells that are not more or
L7	less classified as marginal and then become orphaned.
L8	That is the main objective.
L9	MR. PURVIS: The main objective is to
20	truly plug all wells by industry as opposed to by
21	taxpayers.
22	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Okay. So then,
23	you know, Mr. Tremaine, when he was going back and
24	forth with you discussing about how much money they
25	can get from the Reclamation Fund to to plug these

1	wells, don't you believe that probably that should
2	have been more or less the avenue, you know, to more
3	or less make some recommendations to more or less
4	improve that amount that OCD gets on a yearly basis?
5	MR. PURVIS: As I said before, the best
6	concept I have for a financial assurance regime is
7	outlined in the paper I wrote earlier this year. What
8	I like or would like to see or would recommend is not
9	part of the proposal. I do I do think we all agree
10	that Industry should be paying for the cost and not
11	the taxpayer.
12	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Yeah. The
13	Reclamation Fund, isn't all the industry paying for
14	that?
15	MR. PURVIS: The Reclamation Fund has
16	its it does come on from tax on the industry and
16 17	its it does come on from tax on the industry and it does go to pay the industry. The the issue that
17	it does go to pay the industry. The the issue that
17 18	it does go to pay the industry. The the issue that I'm concerned about is the shortfall of the
17 18 19	it does go to pay the industry. The the issue that I'm concerned about is the shortfall of the Reclamation Fund to deal with the line-of-sight
17 18 19 20	it does go to pay the industry. The the issue that I'm concerned about is the shortfall of the Reclamation Fund to deal with the line-of-sight orphans and particularly the tens of thousands of
17 18 19 20 21	it does go to pay the industry. The the issue that I'm concerned about is the shortfall of the Reclamation Fund to deal with the line-of-sight orphans and particularly the tens of thousands of wells that are already near the end of their economic
17 18 19 20 21	it does go to pay the industry. The the issue that I'm concerned about is the shortfall of the Reclamation Fund to deal with the line-of-sight orphans and particularly the tens of thousands of wells that are already near the end of their economic life.
17 18 19 20 21 22	it does go to pay the industry. The the issue that I'm concerned about is the shortfall of the Reclamation Fund to deal with the line-of-sight orphans and particularly the tens of thousands of wells that are already near the end of their economic life. COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Yeah. Let me

1	know, amendments or let's say changes to the financial
2	assurance on a yearly basis. Right? Don't you
3	believe that Industry needs certainty, you know, in
4	the process, you know, for them to be able because
5	we also have to be competitive as a state. Right?
6	MR. PURVIS: No. I don't agree with
7	that.
8	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: You don't agree
9	with that?
10	MR. PURVIS: As I described in my
11	rebuttal, the literature on tax competition for
12	mineral resources, the kinds of things that can't
13	leave the state, is pretty uniform that tax
14	competition is not effective.
15	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Tax competition
16	is not
17	MR. PURVIS: The concept of tax
18	competition is one jurisdiction will lower their taxes
19	so that they can compete for and preferentially get
20	the business of companies rather than a an
21	alternative jurisdiction next door.
22	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: So you're saying
23	that if Texas makes it much easier for operators to
24	operate in their state, you'll see that I mean,
25	it's not going to be in direct competition with New
	Page 511

1	Mexico if we are setting really strict laws?
2	MR. PURVIS: No. The literature shows
3	that there is little loss of activity in the state
4	with the higher costs.
5	COMMISSIONER AMPOMAH: Interesting.
6	Thank you for your time. I appreciate you. Thank
7	you.
8	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you,
9	Commissioner Ampomah.
10	Commissioner Bloom?
11	COMMISSIONER BLOOM: Thank you, Madam
12	Hearing Officer.
13	Welcome, State Representative Mark
14	Murphy. Nice to see you here.
15	And maybe with I know Mr. Murphy had
16	some comments that were provided as he's a witness for
17	IPANM, so maybe I'll start there.
18	Mr. Purvis, you haven't talked about
19	this today, but I did ask this question yesterday.
20	One of IPANM's witnesses concerns or complaints was
21	that once a well leaves marginal status and it has
22	that bond because it's now been it was deemed
23	marginal and it has a single bond, once it leaves
24	marginal status, under the current rule it's proposed
25	that single bond would need to be retained because it

1	can't be canceled apparently. Is there any do you
2	see any reason for that?
3	MR. PURVIS: I I don't see a reason
4	for it. I also don't think that's what the rule says
5	as I have understood the proposal. Thank you. I also
6	don't
7	COMMISSIONER BLOOM: You might want to
8	start your answer over there.
9	MR. PURVIS: Thank you. It I see
10	the reasoning for not maintaining a a financial
11	assurance on a well that's no longer no longer
12	qualifies under criteria, but more importantly, as I
13	understand the rules and how they're applied, the bond
14	is only required on the wells that are currently
15	marginal. A well that is no longer marginal, that has
16	successfully improved its production, no longer has to
17	post a single well bond.
18	COMMISSIONER BLOOM: Okay. Yeah. And
19	I guess the concern was that bonds cannot be canceled
20	once they're issued. I guess the bonds that are taken
21	out in New Mexico, according to that witness, said
22	that they could not be canceled after being issued and
23	therefore would always be in place even once the well
24	left marginal status.
25	MR. PURVIS: Yeah. In my experience

1	operating a grand total of three wells, a bond is a
2	contract for one year at a time.
3	COMMISSIONER BLOOM: Okay. Thank you.
4	I also noted that two or three of IPANM's witnesses,
5	many of whom own companies and are operators, said
6	that they show they find substantially lower dollar
7	figures for plugging and abandoning their own wells
8	versus OCD's average cost. Might it be the case that
9	orphan wells are more expensive to clean up because
10	they were last run by companies that could not or did
11	not want to care for them?
12	MR. PURVIS: That certainly could be
13	the case. It could also be the case that they're
14	talking about data from three or four years ago that's
15	not relevant.
16	COMMISSIONER BLOOM: And put it another
17	way, would it be fair to say that perhaps better
18	companies that don't let their wells deteriorate,
19	companies that clean up their spills, that always
20	intended to P&A their wells have ultimately lower P&A
21	costs?
22	MR. PURVIS: I think that's a fair
23	theoretical idea. I I don't know any way to test
24	it quantitatively, but a but a certainly a fair
25	idea.

1	COMMISSIONER BLOOM: Yeah. So we might
2	be dealing with two different sets of companies with
3	different outcomes?
4	MR. PURVIS: Yes.
5	COMMISSIONER BLOOM: Okay. I'd like to
6	refer to the applicants' prehearing statement, page
7	739, if you could pull that up. I have it up here. I
8	can find it. This hasn't come up, I don't believe, in
9	our discussions today, but, Mr. Purvis, I believe you
10	cite two studies, Boomhower, 2019; and Lange and
11	Redlinger, also in 2019?
12	MR. PURVIS: I think the Lange and
13	Redlinger is a different year, but I do cite both
14	those papers.
15	COMMISSIONER BLOOM: Okay. Yeah. And
16	what these find, I'll quote. I'm looking at page 739
17	of the prehearing statement. Must have different
18	pagination.
19	THE HEARING OFFICER: Page 52 of your
20	direct.
21	MR. CHANG: You have 45 over there on
22	your page.
23	COMMISSIONER BLOOM: I'm looking at a
24	PDF. It's 955 pages.
25	MR. PURVIS: May I revise one statement
	Page 515

1	I just made? You said that different costs for
2	different companies. I might characterize it
3	differently as different costs based on different
4	paths to the point of being plugged.
5	COMMISSIONER BLOOM: Thank you.
6	MR. NYKIEL: Commissioner, just to
7	clarify, the number of the PDF page doesn't align with
8	the Bates Stamp number, so just to distinguish where
9	you're locating.
10	COMMISSIONER BLOOM: 732 of the PDF or
11	of the document and the yeah.
12	MR. CHANG: So for the record, the
13	Bates number is 0732. Is that correct? Right? And
14	it says page you're looking at the page that says
15	45. It's got two bullet points?
16	COMMISSIONER BLOOM: Yes. Yes.
17	MR. CHANG: So the Bates Number is
18	0732.
19	COMMISSIONER BLOOM: Yeah.
20	So you quote from your paper,
21	Mr. Purvis, and said that Boomhower 2019 examined the
22	effects of increased bonding in Texas in 2012,
23	especially in 2002, and Lange and Redlinger 2019
24	examined the effects in 2012, increased bonding and
25	other costs in North Dakota. Both studies support the

1	conclusion that these policies have little effect on
2	overall production.
3	And why I'm interested in this is it
4	gets to some of the waste questions that we're
5	concerned with at the OCC. Please. Any comments?
6	MR. PURVIS: I would point out that
7	the both these papers found a change in in
8	production that were a fraction of a percent. I would
9	observe that if the Commission were concerned about a
10	fraction of a percent, then it should revisit its
11	rules on venting and flaring waste gas and it should
12	revisit its rules on spacing of horizontal wells.
13	COMMISSIONER BLOOM: We just redid our
14	rules on methane.
15	MR. PURVIS: Just a suggestion.
16	COMMISSIONER BLOOM: Thank you. That
17	was another few months of our lives, but thank you,
18	Mr. Purvis.
19	MR. PURVIS: Glad to help.
20	COMMISSIONER BLOOM: Not before
21	Christmas anyhow. Yes. I think you went on to say
22	that Boomhower observed that a small number of firms
23	shut down after an increase in bonding requirements
24	took effect, but most of their production was
25	transferred to larger operators.

1	Let's see what else. I think the last
2	bullet on the page, the primary effect of the policy
3	was to reallocate wells from small to larger
4	producers. The bond requirement moved from about 4
5	percent of wells operated by the smallest 80 percent
6	of firms to new operators. Another 1 percent of the
7	wells operated by these firms were shut down,
8	primarily representing low producing wells where
9	social cost is most likely to exceed social benefit.
10	Goes on to say environmental outcomes improve sharply,
11	so you just stated.
12	And then we come down on page 733 to
13	your synopsis of the Lange and Redlinger 2019 study.
14	You write "Lange and Redlinger 2019 looked back at the
15	two years of activity after the change compared to the
16	prior two years in order to normalize for other
17	factors.
18	"The authors compared activity around
19	the state's border with Montana, which did not have a
20	corresponding change, thus rigorously controlled for
21	other variables. The authors conclude 'Results find
22	no statistical change in the pace of drilling wells
23	after the North Dakota regulations came into effect.'"
24	And then "'The reduction in production
25	for small operators in North Dakota after the

1	regulation went into effect relative to production in
2	Montana is about 0.5 percent. The reduction in
3	production from small operators seems to be coming
4	from operator exit.'" You go on to say "The authors
5	found that 8 percent of operators exited, but still
6	the effect on drilling and production was trivial at
7	best." Think I'll leave that there. Any other
8	comments?
9	MR. PURVIS: I believe that you read
LO	all that correctly. I would only add one other thing.
L1	The article, the the journal paper, reproduces a
L2	quote from industry. The president of the North
L3	Dakota Petroleum Council stated about the rules that
L4	had those de minis effects, "They're the most onerous
L5	regulatory changes we've ever seen, now overly
L6	burdensome and among the most stringent and costly in
L7	the nation." And so I'd just point out the disconnect
L8	between the expectation, the representation of
L9	industry, and the quantitative effect by academics.
20	COMMISSIONER BLOOM: And these were
21	and just to kind of recap, we were talking about
22	changes to financial assurances in Texas and North
23	Dakota where oil and gas is still doing well?
24	MR. PURVIS: Yes, sir.
25	COMMISSIONER BLOOM: Okay. All right.
	Page 519

1	Yeah. Thank you. I just wanted to explore that
2	concept of waste and that this potentially would not
3	lead to waste given what we've seen in these studies
4	and their looks at Texas and North Dakota.
5	Finally, we've talked a good bit about
6	this, but the Vertex study that has been mentioned fed
7	into a study by the Center for Applied Research, and
8	that study was called "An Analysis of the Adequacy of
9	Financial Assurance Requirements for Oil and Gas
10	Infrastructure Located on State Trust and Private
11	Lands in New Mexico."
12	MR. PURVIS: Yes. I'm familiar with
13	that.
14	COMMISSIONER BLOOM: Okay. And that's
15	something I'm familiar with, you know, being the
16	representative from the Land Office, and what we found
17	there was in that study cites \$164 million in bonds
18	being held at the Land Office, 5.173 billion in
19	ultimate cleanup cost, P&A costs, with a gap to the
20	Land Office of just over \$5 billion, and those were
21	2020 dollars, so it could be 6 or 7 billion dollars
22	today. Just anything else you'd like to say about the
23	Vertex study?
24	MR. PURVIS: I have I'm familiar
25	with with the study by the Center for Applied
	Page 520

1	Research, and I thought it was a relevant, useful
2	study.
3	COMMISSIONER BLOOM: Yeah. Thank you.
4	And, you know, it's important to us too because as
5	fiduciaries for our state trust lands, at the end of
6	the day, we over the decades or, you know, maybe a
7	century, we've been able to put aside 30-some billion
8	dollars into land in our permanent fund, and we'd hate
9	to see that, you know, be tapped someday or have state
10	funds, taxpayer funds, go to pay for, you know,
11	something like \$7 billion in cleanup costs on state
12	trust lands when you know, if and when the oil and
13	gas industry wraps up in the state.
14	MR. PURVIS: On a on a personal
15	note, I I agree with you. I I would hate to see
16	those gains lost.
17	COMMISSIONER BLOOM: Thank you,
18	Mr. Purvis.
19	No further questions.
20	MR. PURVIS: Thank you.
21	THE HEARING OFFICER: Chair Chang?
22	MR. CHANG: I don't think I need to
23	that's okay. I was going to say I'm not going to
24	belabor this witness anymore. I wonder if we're close
25	to a break? Should we do that?

1	THE HEARING OFFICER: We are. It was
2	just to you and then but do you have questions when
3	we come back?
4	MR. CHANG: No. No, I don't.
5	THE HEARING OFFICER: All right.
6	Terrific. So I think we can excuse Mr. Purvis. Yes?
7	All right.
8	Thank you very much, Mr. Purvis.
9	Let's take ten minutes. Let's see or
10	yeah. Come back at 2:35.
11	(Off the record.)
12	THE HEARING OFFICER: All right. We
13	are back after a short break.
14	Let's see. Ms. O'Grady?
15	MS. M. O'GRADY: Good morning. Good
16	afternoon. My name is Morgan O'Grady for the
17	applicants, and we call our next witness, Peter
18	Morgan.
19	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.
20	MS. M. O'GRADY: And I'd like to share
21	my screen, please.
22	THE HEARING OFFICER: All right. Would
23	you please spell your first and last name?
24	MR. MORGAN: Sure. It's P-E-T-E-R
25	M-O-R-G-A-N.
	Page 522
	rage J22

1	WHEREUPON,
2	PETER MORGAN,
3	called as a witness and having been first duly sworn
4	to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but
5	the truth, was examined and testified as follows:
6	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you very
7	much.
8	Go ahead, Ms. Grady.
9	MS. M. O'GRADY: Give me just a moment
10	to get them set up.
11	THE HEARING OFFICER: Commissioners, in
12	your exhibit books, Mr. Morgan's testimony on direct
13	is Exhibit 15.
14	DIRECT EXAMINATION
15	BY MS. M. O'GRADY:
16	MS. M. O'GRADY: Mr. Morgan, please
17	state your name.
18	MR. MORGAN: Peter Morgan.
19	MS. M. O'GRADY: Where are you employed
20	and what is your position?
21	MR. MORGAN: I am legal and policy
22	director for the Center for Asset Retirement
23	Accountability or CARA whose mission is to address the
24	national problem of unplugged oil and gas wells,
25	including through regulatory solutions. My work

1	involves understanding existing regulatory
2	requirements at the federal and state level,
3	identifying gaps and flaws with those requirements
4	that lead to the creation of additional orphaned
5	wells, and proposing solutions to address those gaps
6	and flaws.
7	MS. M. O'GRADY: What is your
8	educational background?
9	MR. MORGAN: I have a bachelor of arts
10	from Middlebury College, I have a J.D. from Stanford
11	Law School, and a master of science from Stanford's
12	interdisciplinary program in environment and
13	resources.
14	MS. M. O'GRADY: Can you briefly
15	describe your work background?
16	MR. MORGAN: Prior to my current
17	position with CARA, I worked for 16 years as an
18	attorney for the Sierra Club, focusing on issues
19	around the operation and cleanup of fossil fuel
20	extraction facilities nationwide with a concentration
21	on oil and gas operations and coal mines.
22	Through this work, I have expertise in
23	understanding the strengths and weaknesses in state
24	and federal regulatory requirements for financial
25	assurance from oil and gas operators; oil and gas

1	operators' failure to comply with regulatory
2	requirements and best practices; and the fiscal,
3	environmental, and public health problems resulting
4	from orphaned and abandoned wells across the nation
5	including in New Mexico.
6	I testified before Congress at a 2023
7	hearing of the House Subcommittee on Energy and
8	Mineral Resources on the need for improved regulations
9	to strengthen financial assurances, restrict transfer
10	of obligations, and address other issues related to
11	cleaning up fossil fuel extraction sites.
12	MS. M. O'GRADY: Is Applicants' Exhibit
13	14 an accurate copy of your resume?
14	MR. MORGAN: Yes.
15	MS. M. O'GRADY: Mr. Morgan, you
16	supplied direct and rebuttal testimony on behalf of
17	the applicants in this matter, Applicants' Exhibits 15
18	and 81 respectively?
19	MR. MORGAN: Yes.
20	MS. M. O'GRADY: Is that testimony
21	accurate to the best of your knowledge and do you
22	adopt it?
23	MR. MORGAN: Yes.
24	MS. M. O'GRADY: In broad terms, what
25	opinions will you provide?

MR. MORGAN: I will provide opinions on
Applicants' proposed amendments to 19.15.2 NMAC,
Providing a Definition for Marginal Well; 19.15.5
NMAC, Addressing Well Plugging Requirements; 19.15.8
NMAC, Regarding Financial Assurances; and 19.15.9
NMAC, Regarding OCD's Review of Applications for
Operator Registration and Change of Operator at Well
Transfer.
Overall my recommendations are intended
to help prevent wells being orphaned without adequate
financial assurance in place to provide for plugging.
My goal is to encourage the timely plugging of wells
by operators and ensure OCD has access to adequate
resources to plug any wells that have been orphaned.
MS. M. O'GRADY: Are current oil and
gas regulations in New Mexico adequate to ensure
appropriate and timely plugging of oil and gas wells?
MR. MORGAN: No. Unfortunately, New
Mexico's current regulations allow oil and gas
operators to delay and avoid meeting their asset
retirement obligations. The result is that landowners
and communities must contend with unplugged inactive
wells, many of which leak or pose other threats to
human health and the environment.
When operators go out of business

1	without completing plugging, the responsibility and
2	associated costs get passed to the state. Because
3	financial assurances for well plugging are far below
4	actual costs, the state must use funds from other
5	sources to pay for plugging. Meanwhile, the oil and
6	gas industry continues to enjoy substantial profits.
7	Operators often take advantage of New
8	Mexico's weak regulatory provisions to transfer the
9	wells and associated cleanup obligations to less
10	resourced operators, who are much more likely to go
11	out of business and pass the cleanup costs on to the
12	public.
13	The New Mexico Legislative Finance
14	Committee recently issued a Policy Spotlight:
15	Orphaned Wells report. LFC found that there are
16	currently 700 non-producing wells in New Mexico that
17	will not be plugged by their operator and will instead
18	need to be plugged by the state and another 2100
19	non-producing wells the state will likely need to
20	plug. The actual figure is almost certainly at the
21	higher end of that range. Although New Mexico does
22	not have a statutory or regulatory definition for the
23	term, these can be understood to be orphaned wells.
24	LFC reports based on its review of OCD
25	invoices the average cost for OCD to plug a well in

1	fiscal year 2024 was \$163,000. It will therefore cost
2	the state between 114 million and 342 million dollars
3	just to plug this existing inventory of orphaned
4	wells. This does not include site remediation costs,
5	which can be much higher. New Mexico's Reclamation
6	Fund will not cover these costs, which which will
7	include site remediation costs because as of April
8	2025, the fund contained just \$66.7 million.
9	These figures do not include the
10	additional thousands of wells almost certain to be
11	orphaned in coming years. New Mexico has
12	approximately 63,000 wells that are currently
13	unplugged and will eventually need to be plugged. Of
14	these, approximately 3,765 wells were on the OCD
15	inactive well list as of July 3, 2025.
16	In addition, according to LFC, "There
17	are more than 3,000 wells on state or private land
18	producing extremely small quantities of oil and gas
19	whose expected cleanup costs far exceed their
20	predicted future revenues. These inactive and low
21	producing wells are at high risk of orphaning,
22	particularly when transferred to under-resourced
23	operators, including operators who already hold a
24	large number of inactive and low producing wells."
25	MS. M. O'GRADY: Are there specific

1	deficiencies in the current rules?
2	MR. MORGAN: Current New Mexico
3	regulations contribute to and precipitate this present
4	and growing orphan well crisis in three ways. First,
5	the current regulations allow operators to delay and
6	avoid plugging by allowing wells to be placed in
7	temporary abandonment status without any demonstration
8	the wells have future beneficial use.
9	Second, because current financial
LO	assurance requirements are set far below actual
L1	plugging costs, the rules do not provide an incentive
L2	to operators to timely plug wells in order to be
L3	released from financial assurance obligations. The
L4	lack of adequate financial assurances means that when
L 5	the wells are orphaned, essentially all the plugging
L6	and remediation costs must be borne by the state.
L7	Third, the current regulations
L8	facilitate and encourage the practice of transferring
L9	inactive and low producing wells away from the
20	operators who profited from their earlier production.
21	OCD lacks the information and authority to take
22	meaningful action to scrutinize and reject proposals
23	to transfer inactive and low producing wells to
24	under-resourced operators most likely to orphan those
25	wells rather than plug them. Applicants' proposed

1 amendments address all of these issues. 2 MS. M. O'GRADY: Turning to Applicants' 3 specific proposals, Applicants propose to amend 19.15.5.9.A NMAC, Enforcement and Compliance. What is 4 5 the purpose of this section, and what amendments are 6 proposed? 7 This section lists MR. MORGAN: 8 criteria for a compliance determination for purposes 9 of certain regulatory actions in the rules, including whether to release financial assurances and whether to 10 11 approve operator registration and change of operator. 12 First, the proposed amendments would 13 eliminate existing language allowing operators to maintain a specified number of wells out of compliance 14 15 with well plugging requirements. The proposed 16 amendment restores needed clarity by requiring that 17 all wells must be plugged when plugging obligations are triggered. This does not leave operators without 18 recourse for a well that may be returned to service 19 20 because the existing regulations already allow an 2.1 operator to secure designated temporary abandonment 22 status for such a well. 23 Second, the proposed amendments would 2.4 add an additional criterion requiring operators to 25 meet the requirements for venting and flaring of

1	natural gas at wells. Operators who regularly vent
2	and flare natural gas in violation of regulatory
3	requirements may also lack capacity to properly
4	operate and plug their wells, and the inclusion of the
5	reference in the compliance provisions provides OCD
6	with the opportunity to address these operational
7	deficiencies and to determine whether the operator has
8	the resources and ability to assume additional well
9	operating and plugging obligations.
10	MS. M. O'GRADY: Before you discuss
11	Applicants' specific proposals to amend financial
12	assurance requirements, could you discuss the role of
13	financial assurance in general and the problems that
14	arise when financial assurance is not adequate?
15	MR. MORGAN: Before an oil or gas well
16	is even drilled, it's known that one day it will stop
17	producing in economic quantities and must be plugged.
18	The nature of oil and gas operations is that the
19	obligation to plug comes due at the point when the
20	well has stopped generating revenue. Plugging and
21	decommissioning is expensive and represents a pure
22	cost with no potential to produce additional revenue.
23	This stark economic reality increases
24	the likelihood that an operator will go out of
25	business or otherwise walk away from its obligations

1	before completing plugging. At that point, even if
2	the regulator were to sue the operator, the operator
3	would be effectively judgment proof with no assets
4	left for the regulator to claim. This risk increases
5	the more inactive wells an operator holds.
6	Regulators can address this dynamic by
7	requiring operators to post financial assurances prior
8	to drilling or acquiring operating authority over a
9	well sufficient to cover the costs of plugging or at
10	least sufficient to shift the incentives so that the
11	operator prioritizes well plugging.
12	Effective financial assurance programs
13	facilitate timely and effective decommissioning in
14	three ways. First, the financial assurance assures
15	that some resources will be available for reclamation
16	if the operator fails to clean up the site. This
17	financial backstop is particularly important in
18	industries such as oil and gas extraction that are
19	subject to boom and bust cycles that can lead
20	operators to drill wells when prices for oil and gas
21	are high but can contribute to bankruptcies when
22	prices are low.
23	Second, effective financial assurance
24	creates an incentive for the operator to complete the
25	plugging as soon as the well is no longer economic by

1	imposing ongoing costs, annual premiums, and
2	collateral requirements that are only released once
3	plugging is complete. The desire to free up capital
4	and avoid these ongoing costs should offset an
5	operator's desire to avoid or delay the cost of
6	plugging.
7	Third, financial assurance requirements
8	shift risk away from the state and onto a third party,
9	such as a surety bond provider, which conducts its own
10	analysis of an operator's reliability and likelihood
11	of default. Financial assurance providers screen
12	operators and set premiums and other fees based on
13	observable indicators of factors including regulatory
14	compliance and the number of non-producing wells held
15	by the operator.
16	MS. M. O'GRADY: Under current
17	regulations, what percentage of plugging costs for
18	orphaned wells are covered by forfeited financial
19	assurances in New Mexico?
20	MR. MORGAN: Almost none. According to
21	OCD's annual reports on the Reclamation Fund for
22	fiscal years 2019 through 2024, although OCD expended
23	\$15 million plugging 193 wells, it recovered only
24	\$250,000 from financial assurance forfeitures,
25	salvage, and recovery from operators. That works out
	Page 533

1	to only 1.6 percent of total plugging costs recovered
2	by the state.
3	In three of the five years analyzed,
4	OCD recovered \$0. LFC found that OCD has not
5	successfully redeemed any financial assurance since
6	2018. This dramatic gap is attributable to the fact
7	that the low amounts recoverable via bond forfeiture
8	may lead OCD to conclude that it is not worth the time
9	and effort to complete bond forfeiture.
LO	MS. M. O'GRADY: Why is it important to
L1	maintain policies that promote prompt plugging of
L2	non-producing oil and gas wells?
L3	MR. MORGAN: Unplugged oil and gas
L4	wells can leak numerous harmful pollutants into the
L5	air and water. Pollutants may escape when the well
L6	casings or wellheads of unplugged wells rust or crack,
L7	which can happen over time through corrosion, improper
L8	maintenance, subsidence, or from other causes.
L9	Oil and gas wells can emit air
20	pollutants including methane, nitrogen oxide, sulfur
21	dioxide, and hazardous air toxins like benzene,
22	toluene, ethyl benzene, and xylene. These pollutants
23	are known or suspected to cause cancer or other
24	serious health effects such as reproductive diseases
25	or birth defects.

1	Methane leaks are a particular concern
2	from unplugged wells because at high levels methane
3	can pose an asphyxiation and explosion risk and is a
4	potent greenhouse gas driving global climate change.
5	Researchers have observed increased concentrations of
6	air pollutants at distances of 4 kilometers downwind
7	of wells.
8	Leaking wells can also pollute
9	groundwater and surface water, including contaminating
L O	drinking water sources. Oil and gas wellbores pass
L1	through shallower strata that may contain groundwater
L2	used for drinking or other purposes. Unplugged
L3	non-producing wells can facilitate migration of
L 4	pollutants from deeper hydrocarbon producing strata
L 5	into this groundwater or up to the surface.
L6	The communities most likely to be
L7	exposed to pollutants from unplugged oil and gas wells
L8	include historically marginalized groups. This
L9	includes communities in northwest New Mexico living in
20	close proximity to high density of wells. Proximity
21	to wells is associated with a range of negative health
22	outcomes including increased risk of cancer, birth
23	defects, and cardiac and pulmonary impairment.
24	Wells that are plugged have roughly 100
25	times lower average emissions than wells that are

unplugged. The longer a non-producing well sits idle,
the more opportunity there is for air, land, and water
pollution. Wells that already leak will produce more
pollution, and non-leaking wells may deteriorate to
the point where they begin to leak.
MS. M. O'GRADY: Does inadequate
financial assurance impact regulators' decision
making?
MR. MORGAN: Yes. When financial
assurances are set too low, regulators may become wary
of taking any form of enforcement action, including
enforcing plugging requirements, out of concern that
such actions will push the operator toward bankruptcy.
When financial assurances are adequate, regulators are
free to enforce regulations without concern that an
operator could respond by filing for bankruptcy.
MS. M. O'GRADY: How much does it cost
OCD to plug a well in New Mexico?
MR. MORGAN: LFC reviewing invoices for
OCD directed plugging has reported the average
plugging cost for fiscal year 2024 as \$163,000 per
well. Other calculations of well plugging costs in
New Mexico have resulted in similar or higher figures.
In its 2021 Notice of Intent to Apply to the U.S.
Department of the Interior for Orphaned Well Plugging

1	Program Grants, OCD reported spending an average of
2	\$167,000 per well. In its 2024 Phase 2 work plan
3	proposal to DOI, OCD reported recent average plugging
4	costs of \$180,000 per well.
5	MS. M. O'GRADY: How do these actual
6	plugging costs compare to the financial assurance
7	levels in New Mexico's current regulations?
8	MR. MORGAN: Currently, financial
9	assurance amounts in New Mexico fall far below the
10	average cost to plug a well. Under the existing
11	regulations, single well financial assurances are
12	expressed in terms of the depth of the well as \$25,000
13	plus \$2 per foot of the projected depth of a proposed
14	well or the depth of an existing well. For even a
15	10,000-foot well, that would equal only \$45,000 in
16	financial assurance, less than a third of the actual
17	average plugging cost.
18	The current blanket bonding provisions
19	allow for significantly lower financial assurance
20	amounts. The currently allowable blanket bond for an
21	operator with 100 active wells is \$125,000, working
22	out to just \$1,250 per well. If an operator with 100
23	wells were to default and orphan its wells, the
24	shortfall between the bonded amount and the well
25	plugging cost using the \$160,000 average would be

1	\$16,175,000.
2	MS. M. O'GRADY: Turning to Applicants'
3	specific proposals for 19.15.8 NMAC, Governing
4	Financial Assurance, what amendments do Applicants
5	propose to subsection 19.15.8.9.A NMAC, Setting Forth
6	the Scope of Applicability of the Part?
7	MR. MORGAN: Applicants propose adding
8	the sentence "The Division shall not approve and the
9	operator shall not proceed with any proposed drilling
10	or acquisition until the operator has furnished the
11	required financial assurance."
12	This amendment prevents a situation
13	where an operator may incur a plugging obligation by
14	drilling or acquiring operating authority over a well
15	before it is provided the required financial
16	assurance. Under that scenario, there would be a
17	chance that the operator could then default on its
18	obligation and there would be no financial assurance
19	available to OCD to put toward the cost of finishing
20	the work and plugging the well.
21	MS. M. O'GRADY: What amendments do
22	Applicants propose to financial assurance requirements
23	for active wells at 19.15.8.9 NMAC?
24	MR. MORGAN: The proposed amendments
25	would increase the one well financial assurance amount

for active wells to \$150,000 and would set all blanket
financial assurances to the statutory maximum of
\$250,000. The Oil and Gas Act requires OCD to
"Establish a one well plugging financial assurance in
amounts determined sufficient to reasonably pay the
cost of plugging the wells covered by the financial
assurance."
A one well financial assurance of

2.1

2.4

\$150,000 per well closely approximates an amount sufficient to reasonably pay the cost of plugging the wells. OCD's average cost to plug a single orphan well is \$163,000, and while there will always be some variation in actual plugging costs from well to well, it's reasonable to use a figure close to the average plugging cost, and because the vast majority of operators maintain multiple wells, this averaging is likely to work out across the operator's well inventory.

Although the use of a \$150,000 per well figure is still likely to result in a gap between financial assurance amounts and actual plugging costs, the significantly smaller scale of this gap can be addressed through use of the Reclamation Fund. In contrast, the current approach to calculating a one well financial assurance, the \$25,000 plus \$2 per foot

1	of the well's depth, is not sufficient to reasonably
2	pay the cost of plugging a well. In almost all cases,
3	actual plugging costs will far exceed a financial
4	assurance calculated on this basis.
5	While the Commission must consider the
6	well depth in setting financial assurance amounts,
7	there is no statutory requirement that the financial
8	assurance amount be directly pegged to the depth of
9	the well. Furthermore, the primary cost drivers in
LO	well plugging are not related to the depth of the
L1	well. Much more important are factors including the
L2	condition of the well and issues related to access to
L3	the well.
L4	All of these cost factors, including
L5	well depth, are inherently incorporated into the
L6	\$150,000 based on average plugging costs, but are not
L7	captured by an approach based purely on one variable,
L8	well depth. The proposed amendments would also
L9	replace the current scaled approach to calculating
20	blanket financial assurance amounts for active wells
21	with a single blanket financial assurance set at the
22	statutory maximum rate of \$250,000.
23	MS. M. O'GRADY: What is the basis for
24	the new financial assurance category for marginal
25	wells?

1	MR. MORGAN: OCD first proposed this
2	category. Marginal well is defined under the proposed
3	amendments as "An oil or gas well that produced less
4	than 180 days and less than 1,000 barrels of oil
5	equivalent within a consecutive 12-month period."
6	Such marginal wells pose a significant
7	risk of being orphaned because the revenue they will
8	produce over their remaining production may be less
9	than the cost of plugging and remediating the well.
LO	This creates a powerful incentive for operators,
L1	particularly new operators who did not enjoy the
L2	original the original profitable period of higher
L3	production, to avoid these costs.
L4	The proposed definition of marginal
_	well includes components related to both the amount of
L5	well includes components related to both the amount of
L5 L6	production and the number of days the well produces.
L6	production and the number of days the well produces.
L6 L7	production and the number of days the well produces. Each component is critical. The total amount of
L6 L7 L8	production and the number of days the well produces. Each component is critical. The total amount of production relates directly to the revenue generated
L6 L7 L8	production and the number of days the well produces. Each component is critical. The total amount of production relates directly to the revenue generated by that well. The number of days producing is also
L6 L7 L8 L9	production and the number of days the well produces. Each component is critical. The total amount of production relates directly to the revenue generated by that well. The number of days producing is also important because operators can manipulate well
L6 L7 L8 L9	production and the number of days the well produces. Each component is critical. The total amount of production relates directly to the revenue generated by that well. The number of days producing is also important because operators can manipulate well production to make wells appear artificially
16 17 18 19 20 21	production and the number of days the well produces. Each component is critical. The total amount of production relates directly to the revenue generated by that well. The number of days producing is also important because operators can manipulate well production to make wells appear artificially productive but only over short periods of time, giving
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	production and the number of days the well produces. Each component is critical. The total amount of production relates directly to the revenue generated by that well. The number of days producing is also important because operators can manipulate well production to make wells appear artificially productive but only over short periods of time, giving a false impression that a well is economic when it is

approximately 2200 wells would be categorized as marginal wells under the new rules, exclusive of wells presumed not to have beneficial use, constituting 3.7 percent of the well population and 0.045 percent of production. The proposal recognizes that marginal wells carry a high risk that should be reflected in the amount of financial assurance the state requires to protect against the well becoming orphaned.

2.1

2.4

The phased in approach proposed by Applicants gives operators with existing marginal well inventories currently covered under blanket financial assurances until January 1, 2028, to plug these wells, return them to a higher level of production so the marginal wealth financial assurance requirement no longer applies, or secure individual well financial assurances.

The one well financial assurance would apply immediately for any marginal well being transferred to a new operator, recognizing that transfer of low producing wells to under-resourced operators is a major contributor to well orphaning. The transfer requirement also precludes operators from avoiding the January 2028 deadline by transferring away their marginal wells rather than plugging them or providing the one well financial assurance.

represents a common sense approach to financial assurances for low producing wells at the time of transfer, consistent with the approach already employed by other states. MS. M. O'GRADY: What is the basis to require an operator with over 15 percent of their wells in marginal and/or inactive status to provide a one well plugging financial assurance of \$150,000 for all of their wells? MR. MORGAN: Operators with a significant proportion of marginal and inactive wells	1	At least two other states, Arkansas and
producing well is transferred. The proposed amendment represents a common sense approach to financial assurances for low producing wells at the time of transfer, consistent with the approach already employed by other states. MS. M. O'GRADY: What is the basis to require an operator with over 15 percent of their wells in marginal and/or inactive status to provide a one well plugging financial assurance of \$150,000 for all of their wells? MR. MORGAN: Operators with a significant proportion of marginal and inactive wells pose a heightened threat of failure because they may not be able to generate sufficient cash flow to meet their well plugging obligations. Operators with a higher proportion of marginal and inactive wells generate less revenue at the same time they face higher costs from plugging. Requiring a one well financial assurance set at an amount pegged to the actual cost of plugging to OCD is not a penalty imposed on	2	California, require operators to provide one well
represents a common sense approach to financial assurances for low producing wells at the time of transfer, consistent with the approach already employed by other states. MS. M. O'GRADY: What is the basis to require an operator with over 15 percent of their wells in marginal and/or inactive status to provide a one well plugging financial assurance of \$150,000 for all of their wells? MR. MORGAN: Operators with a significant proportion of marginal and inactive wells pose a heightened threat of failure because they may not be able to generate sufficient cash flow to meet their well plugging obligations. Operators with a higher proportion of marginal and inactive wells generate less revenue at the same time they face higher costs from plugging. Requiring a one well financial assurance set at an amount pegged to the actual cost of plugging to OCD is not a penalty imposed on	3	plugging financial assurances at the time a low
assurances for low producing wells at the time of transfer, consistent with the approach already employed by other states. MS. M. O'GRADY: What is the basis to require an operator with over 15 percent of their wells in marginal and/or inactive status to provide a one well plugging financial assurance of \$150,000 for all of their wells? MR. MORGAN: Operators with a significant proportion of marginal and inactive wells pose a heightened threat of failure because they may not be able to generate sufficient cash flow to meet their well plugging obligations. Operators with a higher proportion of marginal and inactive wells generate less revenue at the same time they face higher costs from plugging. Requiring a one well financial assurance set at an amount pegged to the actual cost of plugging to OCD is not a penalty imposed on	4	producing well is transferred. The proposed amendment
transfer, consistent with the approach already employed by other states. MS. M. O'GRADY: What is the basis to require an operator with over 15 percent of their wells in marginal and/or inactive status to provide a one well plugging financial assurance of \$150,000 for all of their wells? MR. MORGAN: Operators with a significant proportion of marginal and inactive wells pose a heightened threat of failure because they may not be able to generate sufficient cash flow to meet their well plugging obligations. Operators with a higher proportion of marginal and inactive wells generate less revenue at the same time they face higher costs from plugging. Requiring a one well financial assurance set at an amount pegged to the actual cost of plugging to OCD is not a penalty imposed on	5	represents a common sense approach to financial
8 employed by other states. 9 MS. M. O'GRADY: What is the basis to require an operator with over 15 percent of their wells in marginal and/or inactive status to provide a one well plugging financial assurance of \$150,000 for all of their wells? 12 MR. MORGAN: Operators with a significant proportion of marginal and inactive wells pose a heightened threat of failure because they may not be able to generate sufficient cash flow to meet their well plugging obligations. Operators with a higher proportion of marginal and inactive wells generate less revenue at the same time they face higher costs from plugging. Requiring a one well financial assurance set at an amount pegged to the actual cost of plugging to OCD is not a penalty imposed on	6	assurances for low producing wells at the time of
MS. M. O'GRADY: What is the basis to require an operator with over 15 percent of their wells in marginal and/or inactive status to provide a one well plugging financial assurance of \$150,000 for all of their wells? MR. MORGAN: Operators with a significant proportion of marginal and inactive wells pose a heightened threat of failure because they may not be able to generate sufficient cash flow to meet their well plugging obligations. Operators with a higher proportion of marginal and inactive wells generate less revenue at the same time they face higher costs from plugging. Requiring a one well financial assurance set at an amount pegged to the actual cost of plugging to OCD is not a penalty imposed on	7	transfer, consistent with the approach already
require an operator with over 15 percent of their wells in marginal and/or inactive status to provide a one well plugging financial assurance of \$150,000 for all of their wells? MR. MORGAN: Operators with a significant proportion of marginal and inactive wells pose a heightened threat of failure because they may not be able to generate sufficient cash flow to meet their well plugging obligations. Operators with a higher proportion of marginal and inactive wells generate less revenue at the same time they face higher costs from plugging. Requiring a one well financial assurance set at an amount pegged to the actual cost of plugging to OCD is not a penalty imposed on	8	employed by other states.
wells in marginal and/or inactive status to provide a one well plugging financial assurance of \$150,000 for all of their wells? MR. MORGAN: Operators with a significant proportion of marginal and inactive wells pose a heightened threat of failure because they may not be able to generate sufficient cash flow to meet their well plugging obligations. Operators with a higher proportion of marginal and inactive wells generate less revenue at the same time they face higher costs from plugging. Requiring a one well financial assurance set at an amount pegged to the actual cost of plugging to OCD is not a penalty imposed on	9	MS. M. O'GRADY: What is the basis to
one well plugging financial assurance of \$150,000 for all of their wells? MR. MORGAN: Operators with a significant proportion of marginal and inactive wells pose a heightened threat of failure because they may not be able to generate sufficient cash flow to meet their well plugging obligations. Operators with a higher proportion of marginal and inactive wells generate less revenue at the same time they face higher costs from plugging. Requiring a one well financial assurance set at an amount pegged to the actual cost of plugging to OCD is not a penalty imposed on	10	require an operator with over 15 percent of their
all of their wells? MR. MORGAN: Operators with a significant proportion of marginal and inactive wells pose a heightened threat of failure because they may not be able to generate sufficient cash flow to meet their well plugging obligations. Operators with a higher proportion of marginal and inactive wells generate less revenue at the same time they face higher costs from plugging. Requiring a one well financial assurance set at an amount pegged to the actual cost of plugging to OCD is not a penalty imposed on	11	wells in marginal and/or inactive status to provide a
MR. MORGAN: Operators with a significant proportion of marginal and inactive wells pose a heightened threat of failure because they may not be able to generate sufficient cash flow to meet their well plugging obligations. Operators with a higher proportion of marginal and inactive wells generate less revenue at the same time they face higher costs from plugging. Requiring a one well financial assurance set at an amount pegged to the actual cost of plugging to OCD is not a penalty imposed on	12	one well plugging financial assurance of \$150,000 for
significant proportion of marginal and inactive wells pose a heightened threat of failure because they may not be able to generate sufficient cash flow to meet their well plugging obligations. Operators with a higher proportion of marginal and inactive wells generate less revenue at the same time they face higher costs from plugging. Requiring a one well financial assurance set at an amount pegged to the actual cost of plugging to OCD is not a penalty imposed on	13	all of their wells?
pose a heightened threat of failure because they may not be able to generate sufficient cash flow to meet their well plugging obligations. Operators with a higher proportion of marginal and inactive wells generate less revenue at the same time they face higher costs from plugging. Requiring a one well financial assurance set at an amount pegged to the actual cost of plugging to OCD is not a penalty imposed on	14	MR. MORGAN: Operators with a
not be able to generate sufficient cash flow to meet their well plugging obligations. Operators with a higher proportion of marginal and inactive wells generate less revenue at the same time they face higher costs from plugging. Requiring a one well financial assurance set at an amount pegged to the actual cost of plugging to OCD is not a penalty imposed on	15	significant proportion of marginal and inactive wells
their well plugging obligations. Operators with a higher proportion of marginal and inactive wells generate less revenue at the same time they face higher costs from plugging. Requiring a one well financial assurance set at an amount pegged to the actual cost of plugging to OCD is not a penalty imposed on	16	pose a heightened threat of failure because they may
higher proportion of marginal and inactive wells generate less revenue at the same time they face higher costs from plugging. Requiring a one well financial assurance set at an amount pegged to the actual cost of plugging to OCD is not a penalty imposed on	17	not be able to generate sufficient cash flow to meet
generate less revenue at the same time they face higher costs from plugging. Requiring a one well financial assurance set at an amount pegged to the actual cost of plugging to OCD is not a penalty imposed on	18	their well plugging obligations. Operators with a
higher costs from plugging. Requiring a one well financial assurance set at an amount pegged to the actual cost of plugging to OCD is not a penalty imposed on	19	higher proportion of marginal and inactive wells
Requiring a one well financial assurance set at an amount pegged to the actual cost of plugging to OCD is not a penalty imposed on	20	generate less revenue at the same time they face
23 assurance set at an amount pegged to the actual cost 24 of plugging to OCD is not a penalty imposed on	21	higher costs from plugging.
of plugging to OCD is not a penalty imposed on	22	Requiring a one well financial
	23	assurance set at an amount pegged to the actual cost
25 operators. It is a common sense means by which the	24	of plugging to OCD is not a penalty imposed on
	25	operators. It is a common sense means by which the

1 state can protect its own interests and those of its 2. residents. Financial assurances set at levels at or 3 near the actual cost of plugging protect the interests of the state by providing a financial backstop in the 4 event of operator default and providing an incentive 6 for operators to complete timely plugging.

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

Some jurisdictions, including New Mexico, have made the determination that such protections and incentives are not necessary for certain types of operators. Some operators, the theory goes, generate sufficient ongoing revenue that they should not have any trouble covering their plugging costs and therefore represent a low risk of default and do not require a full financial assurance backstop.

This is a benefit extended to certain operators which must be weighed against the corresponding increased risk borne by the state. The logic underlying the policy of allowing certain operators to provide less than adequate bonding simply does not hold for operators who have more than 15 percent of their wells inactive or producing at only marginal levels. Such operators face the simultaneous pinch of reduced revenues at the same time they faced increased immediate plugging costs.

1	The proposed amendment discourages
2	operators from specializing in the acquisition of low
3	producing wells. Such operators who take this
4	approach may be betting on a dramatic increase in
5	commodity prices that would render their wells
6	profitable or may be betting that they can pocket
7	whatever remaining revenue their wells can produce
8	while avoiding the plugging costs. In either case,
9	the state and public monies should not be compelled to
LO	underwrite this risk.
L1	MS. M. O'GRADY: Why is it necessary to
L2	increase the required bonding for inactive wells and
L3	wells in approved and expired temporarily abandoned
L4	status as the applicants propose?
L5	MR. MORGAN: By increasing the bonding
L6	required for inactive wells and wells in TA, the
L7	proposed amendment ensures that New Mexico will have
L8	adequate financial assurances for the categories of
L9	wells at highest risk of being orphaned.
20	The Interstate Oil and Gas Compact
21	Commission, a body representing and made up of state
22	regulators, has specifically highlighted the risk of
23	well orphaning posed by inactive wells and by
24	operators with a high percentage of inactive wells.
25	In a 2021 report, the IOGCC noted that "The number of

1	idle wells in a state or province is a concern because
2	of the potential for the wells to deteriorate over
3	time or become orphans."
4	An even more critical factor is the
5	number of idle wells held by an individual operator,
6	especially as a percentage of the operators' total
7	wells that have been drilled but not plugged. A high
8	percentage of idle wells may indicate an increased
9	vulnerability of the state or province to the operator
LO	becoming insolvent and leaving orphan wells. States
L1	and provinces use various approaches to ensure
L2	operators actively manage their idle well inventories
L3	and plug wells with no future beneficial use.
L4	The proposed amendment is therefore in
L5	line with regulations of many other oil and gas
L6	producing states. The New Mexico legislature has
L7	already recognized that wells in TA inactive status
L8	represent a higher risk by setting a minimum blanket
L9	bond amount of \$50,000 for wells in TA status, but
20	there is no maximum, and by requiring a one well
21	financial assurance on any well that has been held in
22	a temporary abandonment for more than two years.
23	MS. M. O'GRADY: Why do the proposed
24	amendments restrict the use of blanket financial
25	assurances for some categories of wells?

1	MR. MORGAN: Under the proposed
2	amendments, blanket financial assurance where the per
3	well coverage varies depending on the number of wells
4	is only available for active wells. Financial
5	assurances for all other categories of wells are
6	calculated based on a per well cost of \$150,000,
7	including under the blanket financial assurance in
8	subsection E for inactive wells and wells in approved
9	and expired TA status.
10	These changes are appropriate because
11	these wells have the greatest chance of being
12	orphaned. Imposing individual well financial
13	assurance requirements for these wells should lead
14	operators to plug these wells sooner to avoid ongoing
15	fees and carrying costs required to maintain those
16	bonds.
17	The first problem with blanket
18	financial assurances is it results in a very limited
19	per well coverage. Under the amounts in New Mexico's
20	financial assurance regulations, coverage under a
21	blanket financial assurance can be \$1,250 per well or

even lower. That's less than 1 percent of OCD's actual averaging plugging cost of \$163,000. When an operator who has provided only a blanket financial assurance defaults and orphans its wells, almost all

22

23

24

25

1 of those plugging costs must be covered by the state. 2 Blanket financial assurances provide 3 very little incentive for operators to plug their wells as they cease producing. This is because when 4 5 an operator plugs a well covered under a blanket 6 financial assurance, it does not receive a corresponding decrease in the carrying costs 8 associated with maintaining the blanket financial 9 assurance. 10 Instead, the operator continues to pay 11 the same costs to maintain the same blanket financial 12 assurance for its remaining wells. This encourages 13 operators to delay plugging these wells, potentially 14 until all wells covered under that blanket financial 15 assurance has stopped producing. 16 Blanket bonding also poses a high risk 17 because bankruptcy occurs at the operator level, not 18 the individual well level, so when an operator defaults all of its wells, particularly its inactive 19 and marginal wells are likely to be orphaned. 20 21 poses only a minimal problem for the regulator when those wells are all covered by individual bonds, but 22 23 it poses a massive problem when those wells are 24 covered by a single blanket financial assurance. 2.5 MS. M. O'GRADY: Why do applicants

1	propose expressly including approved and expired
2	temporarily abandoned wells in 19.15.8.9.E NMAC?
3	MR. MORGAN: The proposed amendment
4	provides better consistency between the language of
5	the regulation and the language of the statute. The
6	statute expressly references wells in temporarily
7	abandoned status.
8	The current regulations omit several
9	important categories of inactive and temporarily
10	abandoned wells, including one, wells that are
11	inactive but for which the operator has not sought
12	temporarily abandoned status; two, wells that have
13	received approved temporarily abandoned status but
14	have been in the status for less than two years; and
15	three, wells in expired temporarily abandoned status.
16	The proposed amendment closes this gap
17	by expressly including such wells among the categories
18	of wells to which the financial assurance requirements
19	of 19.15.8.9.E NMAC apply.
20	MS. M. O'GRADY: Will increased
21	financial assurance requirements harm small businesses
22	and hurt New Mexico's economy?
23	MR. MORGAN: The experiences of
24	regulators in other jurisdictions make clear that
25	increasing financial assurance requirements leads to
	Page 549

1	decreases in well orphaning and better environmental
2	compliance among operators with no or minimal impact
3	to overall oil and gas production in the state.
4	The economic analysis by Boomhower of
5	the effect of the 2001 increase to Texas's financial
6	assurance requirements for oil and gas producers
7	concluded that "Despite affecting small firms, the
8	bond requirement yielded large environmental
9	improvements because small producers caused a
10	disproportionate share of environmental problems."
11	The bond requirement reduced the industry-wide orphan
12	well rate by 65 percent.
13	The study also found that the new
14	financial assurance requirement had a negligible
15	impact on production. "Notably, the state's total
16	output of oil and gas was essentially unaffected by
17	the policy." This is because the firms affected by
18	the policy accounted for a small fraction of
19	production and because most of the valuable production
20	associated with exiting firms was reallocated to other
21	producers instead of shutting down.
22	A separate study looking at the effects
23	of changes to oil and gas regulations in North Dakota,
24	including increased financial assurance requirements,
25	observed nearly identical results. The study found

1	"No statistical change in the pace of drilling wells
2	after the North Dakota regulations came into effect,"
3	and that "The reduction in production for small
4	operators in North Dakota after the regulation went in
5	effect relative to production in Montana is about 0.5
6	percent."
7	Although the Texas and North Dakota
8	laws reviewed in the two studies required bond amounts
9	that are lower in absolute terms than the adjusted
LO	financial assurance amounts in the proposed
L1	amendments, each law represented a significant
L2	increase compared to prior requirements. I believe
L3	the proposed amendments would have a similar effect in
L4	New Mexico. Irresponsible operators may be pushed out
L5	of the market, but the overall impact to the industry
L6	and overall production will be small and the companies
L7	who continue to operate will have better compliance
L8	records.
L9	MS. M. O'GRADY: If financial assurance
20	amounts are increased, will the full cost of the
21	increases be borne by operators?
22	MR. MORGAN: Most operators satisfy
23	financial assurance requirements by posting surety
24	bonds. Surety bond providers charge an annual premium
25	typically between 1 and 5 percent. Note that in my
	Page 551

1 original direct testimony, I cited a range of between 2 1 and 2.5 percent. Industry witnesses provided an updated range based on recent data, and I incorporate 3 that here. 4 5 Surety providers may also require 6 operators to pledge collateral, which would be released once the well is plugged and the bond no 8 longer needed. These are costs to the operator, but 9 amount to less, often far less, than the face value of 10 the bond. 11 The surety bonding industry is a 12 competitive market with multiple providers competing 13 for the business of operators. Surety providers set 14 the terms of individual bonds depending on the risk of 15 default they perceive from the operator balanced against the risk that a different provider will offer 16 17 more favorable terms.

To the extent an operator may only be able to secure a bond under onerous terms with higher premiums and more collateral required, this is a clear signal that the surety industry perceives that operator to represent a high risk of default. Such operators also pose a high risk to the state's interests in that they are more likely to default and orphan wells and depose other compliance problems.

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

If the market makes it difficult or
impossible for such operators to secure the bonds
needed to operate, that is to the benefit of New
Mexico by protecting the state against high risk
operators.
MS. M. O'GRADY: Why do Applicants
propose to provide for adjustments to financial
assurance requirements based on inflation?
MR. MORGAN: It's widely recognized
that plugging costs increase over time, including as a
result of inflation. In a 2021 report, the IOGCC
noted that "Plugging and restoration costs rise over
time due to inflation and in some cases due to
improved and more stringent regulatory requirements
for materials and methods."
The Federal Bureau of Land Management
in its recent rulemaking, Increasing Bond Amounts for
Wells on Federal Land, similarly cited the role of
inflation in necessitating adjustments to financial
assurance amounts, and Wyoming's regulatory bonding
requirements for oil and gas wells provide the bond
amounts shall be "adjusted every three years based on
the Wyoming consumer price index or actual plugging
costs."
MS. M. O'GRADY: In addition to the
Page 553

1	financial assurance requirements, New Mexico maintains
2	the Reclamation Fund. Why not just rely on the
3	Reclamation Fund to make up any shortfall rather than
4	amend the financial assurance requirements?
5	MR. MORGAN: There's simply not enough
6	money in the Reclamation Fund to cover the shortfall
7	between existing financial assurance levels and the
8	current and anticipated inventory of orphan wells.
9	According to LFC, the Reclamation Fund contained \$66.7
10	million as of April 2025. LFC further estimates the
11	state's potential liability far exceeds that total
12	finding that "Altogether, the state's current and near
13	future liability for well plugging and site
14	remediation is estimated at \$700 million to \$1.6
15	billion."
16	Some of the plugging costs for those
17	existing orphan wells may be covered by federal funds
18	administered by DOI under its orphan well plugging
19	program, but not nearly the full amount. LFC lists
20	New Mexico's total federal funding eligibility as
21	\$167.3 million. Accordingly, federal funds will not
22	cover the shortfall.
23	Relying on the Reclamation Fund to
24	cover the cost of plugging newly orphaned wells also
25	creates a negative incentive and moral hazard for

1	operators. If operators know OCD will not seek to
2	enforce plugging requirements and will not seek to
3	recover plugging costs from operators themselves, this
4	will create a powerful incentive for operators to
5	continue and even increase the practice of orphaning
6	wells to OCD. Why would an operator choose to bear
7	the cost of plugging a well itself if it knows that
8	its competitors are avoiding that cost category?
9	MS. M. O'GRADY: Applicants propose a
10	number of changes to the change of operator rules at
11	19.15.9.9 NMAC. Before you discuss the specific
12	amendments, can you describe the increased risk of
13	well orphaning that is associated with well transfer?
14	MR. MORGAN: Well transfers,
14 15	MR. MORGAN: Well transfers, particularly of inactive, marginal, or other low
15	particularly of inactive, marginal, or other low
15 16	particularly of inactive, marginal, or other low producing wells, dramatically increase the risk that
15 16 17	particularly of inactive, marginal, or other low producing wells, dramatically increase the risk that the well will be orphaned. This is because such
15 16 17 18	particularly of inactive, marginal, or other low producing wells, dramatically increase the risk that the well will be orphaned. This is because such transfers create a separation between the operator who
15 16 17 18	particularly of inactive, marginal, or other low producing wells, dramatically increase the risk that the well will be orphaned. This is because such transfers create a separation between the operator who profited from the well's highest production and the
15 16 17 18 19 20	particularly of inactive, marginal, or other low producing wells, dramatically increase the risk that the well will be orphaned. This is because such transfers create a separation between the operator who profited from the well's highest production and the operator who must bear the cost of plugging and
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	particularly of inactive, marginal, or other low producing wells, dramatically increase the risk that the well will be orphaned. This is because such transfers create a separation between the operator who profited from the well's highest production and the operator who must bear the cost of plugging and decommissioning the well.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	particularly of inactive, marginal, or other low producing wells, dramatically increase the risk that the well will be orphaned. This is because such transfers create a separation between the operator who profited from the well's highest production and the operator who must bear the cost of plugging and decommissioning the well. Often at the time a low producing well

1	transfer of such a well only make sense if the
2	transferee operator can avoid the cost of plugging,
3	and yet such transactions regularly occur.
4	A variety of oil and gas regulators
5	have recognized the risk of orphaning inherent in the
6	transfer of low producing wells. The IOGCC has found
7	that "It is common for operators to transfer wells and
8	associated facilities and pipelines to other
9	companies." State and provincial regulators have a
10	special concern with transfers of wells with declining
11	production because of the increased risk that such
12	wells may become orphans.
13	Many states and provinces have
14	implemented measures to reduce this risk by setting
15	additional requirements for financial assurance and by
16	evaluating corporate solvency and compliance history
17	and the status and condition of the wells and
18	associated facilities and pipelines before approving a
19	transfer. An effective regulatory program for oil and
20	gas operations must include provisions addressing the
21	transfer of wells, particularly inactive, marginal,
22	and other low producing wells.
23	MS. M. O'GRADY: Why isn't it
24	sufficient to just increase the amount of financial
25	assurance required as other parts of the proposed
	Page 556

1	rulemaking do?
2	MR. MORGAN: In theory, a fully
3	effective financial assurance program would address
4	the primary risks posed by the transfer of inactive,
5	marginal, and other low producing wells. The proposed
6	changes to financial assurance requirements in this
7	rulemaking are a step in the right direction, but
8	still fall short of what would be required.
9	Several factors prevent New Mexico from
10	maintaining a fully effective financial assurance
11	program at this time. These include one, average
12	plugging costs are just that, an average. Some number
13	of wells will have actual plugging costs that exceed
14	the average.
15	Two, financial institutions, including
16	the providers of surety bond coverage, may fail. This
17	risk is particularly high for surety bond providers
18	who specialize in providing financial assurances for
19	the oil and gas industry. And three, New Mexico
20	statute currently places limits on the state's
21	authority to require full cost financial assurances,
22	including by allowing blanket bonding for some wells,
23	but capping the coverage amount.
24	An effective regulatory program
25	designed to prevent the creation of additional orphan
	Page 557

1	wells will both require adequate financial assurances
2	and restrictions on the transfer of wells. A
3	peer-reviewed economic study of the law and economics
4	of reclamation bonding found that compliance with
5	plugging requirements "can be induced with bond levels
6	that are below the expected reclamation costs if
7	regulators have the authority to block permits for any
8	operator that has a record of non-compliance."
9	MS. M. O'GRADY: Let's turn to 19.15.9
10	NMAC, Well Operator Provisions. What is the general
11	purpose of this section and what amendments do
12	Applicants propose?
13	MR. MORGAN: This section governs OCD's
14	registration and approval of new operators and changes
15	of operator for specific wells; essentially, well
16	transfers. It specifies the types of information OCD
17	may collect when considering operator applications and
18	provides the grounds on which OCD may deny an
19	application. This section therefore authorizes OCD to
20	evaluate the qualifications and capacity of an
21	operator to meet the requirements of New Mexico's oil
22	and gas program.
23	The proposed amendments add a new
24	criterion for approval of initial operator
25	registration. After I submitted my direct testimony,

1 Applicants and OCD engaged in discussions with OXY 2 regarding this amendment and negotiated changes to the 3 original proposal with OXY. Under the updated proposal, an 4 5 applicant would have to disclose whether it is subject 6 to any forfeiture demands from a state or federal agency, has forfeited financial assurance to a state 8 or federal agency, or has any unresolved adjudicated 9 orders or unresolved settlement agreements for any state or federal violations. OCD would also be 10 11 authorized to deny operator registration on this 12 basis. 13 The required disclosure is important because many oil and gas operators do business in 14 15 multiple jurisdictions. OCD currently has the 16 capacity to track operator compliance at wells and 17 sites within New Mexico, but has no means to efficiently collect that information outside the 18 19 state. 20 OCD should be able to know if an 2.1 operator has a past history of forfeiture and 22 non-compliance at its facilities out of state. Among 23 other things, this is necessary to prevent bad actor

operators from seeking refuge in New Mexico after running afoul of regulators in other jurisdictions.

2.4

25

More fundamentally, it allows OCD to gauge the likelihood of an operator's capacity and willingness to satisfy the obligations associated with operating oil and gas wells in New Mexico.

2.1

2.4

The proposed amendment also requires operators to disclose officers, directors, partners, and persons with an interest in the new operator exceeding 25 percent who are or have been within the previous five years part of a company not currently in compliance with the well plugging requirements of 19.15.5.9 NMAC. This prevents individuals who incurred violations at one company from walking away from that company and its liabilities and starting a new company or seeking operator status as an individual.

The approach of tracking officers, directors, and other interested parties across companies is common in the regulation of resource extractors. For example, the Federal Surface Mining Act prohibits issuance of a new permit to any applicant who owns or controls mining operations having unabated or uncorrected violations anywhere in the United States until those violations are abated or corrected or are in the process of being abated or corrected, and DOI maintains a national applicant

1 violator system to track these violations. 2 The proposed amendment also expands the existing regulatory provision, allowing OCD to require 3 an operator to disclose its current and past officers, 4 5 directors, and partners, and its current and past 6 ownership interest in other operators. The proposed amendment would make such disclosures mandatory, 8 specify the form of disclosure as a certification, and 9 require operators to update that certification 10 annually. 11 MS. M. O'GRADY: What amendments do 12 Applicants propose to applications for change of 13 operator? 14 MR. MORGAN: The proposed amendment 15 requires the same certification regarding the 16 operator's history of forfeiture in other 17 jurisdictions and tracking the compliance history of associated entities that also applies to new operator 18 registrations, and it also requires change of operator 19 20 applicants to provide a certified plugging and 2.1 abandonment plan. 22 The justification for the certification 23 of the operator's forfeiture record and the compliance 2.4 history of associated entities is the same as for the 25 amendments pertaining to new operator registration.

The same rationale applies to applications for change of operator associated with well transfers. The plugging and abandonment plan requirement is necessary to prevent the scenario where a new operator plainly lacks the resources to satisfy the plugging obligations it is assuming.

2.1

2.4

For existing operators who may already hold inactive and marginal wells, it allows OCD to consider those existing plugging liabilities in addition to the new liabilities being assumed through the proposed transfer. It also allows OCD to verify an operator's claims that future production from existing wells and the wells to be transferred will be adequate to produce revenue sufficient to satisfy the operator's aggregate plugging obligations.

operator's actual history of compliance and success at eliciting additional production from wells other operators consider spent, including the operators history of inactive wells and returning wells to production. These amendments authorize OCD to take appropriate action when a proposed transfer of wells raises questions about whether the new operator will have the resources and capacity to actually satisfy the well plugging obligations it is assuming.

1	MS. M. O'GRADY: Why is it appropriate
2	for OCD to consider factors including a transferee's
3	financial condition?
4	MR. MORGAN: When OCD issues a permit
5	or approves a transfer, it is effectively extending
6	credit to the operator because OCD is assuming the
7	ultimate responsibility to ensure well plugging. This
8	is just the same as the credit a bank extends to the
9	holder of a credit card. If you don't pay your credit
10	card bill, the bank is still obligated to pay the
11	vendors for the charges you made.
12	And just as a bank considers an
13	applicant's credit score and other indicators of
14	credit worthiness before issuing a credit card or a
15	mortgage, OCD as the issuer of credit must be able to
16	ensure the credit credit worthiness of the
17	operator.
18	MS. M. O'GRADY: What amendments do
19	Applicants propose to 19.15.9.9.E NMAC?
20	MR. MORGAN: The proposed amendment
21	focuses on the conditions of the well rather than the
22	operator and prohibits transfer of wells that are
23	overdue for plugging or have unaddressed spills or
24	otherwise have outstanding remediation needs unless
25	OCD determines that the well is in compliance or there

1	is an approved schedule of compliance.
2	Transfer of a well can dramatically
3	increase the chances of that well being orphaned.
4	That is particularly true for wells with higher
5	remediation costs or with plugging and remediation
6	obligations that are due immediately before the well
7	can generate any revenue to offset those costs. The
8	proposed amendment creates an opportunity for OCD to
9	monitor the status of the wells to be transferred and
10	to take steps to minimize the chance of those wells
11	being orphaned.
12	MS. M. O'GRADY: Thank you for that
13	summary of your direct testimony. We will now move to
14	your summary of rebuttal testimony.
15	And, Madam Hearing Officer, I have
16	some I'd like to pass out Exhibit 88.
17	(Applicant Exhibit 88 was marked for
18	identification.)
19	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.
20	MS. M. O'GRADY: Thank you.
21	BY MS. M. O'GRADY:
22	MS. M. O'GRADY: Mr. Morgan, do you
23	have any general comments at the outset about the
24	direct testimony filed by the industry parties in this
25	matter?

1	MR. MORGAN: Significant portions of
2	the testimony of NMOGA and IPANM experts confirm the
3	fundamental premises identified by Applicants that
4	established the need for the proposed amendments, and
5	yet only Applicants proposed solutions to these
6	problems.
7	Industry experts acknowledge that oil
8	and gas production in New Mexico has entered its
9	decline phase. Mr. McGowen states "The likelihood
- 0	that Permian shale production has already peaked is
L1	more than just speculation. It is becoming the
L2	prevailing light motif for the industry's evolving
L3	dynamics." This decline means that action must be
L4	taken immediately to ensure that existing revenue from
-5	these wells is put towards satisfying plugging
L6	obligations.
L7	Industry experts also acknowledge that
-8	the practice of transferring low producing wells from
_9	highly profitable initial producers to under-resourced
20	small operators is a fundamental part of the
21	industry's business model. Mr. McGowen describes the
22	role small operators play in "de-risking legacy assets
23	that the larger companies no longer prioritize." Under
24	the current rules, that risk is passed to the state.
25	Industry experts also all but conceded

1	that operators of marginal wells have not set aside
2	funds to cover the cost of plugging their wells and do
3	not have the resources to satisfy those obligations.
4	Mr. Emerick states "For these sizes of operators,
5	working capital and investment capital are generally
6	minimal. The minimal working capital referenced
7	includes the capital needed to plug wells."
8	Industry witnesses state that operators
9	are unlikely to be able to satisfy surety provider
10	requirements that they have working capital equal to
11	25 percent of a \$150,000 bond. That's just three
12	\$37,500 per well. Industry experts cite to the Raimi
13	study, which provides a national median plugging and
14	remediation cost of \$76,000. Even assuming that
15	figure is accurate, that means New Mexico operators
16	maintain working capital per well of less than half of
17	that plugging cost and one quarter of OCD's average
18	cost of \$163,000 per well.
19	The available working capital is even
20	insufficient to cover the plugging costs of \$40,000 to
21	\$60,000 per well cited in Mr. Arthur's rebuttal
22	testimony. In other words, operators do not have the
23	capital to plug their wells. That means the cost of
24	plugging these wells will fall to the state.
25	Finally, industry experts implicitly

1	acknowledge that the surety bonding industry has
2	concluded that under the current rules, New Mexico oil
3	and gas operators pose an extremely high risk of
4	defaulting on their plugging obligations.
5	Mr. Gilstrap states "Currently we are in one of the
6	hardest surety markets I've experienced in my career."
7	Mr. Emerick states "The simple fact is that the surety
8	market today is very demanding and difficult to
9	navigate. Surety companies have become more
10	restrictive in their underwriting guidelines to
11	minimize the risk that a bond will be called."
12	Surety providers are sophisticated,
13	profit motivated firms. To the extent sureties are
14	imposing stricter collateral requirements, it is
15	because of the risk they see from marginal operators
16	in New Mexico. If surety has perceived these risks,
17	then New Mexico's regulators must also and must take
18	immediate action to protect the state from defaults.
19	Even if industry parties fail to
20	expressly acknowledge the existence of the orphan well
21	crisis in New Mexico, they have acknowledged each of
22	the dynamics that has led to the crisis. This means
23	the only remaining question for the Commission is what
24	steps to take to address this crisis.
25	MS. M. O'GRADY: Before we turn to

1	Applicants' specific proposals, can you address
2	general concerns raised by industry witnesses
3	regarding the ability of operators to secure surety
4	bonds under applicant's financial assurance proposals?
5	MR. MORGAN: New Mexico must ask why an
6	operator wouldn't qualify for a surety bond that
7	covers the anticipated liability. Wouldn't the surety
8	want to collect premiums? When determining whether to
9	offer bonds and on what terms, sureties consider
10	factors such as the remaining revenue in the
11	operator's wells, the operator's expenses, and the
12	operator's cash reserves.
13	If a surety declines to issue a bond or
14	requires higher premiums or higher amounts of
15	collateral, that means the surety has concluded that
16	that operator poses a higher risk of default. That
17	should sound an alarm prompting more action from state
18	regulators, not less.
19	Furthermore, surety providers are
20	unlikely to treat the entire oil and gas industry as a
21	monolith. New Mexico operators who can demonstrate a
22	history of plugging wells and setting aside funds for
23	plugging should still have ready access to the surety
24	market. To the extent the proposed amendments help
25	identify the operators with the riskiest wells, that

1	will only assist New Mexico's responsible operators.
2	Those responsible operators should be able to acquire
3	wells and continue production as the highest risk
4	operators exit the market.
5	MS. M. O'GRADY: NMOGA witnesses claim
6	the surety market isn't equipped to issue the volume
7	of surety instruments that would be needed to comply
8	with these rules. What is your response?
9	MR. MORGAN: Surety bonding is a robust
10	and sophisticated industry with hundreds of firms
11	providing bonds for a wide range of industries
12	including oil and gas. There are 245 distinct surety
13	providers on the U.S. Treasury Department's Circular
14	570 listing companies vetted by the Department and
15	deemed qualified to do business with the United
16	States. Almost all those sureties are licensed to do
17	business in New Mexico.
18	Sureties are always happy to collect
19	premiums. Sureties keep the premiums they collect,
20	regardless of whether they ultimately pay out the
21	bond. If the operator completes the plugging and the
22	regulator releases the bond, the surety still keeps
23	the collected premiums, which can be considered a pure
24	profit.
25	The larger the bond, the more premiums
	Page 569
	1496 307

1	may be collected, and if the operator defaults, the
2	surety can recover the bond amount on top of the
3	premiums collected by foreclosing on collateral and
4	filing a collection action against the operator.
5	Given the established capacity within
6	the surety bonding industry and the inherent desire to
7	collect premiums, concerns about the ability of surety
8	providers to satisfy an increased demand for bonding
9	are overstated, at least for responsible operators.
10	MS. M. O'GRADY: IPANM and NMOGA
11	witnesses claim that the unintended consequences of
12	the proposed amendments include premature plugging of
13	marginal wells, bankruptcies, increased orphaning,
14	increased bank debt, and operators exiting the state.
15	What is your response?
16	MR. MORGAN: These predictions are
17	contrary to the actual outcomes described by Boomhower
18	and Lange and Redlinger in their respective economic
19	studies describing the effects of increased bonding in
20	Texas and North Dakota. Those studies found no
21	meaningful decrease in production following adoption
22	of the increased bonding requirements.
23	Specifically, Boomhower observed that
24	"The state's total output of oil and gas was
25	essentially unaffected by the policy." This is
	Page 570

1 because the firms affected by the policy accounted for 2 a small fraction of production and because most of the valuable production associated with exiting firms was 3 reallocated to other producers instead of shutting 4 5 I would expect to see the same in New Mexico. 6 Although the Texas and North Dakota laws reviewed in the two studies required bond amounts 7 8 that are lower in absolute terms than the adjusted 9 financial assurance amounts in the proposed amendments, each law represented a significant 10 11 increase compared to prior requirements. 12 It is likely that certain high risk operators will see a decrease in access to capital and 13 may choose to exit the market, but it's not accurate 14 15 to say that the industry as a whole will be impacted 16 the same way. The financially capable operators who 17 remain will be able to acquire and continue producing economic wells. 18 19 To the extent any additional wells are 20 orphaned following adoption of the proposed 2.1 amendments, the changes to the regulations would not 22 be to blame. These wells are likely already going to be orphaned, regardless of what action the Commission 23 2.4 takes. Operators of these wells have failed to set aside the funds necessary for plugging. 25

1	The only question is timing. Under the
2	current regulations, operators are encouraged to kick
3	the can down the road, but the outcome will be well
4	orphaning. To the extent the amended regulations
5	accelerate this process, the amendments are merely
6	exposing this reality and allowing the state to take
7	action sooner to address the need to plug those wells.
8	MS. M. O'GRADY: NMOGA witnesses claim
9	the proposed rules are a one-size-fits-all approach in
LO	contravention of the statute. What is your response?
L1	MR. MORGAN: In relevant part, the
L2	statute states "In establishing categories of
L3	financial assurance, the Oil Conservation Commission
L4	shall consider the depth of the well involved, the
L5	length of time since the well was produced, the cost
L6	of plugging similar wells, and such other factors as
L7	the Oil Conservation Division deems relevant."
L8	The listing of multiple factors to
L9	together with inclusion of the additional catchall
20	"such other factors as the Oil Conservation Division
21	deems relevant" directs the Commission to consider
22	relevant available information, and the ultimate
23	mandate of the statute is that the one well plugging
24	financial assurance be sufficient to reasonably pay
25	the cost of plugging the wells covered by the

financial assurance.

2.1

2.4

The proposed amendments fully satisfy the statutory requirements. Under the existing regulations, one well financial assurances are determined solely on the basis of a single statutory factor, the depth of the well. None of the parties opposing the proposed amendments have suggested that this existing regulation contravenes the statute by focusing on a single statutory factor nor have any of the parties offered testimony demonstrating that the current standard of \$25,000 plus \$2 per foot of well depth bears any relationship to actual well plugging costs.

Indeed, under that formula, a 10,000-foot well would require only a \$45,000 bond or less than one third OCD's actual average plugging cost of \$163,000. The current approach of focusing solely on well depth fails to capture additional significant cost drivers including the age of the well, how long since the well stopped producing, the condition of the wellbore, and any challenges in accessing the well site.

Those factors, including well depth, are inherently incorporated into the approach adopted in the proposed amendments, where the \$150,000 one

1	well financial assurance is based on OCD's actual
2	average cost of plugging wells. This approach of
3	relying on OCD's actual plugging costs is the most
4	effective way to ensure that the one well plugging
5	financial assurance is sufficient to reasonably pay
6	the cost of plugging the wells covered by the
7	financial assurance.
8	MS. M. O'GRADY: NMOGA and OXY
9	witnesses claim that OCD lacks the legal authority
10	under the statute to require the large blanket bonding
11	amounts that would be required under the proposed
12	rule. What is your response?
13	MR. MORGAN: Applicants' proposal does
14	not conflict with any of the Act's requirements,
15	including the requirement to establish a blanket
16	plugging financial assurance capped at \$250,000.
17	Applicants' proposal still includes a \$250,000 blanket
18	plugging financial assurance for active wells.
19	Applicants also propose to add
20	additional categories of financial assurance, all of
21	which come within the Commission's authority to
22	establish different categories of financial assurance,
23	and none of which are blanket bonds that exceed the
24	statutory maximum.
25	For the administrative convenience of

1	operators, Applicants and OCD propose that for
2	marginal wells, an operator may furnish all necessary
3	one well plugging and financial assurance in the form
4	of a single instrument. Allowing a single instrument
5	instead of multiple instruments for marginal and
6	inactive wells does not turn the one well plugging
7	financial assurance required into a blanket plugging
8	financial assurance.
9	There is an important distinction
10	between a blanket plugging financial assurance and the
11	allowance that an operator may satisfy its cumulative
12	financial assurance obligations through a single
13	instrument. Under the former, the operator is allowed
14	to provide coverage for multiple wells at a fixed
15	amount such that as the number of covered wells
16	increases, the per well coverage decreases.
17	In contrast, under the single
18	instrument approach, the total amount of financial
19	assurance required is calculated, including both
20	eligible blanket financial assurance amounts and one
21	well financial assurance amounts, and then the
22	operator secures a bond or other financial assurance
23	instrument for that total combined figure.
24	Just because an operator qualifies for
25	use of a blanket financial assurance for some of its

1	wells does not mean that the \$250,000 cap applies to
2	all of the financial assurances required for that
3	operator.
4	MS. M. O'GRADY: IPANM and NMOGA
5	witnesses object to the proposed amendment or
6	excuse me object that the proposed amendment
7	preventing drilling or acquisition until the operator
8	has furnished the required financial assurance is
9	vague and broad and would inject a new pre-acquisition
10	approval power. What is your response?
11	MR. MORGAN: The Hearing Officer
12	addressed a similar argument in her recent
13	recommendation on the motion to dismiss, noting that
14	the movement suggest insertion of the phrase
15	"operating authority" to remove any confusion over the
16	effect of this provision. Applicants support
17	insertion of the phrase "operating authority" or
18	related phrases at three points in Section 19.5.8.9.A
19	NMAC, both in the proposed additional language and in
20	existing portions of the provision.
21	MR. SUAZO: Madam Hearing Officer, I
22	object to this testimony from the witness. I know
23	that there's a handout that was circulated on this
24	rule, and I guess in my mind this constitutes an
25	untimely new rule.

1	You know, NMOGA has not had the chance
2	to review it with Industry. We have not received
3	feedback from our experts. This has not been subject
4	to public notice, and I think if Applicants want to
5	raise this in post-hearing arguments or something like
6	that, that's fine. But, you know, that's based on the
7	feedback of what we learned at the hearing, and I
8	don't think it's appropriate for them to be providing
9	these rule changes at this juncture.
10	THE HEARING OFFICER: So I invited them
11	to do that in my recommendation, and I understand the
12	Commission didn't take a final action on the motion.
13	But because the applicants and NMOGA and IPANM, the
14	movements of the motion seemed to just be in agreement
15	that this was the appropriate interpretation of this
16	language. I believe
17	MR. SUAZO: Well, I'm not sure that
18	that is a fair characterization of our position. I
19	mean, operating authority is not a defined term.
20	THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Well, let
21	me put it this way. I invited them to do this during
22	their case.
23	MR. SUAZO: Understood.
24	THE HEARING OFFICER: So I'm going to
25	accept it, and the Commission is going to have to
	Page 577

1	decide what to do with it. You can certainly offer
2	your response later, but truly because my reading of
3	both the applicants' legal argument and the movement's
4	legal argument was that this is, you know, all
5	effectively agreed that this is what drilling and
6	acquisition meant. Was not about real property; it
7	was about operating authority.
8	So, Ms. Fox, do you have anything to
9	add?
10	MS. FOX: We would just add that this
11	is both within the scope of the rulemaking and
12	responsive to NMOGA's filings.
13	THE HEARING OFFICER: That's my take as
14	well.
15	So again, if you'd like to address this
16	in the next three weeks before the hearing ends, that
17	would be great. And I'm sorry if I misunderstood your
18	argument. I actually thought you believed that this
19	was the right language. In fact, at the top of page
20	6 is it the top of page 6 in your reply I think
21	you suggested exactly well, now I'd have to find
22	it.
23	MR. SUAZO: Well, we offered that as a
24	potential clarification, but, you know, even still,
25	you know, this belies kind of the inherent problems

1	with the rulemaking in terms of not getting industry
2	feedback. And so, you know, again, I feel like this
3	is a new rule proposal that's in front of the
4	Commission. I understand you're admitting it over our
5	objection, and the Commission has the authority to
6	assess this going forward.
7	I guess at some point we will have some
8	sort of oral argument on the motion to dismiss and the
9	authority and all that kind of thing, but I just
10	wanted to note our objection to this for the record.
11	THE HEARING OFFICER: All righty.
12	So, Ms. O'Grady, I forgot to look at
13	the time when Mr. Suazo raised his objection, and now
14	we are on the cusp of public comment. How much longer
15	would you have?
16	MS. M. O'GRADY: We have, I would
17	guess, more than ten minutes, so we're fine to
18	continue after public comment.
19	THE HEARING OFFICER: All righty. So
20	let's break then. I have just one person on the
21	platform desiring to make public comment.
22	And, Sheila, can you say whether there
23	are others reaching out to you on the platform? I
24	think I see two more. Okay. And let me ask if
25	there's anyone in the room here to offer public

1	comment during the four o'clock session. No.
2	All right. So, Sheila, the Spanish
3	interpreter sent a text asking that you unmute her so
4	that in the event someone would like interpretation
5	between English and Spanish, she can provide that.
6	MS. APODACA: She's on the platform.
7	Her name is Lisa O'Grady, and she's unmuted now.
8	THE HEARING OFFICER: She is unmuted?
9	MS. APODACA: Yeah.
10	THE HEARING OFFICER: All right, Lisa.
11	You're unmuted.
12	MS. L. O'GRADY: May I test just to see
13	if I can be heard?
14	THE HEARING OFFICER: I can hear you.
15	MS. L. O'GRADY: Perfect. Thank you.
16	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.
17	So let's turn to public comment. Is
18	Walter Gerstle on the platform?
19	MS. APODACA: I'm not seeing him.
20	THE HEARING OFFICER: You don't see
21	him? All right. So let me make a few comments then
22	about public comment at this four o'clock session.
23	This is one of the sessions in which interpretation is
24	being provided between English and Spanish and Spanish
25	and English. We will have one or two more of those.

1	The next one will be October 27th.
2	Lisa, would you like to say something
3	in Spanish in the event someone is listening?
4	MS. L. O'GRADY: Of course, Madam
5	Hearing Officer.
6	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you very
7	much. So just a few things. I'll ask you to spell
8	your first and last name. I'll ask you to swear or
9	affirm that you will tell the truth. I'll ask you to
10	keep your oral comments to three minutes. You may
11	certainly add to whatever you say orally in writing.
12	Written public comments go to Sheila Apodaca, the
13	Commission administrator, and thank you all.
14	So, Sheila, who is our is our first
15	person Sherry Morrison?
16	MS. APODACA: Yes. That's number one.
17	THE HEARING OFFICER: All right.
18	Ms. Morrison, can you unmute yourself?
19	Ms. Morrison? Let's see. You may need to press
20	Control, Shift, M to unmute.
21	Sheila, I see someone named Paul
22	Morrison has his hand up. Would you unmute Paul
23	Morrison instead, please?
24	Mr. Morrison, can you unmute yourself?
25	You may need to hit Control, Shift, M. Okay. Can you

1	unmute yourself now, Mr. Morrison? No. All right.
2	Sheila, I'm not sure what's happening
3	with the Morrisons, but I see that Senator Townsend is
4	on the platform. Would you allow him to unmute
5	himself, please?
6	MS. APODACA: Okay. He's been given
7	permission.
8	THE HEARING OFFICER: Senator, can you
9	unmute yourself? You may need to hit Control, Shift,
10	М.
11	MR. TOWNSEND: Can you hear me now?
12	THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes. Yes. Thank
13	you very much. Thank you.
14	MR. TOWNSEND: Okay. Thank you very
15	much.
16	THE HEARING OFFICER: So, Senator, I
17	see that your name is J-I-M T-O-W-N-S-E-N-D. That's
18	for the transcript.
19	WHEREUPON,
20	JIM TOWNSEND,
21	called as a witness and having been first duly sworn
22	to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but
23	the truth, was examined and testified as follows:
24	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Go
25	ahead.

1	MR. TOWNSEND: You bet. Thank you for
2	the opportunity.
3	My comments today are in opposition to
4	the increase that's being proposed. Today, operators
5	in New Mexico pay a substantial fee into the
6	Reclamation Fund. That fund has been used and
7	diverted for many other purposes over the years, and
8	it has been drawn down and not used as it was
9	originally agreed upon, one.
10	Two, this issue has been debated by the
11	legislature on more than one occasion. The last time
12	I think was in about 2018 or '19. And there was a
13	decision made then to increase it, and that increase
14	at that particular time was substantial. And I
15	believe it is sufficient, and when you take that
16	increase of just a few years ago and the the proper
17	use of the Reclamation Fund, that effort would be more
18	than funded.
19	And the third thing I'd like to say is
20	that when issues like this are debated and a
21	conclusion is reached in the legislature, I don't
22	believe it is proper for this to be taken in another,
23	you know, kind of around the back door and try to do
24	something that the when they don't get the right
25	answer or when they don't get an answer that they
	Page 583

1	agree on, whether a secretary wants to go have a
2	rulemaking over here or rulemaking over there or
3	somebody wants to take it around and go through the
4	courts, that's not what this process is about.
5	And so I strongly oppose this. I think
6	we have the tools within our tool chest to use to
7	address the issue. And if we would straighten out the
8	misuse of the Reclamation Fund first and we would give
9	that time to recuperate, we would have more than
10	enough to do to meet the needs of any wells that might
11	need to be plugged.
12	So those are my comments, and that's
13	the reason I strongly oppose.
14	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you very
15	much, Senator.
16	MR. TOWNSEND: Thank you.
17	THE HEARING OFFICER: Sheila, would you
18	go back oh, all right.
19	Rod Montoya, can you unmute yourself?
20	MR. MONTOYA: I think. Can you hear
21	me?
22	THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes, I can. And
23	for the transcript, your name is spelled R-O-D
24	M-O-N-T-O-Y-A.
25	WHEREUPON,
	Page 584

1	ROD MONTOYA,
2	called as a witness and having been first duly sworn
3	to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but
4	the truth, was examined and testified as follows:
5	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.
6	Please go ahead.
7	MR. MONTOYA: Okay. And by the way,
8	I'm House Representative Rod Montoya. I'm the ranking
9	member on the House Energy Committee for the
10	Republicans.
11	THE HEARING OFFICER: Oh, thank you.
12	MR. MONTOYA: So I wanted to follow up
13	a little bit on what Senator Townsend just said. And
14	further than just the fact that the dollars that are
15	going into the Reclamation Fund are being diverted,
16	they have been diverted for for years and years.
17	So this year, Representative Mark Murphy, myself,
18	Democrat Representative Meredith Dixon, and a couple
19	of others, we introduced House Bill 403, and it made
20	it through the Energy Committee unanimously. And
21	there are there are six Democrats on that committee
22	and four Republicans and I'm sorry. Seven
23	Democrats and four Republicans, and it was unanimous.
24	And what that House Bill 403 did is it
25	started to divert money back to the Reclamation Fund,

which is supposed to be for financial assurance. And the amount of money that's being diverted or at least the amount of money that was diverted last year out of the fund to the general fund was \$129 million. If those dollars would be -- would have remained in the fund, we would have more than enough money to plug the approximately 2,000 wells that are out there.

2.4

As a matter of fact, if we just diverted the money back to the fund the way it's supposed to be instead of going to the general fund, which is not the purpose, the -- it would take about four years for all of the wells that are currently needing to be plugged could be plugged. So this rulemaking is unnecessary in part because we were working towards a solution in the House Energy Committee, and we had the agreement of every member of that committee to move forward.

So quite frankly, you're preempting the actual process that we have because there's more than enough money coming into the general fund that we could completely backfill the money if it were to go to where it's supposed to go. So I would suggest that even if you're wanting to do this, shouldn't do it before the 30-day session because we are planning on addressing this. And if you want to look it up, House

1	Bill 403, and it's something we're trying to negotiate
2	right now.
3	So please let the legislature do our
4	job, and as Senator Townsend said, don't usurp our
5	authority. Thank you.
6	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you,
7	Representative Montoya.
8	Should we go back to the Morrisons,
9	Sheila? They're still on.
10	MR. MORRISON: Okay. My name is Paul
11	Morrison.
12	THE HEARING OFFICER: Oh, hello. I can
13	hear
14	MR. MORRISON: What's that?
15	THE HEARING OFFICER: I can hear you.
16	Thank you.
17	MR. MORRISON: Oh.
18	THE HEARING OFFICER: So for the
19	transcript, I see your name is spelled P-A-U-L
20	M-O-R-R-I-S-O-N.
21	WHEREUPON,
22	PAUL MORRISON,
23	called as a witness and having been first duly sworn
24	to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but
25	the truth, was examined and testified as follows:
	Page 587

1	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Go
2	ahead. Go ahead. Please go ahead.
3	MR. MORRISON: I just tell the truth
4	naturally, but okay. My name is Paul Morrison, and I
5	want to thank you for the opportunity to make some
6	comments here. I have lived in New Mexico for 23
7	years, and during that time, our son earned his Ph.D.
8	at UNM and he is now chief economist for the
9	Department of Transportation.
10	His department is very concerned with
11	the oil and gas industry. As you may know that the
12	Department of Transportation is pretty well self-
13	funded, and his job is to help find out how much money
14	is going to be coming in his and and but so and
15	it's important to him so they can get funding there.
16	And and my work before I came down
17	here as a retiree was in put me in touch with the
18	oil and gas industry through my underwriting career.
19	My econ degree is helpful for that, and I I can
20	analyze and analyze risk and price for it. But
21	this is something completely different, and and
22	but I but I know from my work that there's so many
23	different skills and crafts involved in production of
24	oil and gas and all the ancillary things to it and
25	further down the line.

1	And that includes and that does make
2	it so that there's an awful lot of employees depending
3	on oil and gas, and more regulations don't help. So I
4	would like to say I'm opposed to any more regulations,
5	and maybe we could get rid of a few of them that
6	that are not really useful.
7	So and I also worked with the oil and
8	gas industry in Alaska, where the jobs are very
9	similar but slightly different, and it's all it's
10	all very close, and there's a lot of federal
11	regulations as as well. It it and the oil
12	and gas production in New Mexico provides an awful lot
13	of energy for our country, and we cannot make it on
14	the renewables.
15	The solar and wind do not help the base
16	power, and they're not going to help anything as much
17	as they they help a little, but we still need power
18	plants running on natural gas, as they're doing a
19	great job now in different parts of the country. And
20	so it's so we need to promote oil and gas industry
21	here in New Mexico rather than trying to limit it,
22	which I think more more regulations would do.
23	And so I again, I thank you and I
24	think other people ought to get involved to help and
25	this end of my comments. Thank you.

1	MS. MORRISON: This is Sherry. Can I
2	just speak right now?
3	MR. MORRISON: Yeah.
4	THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes. Yes, you
5	may. Is your first name spelled S-H-E-R-R-Y?
6	MS. MORRISON: Yes.
7	THE HEARING OFFICER: All right.
8	Sherry Morrison.
9	WHEREUPON,
10	SHERRY MORRISON,
11	called as a witness and having been first duly sworn
12	to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but
13	the truth, was examined and testified as follows:
14	THE HEARING OFFICER: I'll start your
15	time. Thank you. Go ahead.
16	MS. MORRISON: Okay. Like I said, my
17	name is Sherry Morrison, and thank you for giving
18	me me the opportunity to present my concerns. I've
19	lived in New Mexico for the last 23 years. My family
20	immigrated to this to the U.S. when I was three
21	years old. My father was so thankful to America
22	because he fulfilled his dream by building two
23	successful small businesses.
24	Transportation was critical to both
25	business. One business was where he made box springs,
	Page 590

.e
.e
.d
W
1
1

1 Can you unmute yourself? You may need to press 2 Control, Shift, M. Rebecca Haulenbeek? No? All 3 right. 4 Shall we try "SM" first? Let's see. Where did "SM" go? Oh, I think "SM" was Sherry 5 Morrison. 6 Sorry. 7 Ms. Haulenbeek, are you able to unmute 8 yourself? Apparently not. 9 MS. APODACA: And Walter Gerstle, I believe, is on the line. 10 11 THE HEARING OFFICER: Oh, is that 12 Mr. Gerstle? Hello. Can you unmute yourself, 13 Mr. Gerstle? You might have to press Control, Shift, 14 M. We're not hearing you. 15 MS. APODACA: Let's try something else. 16 Let's see if he can do it now. 17 THE HEARING OFFICER: You can unmute 18 yourself. Perhaps Control, Shift, M? We're pressing 19 the unmute button. 20 MR. GERSTLE: Now do you hear me? 2.1 THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes. Thank you. 22 MR. GERSTLE: Okay. 23 THE HEARING OFFICER: Is your name for 24 the transcript W-A-L-T-E-R G-E-R-S-T-L-E? 25 MR. GERSTLE: Yes.

1	WHEREUPON,
2	WALTER GERSTLE,
3	called as a witness and having been first duly sworn
4	to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but
5	the truth, was examined and testified as follows:
6	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Yeah.
7	Please begin.
8	MR. GERSTLE: Hi. Hello, New Mexico
9	Oil Conservation Commissioners. My name is Walter
10	Gerstle. I am a professor emeritus of civil
11	engineering at the University of New Mexico. These
12	are my personal comments regarding the necessity to
13	adequately clean up the environmental destruction
14	created when extracting oil and gas from deep deep
15	underground.
16	It is clear that until now and
17	currently the requirements for cleanup from gas and
18	oil extraction are inadequate. When we talk about
19	sustainability and circular economy, we cannot afford
20	to allow gas wells to be left unplugged and orphaned
21	after they become uneconomical to operate.
22	On a more general note, the burning of
23	fossil fuels is unacceptably damaging our environment.
24	Drought, excessive heat, wildfires, and flooding have
25	been clearly exacerbated by climate change caused by

1	the burning of fossil fuels since the advent of the
2	Industrial Revolution. The public pays dearly for
3	these effects of the climate of climate change.
4	We've seen a lot of forest fires and flooding in New
5	Mexico and as well as drought, which are linked to
6	climate change.
7	New Mexico is in the difficult position
8	of relying in the short term upon revenues from oil
9	and gas extraction while at the same time seeking to
10	limit carbon emissions in an effort to save the
11	environment. These goals are in conflict. One small
12	step that we can take is to at least make sure that
13	the companies that profit from oil and gas extraction
14	clean up their operations once their wells stop
15	producing.
16	The proposed rules must ensure that all
17	oil and gas wells are plugged at no cost to the state
18	of New Mexico. People's health has been shown to be
19	negatively affected by proximity to oil and gas wells.
20	Please set the strongest possible rules for plugging
21	of oil and gas wells. We should strive to leave the
22	state of New Mexico better than we found it.
23	Thank you.
24	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you,
25	Mr. Gerstle.

1	Is Rebecca Haulenbeek able to unmute
2	herself at this point?
3	MS. HAULENBEEK: Yes, ma'am.
4	THE HEARING OFFICER: Oh, terrific. I
5	can hear you. Is your name spelled R-E-B-E-C-C-A
6	H-A-U-L-E-N-B-E-E-K?
7	MS. HAULENBEEK: Yes, ma'am.
8	WHEREUPON,
9	REBECCA HAULENBEEK,
10	called as a witness and having been first duly sworn
11	to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but
12	the truth, was examined and testified as follows:
13	THE HEARING OFFICER: Please go ahead.
14	MS. HAULENBEEK: Hi. My name is
15	Rebecca Haulenbeek, and I have lived in New Mexico for
16	50 years. I was raised in Alaska, so the energy
17	industry has played a prominent role in my life. My
18	father, brother, and I have had the unique experience
19	of working in construction. Having worked in
20	construction, I have seen the impact oil and gas has
21	made on the economy of the entire state. Every person
22	in business requires goods to be transported to their
23	location.
24	I support the industry because both of
25	my children went to our public school system and
	Page 595

1	therefore I'm very concerned about funding being
2	pulled from our schools. Currently we are 50th in the
3	nation in education, and I would like to continue to
4	see funding for our next generation. I can no
5	longer I'm sorry. I can see no other industry
6	being able to step in with the additional support that
7	the oil and gas industry has provided to us.
8	I would appreciate the Commission
9	rejecting this regulation since it would not only put
10	small business oil and gas companies out of business
11	because they would not be able to afford the new
12	regulations, and when they go out of business, then it
13	affects other companies to be going out of business as
14	well, examples being construction companies,
15	restaurants, housing projects, banks, and mom and pop
16	shops.
17	Having lived and worked on and near
18	military installations, I can also see how the oil and
19	gas industry affects our national security as well as
20	our standing in the world economy. Thank you very
21	much.
22	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you,
23	Ms. Haulenbeek.
24	Sheila, do we have anyone else on the
25	platform desiring to make public comment at this time?

1	There'll be another opportunity tomorrow at nine in
2	the morning. Another opportunity tomorrow at four in
3	the afternoon.
4	MS. APODACA: I don't see any other
5	hands raised.
6	THE HEARING OFFICER: Well,
7	Ms. Haulenbeek's hand is raised, but no others?
8	MS. APODACA: I I don't see any
9	others.
10	THE HEARING OFFICER: All right. And
11	no one has joined us in the room.
12	All right. So here's the thing. We've
13	been going a little more than 90 minutes, about a
14	hundred minutes, and we need a brief standup break.
15	So let's come back at 4:30, and we'll return to
16	Mr. Morgan. Thank you.
17	MS. L. O'GRADY: And, Madam Hearing
18	Officer, may the interpreter be excused?
19	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Lisa.
20	Yes. Thank you.
21	MS. L. O'GRADY: Thank you. Have a
22	good afternoon, everyone.
23	(Off the record.)
24	THE HEARING OFFICER: Let's come back
25	from the break, please. I know that was a really
	Page 597

1	short break, but we can only go about another 30
2	minutes, so wanted to keep us cooking along, as
3	Mr. Tremaine said.
4	Let's see. I see Mr. Morgan on the
5	stand.
6	Ms. O'Grady?
7	MS. M. O'GRADY: I apologize. My
8	computer is shut down unexpectedly and is restarting.
9	Please give just a moment, but I do believe we only
10	have about 10 to 15 more minutes of his testimony, so
11	should fit perfectly for the rest of this afternoon.
12	Thank you.
13	THE HEARING OFFICER: Yep.
14	MS. M. O'GRADY: Sheila, Tannis Fox
15	would like to share her screen, please.
16	MS. APODACA: Okay. She has
17	permission.
18	MS. M. O'GRADY: Really appreciate
19	everyone's patience there. I think that we have the
20	slide deck up. Perfect. And I am going to restate
21	the question that we were on when we received an
22	objection.
23	BY MS. M. O'GRADY:
24	MS. M. O'GRADY: So, Mr. Morgan, IPANM
25	and NMOGA witnesses object to the proposed amendment

1	that prevents drilling or acquisition until the
2	operator has furnished the required financial
3	assurance, claiming that the proposed new language is
4	vague and broad and would inject a new pre-acquisition
5	approval power. What is your response?
6	MR. MORGAN: So as we just discussed,
7	the Hearing Officer addressed a similar argument in
8	her recent recommendation on the motion to dismiss,
9	noting that the movements suggest insertion of the
LO	phrase "operating authority" to remove any confusion
L1	over the effect of this provision. Applicants support
L2	insertion of the phrase "operating authority" or
L3	related phrases at three points in Section 19.15.8.9.A
L4	NMAC, both in the proposed additional language and in
L5	the existing portions of the provision.
L6	This newly proposed language is
L7	reflected in Applicants' Exhibit 88, which has been
L8	handed out to the commissioners and all parties. I'll
L9	note it is not reflected on the slide here, but I'm
20	going to describe where it fits within there. So in
21	all cases, the phrase "operating authority" follows
22	and modifies the phrase "drilled or acquired" or
23	similar phrase. So this occurs twice in the existing
24	language and then in the language that's highlighted
25	in red in the in the slide and again is reflected
	Page 599

in Exhibit 88.

2.1

2.4

This approach of modifying "drilled or acquired" with the phrase "operating authority" is entirely consistent with Applicants' original intent, which has always been to require financial assurances prior to a change in operating authority, which already falls under OCD's authority.

Nothing in the proposed language suggests that OCD would or could have a role in approving the sale of a well. Operators engaged in the sale of wells should, however, continue to be aware that even after a well is sold, if the parties wish to change the -- the designated operator, that step does involve OCD oversight and review.

It is inherent in any financial assurance scheme that the financial assurance must be provided before the obligation is incurred, whether it be drilling the well or becoming the operator of an existing well. It would defeat the entire purpose of financial assurance where it otherwise.

For example, what would happen if a well were drilled and then the operator could not secure a bond or other financial assurance? OCD would be without recourse because it would be too late to undo the activity giving rise to the obligation. You

1	cannot undrill a well. If the operator were not then
2	able to provide the required financial assurance, OCD
3	would still be responsible for covering the full
4	plugging cost in the event of orphaning.
5	MS. M. O'GRADY: NMOGA, IPANM, and OXY
6	witnesses object to the proposed new categories of
7	financial assurance for marginal wells, claiming that
8	the one well financial assurance of \$150,000 for
9	marginal wells, inactive wells, and wells in approved
10	or expired temporarily abandoned status would be
11	prohibitively expensive for many operators and may
12	disproportionately affect smaller operators. What is
13	your response?
14	MR. MORGAN: Because it is OCD that is
15	responsible for plugging wells that have been orphaned
16	and subject to financial assurance forfeiture, the
17	only relevant figure for determining the typical cost
18	to plug and abandon a New Mexico well is the cost to
19	OCD. The current average cost to plug a well in New
20	Mexico is \$163,000, though OCD has reported average
21	costs as high as \$180,000 per well.
22	To the extent witnesses for NMOGA or
23	IPANM claim that the \$163,000 is artificially high and
24	attributable to factors that OCD is in the process of
25	correcting, that potential is already factored into

1	the proposed amendments. The proposed amendments set
2	one well financial assurance amounts at \$150,000, not
3	\$163,000.
4	Nothing in the proposed amendments
5	targets small operators. Small, medium and large
6	operators are all subject to the financial assurance
7	requirements. That said, smaller operators should be
8	required to comply with the same regulatory
9	requirements as any other operator and should not be
LO	exempted.
L1	These requirements, including financial
L2	assurance requirements, are intended to protect New
L3	Mexico's communities, environment, and economy. If an
L4	operator cannot comply with these requirements, it
L 5	should not be in the oil and gas business. It's also
L6	worth emphasizing that wells that enter into marginal
L7	well status can also come out of marginal well status
L8	if production sufficiently increases. Such wells
L9	would no longer be subject to the increased financial
20	assurance amount.
21	The proposed amendment at
22	19.15.8.9.D(2) NMAC, which is reflected in Applicants'
23	Exhibit 72, provides that "Each operator with a
24	marginal well or wells shall annually review the
25	number of marginal wells registered to the operator

1	and shall update the one well plugging financial
2	assurance by May 1 of each year. Any marginal well
3	that was plugged or where production increased above
4	the threshold would no longer be included in the
5	operator's marginal well count following that annual
6	review." This was language Applicants and OCD
7	negotiated with OXY.
8	MS. M. O'GRADY: NMOGA witnesses object
9	to the inflationary adjustment provision in the
10	proposed rules, claiming that it would lead to a
11	conflict with the statutory cap for blanket financial
12	assurance. What is your response?
13	MR. MORGAN: The opposition to this
14	proposed amendment overlooks that the proposal
15	expressly provides OCD with discretion to decline to
16	adjust financial assurance amounts in any given year.
17	The proposal says only that "The Division may adjust
18	the financial assurance amounts." This inherent
19	discretion is adequate to address concerns related to
20	actual costs experienced within the oil fields and
21	other practical considerations.
22	The \$250,000 cap on the amount of
23	blanket financial assurance is not relevant to the
24	proposed amendment allowing for adjustments to
25	financial assurance amounts because the proposed

1	language expressly excludes blanket financial
2	assurances for active wells.
3	The blanket financial assurance amount
4	for active wells is set at 19.15.8.9.C(2) NMAC. This
5	subsection is excluded from the list of financial
6	assurance categories subject to the adjustments. That
7	provision applies only to the financial assurance
8	amounts provided by subsections $C(1)$, D , E , and F of
9	this section.
10	MS. M. O'GRADY: After negotiations
11	with OXY, Applicants proposed to amend 19.15.9.8,
12	Operator Registration, and 19.15.9.9 NMAC, Change of
13	Operator. Correct?
14	MR. MORGAN: Yes. The amended proposal
15	makes three fundamental changes that appear and recur
16	in the proposed amendments to Sections 19.15.9.8 and
17	19.5.9.9 NMAC. First, the amended proposal replaces
18	"Officer, director, or partner" with "authorized
19	official." This provides the operators with greater
20	flexibility in determining who is most suited to
21	provide the required certification and accommodates a
22	broader range of company structures and position
23	titles.
24	The amended proposal also eliminates
25	the phrase "is in compliance with federal and state
	Page 604

1 oil and gas laws and regulations" and replaces it with 2 a list of more specific and concrete actions and The focus on forfeiture demands and actual 3 forfeited financial assurance provides a very specific 4 5 and easily trackable metric. No operator can claim to be unaware of 6 7 a forfeiture demand or a past forfeiture, as this is a 8 serious consequence that would be obvious and well-9 known within a company. Forfeiture also occurs at the 10 end of an administrative process where an operator has 11 multiple opportunities to correct an innocent mistake 12 or paperwork violation. 13 adjudicated orders or unresolved settlement 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

Similarly, the reference to "unresolved adjudicated orders or unresolved settlement agreements" captures instances where operators have been unable or unwilling to comply with program requirements even after being duly notified and given an opportunity to correct. Such are the operators and scenarios most likely to warrant increased attention and action by OCD.

To the extent the proposed amendments reference oil and gas statutes and regulations in other jurisdictions, this is merely to provide information to inform purely New Mexico focused actions by OCD regarding operators seeking to do

1	business in New Mexico. Nothing in the proposed
2	amendments authorizes or requires OCD to take any
3	action outside of its jurisdiction.
4	MS. M. O'GRADY: IPANM and NMOGA
5	witnesses claim that the proposed not excuse me
6	the proposed compliance provisions could lead to
7	unfair treatment of operators based on a former
8	employers non-compliance and that the proposed
9	provisions would delay development and acquisitions.
10	What is your response?
11	MR. MORGAN: The parties opposing these
12	proposed amendments fail to explain why it is in the
13	interest of New Mexico or the industry itself to
14	facilitate the continued employment of bad actors.
15	The proposed amendments bear only on executives or
16	investors who have participated in companies that have
17	accrued violations.
18	If the industry is responsible and
19	self-policing as claimed, and if documented violations
20	are attributable to a small number of bad actor
21	operators, the proposed amendments should not
22	materially impact the vast majority of operators.
23	Industry participants should already be tracking this
24	information and should already be vetting the
25	background of executives.

1	MS. M. O'GRADY: NMOGA witnesses claim
2	that the proposed additional certifications
3	effectively act as a prohibition on some transfers and
4	in so doing violate New Mexico's ban on the impairment
5	of obligations of contracts. What is your response?
6	MR. MORGAN: OCD clearly already has
7	authority to block the transfer of oil and gas assets.
8	Under current regulations, OCD may deny a change of
9	operator if the new operator is out of compliance with
LO	19.15.5.9.A NMAC or is acquiring facilities that are
L1	subject to an existing compliance order and the new
L2	operator has not entered into an agreed compliance
L3	order.
L4	The proposed amendments provide
L5	additional grounds for OCD denial but do not impose a
	addreionar grounds for och dentar bae do noe impose a
L6	new authority where one did not previously exist.
L6	
L6 L7	new authority where one did not previously exist.
L6 L7 L8	new authority where one did not previously exist. Furthermore, and as addressed in the newly proposed
	new authority where one did not previously exist. Furthermore, and as addressed in the newly proposed language recently discussed, nothing in the
L6 L7 L8	new authority where one did not previously exist. Furthermore, and as addressed in the newly proposed language recently discussed, nothing in the regulations applies to the actual sale of a well; only
L6 L7 L8 L9	new authority where one did not previously exist. Furthermore, and as addressed in the newly proposed language recently discussed, nothing in the regulations applies to the actual sale of a well; only to the change of operator for regulatory purposes.
L6 L7 L8 L9	new authority where one did not previously exist. Furthermore, and as addressed in the newly proposed language recently discussed, nothing in the regulations applies to the actual sale of a well; only to the change of operator for regulatory purposes. MS. M. O'GRADY: IPANM and the NMOGA
16 17 18 19 20 21	new authority where one did not previously exist. Furthermore, and as addressed in the newly proposed language recently discussed, nothing in the regulations applies to the actual sale of a well; only to the change of operator for regulatory purposes. MS. M. O'GRADY: IPANM and the NMOGA witnesses claim that the terms "substantial risk" and
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	new authority where one did not previously exist. Furthermore, and as addressed in the newly proposed language recently discussed, nothing in the regulations applies to the actual sale of a well; only to the change of operator for regulatory purposes. MS. M. O'GRADY: IPANM and the NMOGA witnesses claim that the terms "substantial risk" and "good standing" in the disclosure requirements are

1	already authorize OCD to deny operator registration or
2	change of operator. These are already inherently
3	discretionary provisions and nothing in the proposed
4	amendments changes that. The crux of any
5	discretionary determination as to whether to approve
6	or deny a change of operator would be assessment of
7	whether the applicant poses a "substantial risk that
8	the new operator would be unable to satisfy the
9	plugging and abandonment requirements."
10	Furthermore, the substantial risk
11	determination is not open-ended, but is grounded in
12	OCD's assessment of the information operators are
13	required to provide and whether that specific
14	information reveals that the new operator will be
15	unable to satisfy the plugging and abandonment
16	requirements.
17	Good standing is a well-defined term of
18	art under New Mexico law. The Secretary of State
19	office is specifically empowered under New Mexico
20	statute to issue a certificate of good standing for a
21	corporation, limited liability company, or other
22	entity.
23	The inclusion of the reference to in
24	good standing with the New Mexico Secretary of State
25	is a recognition that a corporation or other entity

1	may have registered with the Secretary of State's			
2	office but then fallen out of good standing, for			
3	example, by failing to pay certain fees or file			
4	certain required reports. The proposed amendment			
5	merely closes that loophole by requiring that an			
6	operator be both registered and in good standing.			
7	MS. M. O'GRADY: Thank you for the			
8	summary of your rebuttal testimony.			
9	Madam Hearing Officer, we anticipate			
10	roughly 15 minutes of surrebuttal. Would you like to			
11	hear that today?			
12	THE HEARING OFFICER: I think that's a			
13	good idea. We have 11 minutes to five. Is it okay if			
14	we go four minutes over?			
15	All right. Please go ahead.			
16	MS. M. O'GRADY: Okay. Thank you.			
17	DIRECT EXAMINATION			
18	BY MS. M. O'GRADY:			
19	MS. M. O'GRADY: Mr. Morgan, NMOGA			
20	witness Douglas Emerick claims on pages 10 through 12			
21	of his rebuttal testimony that the W&T Offshore			
22	litigation shows that changes to regulations will			
23	automatically lead sureties to increase collateral			
24	demands on operators, including as a means to get free			
25	of non-cancelable surety contracts. What is your			

1	response?
2	MR. MORGAN: Like Mr. Emerick, I have
3	also been closely following the W&T Offshore
4	litigation. I disagree with Mr. Emerick's
5	characterization of the facts and significance of that
6	litigation. Mr. Emerick repeatedly frames the lawsuit
7	as arising out of surety provider's demand for
8	increased collateral as a direct response to changes
9	to the Department of Interior's financial assurance
10	regulations for offshore facilities.
11	The actual statements of the surety
12	providers in the litigation show that they were not
13	specifically responding to that rule change, but were
14	instead motivated by the financial condition of the
15	W&T entities together with other existing economic
16	trends within the industry.
17	Here's how the sureties described the
18	reasoning behind their demands for additional
19	collateral. "Since Lexon issued the surety bonds at
20	the center of this litigation, W&T has reported
21	significant deterioration of its financial health.
22	"That development, coupled with
23	numerous other industry-wide issues, including
24	relevant court rulings, losses sustained across the
25	industry, and reinsurance considerations, led Lexon to

1 send a collateral demand notice to W&T. 2 "W&T's other sureties, who each have their own indemnity agreements with W&T, apparently 3 observed the same financial trends and independently 4 5 decided to demand collateral payment from WNT." 6 This is from Lexon's partial motion to 7 dismiss, which is Document 57 in the litigation. 8 There is no reference in that statement to the DOI 9 rule, despite the surety's listing of multiple factors to which they were reacting. This articulation of the 10 11 surety bonding industry's general concerns with the 12 health of the oil and gas industry and the risk of 13 operator default is consistent with Mr. Emerick's own 14 statements. 15 In his direct testimony, Mr. Emerick 16 observed that "The simple fact is that the surety 17 market today is very demanding and difficult to navigate. Surety companies have become more 18 restrictive in their underwriting guidelines to 19 20 minimize the risk that a bond will be called." 2.1 In that same W&T litigation filing, the 22 sureties also articulate why a surety provider would not respond to a financial assurance rule change by 23 2.4 dramatically increasing demands on operators under existing surety bond contracts, noting "It would make 25

1 no sense and be economically irrational for the 2 sureties to take any action that would threaten W&T's financial viability such that it could not perform its 3 obligations because the sureties would then be on the 4 5 hook for those obligations." 6 W&T does not explain why the sureties 7 would be motivated to force potential customers out of 8 the market. It would be economically irrational for 9 the sureties to require impossible collateral payments, cripple their customers, and demand 10 11 collateral terms that would effectively prevent 12 smaller oil and gas companies from obtaining 13 government mandated bonding. The same logic would apply to surety's 14 15 16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

The same logic would apply to surety's expected response to a rule change in New Mexico. Far from establishing that a change to financial assurance regulations will prompt a negative response from surety providers, the W&T litigation confirms that surety providers already have significant concerns about oil and gas operators defaulting on their plugging obligations. The Commission should share in those concerns and take common sense actions to protect the state by amending New Mexico's regulations as proposed by the applicants.

Mr. Emerick's repeated emphasis on the

1	non-cancelable nature of financial assurance
2	requirements in New Mexico is also telling because it
3	completely ignores the needs and priorities of the
4	beneficiary of the financial assurance, the state.
5	Mr. Emerick emphasizes that for surety bond providers,
6	"The ability to cancel or non-renew is a critical risk
7	management tool."
8	That may be true, but what the
9	statement omits is that as the surety's risk goes
10	down, the state's risk goes up. Were the state to
11	allow operators to provide cancelable surety bonds,
12	there would be no financial assurance to call on by
13	the end of a well's productive life.
14	Under that scenario, sureties would've
15	every incentive to provide bonding during the first
16	few years of a well's initial profitable production.
17	That's basically free money for the surety, where they
18	can pocket the annual premium payments while bearing
19	essentially zero risk of having to pay out the cleanup
20	bond.
21	But as soon as the wells production
22	goes down, the surety's calculus changes. As
23	production declines, the risk of having to pay out the
24	bond goes up. At that point, a rational surety would

cancel the bond or decline to renew a term limited

25

1	bond. Once the initial surety cancels its bond, no
2	rational surety would be willing to provide a
3	replacement bond.
4	As Mr. Emerick stated in his direct
5	testimony "For a host of reasons, surety companies
6	have become more restrictive in their underwriting
7	guidelines to minimize the risk that a bond will be
8	called." Once the initial bond is canceled, the state
9	will be left with no recourse and no protection.
10	It should be noted, however, that as
11	surety contract is a three-party contract, and OCD, as
12	one of the parties, may release a bond. For example,
13	if a well increases production and no longer qualifies
14	as a marginal well, OCD could release the extra
14 15	as a marginal well, OCD could release the extra marginal well bonding.
15	marginal well bonding.
15 16	marginal well bonding. MS. M. O'GRADY: With regard to new
15 16 17	marginal well bonding. MS. M. O'GRADY: With regard to new single well financial assurance provisions for
15 16 17 18	marginal well bonding. MS. M. O'GRADY: With regard to new single well financial assurance provisions for marginal wells, IPANM witness Trevor Gilstrap claims
15 16 17 18	marginal well bonding. MS. M. O'GRADY: With regard to new single well financial assurance provisions for marginal wells, IPANM witness Trevor Gilstrap claims on pages 5 through 6 of his rebuttal testimony that
15 16 17 18 19	marginal well bonding. MS. M. O'GRADY: With regard to new single well financial assurance provisions for marginal wells, IPANM witness Trevor Gilstrap claims on pages 5 through 6 of his rebuttal testimony that Applicants have not offered evidence that marginal
15 16 17 18 19 20	marginal well bonding. MS. M. O'GRADY: With regard to new single well financial assurance provisions for marginal wells, IPANM witness Trevor Gilstrap claims on pages 5 through 6 of his rebuttal testimony that Applicants have not offered evidence that marginal well operators are more likely to be out of compliance
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	marginal well bonding. MS. M. O'GRADY: With regard to new single well financial assurance provisions for marginal wells, IPANM witness Trevor Gilstrap claims on pages 5 through 6 of his rebuttal testimony that Applicants have not offered evidence that marginal well operators are more likely to be out of compliance or more likely to abandon wells. What is your
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	marginal well bonding. MS. M. O'GRADY: With regard to new single well financial assurance provisions for marginal wells, IPANM witness Trevor Gilstrap claims on pages 5 through 6 of his rebuttal testimony that Applicants have not offered evidence that marginal well operators are more likely to be out of compliance or more likely to abandon wells. What is your response?

1	wells is motivated by the heightened risk that these
2	low producing wells will be orphaned to the state.
3	That risk is the product of simple economics.
4	Marginal wells produce little revenue,
5	particularly as compared to plugging costs, and much
6	of that revenue is already committed to other
7	purposes, including royalty payments and well
8	maintenance unrelated to plugging. So even if all
9	remaining revenue from these wells were set aside only
LO	to pay for plugging, the funds would be inadequate for
L1	the purpose.
L2	Now, some operators may be able to use
L3	revenue from higher producing wells to cover the costs
L4	of plugging marginal wells, but the question remains
L5	as to how excuse me the question remains as to
L6	where the funds will come from to plug the last of
L7	those operators' wells. No industry witness has
L8	provided any testimony that operators of marginal
L9	wells are in the practice of setting aside such
20	plugging funds during periods of higher production.
21	To the contrary, both Mr. Emerick and
22	Mr. Gilstrap state in their testimony that marginal
23	well operators maintain very low levels of working
24	capital, such that they could not satisfy a surety
25	provider's requirement that they have the equivalent

1 of \$37,500 in available working capital per well. 2 Plugging wells costs money. 3 marginal wells will not cover their own plugging costs and if operators have not otherwise set aside the 4 5 funds, then the only reasonable conclusion is that 6 these wells will not be plugged by their operators. That plain reality gives rise to the need for the 8 state to protect itself by requiring single well 9 financial assurances adequate to cover the cost of 10 plugging. 11 Finally, the proposal to require one 12 well financial assurances for marginal wells is 13 unrelated to marginal well operators' compliance with regulatory provisions other than the requirement that 14 15 they complete well plugging. The heightened risk that 16 motivates the need for one well financial assurance is 17 the risk that the operator will orphan the well, not other risks related to operation or maintenance of the 18 well. 19 20 MS. M. O'GRADY: NMOGA witness Dan 2.1 Arthur objects to your use of OCD's average plugging 22 costs on page 73 of his rebuttal testimony. 23 Specifically, he claims that you emphasize headline 24 averages without analyzing median costs, trimmed means, or stratification by depth or well type, and 25 Page 616

1	that by his analysis, removing even the top 10 percent
2	of cost outliers drops the average far below the
3	\$150,000 figure that you cite. What is your response?
4	MR. MORGAN: First, it's worth
5	emphasizing that the \$150,000 single well financial
6	assurance amount already incorporates a significant
7	reduction from OCD's actual average plugging cost of
8	\$163,000 per well. Further, the \$163,000 plugging
9	cost figure represents the actual average cost to OCD
10	to plug wells.
11	There's no question that some wells
12	will cost less and some will cost more.
13	Unfortunately, OCD doesn't have the luxury of ignoring
14	the top 10 percent of most expensive orphan wells.
15	They must plug them all. Under this average based
16	approach, the bond coverage will be less than the
17	actual cost to OCD in many instances. That's a risk
18	to the state, but one that it is reasonable to ask the
19	state to bear as balanced against the cost to
20	individual operators of securing and maintaining the
21	required financial assurance.
22	Mr. Arthur would tip this balance so
23	that it is overwhelmingly tilted in favor of operators
24	and to the detriment of the state, ensuring inadequate
25	bond coverage in the majority of cases. Such an

Τ	approach is untair and unjustified and pushes the cost
2	of cleaning up after a profitable industry onto the
3	communities who must live with unplugged wells and who
4	are deprived of the alternative uses to which state
5	funds that could go to plugging would otherwise be
6	put.
7	Finally, it's worth noting that
8	operators are not required to pay the full financial
9	assurance amount out of pocket. Instead, operators
10	pay a fraction of that cost in the form of annual
11	premiums and collateral requirements. To secure a
12	financial assurance such as a surety bond, for
13	example, an operator with 100 marginal wells would not
14	pay \$15 million out of pocket. Instead, assuming an
15	annual premium of 2.5 percent, the annual cost would
16	be closer to \$375,000.
17	MS. M. O'GRADY: NMOGA witness
18	Mr. Arthur recommends on page 85 of his rebuttal
19	testimony that operators with proven compliance
20	records and strong safety performance should be able
21	to qualify for reduced bonding or blanket bond
22	options.
23	Similarly, he recommends that
24	flexibility extend to recognition of well specific
25	conditions. Mr. Arthur claims that such an approach
	Page 618
	1436 010

1	would be consistent with your testimony regarding the
2	incorporation of an compliance incentives into
3	financial assurance systems. What is your response?
4	MR. MORGAN: Nothing in my testimony,
5	including on the pages cited by Mr. Arthur, endorses a
6	compliance incentive approach to financial assurances.
7	Setting that aside, there are two
8	problems with Mr. Arthur's recommendation. First,
9	consideration of operator or well specific conditions
LO	would dramatically increase the administrative burden
L1	on OCD. Given current agency resources and staffing
L2	levels, this is simply not practical.
L3	Second, properly structured financial
L4	assurance programs with bonding levels tied to the
L5	actual cost of plugging inherently provide appropriate
L6	incentives for operators. The costs of maintaining
L7	financial assurance instruments, including premiums
L8	and collateral requirements imposed by surety bond
L9	providers, serve as a counter to the economic
20	pressures that motivate operators to avoid and delay
21	plugging for as long as possible.
22	MS. M. O'GRADY: NMOGA witnesses
23	Ms. Felix on pages 65 through 66, Mr. Sporich on pages
24	14 through 17, and Mr. Arthur on page 104 of their
25	respective rebuttal testimony claim that the proposed

1	requirement at the point of registration or transfer
2	that operators certify compliance with other states
3	laws is unauthorized by statute. What is your
4	response?
5	MR. MORGAN: Nothing in the proposed
6	amendments either before or after incorporation of the
7	changes negotiated among OXY, Applicants, and OCD
8	authorizes or requires OCD to take any action outside
9	of its jurisdiction.
10	The disclosure of forfeitures,
11	adjudicated orders, and settlement agreements in other
12	jurisdictions applies to final determinations already
13	reached by regulators in those jurisdictions and
14	merely provides OCD with information to inform purely
15	New Mexico focused actions regarding operators seeking
16	to do business in New Mexico.
17	It's important for OCD to know if an
18	operator has a history of non-compliance at its
19	facilities out of state, such as would be identified
20	by bond forfeiture or by an adjudicated order or
21	settlement agreement, as this allows OCD to gauge the
22	likelihood of an operator's capacity and willingness
23	to satisfy New Mexico's program requirements.
24	MS. M. O'GRADY: This ends Mr. Morgan's
25	testimony.

1	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you very
2	much, Ms. O'Grady and Mr. Morgan.
3	We will break for the day.
4	Yeah. Oh, yes, Mr. Cloutier?
5	MR. CLOUTIER: Since Mr. Morgan's
6	testimony was kind of coming fast and furious at us on
7	the surrebuttal and it appears to be written out, can
8	we get a copy of it?
9	MS. M. O'GRADY: I don't believe that
10	is a requirement. I'm sorry. Thank you.
11	MR. CLOUTIER: Okay.
12	THE HEARING OFFICER: All right. We'll
13	resume again at nine in the morning and begin with
14	public comment. Thank you.
15	(Whereupon, at 5:06 p.m., the
16	proceeding was concluded.)
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	Page 621

1 CERTIFICATE 2 I, RYAN AUTEN, the officer before whom the 3 foregoing proceedings were taken, do hereby certify that any witness(es) in the foregoing proceedings, 4 5 prior to testifying, were duly sworn; that the proceedings were recorded by me and thereafter reduced 6 to typewriting by a qualified transcriptionist; that said digital audio recording of said proceedings are a 8 9 true and accurate record to the best of my knowledge, 10 skills, and ability; that I am neither counsel for, 11 related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the 12 action in which this was taken; and, further, that I 13 am not a relative or employee of any counsel or 14 attorney employed by the parties hereto, nor 15 financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of 16 this action. 17 18 RYAN AUTEN 19 Notary Public in and for the 20 State of New Mexico 2.1 22 23 2.4

Page 622

2.5

1 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER 2 I, RACHEL HUFF, do hereby certify that this 3 transcript was prepared from the digital audio 4 recording of the foregoing proceeding, that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the 5 proceedings to the best of my knowledge, skills, and 6 7 ability; that I am neither counsel for, related to, 8 nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this was taken; and, further, that I am not a 9 relative or employee of any counsel or attorney 10 11 employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or 12 otherwise interested in the outcome of this action. 13 Packet 2. Hult 14 RACHEL HUFF 15 16 17 18 19 20

Page 623

21

22

23

24

2.5

0	377:24 383:5	125,000 537:21	598:10 609:10
&	402:5 411:7	129 586:4	618:14
& 323:14,21	420:20 471:24	13 361:6 376:1	150 423:10
329:6 343:5	471:25 481:22		430:5 467:13
0	482:24 493:12	430:11,23 492:19	498:6 504:3
0 534:4	506:10 598:10		150,000 377:6
0.045 542:4	609:20 617:1	130,000 490:4 131 409:20	377:13 387:10
0.05 393:23			
0.2 393:22	617:14	135,000 488:11	423:8 427:24
0.2 393:22 0.3 394:7	10,000 472:22	14 397:11	428:10 431:16
0.5 519:2 551:5	489:1 537:15	398:12 455:2	435:2 461:1,7
0.6 453:8	573:15	493:16 525:13	461:25 462:7
0.0 455.8 0732 516:13,18	100 464:11	619:24	462:15 466:15
	535:24 537:21	14,800 472:20	466:24 468:4
1	537:22 618:13	140,000 488:12	477:13,14,18
1 357:9 394:14	104 619:24	145,000 488:12	489:24 490:9
408:18 431:18	10:40 399:11	15 345:20	491:14 492:24
444:7 448:18	10th 353:7	363:21,23,24	498:6 503:3
453:1 471:24	11 407:12	363:25 402:5	505:8,20,20
473:17,20,22	408:10 486:9	404:24 411:7	506:17 507:7,8
474:16 488:3,3	609:13	433:6,8 434:9	507:22 508:5
495:16 518:6	11.25 395:3,22	434:23 435:5	509:5 539:1,9
542:12 547:22	11.25. 395:23	437:12,16,19	539:19 540:16
551:25 552:2	110 473:16	437:20 438:1,4	543:12 547:6
603:2 604:8	110,000 465:10	438:11,21	566:11 573:25
1,000 486:9	473:13	439:19 452:15	601:8 602:2
541:4	114 528:2	452:17 453:7	617:3,5
1,250 537:22	12 372:3 376:1	454:16 458:5	1500 476:20
547:21	399:11 423:4	458:13,16	488:25
1.1 372:21	464:13 473:19	459:14 460:9	156,000 366:16
1.4 408:18,21	486:10 487:25	472:7 492:21	15th 363:2
1.6 534:1	541:5 609:20	493:1,7,10	364:15 367:7
554:14	12,000 473:1	495:14 501:25	371:12 407:19
1.9 386:4,5	1200 472:10	502:1 523:13	16 354:22
10 322:7 344:6	1220 320:14	525:17 533:23	361:6 376:9
345:20 372:2	322:18	543:10 544:21	394:3 468:14

[16 - 2024]

497:11 508:3	19.15.2 320:5	19.5.8.9.a	20 348:19
524:17	526:2	19.5.6.9.a 576:18	354:21 356:5
16,175,000 538:1	19.15.25 320:6	19.5.9.9 604:17	363:16,21,23
160,000 537:25	19.15.5 320:5 526:3	193 533:23 1971 337:21	363:24,25 381:17 382:6
163,000 528:1	19.15.5.9	1971 337.21 1992 476:15	400:22 438:21
536:21 539:12	560:11	1992 470.13 1993 331:25	441:24 454:10
547:23 566:18	19.15.5.9.a	1993 331.23 1994 441:23	455:3 500:13
573:17 601:20	530:4 607:10		20.3 406:9,20
601:23 602:3	19.15.8 320:6	2	200 377:13
617:8,8	526:4 538:3	2 320:9 321:8	473:15
164 520:17	19.15.8.9	344:6 349:14	2001 490:3
167,000 537:2	538:23	404:16 432:4	550:5
167,000 337.2 167.3 554:21	19.15.8.9.a	472:2 473:22	2002 516:23
167.5 324:20	538:5 599:13	488:11,12	2002 310.23 2004 441:24
17 334:24	19.15.8.9.c	490:4 507:20	2012 516:22,24
348:19 354:22	423:5 604:4	508:2 537:2,13	2012 310.22,24 2013 332:12
392:16,24	19.15.8.9.d	539:25 573:11	338:3
442:23 443:4	602:22	602:22 604:4	2018 534:6
443:13 619:24	19.15.8.9.e	2,000 472:10	583:12
17th 323:22	497:12 549:2	476:20 586:7	2019 335:19
18 348:19	549:19	2.183 394:24	515:10,11
394:3	19.15.8.9.g.	2.2 394:19	516:21,23
180 486:9	510:25	2.3 438:25	518:13,14
487:10 541:4	19.15.8.c	439:6,12 441:8	533:22
180,000 537:4	428:13	442:23 443:12	2020 520:21
601:21	19.15.9 320:6	444:6,17 446:9	2021 331:7
1800 374:19	526:5 558:9	446:17,23	350:7 404:15
376:9 455:8	19.15.9.8	448:18 473:7 2.5 397:25	404:22 405:17
182 376:17,23	604:11,16		408:21 536:24
377:17	19.15.9.9	398:2,6 439:5 444:6 481:4	545:25 553:11
19 348:19	555:11 604:12	552:2 618:15	2023 525:6
358:21 392:16	19.15.9.9.e	2.5. 439:6	2024 370:23
392:24 583:12	563:19	2.8 372:24	439:15 441:22
		2.0 J/2.24	442:12 448:19

[2024 - 373]

481:3 487:4	24683 320:6	295-8369	310 324:5
528:1 533:22	333:5	323:25	374:22
536:21 537:2	247 321:18	2:35 522:10	312 375:2
2025 320:10	25 357:9 359:9	3	3150 468:3
370:24 376:14	459:22 460:9	3 336:9 348:19	3200 323:22
405:9 441:14	460:14 493:3,7	381:17 392:2	33 338:4
442:17 528:8	560:8 566:11	404:16 434:22	404:24 453:15
528:15 554:10	25,000 537:12	472:2 473:22	478:13,21
2028 432:3	539:25 573:11	492:20 528:15	33.74. 366:12
542:12,23	250,000 423:18	3,000 336:10	34 331:4 378:4
21 320:10	424:22 425:17	467:19 528:17	407:22 408:3,4
351:3 352:19	426:1,10	3,150 465:25	342 528:2
354:22 356:6	427:22 428:8	3,765 528:14	347 330:4
405:18	428:19,22,25	3.4 406:8,19,22	34885 622:17
2100 527:18	429:3 430:4	3.5 481:1	35 369:13,18,19
22 351:4	483:8 491:18	3.7 542:3	447:2
362:16 364:5	491:24 503:4	30 338:4	35.8. 366:8
403:5 405:22	503:23 504:25	360:11 365:10	3500 472:16
407:12 408:11	533:24 539:3	403:11,16	355 331:14
415:17	540:22 574:16	452:25 453:6	357 331:11
22,000 355:10	574:17 576:1	459:23 460:13	36 352:25
2200 542:1	603:22	460:16 467:9	353:1 358:23
2208 323:15	2500 472:7	480:24 521:7	366:8 369:18
224 321:18	264-8740	586:24 598:1	369:19
225,000 366:17	323:10	300 335:16	363 332:6
467:9	275 472:6	365:25 366:7	364 332:9
23 350:1 394:3	473:7	374:22 376:4,8	365 487:13
588:6 590:19	275,000 473:2	·	37 369:18,19
231-9312	27th 581:1	376:16,22 3000 466:9	480:14
322:22	28 354:22	303 323:25	37,500 566:12
24 340:9 350:2	357:9 437:11		616:1
400:22 407:13	452:8	324:23 375:2	371 332:12
408:14	29 348:25	30318 623:13	373 330:5
245 569:12	468:18 510:24	31 350:15	331:23
		394:15	

[374 - 63,000]

254 221 21	415 220 7	F 000 470 7 1 6	200 10 11
374 331:21	417 330:7	5,000 472:7,16	398:10,11
375,000 618:16	44 360:11	5.173 520:18	464:23
38 331:8	367:2 469:10	50 370:23	555 323:22
357:17,22	44,000 366:18	371:25 372:3	564 332:15
420:20 424:18	366:25	393:24 403:12	57 611:7
427:21,25	45 515:21	403:16,23	570 569:14
481:23	516:15	595:16	575 321:13
39 473:14	45,000 537:15	50,000 467:9	322:11
474:19 475:19	573:15	473:14,16	59 474:16
477:11	450 394:25	546:19	5:06 621:15
390 331:17	395:7,16,18	500 324:13	6
399 330:6	457 330:8	505 321:14	
4	460 394:25	322:22,23	6 392:15,22,23
-	469 330:4	323:10,18	473:3 478:13
4 344:21 357:9	47 331:12	324:8,16	520:21 578:20
369:12 370:19	355:8,16	50th 341:3	578:20 614:19
407:10,17,24	472 468:7	596:2	6,000 442:4
409:21 518:4	472.5 468:5	51 339:6	60 395:24
535:6	476-3310	340:22 438:12	443:18,19
4,000 472:14	322:23	439:20 440:18	469:9 471:21
506:5,8,10,13	48 396:12,12	51st 341:4	498:25
4.1 372:21	480 331:25	52 331:15	60,000 566:21
40 487:1	4:30 597:15	389:17 390:1	600 324:20
40,000 506:11		437:11 453:5	609 330:11
566:20	5	457:24 459:19	61 471:20,20,22
400 424:25	5 341:24		613-8050
433:8	350:19,23	515:19	321:13
403 585:19,24	360:9 361:22	523 330:10	622-6510
587:1	369:24 377:19	53 473:14	322:11
407-4492	378:5,12,19	54 331:18	629-0732
324:23	379:10 417:21	358:23 411:17	321:14
408 331:7	417:23 465:20	411:19 414:17	63,000 353:23
409 321:8	465:25 466:6	55 331:21	465:3,12,25
411 331:20	474:18 476:9	374:12,14	471:22 484:22
395:6	520:20 551:25	378:22 396:9	485:11 528:12
	614:19	397:2,7,18,25	

[65 - ability]

(E 550.10	276.17.01	271.12	00 502.15
65 550:12	376:17,21	371:13	99 502:15
619:23	778-1902	87199 323:7	9:00 320:11
66 619:23	321:21	87501 321:9	a
66.7 528:8	79 331:24	324:6	a.m. 320:11
554:9	480:15,16,19	87504 323:16	aaron 323:20
675 396:1	8	87505 320:15	abandon
7	8 335:11 348:8	322:19 324:14	387:22 388:9
7 381:10,17	360:9 369:24	88 332:13	601:18 614:22
520:21 521:11	381:11,17	564:16,17	abandoned
7,000 476:9,22	519:5	599:17 600:1	338:23 343:17
70 396:23	8,000 476:25	88202 322:8	406:15 497:15
70-2-14 426:18	8.15 396:4	9	525:4 545:13
700 394:17	80 370:22	9 348:8 385:25	549:2,7,10,12
442:19 463:12	371:23,25	385:25 471:16	549:13,15
527:16 554:14	372:2,2 518:5	471:19 473:11	601:10
71 363:13	80202 323:23	9.8 407:13	abandoning
473:6	324:21	408:15	514:7
72 602:23	81 525:18	90 354:15,15	abandonment
720 321:21	81201 321:19	363:15 394:3	386:24 406:24
73 362:16	825 411:17	404:17 480:25	407:2 468:10
364:5 616:22	827-5752 324:8	481:3 597:13	497:7,23 502:5
732 516:10	85 332:4	900 335:11	502:18 504:8
733 518:12	362:25 363:3	90233 323:6	529:7 530:21
739 515:7,16	364:21 365:5	91 350:15	546:22 561:21
740 442:12	618:18	409:20 410:2,4	562:3 608:9,15
469:4	86 332:7	946-2090	abated 560:23
75 383:4	356:19 364:14	324:16	560:24
463:20	364:16 366:22	95 377:20	ability 380:15
750 394:17	367:6 383:7	381:23 382:13	380:25 390:13
442:19	460:20 461:6	415:7 465:14	435:12 446:23
76,000 566:14	461:12,16	954-7294	494:13 531:8
7626616 320:17	462:2,7,13	323:18	568:3 570:7
77 331:22	463:4	955 515:24	613:6 622:10
373:21,24	87 332:10	962 400:22	623:7
374:7 375:21	356:20 371:11		
314.1 313.21	330.20 3/1.11		

[able - activity]

		I	T -
able 350:9	acceptable	382:3 395:4,6	action 380:14
384:21 393:18	352:16 486:18	400:6 401:10	455:7,9 464:2
398:23 432:10	493:20	402:16 403:6	464:7 529:22
434:11,17	accepted	404:19 407:14	536:11 562:22
436:20 449:14	352:15 359:10	439:8 449:4	565:13 567:18
450:6 454:7	access 352:12	525:13,21	568:17 570:4
495:12 503:11	478:11,11	566:15 571:14	571:23 572:7
505:4 511:4	526:13 540:12	622:9 623:5	577:12 605:20
521:7 543:17	568:23 571:13	accurately	606:3 612:2
552:19 559:20	accessible	394:8	620:8 622:12
563:15 566:9	351:14	achieve 418:17	622:16 623:8
569:2 571:17	accessing	acknowledge	623:12
592:7 595:1	573:21	565:7,17 567:1	actions 530:9
596:6,11 601:2	accommodates	567:20	536:13 605:2
615:12 618:20	604:21	acknowledged	605:25 612:22
above 412:12	accomplish	567:21	620:15
424:3 478:9	358:18	acloutier 322:9	active 372:7
492:7,11 603:3	account 380:20	acquire 569:2	404:11 423:3
absolute	393:17	571:17	423:17 425:11
480:17 551:9	accountability	acquired	425:20,25
571:8	344:11 360:14	599:22 600:3	426:5,8,9
absolutely	385:8 523:23	acquiring	428:17 432:9
488:19	accountable	532:8 538:14	433:9 434:12
abstract 412:16	481:17	607:10	435:14 452:16
413:1 482:6	accounted	acquisition	483:8 487:10
abtucker	550:18 571:1	538:10 545:2	488:3 503:8,22
323:24	accounts	576:7,9 578:6	506:6 537:21
academics	393:17	599:1,4	538:23 539:1
519:19	accrued 606:17	acquisitions	540:20 547:4
accelerate	accuracy	606:9	574:18 604:2,4
572:5	403:13 404:6,7	act 341:8 362:2	actively 546:12
accelerates	409:3 439:7	424:22 539:3	activity 370:5,7
389:15	474:2	560:20 607:3	512:3 518:15
accept 378:19	accurate 353:2	act's 574:14	518:18 600:25
454:13 577:25	356:25 381:19		

[actor - adoption]

actor 388:16	acumen 368:6	address 341:7	adjudicated
559:23 606:20	adam 323:13	341:12 355:14	559:8 605:14
actors 381:9	add 351:24	363:6 364:4	620:11,20
382:21,25	399:1 416:15	427:18 437:2	adjuncts
383:21 384:7	436:2 471:13	523:23 524:5	331:20 391:15
606:14	473:2 499:17	525:10 530:1	414:14
actual 331:22	519:10 530:24	531:6 532:6	adjust 603:16
332:7 336:10	558:23 574:19	557:3 567:24	603:17
355:14 366:17	578:9,10	568:1 572:7	adjusted 551:9
367:16 375:15	581:11	578:15 584:7	553:22 571:8
376:3 429:6	adding 345:20	603:19	adjustment
460:20 461:19	538:7	addressed	603:9
475:10 477:10	addition	348:2,3 397:23	adjustments
482:7 527:4,20	383:25 390:24	449:7 539:23	553:7,19
529:10 537:5	415:21 528:16	576:12 599:7	603:24 604:6
537:16 539:13	553:25 562:10	607:17	administered
539:21 540:3	591:19	addresses	554:18
543:23 544:3	additional	398:3	administration
547:23 553:23	351:24 355:22	addressing	340:16
557:13 562:17	364:4 391:6,9	430:7 431:21	administrative
570:17 573:12	391:11 414:11	526:4 556:20	574:25 605:10
573:16 574:1,3	429:22 446:14	586:25	619:10
586:19 603:20	452:10 466:23	adequacy	administrator
605:3 607:19	474:2 505:17	520:8	581:13
610:11 617:7,9	524:4 528:10	adequate 385:2	admitting
617:17 619:15	530:24 531:8	385:10 481:18	579:4
actually 334:19	531:22 556:15	526:10,13,16	adopt 336:18
354:4 385:24	557:25 562:18	529:14 531:14	390:6 525:22
410:6 431:23	571:19 572:19	536:14 544:20	adopted 351:6
432:18 436:19	573:18 574:20	545:18 558:1	415:12 434:5
440:12 443:16	576:19 596:6	562:14 603:19	435:13 490:2,3
449:12 452:2	599:14 607:2	616:9	573:24
479:5 482:25	607:15 610:18	adequately	adoption
488:23 506:17	additionally	593:13	445:19 570:21
562:24 578:18	339:5		571:20

[advance - alternative]

advance 393:18	afoul 559:25	521:15 584:1	alexander
464:18	afternoon	agreed 493:4	378:11 379:20
advantage	457:10,12	497:3 503:18	417:7 495:15
489:19 527:7	522:16 597:3	578:5 583:9	496:25 503:18
advent 594:1	597:22 598:11	607:12	align 516:7
advise 348:11	age 478:6	agreement	aligned 384:15
348:13	573:19	577:14 586:16	allison 325:11
advised 348:8	agencies 378:7	620:21	allow 351:20
advisors	agency 387:5	agreements	414:3 482:8
413:12	489:15 559:7,8	559:9 605:15	526:19 529:5
advocate	619:11	611:3 620:11	530:20 537:19
400:12	aggregate	agricultural	582:4 593:20
advocates	562:15	365:15	613:11
338:9 400:5	ago 364:21	ah 412:13	allowable
advocating	384:17 450:23	508:8	537:20
482:25 484:4	468:7 479:17	ahead 346:21	allowance
affect 339:3,8	500:13 514:14	399:2 405:13	575:11
348:12 421:8	583:16	417:22 457:4	allowances
445:24 446:22	agrankin	523:8 582:25	389:6
484:21 601:12	323:17	585:6 588:2,2	allowed 501:24
affected 353:6	agree 348:5	588:2 590:15	502:1 575:13
356:3 480:7	353:18,19	595:13 609:15	allowing
481:15 491:7	377:18 378:2	aim 361:7	425:12 529:6
550:17 571:1	380:2 401:9	air 335:1 344:9	530:13 544:19
591:18 594:19	402:13 403:15	534:15,19,21	557:22 561:3
affecting 550:7	407:7 417:13	535:6 536:2	572:6 575:4
affects 349:2,15	458:4,16 461:7	alarm 568:17	603:24
350:7 596:13	461:25 465:24	alarming	allows 334:12
596:19	466:15,17,24	334:22	560:1 562:8,11
affirm 581:9	467:21 468:15	alaska 589:8	562:16 620:21
affirmation	469:10 491:14	595:16	alternative
333:11	491:17 493:4	albert 325:3	358:11 390:25
afford 343:21	497:17 498:4	albuquerque	391:5,9,12
344:12 593:19	508:15,16	323:7 338:3,5	397:22 406:12
596:11	510:9 511:6,8		414:8,10

[alternative - analysis]

505:25 506:6	555:12 558:11	568:14 571:7,9	502:11,25
511:21 618:4	558:23 561:11	574:11 575:20	503:9,15,17
altogether	561:25 562:21	575:21 602:2	505:1 506:15
554:12	563:18 565:4	603:16,18,25	507:20 508:2
alumni 340:24	568:24 570:12	604:8	508:12,20
amanda 328:14	571:10,21	ampomah	509:1,14,22
333:22 334:2	572:5 573:2,7	325:5 474:10	510:12,23
amazing	573:25 602:1,1	474:12,22	511:8,15,22
457:19	602:4 604:16	475:9,17,25	512:5,9
amend 430:25	605:21 606:2	476:6,10,12,16	analogy 358:19
530:3 531:11	606:12,15,21	476:19 477:8	399:5
554:4 604:11	607:14 608:4	477:17 478:1	analyses 365:4
amended 572:4	620:6	478:12,18,21	392:11,13
604:14,17,24	america 590:21	478:24 479:4	analysis 350:18
amending	amount 361:1	479:11,19,24	351:5,25
612:23	435:2 492:24	480:9,21 481:5	362:20 364:4
amendment	510:4 537:24	481:8,21 482:4	364:19 367:9
530:16 538:12	538:25 539:9	482:12,17,23	367:11 370:1
543:4 545:1,17	540:8 541:15	483:6,10,24	371:5,16 372:5
546:14 549:3	541:17 542:7	484:9,14,19	383:9 401:10
549:16 559:2	543:23 546:19	485:4,14,20	427:16 429:5
560:5 561:2,7	552:9 554:19	486:8,17,20	440:1 443:21
561:14 563:20	556:24 557:23	487:16,24	444:17,21
564:8 576:5,6	570:2 575:15	488:14,22	445:8,22,24
598:25 602:21	575:18 586:2,3	489:20 490:6	446:7,21
603:14,24	602:20 603:22	490:25 491:13	447:17 449:6
609:4	604:3 617:6	491:22 492:3,6	449:11 450:5
amendments	618:9	492:10,18	460:2 461:6
320:5 333:3	amounts	493:15 495:2	462:5 465:1
511:1 526:2	332:13 534:7	495:13 496:10	471:2 477:12
530:1,5,12,23	537:9,20 539:5	496:16,24	479:15,20
538:4,21,24	539:21 540:6	497:10,14,25	496:4,8 506:9
540:18 541:3	540:20 547:19	498:9,20 499:8	520:8 533:10
546:24 547:2	551:8,10,20	499:14,17	541:25 550:4
551:11,13	553:17,20,22	501:13 502:6	617:1

[analyze - applied]

700.20	712 0 702 27		100 17 100 11
analyze 588:20	513:8 583:25	611:3	422:17 423:11
588:20	583:25	appear 492:1	431:11 435:9
analyzed 534:3	answered	541:21 604:15	435:24 443:8
analyzing	398:21 435:16	appears 455:12	460:19 477:12
390:24 616:24	435:18	471:25 621:7	480:16 486:12
ancillary	answering	appendices	515:6 522:17
588:24	383:20 434:1	350:17 409:21	525:12,17,17
andrea 326:12	answers 398:16	applicability	526:2 529:25
andrew 322:4	461:1	538:6	530:2,3 531:11
anecdotal	anthony 325:13	applicant 321:2	538:2,4,7,22
381:12	anticipate	331:3 332:3	542:10 545:14
anecdotally	345:19 609:9	355:16 357:22	548:25 553:6
493:12	anticipated	363:3 364:16	555:9 558:12
ann 322:5	554:8 568:7	371:13 373:24	559:1 561:12
annie 328:15	anymore	374:14 390:1	561:20 563:19
337:2,2,10,14	432:11 487:2	408:4 411:19	565:3,5 568:1
337:20	521:24	417:17 480:19	574:13,17,19
annotations	apodaca 325:9	482:25 483:13	575:1 576:16
355:9	580:6,9,19	484:3,10,15	577:4,13 578:3
annual 468:10	581:12,16	485:16 487:17	599:11,17
477:22 490:16	582:6 592:9,15	488:23 489:7	600:4 602:22
496:13 533:1	597:4,8 598:16	490:7 491:19	603:6 604:11
533:21 551:24	apologies	495:3 559:5	612:24 614:20
603:5 613:18	459:19	560:21,25	614:24 620:7
618:10,15,15	apologize 345:8	564:17 608:7	application
annually	360:19 369:17	applicant's	332:5 349:22
561:10 602:24	391:8 439:10	563:13 568:4	350:25 352:12
annuity 506:10	464:18 476:15	applicants	353:21 450:2,3
answer 385:16	478:19 598:7	351:5 354:25	493:24 558:19
390:19 398:25	appalachia	357:17 360:11	applications
432:14 433:25	486:5	362:25 363:1	526:6 558:17
434:17 436:2	apparent	364:14,14	561:12 562:1
436:10 446:1	335:15	367:6 369:25	applied 377:2
471:15 483:22	apparently	371:10,11	513:13 520:7
496:22 503:6	513:1 592:8	408:2 417:7	520:25

[applies - asking]

applies 390:14	562:22 563:1	area 335:9	397:8 616:21
426:5 466:7	577:8,15	494:22 591:7	617:22 618:18
472:5,12 473:4	619:15	areas 335:5	618:25 619:5
542:15 561:18	appropriated	365:15	619:24
562:1 576:1	468:9	argue 357:14	arthur's 364:5
604:7 607:19	appropriately	369:23	566:21 619:8
620:12	404:14	argues 350:1	article 384:8
apply 354:3	approval	356:19 359:9	391:23 398:3
407:12 408:10	558:14,24	argument	414:13 519:11
485:2 494:7	576:10 599:5	358:9 576:12	articles 391:24
497:22 536:24	approve 530:11	578:3,4,18	articulate
542:18 549:19	538:8 608:5	579:8 599:7	611:22
612:14	approved	arguments	articulation
appreciate	497:15 501:19	347:25 577:5	611:10
371:19 398:16	502:8,18	arising 610:7	artificial 422:7
475:18 479:12	503:10 504:2	arizona 332:6	422:8
512:6 596:8	504:20 545:13	365:25	artificially
598:18	547:8 549:1,13	arkansas 543:1	421:25,25
approach	564:1 601:9	armstrong	441:5 541:21
414:20 422:18	approves 563:5	370:20	601:23
423:16 539:24	approving	arranged	arts 524:9
540:17,19	556:18 600:10	353:12	aside 474:1,2
542:9 543:5,7	approximately	arrington	521:7 566:1
545:4 560:16	376:1 395:23	326:14	568:22 571:25
572:9 573:17	403:5 455:10	arscott 327:8	615:9,19 616:4
573:24 574:2	465:3,14,20,25	350:13 357:7	619:7
575:18 600:2	468:4,14	385:25 386:8	asked 366:22
617:16 618:1	469:10 528:12	arscott's	398:21 435:16
618:25 619:6	528:14 542:1	471:15 472:23	463:15
approaches	586:7	art 340:11	asking 371:19
546:11	approximates	608:18	383:25 399:23
appropriate	467:22 539:9	arthur 325:21	402:21 435:20
502:22,23	april 528:7	348:7,18	439:25 441:13
504:23 508:10	554:10	354:19 356:4	468:23 471:14
526:17 547:10		356:18 362:15	483:7,12 492:4

[asking - assurances]

498:7,10	556:18 560:3	429:22 430:13	551:10,19,23
503:13 504:6	561:18,24	430:25 431:4	553:8,20 554:1
508:6 580:3	562:2 571:3	431:14,16,24	554:4,7 556:15
aspect 431:14	association	432:19,21	556:25 557:3,6
aspects 417:9	322:2 324:10	435:2 446:14	557:10 559:7
417:18	325:15,18,21	447:11 449:8	568:4 571:9
asphyxiation	326:5,13 327:8	488:1 489:25	572:13,24
535:3	328:2 360:3	490:4,21	573:1 574:1,5
assertion 371:6	assume 436:4	492:19,23	574:7,16,18,20
asserts 369:12	466:6,17 468:2	498:14 505:18	574:22 575:3,7
370:18	468:3 531:8	507:21,23,24	575:8,10,12,19
assess 579:6	assumed 348:4	508:4 510:6	575:20,21,22
assessment	466:25 468:13	511:2 513:11	575:25 576:8
401:13,19	562:10	520:9 524:25	586:1 599:3
608:6,12	assuming 376:8	526:11 529:10	600:16,16,20
assessments	468:19 505:7	529:13 531:12	600:23 601:2,7
406:12	562:6,25 563:6	531:13,14	601:8,16 602:2
asset 356:14	566:14 618:14	532:12,14,23	602:6,12,20
523:22 526:20	assumptions	533:7,11,24	603:2,12,16,18
assets 407:3	409:16 466:12	534:5 536:7	603:23,25
470:25 507:17	467:20 468:15	537:6,9,16,19	604:3,6,7
532:3 565:22	469:9	538:4,11,16,18	605:4 610:9
607:7	assurance	538:22,25	611:23 612:16
assigned	332:14 338:15	539:4,7,8,21,25	613:1,4,12
359:17 366:1,7	355:23 380:3	540:4,6,8,20,21	614:17,25
403:14	389:8,9,22	540:24 542:7	616:16 617:6
assist 569:1	392:12 402:15	542:14,17,25	617:21 618:9
associate's	402:19 417:9	543:12,23	618:12 619:3
340:16	417:18 418:16	544:14 546:21	619:14,17
associated	419:17 420:8	547:2,7,13,20	assurances
406:1,22 464:5	420:13 422:11	547:21,25	361:9 519:22
467:2 498:19	423:1 424:8,23	548:6,9,12,15	525:9 526:5
527:2,9 535:21	426:2,10 427:3	548:24 549:18	527:3 529:14
548:8 550:20	427:24 428:9	549:21,25	530:10 532:7
555:13 556:8	428:18 429:10	550:6,14,24	533:19 536:10

[assurances - back]

536:14 537:11	attract 413:11	authorized	536:20 537:1,3
539:2 542:12	attractive	559:11 604:18	537:10,17,25
542:16 543:3,6	386:18 387:2	authorizes	539:11,14
544:2 545:18	387:15	558:19 606:2	540:16 557:11
546:25 547:5	attributable	620:8	557:12,14
547:18 548:2	534:6 601:24	authors 518:18	566:17 573:16
557:18,21	606:20	518:21 519:4	574:2 601:19
558:1 573:4	attributed	automatically	601:20 616:21
576:2 600:5	462:2	609:23	617:2,7,9,15
604:2 616:9,12	audio 622:8	available	averaged
619:6	623:3	360:15 364:1	372:24
assure 506:22	audit 327:22	373:6 379:1	averages
assures 532:14	350:4	389:23 461:22	366:19 616:24
atripp 322:10	auten 320:16	465:2 470:20	averaging
attached	327:21 622:2	474:6 532:15	539:16 547:23
467:15	622:18	538:19 547:4	avoid 338:23
attempt 405:4	author 391:14	566:19 572:22	526:20 529:6
485:18 494:21	391:18 412:16	616:1	533:4,5 541:13
attempting	412:19 414:13	avenue 321:8	547:14 556:2
388:13	414:18 489:14	324:13 510:2	619:20
attendee	authority	average 356:14	avoiding
325:23 326:14	380:24 381:2	357:6 362:17	542:23 545:8
326:16,19,20	414:1 529:21	364:7 366:7,11	555:8
326:22,24	532:8 538:14	366:13,16,17	aware 361:19
327:2,4,12,14	557:21 558:7	366:24 367:2	459:2 482:5,9
327:15,24	574:9,21	368:6,14 386:3	600:12
328:4,6,8,11,15	576:15,17	461:2,8,9,12,18	awful 589:2,12
328:16,21,23	577:19 578:7	462:1,7,8,16	b
329:2,4	579:5,9 587:5	465:16 466:14	b 331:1 332:1
attention	599:10,12,21	466:16,25	390:7 509:3
605:19	600:3,6,7	467:5,9,14	595:5,6
attorney	607:7,16	473:17 475:5	bachelor 524:9
524:18 622:14	authorize	476:25 507:22	back 343:25
623:10	562:21 608:1	508:5 514:8	349:18 369:17
		527:25 535:25	398:24 399:10
			370.27 377.10

[back - beauty]

414:6 424:15	559:23 606:14	453:23 469:4	370:21 372:8
427:20,21	606:20	487:14 496:13	463:10,11
437:4 445:16	baker 372:6	541:4	472:12 476:2
452:8 456:22	balance 451:14	bars 366:5	479:8,9 500:15
457:1,6 482:2	451:17 617:22	base 472:6	basins 363:11
482:24 493:2	balanced	488:11 589:15	478:15
496:25 509:23	552:15 617:19	based 336:8	basis 357:21
518:14 522:3	balancing	361:25 362:6	359:2 367:20
522:10,13	451:11	362:19 382:22	381:12 383:15
583:23 584:18	ballyhoo	383:17 384:7	465:20 468:10
585:25 586:9	372:25 373:1	400:25 401:12	496:5 510:4
587:8 597:15	ban 607:4	402:3 409:7	511:2 540:4,23
597:24	bank 506:17	413:22 415:6	543:9 559:12
backbone	507:10,11	429:3,5 439:15	573:5
591:11	563:8,10,12	460:10 461:5	batch 368:13
backfill 586:21	570:14	466:21 467:19	368:14,25
background	bankrupt	468:15 471:12	bates 516:8,13
399:25 524:8	384:11	474:23 479:20	516:17
524:15 606:25	bankruptcies	491:14 492:4	batteries 335:4
backlog 335:25	532:21 570:13	499:10 501:22	battery 335:9
485:13,16,17	bankruptcy	516:3 527:24	335:14,15
485:19	338:17,21	533:12 540:16	beans 591:6
backlogged	386:21 536:13	540:17 547:6	bear 361:17
485:15	536:16 548:17	552:3 553:8,22	383:1 402:22
backstop	banks 596:15	574:1 577:6	506:3 555:6,20
532:17 544:4	bar 365:24	606:7 617:15	606:15 617:19
544:15	barely 356:11	baseline 358:16	bearing 365:17
bad 381:9	barrel 395:25	367:19 490:2,4	613:18
382:21,25	402:5 443:6,19	basic 359:15	bears 381:23
383:21,21,22	469:9	basically 376:1	573:12
383:22,22	barrels 394:14	613:17	beatty 324:12
384:6,7,10,20	394:17,20,25	basin 331:12	324:19 399:19
384:21,24,25	395:1,20 439:1	332:10 334:18	beauty 338:8
387:6 388:15	442:3,12,23	343:17 355:10	338:11
388:17 507:18	443:4,13 453:3	363:14,17,21	

[becoming - black]

becoming	460:8 464:15	benzene 534:21	587:1
542:8 546:10	465:1 469:3	534:22	billion 381:13
565:11 600:18	477:15 481:10	best 364:1	386:4,5 397:11
bed 472:15	484:10 485:10	369:8 379:3,4	398:12 403:6
began 471:10	486:11,14,24	379:6 387:3	404:24,25
beginning	487:2 488:15	510:5 519:7	405:22 406:9
358:1 373:10	490:20 504:23	525:2,21 622:9	406:19,20,22
472:16	505:2,15	623:6	407:12,13
begins 500:3	508:23 509:2,5	bet 583:1	408:11,15,18
behalf 321:2	509:7,8 510:1	better 344:11	408:18,20,21
322:2,13 323:2	511:3 515:8,9	390:19 401:8	443:21 444:7
323:12 324:2	519:9 551:12	414:7 436:9	448:18 469:11
324:10 525:16	577:16 583:15	499:25 501:22	520:18,20,21
behavior	583:22 592:10	514:17 549:4	521:7,11
336:13 381:10	598:9 621:9	550:1 551:17	554:15
382:21,25	believed 578:18	594:22	billions 405:3
383:16 389:20	believes 386:1	betting 545:4,6	bin 438:8
390:11	388:23	beyond 397:21	binding 424:23
belabor 458:12	benadryl 367:2	474:3 486:6	binned 331:12
521:24	beneficial	492:16 494:2	birth 534:25
belief 437:6	487:15 493:16	497:7,8 502:14	535:22
504:21	494:23 529:8	bi 375:14	bit 403:1 404:3
belies 578:25	542:3 546:13	bias 347:19	404:21 407:10
believe 341:16	beneficiary	360:20 361:13	410:17 437:3
341:17 356:22	503:12 613:4	361:20 366:20	452:1 453:18
361:24 373:21	benefit 390:11	367:12 369:9	454:13 456:22
379:22 394:9	410:13 449:3	biased 361:14	486:22 488:2
400:14,20,21	452:3,4 489:16	364:25	488:24 489:4
400:23 401:5	495:4 501:14	bid 404:15	493:17 520:5
414:1 421:7	518:9 544:16	big 358:21	585:13
430:2 435:16	553:3	385:13 437:25	biya 368:17
435:19 441:1	benefits 447:4	443:24 485:23	bk 375:15
446:25 449:6	447:10	bigger 493:8	black 367:21
452:4 454:23	benjamin	bill 563:10	372:12 487:4,5
459:22 460:1,7	327:12	585:19,24	

[blame - boomhower]

blame 571:22	bloom 325:7	504:25 505:8	447:20 458:1
blanket 423:15	342:3,7 512:10	505:24 506:5	471:17 483:5
423:18 424:5,7	512:11 513:7	506:20 508:11	483:14,15
424:12,22	513:18 514:3	508:25 512:22	489:15 492:8
425:1,6,14	514:16 515:1,5	512:23,25	492:11 506:3
426:19 427:23	515:15,23	513:13,17	506:25,25
428:8,18 430:4	516:5,10,16,19	514:1 518:4	507:1,6 516:22
432:10,17,25	517:13,16,20	533:9 534:7,9	516:24 517:23
433:10 434:11	519:20,25	537:20 546:19	537:18 544:20
435:13 437:19	520:14 521:3	550:8,11 551:8	545:12,15
458:1,5,10	521:17	551:24 552:7	548:16 552:11
483:1,8,14,22	blue 355:12	552:10,19	553:20 557:22
489:5 491:17	366:9 368:6,21	553:17,21	558:4 567:1
492:8,10 503:4	bo 486:9	557:16,17	569:9 570:6,8
503:8,22	board 327:20	558:5 566:11	570:19,22
504:25 507:21	body 545:21	567:11 568:6	574:10 611:11
507:22,23	boe 438:25	568:13 569:21	612:13 613:15
508:3,4,7,9,13	bond 386:3	569:22,25	614:15 618:21
508:13,15,18	387:22 388:5,8	570:2 571:7	619:14
537:18,20	423:8,15,18	573:15 575:22	bonds 343:10
539:1 540:20	424:5,7,12	600:23 611:20	383:18 423:25
540:21 542:11	425:1,7,14	611:25 613:5	425:13 430:5
546:18,24	426:19 427:23	613:20,24,25	458:5 503:8
547:2,7,17,21	428:8,10,18	614:1,1,3,7,8	513:19,20
547:24 548:2,5	430:4 432:5,10	614:12 617:16	520:17 547:16
548:8,11,14,16	432:17,25	617:25 618:12	548:22 551:24
548:24 557:22	433:10 434:12	618:21 619:18	552:14 553:2
574:10,15,17	435:13 437:19	620:20	568:4,9 569:11
574:23 575:7	458:10 473:15	bonded 431:23	574:23 610:19
575:10,20,25	477:13 482:25	506:13 537:24	613:11
603:11,23	483:1 484:4,7	bonding 336:8	books 523:12
604:1,3 618:21	484:24 485:1	344:5,8 385:19	boom 532:19
block 558:7	488:25 489:5	386:2,20 387:5	boomhower
607:7	491:18 498:6	388:20 390:4	384:7 398:3
	503:23 504:3,9	392:10 427:17	515:10 516:21

[boomhower - called]

517,00 550 A	huaals Jasses	hdas4 220.7	h44or 500-10
517:22 550:4	breakdown	budget 339:7	button 592:19
570:17,23	457:24	buffa 326:16	bwenergylaw
booted 457:6	breakdowns	building	324:15,22
border 518:19	459:20	320:13 590:22	c
born 337:24	breakpoint	built 347:22	c 321:1 322:1
borne 529:16	459:15 460:13	bullet 365:9	323:1 324:1
544:18 551:21	460:14	516:15 518:2	325:1 326:1
bother 442:3,9	brief 597:14	bunch 377:5	327:1 328:1
bottom 354:15	briefly 437:5	burden 619:10	329:1 333:1,23
367:13 422:15	469:20 524:14	burdensome	337:11 509:3
424:19 441:21	bring 345:3,21	519:16	595:5,5 604:8
472:5 480:25	405:20	bureau 553:16	calculate
481:3	brings 341:1	buried 340:19	395:17
boulevard	brittany 326:10	340:20 437:5	calculated
321:18	broad 350:23	burning 362:7	409:18 540:4
box 322:7	403:19,20,21	593:22 594:1	547:6 575:19
323:6,15	408:24 409:10	business	calculating
590:25 591:1	525:24 576:9	340:16 360:16	539:24 540:19
boy 358:21	599:4	361:9 413:5	calculation
brackets	broaden	491:5 511:20	442:22
452:10	429:21	526:25 527:11	calculations
bradfute 323:3	broader 494:1	531:25 552:13	347:21 353:10
323:5 416:20	604:22	559:14 565:21	536:22
bradfutelaw.c	broadly 334:20	569:15,17	calculus 613:22
323:8,9	461:20	590:25,25	calder 325:15
brandon 326:6	broadway	595:22 596:10	california
break 399:10	324:20	596:10,12,13	392:4 543:2
456:16,19,21	broke 457:1,2	602:15 606:1	call 354:15
457:2 459:20	broken 409:17	620:16	366:8 394:25
460:4 462:5	462:6,13,14	businesses	397:7,17
505:17 521:25	brother 595:18	339:1 549:21	415:13 433:17
522:13 579:20	brought 464:6	590:23 591:11	522:17 613:12
597:14,25	495:6 506:16	591:13,15	called 334:3
598:1 621:3	bucks 443:19	bust 532:19	337:15 340:3
	443:21		342:21 347:3
	1		

[called - certain]

251.10.250.14	602.22	aceuring.	604.6
351:19 359:14	603:22	carrying	604:6
359:15 375:24	capable 571:16	547:15 548:7	categorized
520:8 523:3	capacity 531:3	case 320:5	354:24 542:1
567:11 582:21	558:20 559:16	345:1 352:1,5	category
585:2 587:23	560:2 562:24	368:17,25	350:19 429:11
590:11 593:3	570:5 620:22	379:8 387:3	429:18 430:13
595:10 611:20	capital 402:2	404:18 414:1	431:1 502:3
614:8	506:19 507:19	421:15 455:1	540:24 541:2
calls 433:14	533:3 566:5,5	464:9 505:16	555:8
camera 334:12	566:6,7,10,16	507:8 514:8,13	catholic 343:4
336:17	566:19,23	514:13 545:8	cause 339:1
camp 338:7	571:13 615:24	577:22	450:25 534:23
campaigner	616:1	cases 368:18	591:14
334:10	capped 574:16	387:13 392:11	caused 550:9
cancel 338:16	capping 557:23	496:6 506:1	593:25
338:20 613:6	caps 425:17	540:2 553:13	causes 534:18
613:25	capture 573:18	599:21 617:25	causing 338:24
cancelable	captured 487:6	cash 331:8	caveat 426:4
609:25 613:1	540:17	358:7,15	463:7
613:11	captures	387:10 391:7	cease 548:4
canceled	605:15	416:6 481:23	ceiling 390:15
338:19 513:1	cara 523:23	506:17 543:17	390:17,18
513:19,22	524:17	568:12	398:1 437:23
614:8	carbon 362:12	cashflow	437:24
cancels 614:1	400:1,4 594:10	504:20	center 321:3,7
cancer 534:23	card 563:9,10	casings 534:16	321:17 520:7
535:22	563:14	castillo 326:24	520:25 523:22
canos 383:6	cardiac 535:23	catchall 572:19	610:20
cantrell 360:8	care 514:11	categories	central 363:20
369:23	career 567:6	332:13 478:14	472:4
canyon 368:25	588:18	497:16,18	century 521:7
369:3	careful 393:10	545:18 546:25	ceo 384:16
canyons 383:6	caring 343:10	547:5 549:9,17	certain 528:10
cap 424:22	carry 542:6	572:12 574:20	530:9 544:10
576:1 603:11		574:22 601:6	544:16,19

[certain - cite]

571:12 609:3,4	championship	changes 423:2	check 374:4
certainly	359:7	423:2 424:18	464:19 467:25
333:13 352:9	chance 411:18	511:1 519:15	468:5
356:23 382:14	538:17 547:11	519:22 547:10	chest 358:23
384:5 388:17	564:10 577:1	550:23 555:10	584:6
402:6 417:14	chances 564:3	557:6 558:14	chief 588:8
417:20 420:4	chang 325:3	559:2 571:21	chiefly 412:11
483:3 493:10	478:19,23	577:9 604:15	children
498:13 514:12	515:21 516:12	608:4 609:22	341:11 595:25
514:24 527:20	516:17 521:21	610:8 613:22	children's
578:1 581:11	521:22 522:4	620:7	341:16
certainty	change 353:5	changing	chilies 591:4
504:19 511:3	382:21,25	381:10	chino 320:13
certificate	383:16 385:5,8	character	choice 376:22
608:20 622:1	385:10 389:11	359:1	506:8
623:1	389:15,20,22	characterizati	choices 384:10
certification	423:12 424:20	348:21 354:23	choose 424:11
561:8,9,15,22	438:8 445:10	382:3 409:4	555:6 571:14
604:21	446:3 450:24	577:18 610:5	chose 360:4
certifications	451:1 471:12	characterize	chosen 364:24
607:2	517:7 518:15	358:15 406:11	368:19
certified	518:20,22	467:3 508:17	christmas
334:10 561:20	526:7 530:11	516:2	517:21
certify 620:2	535:4 551:1	characterized	circular 348:15
622:3 623:2	555:10 561:12	384:6	569:13 593:19
cetera 343:19	561:19 562:1	charge 451:14	circulated
459:23 591:6	593:25 594:3,6	507:4 551:24	576:23
chair 521:21	600:6,13	charges 563:11	circulating
chairman	604:12 607:8	chart 365:24	370:7
343:2	607:20 608:2,6	439:15 441:23	citation 372:18
chakalian	610:13 611:23	491:16	citations 414:3
326:17	612:15,16	charts 439:15	cite 413:10
challenge 451:7	changed	cheaper 463:10	427:5 515:10
challenges	405:15	505:13	515:13 566:12
573:21			617:3

[cited - co2]

		T.	
cited 397:8	482:1,5 516:7	495:1 500:23	380:1,6,13,23
403:7 410:18	clarity 416:16	500:24 501:4	381:2,6,16,19
411:3,12,13	530:16	593:25 607:6	381:22 382:17
413:14 489:14	class 350:19,23	clerk 325:9	382:20 383:1
552:1 553:18	404:16	clients 413:18	383:14,24
566:21 619:5	classification	cliffs 476:4	385:13,17
cites 477:21	350:22	climate 336:19	386:8,15
520:17	classified	535:4 593:25	387:16,21
citing 348:16	509:17	594:3,3,6	388:2,15,18
413:19	clay 326:14	close 404:8	389:12 390:3
civil 593:10	clayton 325:17	405:18 473:10	390:21 391:3,8
claim 348:7	clean 343:15,23	521:24 535:20	391:13,19,23
357:8 360:20	344:14 514:9	539:14 589:10	392:2,8,15,23
361:5 362:15	514:19 532:16	591:15	393:2,6,9,20
362:20 532:4	593:13 594:14	closely 539:9	394:2,10,13,19
569:5 570:11	cleaned 338:19	610:3	394:23 395:7
572:8 574:9	cleaning	closer 440:8	395:11,14,19
601:23 605:6	336:14 344:3	501:6 618:16	395:22,24
606:5 607:1,22	525:11 618:2	closes 549:16	396:2,8,11,17
619:25	cleanup 335:22	609:5	396:22 397:1
claimed 606:19	336:2 343:21	cloutier 322:4	397:15 398:13
claiming 599:3	344:2 520:19	330:5 345:2,4	398:24 399:7
601:7 603:10	521:11 524:19	345:8 346:3,6	402:22 410:7
claims 351:3	527:9,11	346:19 373:10	416:8 437:2
352:19 361:25	528:19 593:17	373:12,15,16	439:24 441:13
562:12 609:20	613:19	373:19 374:2,6	442:10 443:17
614:18 616:23	clear 385:4	374:10,11,18	444:5 463:15
618:25	387:25 391:20	374:22 375:1,6	621:4,5,11
clarification	397:25 420:12	375:8,10,11,12	club 328:9
461:24 479:12	439:3 471:19	375:18,20,25	524:18
578:24	495:10 505:18	376:7,10,15,20	clustered
clarify 366:24	549:24 552:20	377:4,9,11,16	463:20
383:19 401:25	593:16	377:17,24	clusters 354:8
434:3 461:15	clearly 376:25	378:4,10,16,21	co2 499:18
470:1 471:13	494:22,24	379:4,9,19	500:10,13

[co2 - commissioner]

501:12	441:19 442:1,1	commenting	commission's
coal 472:15	442:2,2,11	450:16	448:10 450:18
476:5,7,10,15	columns	comments	451:10 574:21
476:17,24	375:13,14	339:12 512:16	commissioned
488:25 524:21	combination	517:5 519:8	403:10
codified 401:4	434:25 492:22	564:23 580:21	commissioner
coding 355:11	combined	581:10,12	342:3,7 474:10
collateral 387:8	396:3,24	583:3 584:12	474:12,22
387:9 505:20	575:23	588:6 589:25	475:4,9,17,25
505:21 506:3	come 338:11	593:12	476:6,10,12,16
507:5,15 533:2	399:10 411:13	commercial	476:19 477:8
552:6,20	411:14 456:22	495:22 500:21	477:17 478:1
567:14 568:15	471:25 477:21	501:9	478:12,18,21
570:3 609:23	482:8 490:8	commission	478:24 479:4
610:8,19 611:1	491:19 501:2	320:2 325:5,7	479:11,19,24
611:5 612:9,11	510:16 515:8	325:9 333:4,10	480:9,21 481:5
618:11 619:18	518:12 522:3	343:3 352:3	481:8,21 482:4
collect 507:9	522:10 574:21	362:12 366:14	482:12,17,23
558:17 559:18	597:15,24	373:7 383:15	483:6,10,24
568:8 569:18	602:17 615:16	385:17 388:19	484:9,14,19,21
569:19 570:7	comes 363:12	390:4 397:19	485:4,14,20
collected	385:24 468:4	398:17 409:11	486:8,17,20
351:24 569:23	531:19	413:21 415:20	487:16,24
570:1,3	coming 378:23	427:14 450:18	488:14,22
collection	398:24 484:12	450:19 451:14	489:20 490:6
570:4	491:3 519:3	474:7 476:23	490:13,25
college 340:13	528:11 586:20	477:18 481:11	491:13,22
340:14,25	588:14 621:6	495:5 503:19	492:3,6,10,18
524:10	comment 333:7	517:9 540:5	493:15 495:2
color 355:10	333:11,12,17	545:21 567:23	495:13 496:10
colorado 392:4	337:3 344:19	571:23 572:13	496:16,24
490:1	344:20,20,21	572:21 577:12	497:10,14,25
column 349:16	579:14,18,21	577:25 579:4,5	498:9,20 499:8
375:23 377:12	580:1,17,22	581:13 596:8	499:14,17
438:25 441:18	596:25 621:14	612:21	501:13 502:6

[commissioner - completely]

502:11,25	common	490:16 491:6	compared
503:9,15,17	472:17 496:7	493:11 505:12	351:8 406:20
505:1,16	543:5,25 556:7	506:21,21	486:22 489:1
506:15 507:20	560:18 612:22	511:20 514:5	509:2 518:15
508:2,12,20	commonly	514:10,18,19	518:18 551:12
509:1,14,22	335:3	515:2 516:2	571:11 615:5
510:12,23	communities	551:16 556:9	comparison
511:8,15,22	338:25 339:4	560:18 565:23	354:5 397:13
512:5,9,10,11	526:22 535:16	567:9 569:14	397:14 415:22
513:7,18 514:3	535:19 591:12	594:13 596:10	449:8 472:21
514:16 515:1,5	602:13 618:3	596:13,14	509:13
515:15,23	community	606:16 611:18	compelled
516:5,6,10,16	340:13,14,25	612:12 614:5	545:9
516:19 517:13	343:11 491:8	company	compete 511:19
517:16,20	compact	336:11,11	competing
519:20,25	545:20	338:20 350:10	445:5 450:25
520:14 521:3	companies	350:11 351:19	451:12 479:22
521:17	349:19 351:11	368:10 369:15	479:25 552:12
commissioners	351:16 354:9	380:19 382:5	competition
334:9 523:11	354:16 360:13	384:9 389:3	511:11,14,15
593:9 599:18	360:16 380:10	390:12 393:17	511:18,25
commissioning	381:8,25	404:10 424:25	competitive
440:24	383:11,16	471:2 473:8	387:4 511:5
commitment	386:3 389:1,2	478:8 481:9,18	552:12
338:12	389:18,23	506:12 507:6	competitors
committed	393:14,15	507:17 560:9	351:22 555:8
362:5 615:6	394:4 421:25	560:12,13,14	complaints
committee	425:6 438:1,3	604:22 605:9	512:20
348:9 412:14	438:4,16	608:21	complete
413:1 482:7,11	439:20 446:15	company's	532:24 533:3
482:21 527:14	446:22 470:19	361:23	534:9 544:6
585:9,20,21	471:20,20	compare	616:15
586:16,17	473:12 480:18	367:20 480:10	completely
commodity	480:23,25	537:6	389:23 586:21
545:5	481:3,6,11,13		588:21 613:3

[completes - consequences]

completes	compressor	concern 501:10	concrete 605:2
569:21	472:14	513:19 535:1	condition
completing	compromise	536:12,15	400:24 540:12
527:1 532:1	497:21	546:1 556:10	556:17 563:3
completion	computer	concerned	573:20 610:14
485:12 486:2	598:8	338:13 361:15	conditions
complex 490:2	conceded	488:24 489:4	563:21 618:25
496:7	364:24 565:25	510:18 517:5,9	619:9
compliance	conceived	588:10 596:1	conducted
335:1 504:1	494:6	concerns	446:7,20
530:4,8,14	concentrate	512:20 568:2	conducts 533:9
531:5 533:14	472:2	570:7 590:18	confess 375:1
550:2 551:17	concentrated	603:19 611:11	confidence
552:25 556:16	383:5	612:19,22	504:23
558:4,8 559:16	concentration	concert 379:11	confirm 450:5
559:22 560:10	331:16 371:24	427:2	479:1 565:2
561:17,23	383:10 524:20	conclude 466:8	confirms
562:17 563:25	concentrations	518:21 534:8	612:18
564:1 604:25	535:5	concluded	conflates
606:6,8 607:9	concept 357:10	489:14 550:7	356:20
607:11,12	357:25 359:10	567:2 568:15	conflict 574:14
614:21 616:13	392:4,9,17	621:16	594:11 603:11
618:19 619:2,6	393:13 396:16	concludes	confusion
620:2,18	401:4,5,18,18	373:5	416:16 576:15
comply 384:3	401:21 415:15	concluding	599:10
525:1 569:7	447:3 449:18	378:12	congress 525:6
602:8,14	449:20 450:10	conclusion	consecutive
605:16	450:11 499:24	373:3 427:10	486:10 541:5
component	510:6 511:17	433:14 434:1	consensus
541:17	520:2	517:1 583:21	472:1
components	concepts	616:5	consequence
541:15	331:11 481:25	conclusions	605:8
comprehensive	conceptually	347:21,22	consequences
350:17	504:10	348:14 353:10	384:10 570:11

[conservancy - contribution]

conservancy	consistency	contain 535:11	continued
343:3	549:4	contained	606:14
conservation	consistent	412:15 528:8	continues
320:2 322:13	366:18 368:5	554:9	527:6 548:10
325:3,9 326:2	402:10 445:22	contaminating	continuous
327:10 333:4	463:24 465:19	535:9	335:8 497:2
343:3 352:4	467:22 469:5	contemplated	contours
572:13,17,20	543:7 600:4	346:14	358:15 359:1
593:9	611:13 619:1	contempt	391:6
conservative	consistently	360:20	contract
354:5 403:23	393:13	contend 526:22	403:19 514:2
422:17 466:25	constitute	contents	614:11,11
467:15 472:3	460:3	412:16	contractor
487:23 509:9	constitutes	context 350:9	410:9
consider	576:24	350:16 407:6,8	contracts 607:5
339:12 341:18	constituting	contexts 391:18	609:25 611:25
409:12 450:19	542:3	contingency	contrary
452:11 489:17	constrained	353:17 365:1	570:17 615:21
494:25 506:9	491:21	367:13 368:20	contrast 363:25
540:5 562:9,16	construct	369:6,10	539:24 575:17
562:19 563:2	494:17	contingent	contravenes
568:9 572:14	construction	358:4 501:6	573:8
572:21 591:20	478:7 494:10	continually	contravention
consideration	595:19,20	335:16	497:24 572:10
341:15 451:8	596:14	continue 347:9	contribute
488:16 619:9	consumer	353:19,23	356:13 361:1
considerations	553:23	362:9 386:23	383:12 529:3
603:21 610:25	consumers	387:23 398:6	532:21
considered	591:9	437:18 446:23	contributed
496:22 569:23	cont'd 322:1	449:5 452:3	481:1,4
considering	323:1 324:1	485:8 551:17	contributes
429:1 558:17	325:1 326:1	555:5 569:3	478:3
considers	327:1 328:1	571:17 579:18	contribution
563:12	329:1 332:1	596:3 600:11	397:3,10,13
			480:11,22

[contribution - cost]

491:7	corner 479:7	431:17 432:6	correspond
contributions	corporate	432:11 437:8	369:15
480:15,17	470:18 556:16	438:13,22,23	corresponding
491:12	corporation	439:2,16,17	518:20 544:18
contributor	344:2 352:3,4	440:20,25	548:7
542:21	608:21,25	441:12 443:10	corrosion
control 342:4	corporations	444:2,3,9,15	534:17
581:20,25	343:8,13,22,25	448:21 450:22	cory 327:14
582:9 592:2,13	344:13	452:23 453:1,2	cost 331:5
592:18	corral 325:19	453:11 459:24	336:1 344:3
controlled	correct 353:1	462:3 465:5,23	350:20,22
352:14 518:20	373:23 374:20	467:17 476:11	353:18 362:7
controls 560:21	374:23 376:4	484:4 488:7	362:12,17
convenience	378:25 382:1	516:13 604:13	364:7 365:12
574:25	382:18,22,23	605:11,18	365:12,20
convention	387:23 388:11	corrected	366:16,17
413:15	390:9 391:1,16	560:24,25	367:18,19,20
conventional	392:6,7,20	correcting	374:23 376:23
472:9 499:5	400:2,13	601:25	376:24 387:11
conversion	403:12 406:2,9	correction	390:10,16
442:3,5,7	408:17 414:15	412:18	403:2,3 404:8
convert 499:7	414:24 415:4	corrections	404:12,22
converted	417:10 418:13	352:20 353:3,4	405:3 406:4
499:3	418:17,25	correctly	418:12 429:3
conviction	419:6,11,17	369:16 381:21	447:14 461:8
362:7	420:8,16,25	392:22 422:22	462:24,24
cook 328:15	421:13,20,23	425:2,4 435:6	466:25 467:5
337:3,6,10,11	422:12,20,23	453:24 519:10	471:17 472:6
337:14,20,20	423:8,12,19	correlated	472:19 473:5
339:16	424:1,5,12	478:7	473:15,16,21
cooking 598:2	425:14,17	correlation	474:19 475:1,5
copy 525:13	426:2,11,18	475:19 477:3,5	475:22 476:23
621:8	428:11,19	477:7 478:2	477:6 478:3
core 352:2,5	429:12,18,23	correlative	480:2 484:7,24
	430:13 431:2,7	451:15	485:1,1 486:1

[cost - covers]

		T.	I
488:11,21	367:22 370:10	553:12,24	course 354:11
490:4,17,20	375:15,15,23	554:16 555:3	467:11 581:4
498:16 505:24	375:24 376:3,4	557:12,13	court 610:24
506:3,19	378:23,24	558:6 564:5,7	courts 584:4
510:10 514:8	382:9 387:13	566:20 573:13	cousin 358:20
518:9 520:19	404:14,23	574:3 591:9	359:4
527:25 528:1	405:15,16,19	601:21 603:20	cover 336:14
531:22 533:5	406:2,8,19	615:5,13 616:2	344:2 418:12
536:17,21	408:18 409:10	616:3,22,24	426:2 428:23
537:10,17,25	409:18 414:23	619:16	429:4,6 432:11
538:19 539:6	429:6 447:3	council 519:13	432:19 489:10
539:10,11,15	461:2,9 462:8	counsel 411:18	496:17 528:6
540:2,9,14	466:14,17,22	622:10,13	532:9 554:6,22
541:9 543:23	467:1,2,14,16	623:7,10	554:24 566:2
544:3 547:6,23	468:4 471:18	counselor	566:20 615:13
551:20 554:24	472:7,17,24	335:7	616:3,9
555:7,8,20,24	473:12,17	count 332:10	coverage 547:3
556:2 557:21	475:8 476:25	369:14 370:1	547:19,20
566:2,14,17,18	489:15 512:4	372:7,11,22	557:16,23
566:23 572:15	514:21 516:1,3	603:5	575:14,16
572:25 573:16	516:25 520:19	counter 619:19	617:16,25
573:19 574:2,6	521:11 527:2,4	counterpropo	covered 363:13
594:17 601:4	527:11 528:4,6	459:3	402:22 410:7
601:17,18,19	528:7,19	countries 360:6	416:8 425:13
616:9 617:2,7	529:11,16	country 589:13	459:7 533:18
617:9,9,12,12	532:9 533:1,4	589:19	539:6 542:11
617:17,19	533:17 534:1	counts 370:22	548:1,5,14,22
618:1,10,15	536:22 537:4,6	couple 359:16	548:24 554:17
619:15	539:13,21	384:17 392:14	572:25 574:6
costly 387:3	540:3,16	450:8 451:25	575:15
519:16	541:13 543:21	456:12,15	covering 344:6
costs 331:23	544:13,25	459:8 469:25	508:5 544:12
336:14 353:19	545:8 547:15	499:24 585:18	601:3
363:8,20	548:1,7,11	coupled 610:22	covers 363:15
365:18 367:16	552:8 553:10		471:18 568:7

[covid - data]

covid 405:19	494:25 513:12	529:1,2,5,9,17	492:1,13,15
crack 534:16	530:8	533:16 537:7	495:16 509:3
crafted 361:12	criterion	537:18 539:24	582:17 584:23
crafts 588:23	530:24 558:24	540:19 549:8	604:8
create 338:22	critical 541:17	554:8,12 561:4	dad 340:11
338:24 379:12	546:4 590:24	561:5 565:24	daily 478:13
384:15,23	591:4,13 613:6	567:2 572:2	dakota 476:21
386:5 389:1	criticized 381:7	573:11,17	477:1 489:23
418:23 427:3,8	cross 373:6,14	601:19 607:8	516:25 518:23
429:11,17	393:21 399:16	619:11	518:25 519:13
430:12 480:2	416:17 417:1	currently	519:23 520:4
481:20 555:4	436:25 457:8	353:23 394:16	550:23 551:2,4
555:18	487:3	455:11 464:11	551:7 570:20
created 449:8	crossed 488:4	465:3 466:7	571:6
477:15 494:3	491:23	513:14 527:16	damaging
593:14	crosshairs	528:12 537:8	593:23
creates 367:12	388:11	537:20 542:11	dan 325:21
480:3 532:24	crude 394:18	557:20 559:15	616:20
541:10 554:25	crux 608:4	560:9 567:5	daniel 325:23
564:8	cubic 442:4	586:12 593:17	dark 355:12
creation 348:10	cumulative	596:2	dashed 367:21
484:17 524:4	331:24 481:1,2	cusp 579:14	367:24
557:25	575:11	customers	data 347:17
credibility	curated 360:4	413:12 612:7	349:23 351:4,6
414:2	curiosity	612:10	351:8,12,20,23
credible 413:21	439:23	cut 502:15,15	352:2,5,11,20
credit 563:6,8,9	current 335:24	cutoff 458:1,12	352:21 362:19
563:9,13,14,14	336:7 359:22	458:16	364:1 365:23
563:15,16,16	376:14 382:11	cx 330:2	372:6 373:2,20
cripple 338:15	394:7 405:9	cycle 497:3	374:23 375:14
612:10	406:5 427:17	cycles 532:19	379:1,3,4,6
crisis 529:4	443:17 458:3	d	395:2 404:1
567:21,22,24	487:6 501:24	d 330:1 333:1	409:8,21
criteria 402:11	512:24 524:16	333:22 339:24	415:20 416:1
487:3 494:3,18	526:15,19	339:24 491:23	461:22 462:24

[data - definition]

463:1 470:22	debt 470:24	368:8,23	default 533:11
477:24 514:14	570:14	379:14,15	537:23 538:17
552:3	decades 385:7	392:19 393:7	544:5,14
database	415:8 455:16	393:16 400:6	552:15,22,24
335:18	500:11 521:6	403:5 406:4	568:16 611:13
date 320:10	decide 397:17	407:14 408:15	defaulting
377:25 387:18	421:5 505:8	410:9 418:11	567:4 612:20
388:7	578:1	418:24 419:5	defaults 547:25
day 320:9	decided 494:10	420:15,16	548:19 567:18
333:2 367:23	500:25 611:5	421:4,20 427:4	570:1
394:20 402:5	decides 387:5	440:24 467:5	defeat 600:19
521:6 531:16	507:18	467:16 506:2,8	defects 534:25
586:24 621:3	decision 536:7	506:14 531:21	535:23
days 334:24	583:13	532:13 555:21	defer 508:9,18
352:25 353:2	deck 598:20	555:25	deficiencies
459:8 486:9	declare 338:21	decrease	529:1 531:7
487:10,13	decline 473:19	479:21 548:7	deficit 509:12
541:4,16,19	473:20 565:9	570:21 571:13	define 388:1
de 480:7	565:13 603:15	decreased	494:18 495:3
504:25 519:14	613:25	354:11 435:4	defined 355:11
565:22	declines 568:13	493:1	355:12,23
dead 397:16	613:23	decreases	356:3,12 358:6
500:4,5	declining	550:1 575:16	359:16 389:4
deadline	334:17,19	deemed 377:2	389:19 402:2
542:23	382:7 473:19	512:22 569:15	404:10,18
deal 362:13	556:10	deems 389:8	541:2 577:19
386:6 486:7	decommission	572:17,21	608:17
510:19	362:18 364:7	deep 376:12	defining 494:25
dealing 495:19	419:11 420:24	476:9 500:6	definitely 489:5
515:2	455:18 467:6	593:14,14	494:19 501:14
dealt 486:3	decommissio	deeper 437:3	508:13
dearly 594:2	421:12	476:21 477:9	definition
debated 583:10	decommissio	481:22 508:19	349:22 355:5
583:20	331:4 353:14	535:14	356:11 400:18
	353:18 365:12		400:25 401:7

[definition - determine]

402:10,14	democrat	department's	description
431:10 458:7	585:18	569:13	331:2 332:2
486:11,12,13	democrats	depending	489:8 503:21
486:21,25	585:21,23	351:23 499:21	design 421:7
487:7,23	demonstrate	547:3 552:14	designated
496:11 526:3	331:10 392:18	589:2	530:21 600:13
527:22 541:14	481:24 568:21	depleted	designed
definitions	demonstrates	382:11	417:25 418:9
354:3,4 494:5	353:16	depose 552:25	422:11 493:24
494:6	demonstrating	deprived 618:4	557:25
degree 340:16	495:17 573:10	depth 409:22	desire 533:3,5
351:24 588:19	demonstration	475:20,22	570:6
delaware	529:7	476:7 478:2	desiring 579:21
500:15	demonstrative	488:16 537:12	596:25
delay 343:21	357:16 407:10	537:13,14	despite 550:7
420:16 421:20	407:18,24	540:1,6,8,10,15	611:9
421:21 422:8,8	423:4 430:24	540:18 572:14	destruction
440:23 441:6	437:11	573:6,12,18,23	593:13
526:20 529:5	demonstratives	616:25	detail 497:12
533:5 548:13	420:21 447:2	depths 477:3	detailed 350:18
606:9 619:20	denial 607:15	derived 447:10	475:12
delaying	density 535:20	describe 402:1	deteriorate
379:15 419:5	denver 323:23	501:17 508:9	514:18 536:4
422:1	324:21	524:15 555:12	546:2
delivered	deny 558:18	599:20	deterioration
350:11	559:11 607:8	described	357:4 610:21
demand 570:8	608:1,6	369:21 415:1	determination
605:7 610:7	department	511:10 570:17	462:20 530:8
611:1,5 612:10	322:17 325:14	610:17	544:8 608:5,11
demanding	325:20 326:7,9	describes 384:8	determinations
567:8 611:17	326:11,18	565:21	620:12
demands 559:6	327:7 536:25	describing	determine
605:3 609:24	569:14 588:9	499:19 510:25	444:17 445:1
610:18 611:24	588:10,12	570:19	445:18 446:7
	610:9		446:22 447:7

[determine - discretion]

449:11 470:14	500:12,18	379:10 383:10	disagree
470:17 531:7	515:2,3,13,17	385:23,25	354:21 364:6
determined	516:1,2,3,3	392:3,16,23	400:17,25
486:10 539:5	552:16 574:22	394:3 400:21	449:6 610:4
573:5	588:21,23	403:3 404:21	disagreement
determines	589:9,19	410:23 411:6	353:16,21,22
563:25	differentials	418:3,5,8	353:10,21,22
determining	470:21	424:17,18	353:24 334:1,2
401:11,11	differently	426:24 427:21	358:1,2,5
568:8 601:17	389:22 426:5	430:20 437:4	disagrees 356:5
604:20	467:4 516:3	463:7 474:4	disappear
deterrent	difficult 553:1	487:11 490:18	394:5
380:11	567:8 594:7	491:11 495:7	disappears
detriment	611:17	511:25 515:20	398:2
617:24	difficulties	523:12,14	disclose 559:5
developed	357:2 467:8	525:16 552:1	560:6 561:4
397:23 488:5	difficulty	558:25 564:13	disclosed
494:15 504:20	507:14	564:24 609:17	409:17
development	dig 437:3 477:9	610:8 611:15	disclosure
370:25 371:2	digital 351:13	614:4	559:13 561:8
400:13 413:5	622:8 623:3	directed 536:20	607:23 620:10
606:9 610:22	digitally 352:3	direction 557:7	disclosures
dialed 341:23	dilemma	directional	379:7 561:7
diede 326:2	386:19	372:14 444:21	disconnect
differ 363:21	diligence	directly 352:13	509:10 519:17
difference	487:18,21	352:13 365:11	discount
363:19,23,24	dimensions	370:13 461:13	506:11
366:12 439:6	363:10	494:7 540:8	discounting
different	dioxide 534:21	541:18	370:25 371:1
351:22 372:12	direct 346:12	director 325:3	discourages
404:6 406:11	347:6 348:1	523:22 604:18	545:1
440:2 448:16	360:10 363:12	directors 560:6	discretion
452:21 462:18	364:9,23 370:5	560:17 561:5	434:25 603:15
462:25 463:13	370:9,10	directs 572:21	603:19
473:12 495:23	377:24 378:5	J. 2000 5 / 2 / 2 / 2 / 2 / 2 / 2 / 2 / 2 / 2 /	000.17
	22.2.2.0.0		

[discretionary - dramatic]

discretionary	display 411:22	327:10 352:4	585:14 586:5
608:3,5	dispose 496:1	538:8 572:17	domain 379:7
discuss 423:1	disproportion	572:20 603:17	don 324:13
497:11 531:10	383:12 550:10	division's 364:7	door 334:23
531:12 555:11	disproportion	divisions	341:1 511:21
discussed 350:2	601:12	478:15	583:23
393:15 416:9	disqualifies	dixon 585:18	dot 487:5
452:1 466:14	458:4	docketed 333:4	dots 487:4
468:3 498:21	disqualifying	document	double 367:25
599:6 607:18	458:1	474:17 516:11	374:4 397:11
discusses	disrespect	611:7	455:11 467:25
420:21	347:19	documentation	doubt 354:4
discussing	distance 414:23	495:16	douglas 326:4
345:13 424:20	distances 535:6	documented	609:20
428:16 437:13	distinct 461:24	378:6 606:19	downhole
457:24 484:3	569:12	doi 537:3	331:22 353:15
502:7,9 509:24	distinction	554:18 560:25	365:12,17
discussion	485:21 575:9	611:8	474:19
355:6 359:19	distinguish	doing 345:14	downloaded
359:20 378:19	516:8	346:5 395:12	352:2
414:4 460:25	distinguished	399:23 415:6	downtown
495:11,14	360:5	441:23 442:3	340:12
496:25 497:5	distribute	457:16 502:1	downwind
discussions	591:6	519:23 589:18	535:6
458:17 515:9	distributing	607:4	dozen 360:6
559:1	591:2	dollar 357:21	dozens 360:1
diseases 534:24	distribution	357:21 377:1	393:13 440:7,8
disincentive	331:15 354:6	381:13 514:6	dr 350:13
384:16	dive 481:22	dollars 336:5	385:25 386:8
dismiss 576:13	divert 585:25	357:19 397:12	398:3 471:15
579:8 599:8	diverted 583:7	405:3 467:9	472:23
611:7	585:15,16	472:7,10	drafted 359:5
disparities	586:2,3,9	473:14 506:7	dramatic
488:17	division 322:13	520:21,21	405:18 534:6
	325:3 326:2	521:8 528:2	545:4

[dramatically - economic]

dramatically	drive 320:14	565:13 567:22	earth 343:6
555:16 564:2	322:18 361:8		earth's 343:11
611:24 619:10		e	
	445:6,7	e 321:1,1 322:1	earthworks
draw 427:9	drivers 370:14	322:1 323:1,1	328:14 334:11
450:8 460:14	477:6,6 540:9	324:1,1 325:1	334:16
498:25	573:19	325:1 326:1,1	easier 511:23
drawing	driving 535:4	327:1,1 328:1	easily 461:21
369:21 457:17	drop 437:25	328:1 329:1,1	605:5
drawn 449:16	dropping 453:1	330:1 331:1	east 321:8
449:17 583:8	drops 438:2	332:1 333:1,1	easy 394:12
draws 472:18	617:2	333:23 337:10	506:8
dream 590:22	drought 593:24	339:24,24,25	echoes 370:6
drew 410:6	594:5	342:16,16,17	econ 588:19
drill 343:10,13	dry 472:9,13,13	342:17 498:1	economic
343:22 344:13	dswd 496:12	501:18 504:1	331:10,18,19
353:24 485:9	dswd's 496:17	522:24,24	349:23 355:15
532:20	due 335:1	547:8 582:17	355:20 359:13
drilled 370:19	338:21 397:18	590:5 592:24	359:15 370:2,4
478:8 484:23	398:15 487:17	592:24,24	370:7,8,13,14
485:3,9 491:2	487:20 531:19	595:5,5,6,6,6	384:18 390:25
531:16 546:7	553:13,13	604:8	391:14,15
599:22 600:2	564:6 591:15	earlier 384:3	398:4 401:17
600:22	duly 334:3	398:15,23	401:21 412:10
drilling 344:5	337:15 340:3	399:2 402:15	414:8,13,14,24
369:13 371:2	342:21 523:3	402:19 436:2	416:4 431:23
372:12,20,22	582:21 585:2	460:19 463:15	445:9,9,10,25
373:3 484:8	587:23 590:11	464:21 468:23	446:4 447:9
518:22 519:6	593:3 595:10	472:8 486:3	449:23,24
532:8 538:9,14	605:17 622:5	491:16 500:1	450:10 451:9
551:1 576:7	dwayne 330:3	510:7 529:20	455:21 474:3,4
578:5 599:1	347:2	early 369:7	480:4 481:24
600:18	dx 330:2	405:17	491:12 494:20
drinking	dynamic 532:6	earned 588:7	496:4 510:21
535:10,12	dynamics	earning 507:10	531:17,23
	479:23,25	507:10	532:25 541:23

[economic - empirical]

550:4 558:3	433:20 434:8	efficiently	eliminates
570:18 571:18	435:11 437:22	559:18	604:24
610:15 619:19	437:23,24	effort 467:11	embedded
economical	445:8 449:17	475:14 534:9	384:14
506:12	470:14 474:4	583:17 594:10	emblematic
economically	488:20,21	efforts 489:14	371:20
501:8 612:1,8	489:12 517:1	eia 395:2	emerick 326:4
economics	517:24 518:2	eight 351:10	566:4 567:7
379:11 384:9	518:23 519:1,6	497:7 498:12	609:20 610:2,6
392:17 393:4	519:19 550:5	498:23 499:18	611:15 613:5
411:15 418:22	551:2,5,13	500:3,4,5,22	614:4 615:21
427:2 470:15	576:16 599:11	either 376:6	emerick's
470:17 495:21	effective	390:12 397:13	610:4 611:13
496:3,9 555:25	380:10,11	406:15 439:7	612:25
558:3 615:3	387:18 388:7	494:5 545:8	emeritus
economist	402:14,18	620:6	593:10
588:8	422:18 434:5	el 343:5	emissions
economy	511:14 532:12	elaborate 404:4	334:21 335:1,8
340:22,23	532:13,23	elect 386:14	335:8,14,16
370:7 549:22	556:19 557:3	423:18,21	535:25 594:10
593:19 595:21	557:10,24	424:11 425:12	emit 534:19
596:20 602:13	574:4	428:17 432:10	emnrd 477:22
edge 455:20	effectively	433:9 434:11	emnrd.nm.gov
editorials 413:5	532:3 563:5	435:13	322:20,21
edits 458:18	578:5 607:3	electing 432:25	emphasis
education	612:11	election 424:5	417:20 612:25
340:25 341:13	effects 370:3	element 353:17	emphasize
397:16 596:3	471:16 480:7	eleven 395:20	616:23
educational	516:22,24	eliciting 562:18	emphasizes
339:9 341:5	519:14 534:24	eligibility	613:5
524:8	550:22 570:19	554:20	emphasizing
effect 338:24	594:3	eligible 575:20	602:16 617:5
424:20,24	efficiency	eliminate	empirical
427:22 428:7	365:9,19	436:20 530:13	349:23
428:11,13,22			

[empirically - especially]

empirically	endorsed	493:20 593:11	environment
493:11	359:22	engineers	338:9,13
employed	endorses 619:5	359:24 411:14	524:12 526:24
523:19 543:8	ends 393:19	412:18,20	593:23 594:11
622:11,14	398:9 578:16	english 344:23	602:13
623:8,11	620:24	580:5,24,25	environmental
employee	endured 455:7	enjoy 338:7,10	321:2,7,17
327:19 334:15	energy 322:16	527:6 541:11	451:15 466:19
622:13 623:10	325:13,19	ensure 338:18	466:23 518:10
employees	326:6,8,10,17	343:22 418:23	525:3 550:1,8
589:2 591:10	327:6 344:10	419:10 526:13	550:10 593:13
employers	368:6 370:20	526:16 546:11	envision 381:9
606:8	413:12 494:8	563:7,16	eog 323:2
employment	500:19,23	565:14 574:4	epa 486:22
339:3 606:14	501:7 525:7	594:16	equal 507:21
empowered	585:9,20	ensures 545:17	508:4 537:15
608:19	586:15 589:13	ensuring	566:10
enact 481:11	591:8 595:16	617:24	equipment
enacted 479:17	enforce 536:15	enter 602:16	504:16
enchantment	555:2	entered 385:7	equipped 569:6
338:6,8	enforced	565:8 607:12	equivalency
encompasses	455:10	enterprise	340:15
401:6	enforcement	351:17	equivalent
encourage	380:24 455:7,9	entire 339:8	402:5 439:1
420:23 526:12	464:2,7 530:4	568:20 595:21	442:4 443:6
529:18	536:11	600:19	453:4,23 541:5
encouraged	enforcing	entirely 406:14	615:25
572:2	536:12	600:4	error 375:2
encourages	engaged 559:1	entities 354:7	es 622:4
548:12	600:10	438:15 440:2,2	escape 534:15
endangered	engineered	453:21 561:18	escrow 484:24
365:17	449:21	561:24 610:15	486:1
ended 608:11	engineering	entity 470:18	especially
endogenize	449:20,21	608:22,25	338:14 341:2
415:16	450:13,14		409:7 483:15

[especially - exception]

495:19 502:20	367:23 375:14	eventually	340:5 342:23
505:10 516:23	375:23 377:6	504:22 528:13	347:5 365:3
546:6	377:12,13	everhart	463:1 475:21
esquire 321:4,5	378:24 403:3	324:18 374:6	491:10 516:21
321:6,16 322:4	404:14 408:18	375:5,7,9	516:24 523:5
322:5,14,15	442:18 460:20	377:8,10	582:23 585:4
323:3,4,13,20	554:14	399:13	587:25 590:13
324:3,11,18	estimates	everyone's	593:5 595:12
essential	331:23 350:23	598:19	examiner 454:2
340:21	367:15 376:23	evidence	example
essentially	376:24 403:2	349:19 351:1	352:23,24
388:16 409:2	404:22 405:8	361:2 369:8	366:20 368:1
410:12 413:20	405:25 429:3	385:23 454:23	389:14,17
423:16 529:15	475:20 554:10	460:16 614:20	494:9 500:19
550:16 558:15	estimation	evil 390:6	501:3 506:4
570:25 613:19	404:9,12	evolving	560:19 600:21
establish 539:4	et 343:19	565:12	609:3 614:12
574:15,22	459:23 591:6	exacerbated	618:13
established	ethical 343:12	593:25	examples 335:6
359:13 565:4	ethyl 534:22	exact 404:7	596:14
570:5	evaluate	exactly 350:24	exceed 379:21
establishing	558:20	367:23 396:12	518:9 528:19
362:17 572:12	evaluated	444:24 485:4	540:3 557:13
612:16	414:3	499:8,14	574:23
estimate	evaluating	502:25 578:21	exceeding
350:20 377:1,3	556:16	exaggerates	560:8
386:2 403:14	evaluation	348:23	exceeds 554:11
403:24 404:15	416:5	examination	excellent
404:16 406:4	evaluations	347:6 373:6,14	399:24
407:13,14	415:9	393:21 399:16	except 353:25
408:11,15	evd 331:2	417:1 436:25	358:3
411:7 461:9,11	332:2	457:8 469:21	exception
467:1 472:4,23	event 406:15	523:14 609:17	497:17,17,18
estimated	544:5 580:4	examined	497:22 498:2
332:8 366:16	581:3 601:4	334:5 337:17	498:21
	T. Control of the Con	T. Control of the Con	

[exceptions - experienced]

exceptions	371:11,13	exist 358:6	expand 479:25
497:1,4 503:20	372:4 373:21	363:13 398:7	506:9
503:21	373:24 374:12	426:23 431:5	expands 561:2
excessive	374:14 375:16	501:25 607:16	expect 359:2
593:24	375:21 376:17	existed 455:16	365:20 382:21
excluded	376:21 378:22	existence	382:25 405:21
376:24 604:5	383:7 385:25	444:19 567:20	413:17 571:5
excludes 604:1	389:17 390:1	existing 362:10	expectation
exclusive 542:2	405:15 407:10	362:13 379:12	519:18
exclusively	407:16,21,22	379:14 418:22	expected
335:12	407:24 408:3,4	419:4 427:3,5	363:20 382:15
excuse 342:4	408:9 411:17	427:7 484:22	454:13,19
445:12 522:6	411:19 414:17	488:6,9,10	468:16 528:19
576:6 606:5	416:5,6 420:20	501:24 502:4	558:6 612:15
615:15	437:11 445:23	509:3 524:1	expended
excused 597:18	452:14 453:5	528:3 530:13	504:12 533:22
execute 384:21	457:24 460:20	530:20 537:10	expense 421:9
418:10 494:13	460:22 461:6	537:14 542:10	421:10 504:17
executives	461:16 471:16	554:7,17 561:3	expenses
606:15,25	471:19 473:11	562:7,9,13	495:24 568:11
exempted	474:19 475:19	565:14 573:3,8	expensive
498:4 602:10	477:11,15	576:20 599:15	514:9 531:21
exercise 360:14	478:13,21	599:23 600:19	601:11 617:14
exhibit 331:4,8	480:16,19	607:11,25	experience
331:12,15,18	481:23 487:1	610:15 611:25	363:14 376:13
331:21,22,24	523:12,13	exists 351:19	398:5 460:10
332:4,7,10,13	525:12 564:16	365:23 368:15	460:17 461:19
349:17 355:8	564:17 599:17	379:6 391:21	461:20 467:7
355:16 357:17	600:1 602:23	391:22	471:6 491:15
357:22 360:11	exhibits 348:25	exit 519:4	493:12 507:1
362:25 363:3	349:8,9 353:8	569:4 571:14	513:25 595:18
364:14,16	369:17 373:22	exited 519:5	experienced
365:5 366:22	374:13 407:18	exiting 550:20	343:17 567:6
367:6 369:13	480:14 525:17	570:14 571:3	603:20
369:18,18			

[experiences - fair]

experiences	exposing 572:6	extra 614:14	facing 341:13
549:23	exposure	extract 490:16	fact 353:3
expert 350:13	422:19	extracting	359:12 370:21
417:8,17 436:9	expressed	593:14	377:23 382:4
expertise	537:12	extraction	405:16 464:16
451:19 492:17	expressly 549:1	524:20 525:11	464:19 478:2
524:22	549:6,17	532:18 593:18	534:6 567:7
experts 336:7	567:20 603:15	594:9,13	578:19 585:14
355:4,25 379:8	604:1	extractors	586:8 611:16
470:1,5,9	extend 618:24	560:19	factor 466:22
490:13 506:25	extended	extraordinary	546:4 573:6,9
565:2,7,17,25	544:16	498:13,23	factored
566:12,25	extending	499:19	601:25
577:3	497:7 500:4	extreme 453:8	factoring 467:1
expired 497:15	563:5	extremely	factors 445:6
501:19 545:13	extends 563:8	528:18 567:3	518:17 533:13
547:9 549:1,15	extension 497:8	eye 334:18	540:11,14
601:10	497:9	ezzell 325:15	557:9 563:2
explain 418:9	extensions	f	568:10 572:16
606:12 612:6	502:10	f 339:24 604:8	572:18,20
explained	extensive	fa 420:4	573:23 601:24
392:16 409:21	482:18	face 338:17	611:9
417:24	extensively	380:2 543:20	facts 610:5
explains 376:22	400:1	544:23 552:9	fail 557:16
472:8	extent 348:3	faced 386:19	567:19 606:12
explanation	349:4 355:25	544:24	failed 571:24
409:24	363:22 370:12	facilitate	failing 609:3
explicitly	385:9 421:25	529:18 532:13	fails 532:16
409:17	422:8 480:13	535:13 606:14	573:18
exploration	481:18 507:16	facilities	failure 357:4
500:8	552:18 567:13	334:14 524:20	525:1 543:16
explore 520:1	568:24 571:19	556:8,18	fair 357:15
explosion 535:3	572:4 601:22	559:22 607:10	358:9,10,11
exposed 535:17	605:21	610:10 620:19	397:1 401:18
			409:3 414:5

[fair - financial]

446:25 447:25	fast 430:21	579:2	528:9 536:23
452:1 461:3	621:6	fees 533:12	file 363:2
474:25 486:22	faster 411:24	547:15 609:3	364:15 367:7
514:17,22,24	fat 358:22	feet 335:11,17	371:12 609:3
577:18	father 590:21	442:5 476:9	filed 407:18
faith 343:7	595:18	477:1 488:25	564:24
fall 404:17	fault 407:20	489:1	filing 536:16
405:6 415:17	favor 379:14	felicia 320:12	570:4 611:21
425:6 497:18	419:4 617:23	felix 326:12	filings 578:12
502:18 537:9	favorable	348:6,17	final 331:13
557:8 566:24	552:17	619:23	341:18 483:21
fallen 609:2	fe 320:15 321:9	fellow 338:10	577:12 591:7
falling 336:2	322:19 323:16	fewer 393:24	620:12
falls 600:7	324:5,6,14	438:3,4 454:10	finally 471:10
false 397:21	340:10,12,14	454:16 455:3	520:5 566:25
541:23	340:17,24	fiduciaries	616:11 618:7
familiar 383:3	feasibility	521:5	finance 348:9
396:15,20	494:21	field 334:18,19	398:4 527:13
404:12 426:23	fed 520:6	335:24 497:3	finances 507:17
436:19 476:2	federal 396:13	499:5	financial
520:12,15,24	396:23 524:2	fields 499:5	332:14 355:22
familiarize	524:24 553:16	500:9 603:20	361:9 380:3
427:6	553:18 554:17	fifteen 334:25	384:14 386:6
families 344:4	554:20,21	fifty 403:18	389:7,9,22
family 590:19	559:6,8,10	438:14,15	392:12 400:15
far 363:25	560:19 589:10	453:14	400:24 402:15
370:24 375:23	604:25	figure 358:17	402:19 417:9
379:3 412:25	fee 583:5	375:3 385:25	417:18 418:16
438:24 441:8	feedback	527:20 539:14	419:16 420:8
461:21 487:12	458:24 459:3	539:20 566:15	420:13 422:10
506:12 527:3	482:18,19,22	575:23 601:17	422:18 423:1
528:19 529:10	577:3,7 579:2	617:3,9	424:23 426:1
537:9 540:3	feel 338:14	figures 361:3	426:10 427:23
552:9 554:11	361:13,14	378:24 405:24	428:9,18 429:9
612:15 617:2	448:1 503:24	415:19 514:7	429:22 430:13

[financial - first]

430:25 431:4	542:7,11,14,15	605:4 610:9,14	firms 517:22
431:14,16,24	542:17,25	610:21 611:4	518:6,7 550:7
432:18,21	543:3,5,12,22	611:23 612:3	550:17,20
433:23 435:1	544:2,4,14	612:16 613:1,4	567:13 569:10
446:8,14,16,21	545:18 546:21	613:12 614:17	571:1,3
447:8,10	546:24 547:2,4	614:25 616:9	first 333:10,20
469:24 470:2,5	547:7,12,18,20	616:12,16	334:3,16 337:8
470:9,13 471:7	547:21,24	617:5,21 618:8	337:15 339:21
487:23,25	548:2,6,8,11,14	618:12 619:3,6	339:24 340:3
489:25 490:21	548:24 549:18	619:13,17	342:15,21
491:12,12	549:21,25	financially	346:20 349:9
492:19,23	550:5,14,24	451:5 494:12	349:13 350:8
498:14 502:23	551:10,19,23	571:16 622:15	353:13 363:6
503:1 504:24	553:7,19 554:1	623:11	363:11 364:20
505:17,22	554:4,7 556:15	find 352:16	365:4,8 366:10
507:21,23,23	556:24 557:3,6	358:17 368:9	366:14 368:3,7
508:4 510:6	557:10,15,18	377:6 379:5	368:11,13,14
511:1 513:10	557:21 558:1	393:14 412:6	368:19 372:15
519:22 520:9	559:7 563:3	514:6 515:8,16	399:5 412:2,2
524:24 525:9	568:4 571:9	518:21 578:21	412:9 413:1
526:5,11 527:3	572:13,24	588:13	418:13 423:2,6
529:9,13,14	573:1,4 574:1	finding 462:20	431:9 450:9
530:10 531:11	574:5,7,16,18	554:12	474:22 475:24
531:13,14	574:20,22	findings 465:19	479:13 488:20
532:7,12,14,17	575:3,7,8,10,12	fine 336:3	495:6 499:25
532:23 533:7	575:18,20,21	346:6 384:12	522:23 523:3
533:11,18,24	575:22,25	399:23 468:1	529:4 530:12
534:5 536:7,9	576:2,8 586:1	489:15 577:6	532:14 541:1
536:14 537:6,8	599:2 600:5,15	579:17	547:17 581:8
537:11,16,19	600:16,20,23	finish 346:20	581:14 582:21
538:4,11,15,18	601:2,7,8,16	finishing	584:8 585:2
538:22,25	602:2,6,11,19	538:19	587:23 590:5
539:2,4,6,8,21	603:1,11,16,18	fires 594:4	590:11 592:4
539:25 540:3,6	603:23,25	firm 362:5	593:3 595:10
540:7,20,21,24	604:1,3,5,7	500:14	604:17 613:15

[first - fossil]

617:4 619:8	floods 500:10	464:25 499:2	605:3,7,7,9
firsthand	500:10	570:21 571:20	620:20
393:16		603:5 610:3	forfeitures
	floundering		
fiscal 469:4	457:19	follows 334:5	533:24 620:10
525:2 528:1	flow 331:8	337:17 340:5	forgive 402:20
533:22 536:21	358:7,16 391:7	342:23 347:5	475:15
fit 458:6 598:11	416:6 481:23	523:5 582:23	forgo 397:18
fits 572:9	543:17	585:4 587:25	forgot 364:21
599:20	flowing 472:9	590:13 593:5	579:12
fittings 335:5	fluids 478:5	595:12 599:21	form 351:13
five 378:8	focus 442:9	food 591:3	536:11 561:8
403:8,24	476:1 479:7	foot 488:11,12	575:3 618:10
405:20 454:3	483:14,18	537:13,15	formal 350:21
497:8 534:3	509:12 605:3	539:25 573:11	415:3,16
560:9 609:13	focused 452:14	573:15	formation
fix 344:12	605:24 620:15	footnote 372:1	348:15 478:10
fixed 575:14	focuses 563:21	376:21	formations
fl 339:17	focusing	force 505:2	476:3 478:9
flaherty 328:9	475:11 524:18	612:7	489:3
flare 368:18	573:9,17	forced 338:20	formed 379:24
531:2	folder 363:2	591:15	former 575:13
flares 335:5	364:15 367:7	forces 450:25	606:7
flaring 517:11	371:12	forcibly 482:15	formula 573:14
530:25	folks 341:2	foreclosing	fort 384:16
flaws 524:3,6	384:20 454:22	570:3	forth 482:2
flexibility	501:21 503:25	foregoing	493:2 496:25
604:20 618:24	follow 349:7	622:3,4 623:4	509:24 538:5
flood 499:6	401:14 402:9	forest 594:4	forthcoming
500:1,13,14	436:9 464:4	forfeited	471:7
501:12 502:17	478:20 484:13	533:18 559:7	forward 357:19
502:21	585:12	605:4	405:20 468:14
flooded 499:6	followed	forfeiture	579:6 586:17
flooding 593:24	415:24	534:7,9 559:6	fossil 524:19
594:4	following	559:21 561:16	525:11 593:23
	360:10 412:15	561:23 601:16	594:1

[found - gabrielle]

found 334:21	framework	557:21 601:3	568:22 571:25
334:25 335:7	336:8 427:7	618:8	615:10,16,20
335:13 348:1	francis 320:14	fuller 414:4	616:5 618:5
465:1 475:4	322:18	fully 375:13	furious 621:6
490:15 517:7	frank 360:24	451:4 557:2,10	furnish 575:2
519:5 520:16	frankly 586:18	573:2	furnished
527:15 534:4	freddie 328:16	functioning	538:10 576:8
550:13,25	336:23 339:23	335:4	599:2
556:6 558:4	340:2,9	fund 335:22	further 404:4
570:20 594:22	free 533:3	396:19 468:11	416:16 455:22
foundational	536:15 609:24	486:1,2 509:25	469:14 474:6
348:21	613:17	510:13,15,19	495:11 521:19
four 350:16	frequency	521:8 528:6,8	554:10 585:14
386:14,18,22	334:21	533:21 539:23	588:25 617:8
387:1 478:16	front 368:21	554:2,3,6,9,23	622:12 623:9
514:14 580:1	409:11 579:3	583:6,6,17	furthermore
580:22 585:22	fruition 340:23	584:8 585:15	540:9 568:19
585:23 586:12	fruitland 476:5	585:25 586:4,4	607:17 608:10
597:2 609:14	476:6,10,15,17	586:6,9,10,20	future 336:6
fourth 429:14	476:24 488:24	fundamental	340:18 341:11
438:8	fuel 524:19	351:11,12	341:16,17
fox 321:5,11	525:11	565:3,20	344:10 358:15
345:24 346:10	fuels 593:23	604:15	382:16 454:19
346:11 362:23	594:1	fundamentally	493:25 499:21
469:16 578:8	fulfill 507:12	362:1 560:1	500:17 504:18
578:10 598:14	fulfilled 590:22	funded 341:12	505:14 528:20
fraction 343:14	full 344:3,11	583:18 588:13	529:8 546:13
354:3 398:8	366:6,13	funding 339:5	554:13 562:12
444:10 453:10	405:25 467:5	341:5 554:20	g
517:8,10	482:6 484:7,24	588:15 596:1,4	g 333:1 522:25
550:18 571:2	484:25,25	funds 378:1	592:24
618:10	485:1 486:1	396:21 504:12	gabriel 327:15
frame 500:3	503:21 506:1,2	521:10,10	gabrielle
frames 610:6	506:7 544:14	527:4 554:17	326:20
	551:20 554:19	554:21 566:2	329.29

[gain - go]

	I	I	ı
gain 447:13,17	519:23 520:9	494:4 531:13	593:2,8,10
447:18,23	521:13 523:24	558:10 564:23	594:25
448:3,12 449:9	524:21,25,25	568:2 586:4,10	getting 381:24
gains 521:16	526:16,17,19	586:20 593:22	390:7 409:15
gallery 340:11	527:6 528:18	611:11	430:14 457:6
gander 345:15	531:1,2,15,18	generally	579:1
gap 520:19	532:18,20	418:25 438:3	gilmore 326:22
534:6 539:20	534:12,13,19	459:12 566:5	gilstrap 567:5
539:22 549:16	535:4,10,17	generate 446:9	614:18 615:22
gaps 524:3,5	539:3 541:3	543:17,20	give 352:23
gas 324:10	545:20 546:15	544:11 555:24	375:3 398:16
325:17,21	550:3,6,16,23	564:7	411:18 496:12
326:4,12 331:6	553:21 556:4	generated	496:21 523:9
331:9,24	556:20 557:19	541:18	584:8 598:9
334:10,13	558:22 559:14	generating	given 350:12
335:19 338:16	560:4 565:8	531:20	433:2 477:23
339:2,6,10	567:3 568:20	generation	504:22 520:3
340:20 341:4	569:12 570:24	341:2 500:23	570:5 582:6
341:10 343:8	588:11,18,24	596:4	603:16 605:17
343:13 344:2	589:3,8,12,18	generic 355:7	619:11
357:11 361:24	589:20 591:14	356:1 401:3	gives 359:1
362:2 370:8	593:14,17,20	generous	542:10 616:7
379:11 380:15	594:9,13,17,19	486:22,25	giving 541:22
380:25 382:8	594:21 595:20	genuine 500:17	590:17 600:25
393:4 396:13	596:7,10,19	500:18	glad 517:19
397:9 400:13	602:15 605:1	george 381:7	global 351:20
403:4 406:16	605:22 607:7	geothermal	351:20 535:4
418:22 422:20	611:12 612:12	494:7	go 340:19
424:22 427:2	612:20	gerasimos	346:21 360:15
437:8 441:18	gases 336:1	327:6	365:10 384:11
442:1,4 443:6	gaspar 324:13	gerholt 326:20	384:11 399:2,4
443:25 472:9	gauge 560:1	gerstle 329:2	405:13 417:22
472:13,13,19	620:21	580:18 592:9	418:19 419:3
476:3 481:24	general 400:12	592:12,13,20	423:2,24
493:25 517:11	401:5,21 477:4	592:22,25	430:10 441:25
		·	

[go - growth]

440 10 444 7	202 1 6 1 0	555.04.05	. 525.1
442:10 444:7	383:16,18	577:24,25	grants 537:1
445:4 452:8	385:21 386:9	579:6 585:15	granular
454:7 457:4	386:10 388:20	586:10 588:14	462:19
460:7 478:12	390:5 402:23	589:16 596:13	graphic 350:7
481:22 484:1	410:8 416:15	597:13 598:20	412:6
486:8 487:1,24	417:16 422:25	599:20	graphs 479:5,6
492:6,11	423:2 425:6	good 333:19	gravity 494:7
493:10,16	427:20 428:23	334:8 341:25	500:19,23
497:10 498:25	429:4,4,6	342:12 343:1	501:7
499:1 503:24	430:10,19,20	347:8 373:16	gray 366:5
505:14 510:17	431:22 432:24	373:18 375:10	372:13 494:22
510:24 519:4	433:20 434:20	383:2,22	great 386:6
521:10 523:8	434:21 436:20	384:25 385:19	578:17 589:19
526:25 527:10	437:1,3,8,17	396:5 399:18	greater 356:7
531:24 581:12	441:14,20,20	457:10,12,14	477:3 604:19
582:24 584:1,3	441:22 442:2,8	457:17 462:16	greatest 547:11
584:18 585:6	442:9 444:7,18	506:16 520:5	green 426:19
586:21,22	444:18,22	522:15,15	greenhouse
587:8 588:1,2	445:4 446:15	597:22 607:23	535:4
588:2 590:15	448:20,23	608:17,20,24	greg 325:7
591:3,14 592:5	449:11,13	609:2,6,13	gregory 326:17
595:13 596:12	451:20 452:8,9	goods 595:22	grocers 339:2
598:1 609:14	454:6,17,21,21	goose 345:15	grounded
609:15 618:5	456:15,17	governing	608:11
goal 526:12	464:18,20	538:3	grounds 558:18
goals 594:11	468:14 470:16	government	607:15
goes 358:9	472:11 476:24	612:13	groundwater
362:8 396:18	481:12 483:11	governs 558:13	535:9,11,15
457:21 493:8	484:1 489:5,6	graduated	group 349:21
518:10 544:11	491:4,7 497:2	337:24,25	384:6 496:3,8
613:9,10,22,24	498:11 501:17	340:14	groups 479:6
goetze 326:8	505:2,9,11	grady 523:8	535:18
going 339:3	507:2 509:23	grand 514:1	growing 529:4
345:10,12	511:25 521:23	grantham	growth 339:3
362:22 383:1	521:23 571:22	328:11	394:8

[guarantee - hearing]

guerentee	hand 2/11:22 2/	hoto 521.9 15	337:7,12,18
guarantee 505:19 507:7	hand 341:22,24	hate 521:8,15	, ,
	371:21 480:1,3	haulenbeek	339:15,20
guess 401:9,16	480:5,6 504:18	329:4 591:25	340:6 341:20
405:8 406:20	581:22 597:7	592:2,7 595:1	342:6,11,14,18
409:15 410:17	handed 599:18	595:3,7,9,14,15	342:24 344:16
413:19 414:5	handful 505:5	596:23	345:4,22,23
423:23 424:2	handle 496:2	haulenbeek's	346:4,8,12,15
513:19,20	handout	597:7	346:22,24
576:24 579:7	576:23	hazard 384:14	373:4,8,12
579:17	hands 597:5	554:25	398:20,22
guest 413:5	happen 389:10	hazardous	399:9,13,14
guide 450:18	421:9 422:12	534:21	416:18,23
guidelines	534:17 600:21	headline	433:13,15,22
567:10 611:19	happened	616:23	435:15,17
614:7	382:18,19	health 336:19	436:1,8,11,14
guns 485:23	happening	343:20 344:9	454:2 455:24
guy 395:14	582:2	525:3 526:24	456:1,6,13,20
h	happens 421:8	534:24 535:21	456:25 457:5
h 331:1 332:1	437:21	594:18 610:21	459:8 469:15
441:18 442:1	happy 346:7	611:12	469:19 474:8
590:5 595:6	378:18 569:18	hear 339:19	512:8,12
half 360:6	hard 352:25	342:10 345:7	515:19 521:21
394:6 395:3,5	381:9	378:14 417:3	522:1,5,12,19
395:16 399:4	harder 335:22	464:11 580:14	522:22 523:6
566:16	hardest 567:6	582:11 584:20	523:11 525:7
hall 320:13	harm 341:9,10	587:13,15	564:15,19
	490:23,23	592:20 595:5	576:11,21
322:15 326:10	491:1,1 549:21	609:11	577:5,7,10,20
hanagan 328:2	harmful 534:14	heard 342:3	577:24 578:13
360:8 361:21	harris 325:13	378:10 393:16	578:16 579:11
361:25 369:11	harsh 360:23	417:11 465:13	579:19 580:8
369:23 370:18	360:24	580:13	580:10,14,16
371:23 416:10	hart 323:14,21	hearing 320:9	580:20 581:5,6
hanagan's	hatch 335:3,15	320:12 333:2,3	581:17 582:8
371:6	591:3	334:6 336:20	582:12,16,24

[hearing - hollandhart.com]

504141700	500.24	160.0 6.400.0	400 4 505 10
584:14,17,22	589:24	463:2,6 493:8	499:4 535:18
585:5,11 587:6	helpful 452:10	498:16 512:4	history 376:12
587:12,15,18	483:25 588:19	527:21 528:5	473:24 478:13
588:1 590:4,7	helping 490:8	536:23 541:12	556:16 559:21
590:14 591:23	hereto 622:14	542:13 543:19	561:16,17,24
592:11,14,17	623:11	543:21 546:18	562:17,20
592:21,23	hi 339:19 593:8	552:19 564:4	568:22 620:18
593:6 594:24	595:14	568:14,14,16	hit 581:25
595:4,13	high 340:15	591:9,16	582:9
596:22 597:6	347:10,13	615:13,20	hmm 437:14
597:10,17,19	353:17 358:1	highest 368:14	hold 411:21
597:24 598:13	358:20 359:4	369:3 545:19	528:23 544:21
599:7 609:9,12	367:13 368:11	555:19 569:3	562:8
621:1,12	368:20,24	highlighted	holdback
hearings	369:6,6,9	412:3,3 417:24	331:11,20
457:20	409:7 444:5	418:13,20	347:18 353:22
heat 593:24	460:17 467:10	419:14 422:16	356:16 357:10
heavily 339:9	472:3,20,21	426:18,25	357:15,19
heels 405:18	501:5 506:23	545:22 599:24	358:6,11 359:7
heightened	506:23 507:5	highly 565:19	359:10,12,16
543:16 615:1	528:21 532:21	hinkle 322:6	390:22 391:15
616:15	535:2,20 542:6	hinklelawfir	392:3,9,18
held 343:9	545:24 546:7	322:9,10	412:7 414:6,7
481:17 520:18	548:16 552:22	hired 500:13	414:14,20
533:14 546:5	552:23 553:4	histogram	415:12,15,21
546:21	557:17 567:3	349:13	416:3,6 420:21
hello 333:17	571:12 591:15	historic 377:25	420:24 481:25
587:12 592:12	601:21,23	historical	holder 368:17
593:8	higher 357:1	355:15 382:13	563:9
help 391:1	365:1,20 366:3	454:18 470:20	holds 532:5
409:18 418:17	366:4 368:3	474:19	holland 323:14
435:21 480:22	382:14 403:23	historically	323:21
517:19 526:10	404:25 405:21	377:20 378:5	hollandhart.c
568:24 588:13	406:21 451:1	378:23 381:25	323:17,24
589:3,15,16,17	452:25 460:7	465:15 480:17	
. , ,			

[holy - implemented]

		impact 369:25
597:14		370:5,6,6,8,13
hundreds	373:25 374:15	370:14 422:19
336:5 383:11	390:2 408:5	437:7 439:20
438:19,20	411:20 480:20	443:7 446:8,16
439:21 440:5,9	564:18	446:21 452:2
440:15,17	identified	452:20 453:22
453:19 454:16	361:22 373:21	453:23 469:24
484:22 485:9	417:7 430:8	470:2,5,9
506:6 569:10	565:3 620:19	479:15 483:20
hurt 549:22	identify 364:11	487:18,22
husband 338:4	365:9 568:25	536:7 550:2,15
338:7	identifying	551:15 591:20
hydrocarbon	524:3	595:20 606:22
334:21 535:14	idle 357:2	impacted
hydrocarbons	493:13 536:1	438:13 443:20
362:8	546:1,5,8,12	444:18 448:20
hypothetical	ignorance	448:24 453:4
331:8 481:23	373:2	454:17 457:25
503:14	ignores 336:10	571:15
i	370:19 371:3	impacts 437:2
idos 250:19	613:3	447:8 452:11
	ignoring	453:8
	617:13	impairment
	ihs 351:18	535:23 607:4
	imagine 353:1	impecunious
	492:14	486:4
ĺ ,	imaging 334:11	imperative
	immediate	343:12
	544:25 567:18	imperatives
	immediately	343:8
	542:18 564:6	implement
	565:14	341:8 499:25
	immigrated	implemented
346:1 355:17	590:20	556:14
	336:5 383:11 438:19,20 439:21 440:5,9 440:15,17 453:19 454:16 484:22 485:9 506:6 569:10 hurt 549:22 husband 338:4 338:7 hydrocarbon 334:21 535:14 hydrocarbons 362:8 hypothetical 331:8 481:23 503:14 i idea 350:18 363:6 391:18 391:21 414:2 453:15 474:25 495:6,9,12 514:23,25 609:13 idealized 446:5 ideas 414:4 501:1 identical 550:25 identification	597:14 364:17 371:14 hundreds 373:25 374:15 336:5 383:11 390:2 408:5 438:19,20 411:20 480:20 439:21 440:5,9 564:18 440:15,17 identified 453:19 454:16 361:22 373:21 484:22 485:9 417:7 430:8 506:6 569:10 565:3 620:19 hurt 549:22 identify 364:11 hydrocarbon 334:21 535:14 hydrocarbons 362:8 362:8 493:13 536:1 hypothetical 373:2 331:8 481:23 373:2 503:14 ignorance 370:19 371:3 613:3 ignoring 617:13 ihs 351:18 imaging 334:11 imaging 334:11 immediate 54:25 567:18 54:25 567:18 immediately 542:18 564:6 565:14 immigrated

[implicated - including]

implicated	imprecisely	528:20,24	include 344:11
440:12	425:4	529:19,23	369:20 430:25
implications	imprecision	532:5 543:11	472:13 528:4,7
424:21	404:3	543:15,19	528:9 535:18
implicitly	impression	544:22 545:12	556:20 557:11
566:25	541:23	545:16,23,24	570:12
implied 490:17	improper	546:17 547:8	included
imply 356:23	534:17	548:19 549:9	406:19 458:6
importance	improperly	549:11 555:15	459:17 460:4
373:1	335:4	556:21 557:4	603:4
important	improve	562:8,20 575:6	includes 363:15
340:20 341:6	386:22 510:4	601:9	364:13 376:12
372:14 506:16	518:10	inadequate	406:21,23
521:4 532:17	improved	344:6 536:6	455:6,8 479:2
534:10 540:11	513:16 525:8	593:18 615:10	535:19 541:15
541:20 549:9	553:14	617:24	566:7 574:17
559:13 575:9	improvement	incentive 380:8	589:1
588:15 620:17	358:4	380:16 480:3	including 360:2
importantly	improvements	529:11 532:24	379:7 404:9
382:4 397:21	550:9	541:10 544:5	443:6,24
490:19 513:12	imputed 370:6	548:3 554:25	459:22 523:25
impose 607:15	inaccurate	555:4 613:15	525:5 528:23
imposed	351:1 404:2,3	619:6	530:9 533:13
543:24 619:18	409:9,9	incentives	534:20 535:9
imposing	inactive 331:17	379:14 380:2	535:22 536:11
446:14 533:1	336:4 356:20	384:14 402:1,3	540:11,14
547:12 567:14	356:24 357:1,5	419:4 420:7,10	544:7 547:7
imposition	421:17 426:5	440:23 532:10	549:1,10,17
338:21	430:13 431:1,3	544:9 619:2,16	550:24 553:10
impossible	434:24 435:4	incentivize	557:15,22
553:2 612:9	452:18 453:7	421:19	562:19 563:2
imprecise	492:22 493:1	inch 358:21,23	569:12 573:19
350:25 404:1	497:14,24	358:23	573:23 574:15
409:9	501:18,23	incidence 357:1	575:19 602:11
	526:22 528:15		609:24 610:23

[including - industry]

615:7 619:5,17	502:21 516:22	327:8 328:2	industry 336:2
inclusion 464:1	516:24 535:5	458:25 505:21	339:6,7,10
531:4 572:19	535:22 544:18	independently	340:21 341:4
608:23	544:25 546:8	351:7 611:4	351:7 354:7
incorporate	549:20 550:24	index 553:23	359:10 361:17
552:3	551:20 555:12	indicate 355:14	377:21 378:1
incorporated	556:11 570:8	369:9 382:22	379:23 381:24
540:15 573:24	570:13,14,19	394:2 546:8	382:5 384:3
incorporates	570:22 591:8	indicated	385:7 386:9
401:6 617:6	591:20 602:19	416:21	405:2,19 406:5
incorporating	603:3 605:19	indicates	411:10 415:3
466:18	610:8	355:11 382:20	415:20 416:1
incorporation	increases	indicators	435:25 449:24
619:2 620:6	356:17 357:6	491:11 533:13	450:2 458:24
increase 353:20	531:23 532:4	563:13	459:5 460:11
356:14 379:15	551:21 575:16	indirect 370:2	461:3,10
419:5,9,13,15	602:18 614:13	370:5	465:14 470:1,4
419:16 423:7	increasing	indirectly	470:8 475:1,7
423:10,12	338:14 367:19	348:16	486:18 487:19
440:23 473:5	506:19 545:15	individual	496:8 509:20
479:21 505:24	549:25 553:17	376:25 390:12	510:10,13,16
509:10 517:23	611:24	462:9 470:13	510:17 511:3
538:25 545:4	incremental	471:6 496:5	519:12,19
545:12 550:5	386:2,5 473:11	542:15 546:5	521:13 527:6
551:12 553:10	473:15,16,21	547:12 548:18	550:11 551:15
555:5,16	475:6 480:2	548:22 552:14	552:2,11,21
556:24 564:3	504:8	560:15 617:20	557:19 564:24
571:11 583:4	incur 495:24	individuals	565:7,17,25
583:13,13,16	538:13	361:12 393:14	566:8,12,25
609:23 619:10	incurred	560:11	567:1,19 568:2
increased	560:12 600:17	induced 558:5	568:20 569:10
353:19 360:13	indemnity	industrial	570:6 571:15
382:10 386:19	611:3	594:2	577:2 579:1
410:13 420:6,8	independent	industries	588:11,18
447:10 471:17	322:2 325:15	532:18 569:11	589:8,20

[industry - introduced]

595:17,24	inherently	instantly 394:5	interest 451:16
596:5,7,19	404:3 540:15	institutions	470:21 507:11
606:13,18,23	573:24 608:2	341:6,13	560:7 561:6
610:16,23,25	619:15	557:15	606:13
611:12 615:17	initial 366:13	instrument	interested
618:2	504:24 558:24	575:4,4,13,18	517:3 560:17
industry's	565:19 613:16	575:23	622:15 623:12
347:10 565:12	614:1,8	instruments	interesting
565:21 611:11	inject 576:9	569:7 575:5	512:5
inflation 553:8	599:4	619:17	interestingly
553:11,13,19	injecting	insufficient	366:15
inflationary	496:13	418:12 566:20	interests
603:9	injection	insures 379:13	451:12 544:1,3
inform 605:24	495:20,22,22	intended 352:7	552:24
620:14	495:25 499:7	357:17 385:1	interface
information	injections	421:7 429:21	352:12
349:13 352:13	499:3	437:21 514:20	interfaith
352:14 412:15	innocent	526:9 602:12	329:6 343:5
465:2 470:12	605:11	intent 383:21	interior 536:25
470:19,23	insertion	421:12 430:1	interior's 610:9
471:1,3,3,8	576:14,17	483:18 488:15	interpret
475:4,7 529:21	599:9,12	488:19 489:11	401:22 402:9
558:16 559:18	insight 410:6	494:12 536:24	427:10
572:22 605:24	insolvent	600:4	interpretation
606:24 608:12	546:10	intentions	432:14,15
608:14 620:14	inspector	383:23 384:7	577:15 580:4
infrared	327:22	384:20,22,24	580:23
334:12	installations	interact 436:7	interpreter
infrastructure	596:18	496:21,23	328:13 344:23
403:4 406:22	instance 377:5	interaction	580:3 597:18
520:10	380:7,18 476:2	434:14 458:9	interstate
inherent 556:5	instances 402:6	503:7	545:20
570:6 578:25	482:15 605:15	interdisciplin	introduced
600:15 603:18	617:17	524:12	352:20 585:19

[invaris - justify]

• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	251 21 252 11	1 712 20	
invaris 351:18	361:21 369:11	issued 513:20	jobs 589:8
inventories	369:22 370:17	513:22 527:14	591:10
542:11 546:12	474:25 512:17	610:19	join 337:1
inventory	565:2 570:10	issuer 563:15	joined 597:11
528:3 539:18	576:4 577:13	issues 335:5	journal 359:24
554:8	598:24 601:5	341:7,12	519:11
inverse 421:22	601:23 606:4	431:21 494:6	journals
invested 338:6	607:21 614:18	524:18 525:10	411:15
investigate	ipanm's 512:20	530:1 540:12	juan 334:18
500:14	514:4	563:4 583:20	363:17,20
investment	ironic 368:9	610:23	476:1 478:25
359:14 416:2,4	irrational	issuing 563:14	479:3,8
566:5	612:1,8	it'll 399:6,11	judgment
investors	irrelevant	475:1	384:8 390:13
606:16	471:18	j	427:18 451:4
invitation	irresponsible	j 582:17	505:21 532:3
360:2	551:14	j.d. 524:10	july 394:15
invited 577:10	ish 463:12	jacob 324:18	395:1 528:15
577:21	issuance	january 394:14	jump 373:19
invoices 527:25	560:20	395:1 432:3	422:25
536:19	issue 348:3,22		juncture 577:9
involve 600:14	348:23 349:5	542:12,23 jennifer 323:3	jurisdiction
involved	349:11,21	323:8	511:18,21
484:17 572:14	353:7,9,14		606:3 620:9
588:23 589:24	397:22 423:1	jesse 322:14	jurisdictions
involvement	425:16,24	jessek.tremaine	544:7 549:24
508:19	428:15,15	322:20	559:15,25
involves 365:7	447:15 449:7	jeverhart	561:17 605:23
524:1	478:11 484:6	324:22	620:12,13
iogcc 477:25	485:6,8 486:4	jim 328:18	justification
545:25 553:11	494:16 510:17	582:20	494:20,20
556:6	568:13 569:6	job 320:17	561:22
ipanm 350:12	583:10 584:7	338:24 457:16	justified 494:11
354:20 357:7	608:20	497:21 587:4	justify 349:4
360:7,19 361:4		588:13 589:19	

[k - lange]

k	king 328:9	489:25 490:6,7	knows 555:7
k 333:23	kirtland 335:13	490:8,9,10,12	kuehn 326:19
335:11 337:11	know 333:8	491:1,2,5	kyle 321:4
595:6	338:17 340:20	493:12 495:4	kyrie 326:16
kansas 337:22	354:12 358:21	496:20 497:1,4	l
keep 335:21	358:22,24	498:24 499:9	l 339:25 342:16
474:3 480:3	359:3 380:17	501:15,15,16	580:12,15
498:17 506:5	380:18,22,23	502:13,17	581:4 587:19
506:12 569:19	381:1 389:6	503:6 504:1	592:24,24
581:10 598:2	390:7 394:13	505:6,10	595:6 597:17
keeping 338:9	396:2,11,17,22	506:15,18	597:21
498:19,22	399:5 406:19	509:4,23 510:2	label 508:11
keeps 336:2	407:1,24	511:1,3,4	labeled 407:25
569:22	408:24 409:8	512:15 514:23	labeling 391:21
ketchledge	410:18,20	520:15 521:4,6	labor 327:19
327:4	413:8,20	521:9,10,12	lack 369:9
key 353:13	415:16 434:13	555:1 559:20	455:10 504:22
354:13	434:18 436:5	576:22 577:1,6	529:14 531:3
kick 572:2	437:15 438:17	578:4,24,25	lacks 529:21
kids 340:19	439:5,24	579:2 583:23	562:5 574:9
kilometers	443:25 444:1,5	588:11,22	laid 467:20
535:6	444:13 447:21	591:10 597:25	land 324:2,4
kind 350:24	448:23 449:2	620:17	325:11 338:6,8
402:23 409:1	451:18 455:13	knowing	344:9 456:9
445:1 447:7	459:6 474:23	448:11	520:16,18,20
461:7 471:3	475:10,11,12	knowledge	521:8 528:17
496:8 508:11	475:22 476:7	458:20,23	536:2 553:16
508:24 519:21	476:19 481:25	459:1 460:10	553:18
578:25 579:9	482:1,17,18	468:9 525:21	landowners
583:23 621:6	483:6,7,25	622:9 623:6	526:21
kindly 341:17	484:5,15,16	known 361:18	lands 408:21
kinds 372:12	485:21 486:18	384:9 385:6	408:21 520:11
411:15 481:14	486:19 488:1,4	481:20 531:16	521:5,12
481:14 500:18	488:5,7,8,15,18	534:23 605:9	lange 515:10
511:12	488:20 489:10		515:12 516:23
			313.12 310.23

[lange - liability]

	T		T.
518:13,14	law 321:2,7,17	leaks 535:1	546:16 583:11
570:18	336:14 425:19	learned 577:7	583:21 587:3
language	425:22,23	lease 368:17	length 572:15
426:19 427:16	427:10 450:17	401:12	lesser 477:24
434:21 435:9	497:24 501:22	leave 344:1	letting 339:14
508:22 530:13	524:11 551:11	390:21 397:24	343:19
549:4,5 576:19	558:3 571:10	498:12 511:13	level 347:10,13
577:16 578:19	608:18	519:7 530:18	351:17 404:16
599:3,14,16,24	laws 381:5	594:21	429:15 447:20
599:24 600:8	512:1 551:8	leaves 424:8	462:20 470:15
603:6 604:1	571:7 605:1	512:21,23	470:17 524:2
607:18	620:3	leaving 546:10	542:13 548:17
languish	lawsuit 610:6	lecture 360:5	548:18
381:10	lawyer 464:19	led 567:22	levels 370:2
large 336:13	468:4	610:25	402:4 535:2
349:11 351:16	lay 336:7	left 358:3 366:2	537:7 544:2,23
353:14 355:19	408:24	368:7 372:8	554:7 558:5
361:15 370:15	layer 384:23	478:25 513:24	615:23 619:12
371:3 383:11	layers 365:7	532:4 593:20	619:14
387:15 389:19	lead 334:10	614:9	lexon 610:19
390:14 420:14	392:19 520:3	legacy 565:22	610:25
424:25 455:19	524:4 532:19	legal 361:17	lexon's 611:6
487:9 491:8	534:8 547:13	388:13 427:16	lfc 348:11,13
496:6 528:24	603:10 606:6	433:14,17	378:11 442:16
550:8 574:10	609:23	434:1 436:5,9	467:23,24
602:5	leader 370:22	438:15 440:2	527:15,24
larger 353:15	leads 409:9	449:18 450:2,3	528:16 534:4
356:2 383:11	549:25	450:17 451:21	536:19 554:9
447:15 455:14	leak 343:19	453:21 481:19	554:10,19
483:3,20 500:7	526:23 534:14	523:21 574:9	liabilities 354:9
517:25 518:3	536:3,5	578:3,4	388:24 560:13
565:23 569:25	leaking 335:16	legislative	562:9,10
largest 483:4	336:1 343:18	348:9 527:13	liability 336:6
late 392:17	343:18 535:8	legislature	344:7 356:14
393:3 600:24	536:4	397:17 477:23	358:3 385:3,5

[liability - longer]

	I	I	I
407:14 408:15	liliana 326:24	list 331:21	488:2,23 489:4
451:9 481:19	limit 355:15	365:9 383:4	493:17 495:23
554:11,13	414:24 422:18	407:23 454:22	500:8,9 512:3
568:7 608:21	445:9,25 446:4	455:3,8 528:15	517:1 548:3
licensed 569:16	453:8 474:3,4	604:5 605:2	585:13 589:17
lieu 396:14	480:4 496:4	listed 374:19	597:13 615:4
life 331:19	589:21 594:10	376:2 411:3	live 618:3
340:10 355:20	limited 370:1	459:19	lived 337:23,23
391:15 392:17	464:5 547:18	listening	340:9 588:6
393:4 405:2	608:21 613:25	398:23 581:3	590:19 595:15
414:14 440:25	limits 349:24	listing 569:14	596:17
445:10 473:24	557:20	572:18 611:9	lives 517:17
500:1,6,20	line 349:14	lists 530:7	living 388:3
510:22 591:19	350:8 353:16	554:19	535:19
595:17 613:13	367:13,22,24	literally 336:16	liz 326:19
lifecycle 382:6	372:12,13,15	literature	llp 322:6
402:15	377:13 381:15	475:23 511:11	323:14,21
light 329:6	381:17,17	512:2	located 338:25
343:5 372:13	428:1 460:14	litigation 380:7	520:10
565:12	468:20 472:4,5	380:9,17	locating 516:9
likelihood	495:1 498:2	609:22 610:4,6	location 320:13
356:7 357:12	499:11,12	610:12,20	355:3 595:23
531:24 533:10	510:19 546:15	611:7,21	logged 374:12
560:2 565:9	588:25 592:10	612:18	logic 401:14
620:22	lines 355:14	little 353:4	544:19 612:14
likely 357:3	372:11 392:16	379:12 394:20	logical 459:14
390:19 467:20	392:24 394:3	403:1 404:21	460:4,14 466:8
489:16 518:9	400:22 459:3	407:10 410:17	long 345:13
527:10,19	link 493:19	418:23 422:19	346:4 392:19
529:24 535:16	linkage 493:21	427:3 437:3	409:20 410:3,4
539:17,20	linked 594:5	438:21 443:18	421:16 573:19
548:20 552:24	lisa 328:13	453:18 454:13	619:21
571:12,22	580:7,10 581:2	456:22 466:9	longer 333:13
605:19 614:21	597:19	467:4 475:3,4	337:23 351:19
614:22		475:12 486:21	357:2 434:11

[longer - m]

444:19 477:4	479:13 492:20	594:4	
498:14 513:11	515:16,23	loud 434:22	m
513:11,15,16	516:14 550:22	love 338:7,8	m 330:10
532:25 536:1	looks 334:19	384:18	333:22 342:4
542:15 552:8	342:8 507:16	low 334:25	342:16 402:2
565:23 579:14	520:4	355:21,21	522:15,20,25
596:5 602:19	loophole 609:5	358:2 401:4	523:9,15,16,19
603:4 614:13	lopez 328:16	404:24 472:22	524:7,14
longstanding	336:23,24	500:22 501:9	525:12,15,20
361:18 385:6	339:18,19,23	518:8 528:20	525:24 526:15
481:19	339:23,25	528:24 529:19	528:25 530:2
look 357:15	340:2,8,9	529:23 532:22	531:10 533:16
369:19 389:17	341:21	534:7 536:10	534:10 536:6
434:21 438:11	loren 326:2	542:20 543:3,6	536:17 537:5
440:11 441:22	lose 394:6	544:13 545:2	538:2,21
442:11 452:9	505:10,11	555:15,22	540:23 543:9
452:13,21	losers 591:19	556:6,22 557:5	545:11 546:23
462:21 487:21	losing 506:4	565:18 615:2	548:25 549:20
489:1,8 492:12	loss 339:1	615:23	551:19 553:6
496:21 497:25	360:17 386:24	lower 349:16	553:25 555:9
499:10 503:1	447:22 449:9	349:17 366:2,3	556:23 558:9
508:14 579:12	464:22 489:16	463:3,6 498:15	561:11 563:1
586:25	512:3 591:10	511:18 514:6	563:18 564:12
looked 367:21	losses 338:25	514:20 535:25	564:20,21,22
380:20 383:7	339:7 610:24	537:19 547:22	567:25 569:5
395:2,2 443:17	lost 357:21	551:9 571:8	570:10 572:8
448:17 452:21	380:19 398:10	591:18	574:8 576:4
490:14 491:6	468:24,25	lowest 398:8,9	579:16 581:20
518:14	494:16 521:16	473:23	581:25 582:10
looking 357:16	lot 372:1 401:6	lunch 456:21	582:17 584:24
412:6 420:19	401:25 417:14	457:1,1,2,14	587:20 592:2
423:5 434:20	454:15 465:13	lunchtime	592:14,18
437:25 443:11	475:14 487:17	456:21	598:7,14,18,23
445:23 446:18	502:13 589:2	luxury 617:13	598:24 601:5
462:5 474:15	589:10,12		603:8 604:10
			606:4 607:1,21

[m - marginal]

600.7 16 19 10	maintain	510:3 541:21	maninulata
609:7,16,18,19 614:16 616:20	530:14 534:11	549:24 554:3	manipulate 541:20
618:17 619:22	539:16 547:15	556:1 561:7	manner 351:14
620:24 621:9	548:11 566:16	579:21 580:21	422:7
m&m 368:17	615:23	588:5 589:1,13	manual 352:20
ma'am 595:3,7	maintained	591:5 594:12	manus 325:23
madai 325:19	334:20	596:25 611:25	manzano
madam 343:2,2	maintaining	makes 335:22	370:20
345:4,22	505:24 513:10	338:9 357:20	march 350:6
346:22 373:4	548:8 557:10	372:1 472:18	404:15 408:21
373:12 398:20	617:20 619:16	498:18 511:23	margin 460:3
399:14 416:23	maintains	553:1 604:15	marginal
433:11,13	554:1 560:25	making 333:9	331:16 349:23
435:15 436:8	maintenance	356:11,12	353:6 354:4,23
455:24 456:13	335:23 534:18	536:8 591:2	354:24 355:5,6
457:5 512:11	615:8 616:18	malfunction	355:12,12,13
564:15 576:21	major 478:14	335:15	355:24 356:1,3
581:4 597:17	480:11 542:21	malfunctions	356:7,10,12
609:9	majority 354:1	335:4	387:18,19
made 353:3,5	368:4 387:15	man 441:24	388:1,1,3,7
385:2,9 389:6	450:2 496:6	manage 336:9	389:4,19
393:16 444:21	539:15 606:22	546:12	400:19,23
445:8 481:18	617:25	management	401:12,17
497:1 505:21	make 333:20	493:24 553:16	402:2,6,10
516:1 544:8	341:18 345:18	613:7	429:12,18
545:21 563:11	353:2 364:1	managing	430:12 431:1
583:13 585:19	384:18 402:21	334:19	431:10,17
590:25 595:21	407:5 422:12	mandate	432:5,9,11
maegan 327:2	423:12,24	572:23	433:7,9,10
magnitude	431:21 445:24	mandated	434:10,24
448:15,16	447:12 451:2,6	612:13	435:4,14
449:7,7	462:20 471:2	mandatory	437:20 438:2,4
main 483:13	474:16 485:21	561:7	450:1 452:15
509:18,19	487:18 497:21	mandy 333:16	452:18 453:6
	504:22 509:15	334:9	458:7 459:4,13

[marginal - means]

	ı	ı	I
477:13 483:11	366:9 371:13	matches 442:15	mcgowen 327:2
483:16 486:25	373:24 374:14	material	348:18 349:25
487:7,11,15	390:1 408:4	412:19 477:16	351:2 352:18
492:21,25	411:19 480:19	materially	354:20 357:8
509:17 512:21	564:17	606:22	359:8 361:5
512:23,24	market 351:22	materials 413:6	362:15 364:4
513:15,15,24	357:15 358:10	413:10,11	397:9 565:9,21
526:3 540:24	358:11,12	553:15	mcgowen's
541:2,6,14	507:1,1 551:15	math 376:5	351:8
542:2,5,10,14	552:12 553:1	394:23 395:12	mean 352:10
542:18,24	567:8 568:24	395:25 443:14	354:25 356:23
543:11,15,19	569:4,6 571:14	443:22,23	383:21 388:1
544:23 548:20	611:17 612:8	464:20 466:11	401:3,15
555:15 556:21	marketing	468:4,6	419:23 426:23
557:5 562:8	413:5	matt 327:19	427:16 428:14
566:1 567:15	markets 567:6	matter 320:4	430:3 431:5
570:13 575:2,5	marks 325:11	345:3 350:13	439:4,24
601:7,9 602:16	marlene 329:6	425:20,25	449:20 455:1,2
602:17,24,25	341:25 342:2,8	495:23 499:25	458:12 476:13
603:2,5 614:14	342:16,20	500:12 525:17	485:5 489:1,7
614:15,18,20	343:4	564:25 586:8	489:21 495:18
614:25 615:4	massive 548:23	matters 433:24	505:1,9,10
615:14,18,22	master 331:21	matthew	511:24 576:1
616:3,12,13	348:20 349:1,3	321:16	577:19
618:13	349:11,18	matthias 323:4	meaning 355:7
marginality	365:23 373:22	323:9	385:9 503:11
401:13	374:11,19	maximize	meaningful
marginalized	376:2 383:4	362:9 449:22	372:5 529:22
535:18	439:25 440:2	maximum	570:21
margins 355:21	440:12 454:9	539:2 540:22	means 424:23
mark 328:8	455:5 463:16	546:20 574:24	427:23 428:8
512:13 585:17	524:11	maxwell	435:22,25
marked 355:16	master's 338:2	327:22 345:6,7	472:23 473:18
357:22 362:25	match 344:4	345:9 456:3,5	529:14 543:25
363:3 364:16			559:17 565:13

[means - mexico]

	I		
566:15,23	meeting 526:20	method 415:21	467:21 472:25
567:22 568:15	member 325:5	methods	474:20 478:14
609:24 616:25	325:7 343:5	415:21 553:15	485:10 489:18
meant 338:18	585:9 586:16	metric 605:5	489:21 490:17
350:23 404:4	members 343:2	mexican 591:3	512:1 513:21
490:21 578:6	388:23 397:19	mexicans	520:11 525:5
measure	412:21	338:10 341:2	526:16 527:13
357:11,15	memory 353:5	343:20 344:1,4	527:16,21
358:25 363:7	374:24 375:22	mexico 320:1	528:11 529:2
369:20 391:1,6	467:10 476:8	322:3,16 324:2	533:19 535:19
402:7 414:11	480:14,15	324:4,10	536:18,23
481:7,9 490:21	mentioned	325:16,17,21	537:9 544:8
490:22	366:25 391:24	326:4,12 327:9	545:17 546:16
measured	392:2 520:6	328:3 331:7	551:14 553:4
370:11,13,13	mentions	332:11 334:10	554:1 557:9,19
370:15	351:18,18	336:3 337:21	559:17,24
measures	mercy 343:4	338:11 339:7	560:4 565:8
363:19 369:19	meredith	340:10,17	566:15 567:2
390:25 391:1	585:18	343:2,5,13	567:16,21
404:6 412:11	merely 421:8	348:9 352:8	568:5,21
414:8 556:14	572:5 605:23	361:10 362:18	569:17 571:5
mechanical	609:5 620:14	371:4 372:10	583:5 588:6
357:3 502:21	merge 489:21	372:17,22	589:12,21
mechanisms	489:23	378:12,23	590:19 591:11
380:24	merits 414:3	380:16 382:5	591:17,21
median 363:20	mesa 476:4	382:12 388:20	593:8,11 594:5
472:23 566:13	mess 336:15	390:6 394:14	594:7,18,22
616:24	344:1	394:16 396:4	595:15 601:18
medium 370:15	met 494:16	396:12 397:5	601:20 605:24
370:16 602:5	methane	403:5 404:12	606:1,13
meet 388:13	334:13 336:1	405:2 410:9	608:18,19,24
393:18 481:19	336:16 343:19	439:16 450:17	612:15 613:2
530:25 543:17	472:15 517:14	461:10,12	620:15,16
558:21 584:10	534:20 535:1,2	464:12 465:4	622:20
		466:8,10	

[mexico's - money]

mexico's	397:25 398:10	minimum	misunderstood
337:22 341:17	398:11 442:12	424:3,8 546:18	578:17
344:9 379:12	442:19,23	mining 338:1	misuse 584:8
396:23 418:22	443:4,13	560:19,21	mitigation
427:2 526:19	464:23 468:5,7	minis 519:14	437:7
527:8 528:5	468:14 469:4	minority 389:5	mix 452:15,25
537:7 547:19	520:17 528:2,2	minus 403:11	mixes 452:11
549:22 554:20	528:8 533:23	403:16	miya 328:9
558:21 567:17	554:10,14,21	minute 364:21	mm 437:14
569:1 602:13	586:4 618:14	397:3,7 450:23	model 445:9
607:4 612:23	millions 336:5	450:24 468:7	446:5 474:1
620:23	467:11	minutes 333:13	501:9 565:21
michael 322:15	mind 506:3	345:21 399:11	modern 344:4
michael.hall	576:24	454:3 456:15	344:5
322:21	mine 434:4	456:18 522:9	modest 473:4
mid 352:1	mineral 511:12	579:17 581:10	modification
middle 350:16	525:8	597:13,14	423:15
368:22,24	minerals	598:2,10	modifications
396:7 491:4	322:16 325:13	609:10,13,14	423:5,6
middlebury	325:19 326:6,8	misconstrued	modifies
524:10	326:10,17	416:10,12	599:22
midstream	327:6 396:23	misleading	modifying
406:5,16 407:3	mines 524:21	372:18	423:16 600:2
migration	minimal 447:14	misplaced	mom 340:12,12
535:13	548:21 550:2	350:19	596:15
miguel 324:11	566:6,6	misquote	moment 469:13
399:19	minimis 480:7	394:11	523:9 598:9
mikah 327:24	504:25	missed 360:17	money 338:15
mike 328:2	minimize	misses 370:2	339:9 343:14
military 596:18	375:13 487:18	mission 400:8	356:11,12
million 394:17	564:10 567:11	523:23	393:18 429:1
394:20,25	611:20 614:7	mistake 605:11	468:9 485:12
395:1,4,6,7,16	minimizes	mister 417:5	504:22 506:4
395:20 396:1,9	487:22	misunderstan	507:11 509:24
397:2,7,12,18		401:1,3	554:6 585:25

[money - murphy]

586:2,3,6,9,20	524:16 525:14	373:18 384:4	move 333:18
586:21 588:13	525:15,19,23	399:18 522:15	410:7 451:24
613:17 616:2	526:1,18 529:2	597:2 621:13	452:6 468:1
monies 545:9	530:7 531:15	morrison	499:11,11
monitor 564:9	533:20 534:13	328:21,23	502:17 564:13
monolith	536:9,19 537:8	581:15,18,19	586:17 591:5
568:21	538:7,24 541:1	581:22,23,24	moved 337:22
montana	543:14 545:15	582:1 587:10	518:4
518:19 519:2	547:1 549:3,23	587:11,14,17	movement
551:5	551:22 553:9	587:22 588:3,4	576:14
month 334:17	554:5 555:14	590:1,3,6,8,10	movement's
352:25 353:2	557:2 558:13	590:16,17	578:3
472:6,10 473:1	561:14 563:4	591:24 592:6	movements
473:20 541:5	563:20 564:22	morrisons	577:14 599:9
monthly	565:1 568:5	582:3 587:8	moving 501:4
414:22 472:24	569:9 570:16	mortgage	mows 349:2
months 384:17	572:11 574:13	563:15	463:20 464:1,5
397:3 446:5	576:11 597:16	mother 343:11	mp 341:22
464:14 473:22	598:4,24 599:6	motif 565:12	msuazo 324:15
486:10 501:25	601:14 603:13	motion 576:13	multi 381:13
502:1 517:17	604:14 606:11	577:12,14	multiple
montoya	607:6,25	579:8 599:8	369:19 377:2
328:19 584:19	609:19 610:2	611:6	425:9,11 426:9
584:20 585:1,7	614:24 617:4	motivate	428:17,23
585:8,12 587:7	619:4 620:5	418:10 420:15	539:16 552:12
moore 324:3	621:2	420:23 619:20	559:15 572:18
456:9	morgan's	motivated	575:5,14
moral 343:8,21	523:12 620:24	567:13 610:14	605:11 611:9
384:14 554:25	621:5	612:7 615:1	multiplied
morgan 321:6	morning	motivates	442:22
330:9 436:12	333:19 334:8	616:16	multiply 386:3
436:15 522:16	336:23 342:1	motivation	multiplying
522:18,24	342:12 343:1	474:3 483:19	394:24
523:2,16,18,18	344:24 346:19	motivations	murphy 328:8
523:21 524:9	347:8 373:16	361:12	512:14,15
•			

[murphy - net]

585:17	national 359:6	nebraska 359:6	needed 343:15
n	360:2 402:4	necessarily	353:4 509:12
n 321:1 322:1	465:16,19	354:12 365:20	509:13 530:16
323:1 324:1	523:24 560:25	412:19 464:8	552:8 553:3
325:1 324:1	566:13 596:19	483:1 484:11	566:7 569:7
327:1 328:1	nationally	489:8 503:18	needing 586:13
329:1 330:1	372:2,3 378:8	necessary	needs 361:24
333:1,22	455:13	379:10 418:21	397:22,23
337:10,10	nationwide	427:1 470:24	405:3 494:11
342:16 441:19	341:4 370:21	471:2 507:12	497:1 498:4
442:2 522:25	370:23 524:20	544:9 545:11	511:3 563:24
582:17,17	natural 322:16	559:23 562:3	584:10 613:3
584:24 587:20	325:13,19	571:25 575:2	negative
595:6	326:6,8,10,17	necessitating	535:21 554:25
name 333:10	327:6 443:25	553:19	612:17
333:20 334:9	484:8 531:1,2	necessity	negatively
337:8,20	589:18	593:12	339:3 594:19
339:22,23,24	naturally 588:4	neck 358:21	negligible
339:25,23,24	nature 338:8	need 344:4,10	550:14
342:15 359:17	349:19,20	346:20 353:24	negotiate 587:1
361:17 368:9	365:18 379:11	355:13 377:8	negotiated
413:25 522:16	391:7 418:21	392:18 399:10	559:2 603:7
522:23 523:17	427:1 451:21	400:15 470:13	620:7
580:7 581:8	461:17 470:18	482:19 488:25	negotiations
582:17 584:23	478:5,8,10	498:5 504:13	604:10
587:10,19	531:18 613:1	512:25 521:22	neighborhood
588:4 590:5,17	navajo 335:12	525:8 527:18	335:17
592:23 593:9	navigate 567:9	527:19 528:13	neither 388:10
595:5,14	611:18	565:4 572:7	622:10 623:7
named 359:16	near 335:7	581:19,25	net 362:5
581:21	510:21 544:3	582:9 584:11	412:11 414:20
nanasi 456:7	554:12 596:17	589:17,20	414:21 447:13
nation 519:17	nearly 365:25	592:1 597:14	447:17,18,22
525:4 596:3	403:8 550:25	616:7,16	447:23,23
020.1070.3	554:19		448:2,12 449:3

[net - nmoga's]

449:9,13 452:3	429:18 431:1,6	568:5,21 569:1	nm 320:15
452:4	432:25 439:16	569:17 571:5	321:9 322:8,19
nevertheless	447:20 450:17	576:9,25 579:3	323:7,16 324:6
438:10 444:2	461:10,12	583:5 588:6	324:14
new 320:1	464:12 465:3	589:12,21	nmac 320:7
322:2,16 324:2	466:8,10	590:19 591:11	526:2,4,5,6
324:4,10	467:21 472:25	591:17,21	530:4 538:3,5
325:16,17,21	474:20 478:14	593:8,11 594:4	538:23 549:2
326:4,12 327:9	479:20 485:10	594:7,18,22	549:19 555:11
328:3 331:6	489:18,21	595:15 596:11	558:10 560:11
332:11 334:9	490:17 500:9	599:3,4 601:6	563:19 576:19
334:15 335:17	505:16,17	601:18,19	599:14 602:22
336:3 337:21	511:25 513:21	602:12 605:24	604:4,12,17
337:22 338:10	518:6 520:11	606:1,13 607:4	607:10
338:11 339:7	525:5 526:16	607:9,11,16	nmed 335:3
340:10,17	526:18 527:7	608:8,14,18,19	nmoga 348:6
341:2,17 343:2	527:13,16,21	608:24 612:15	348:17 349:25
343:5,13,20	528:5,11 529:2	612:23 613:2	351:2 352:18
344:1,3,9	533:19 535:19	614:16 620:15	354:19 356:4
348:8 352:8	536:18,23	620:16,23	356:18 357:8
361:10 362:18	537:7,9 540:24	622:20	359:8 361:5
363:13 369:20	541:11 542:2	newly 485:3	362:14 399:20
369:21 371:4	542:19 544:7	554:24 599:16	416:17 474:24
372:10,17,22	545:17 546:16	607:17	565:2 569:5
378:12,23	547:19 549:22	ngos 400:1	570:10 572:8
379:12 380:15	550:13 551:14	nice 413:25	574:8 576:4
382:5,12	553:3 554:1,20	512:14	577:1,13
388:20 390:5	557:9,19	nicholas 326:22	598:25 601:5
393:23 394:14	558:14,21,23	327:22	601:22 603:8
394:16 396:4	559:17,24	night 367:2	606:4 607:1,21
396:11,22	560:4,7,14,20	441:15	609:19 616:20
397:4 403:5	561:18,25	nine 597:1	618:17 619:22
404:12 405:2	562:4,10,16,23	621:13	nmoga's
410:9 418:22	565:8 566:15	nitrogen	578:12
427:2 429:11	567:2,16,17,21	534:20	

[nmslo.gov - o'grady]

nmslo.gov	noted 463:9	481:22 482:21	349:25 351:2
324:7	514:4 545:25	482:24 486:9	352:7,18 353:8
noise 371:20	553:12 614:10	487:9,25 488:3	354:19 356:4
non 333:7	notice 536:24	489:22,22	356:18 357:7
335:1 350:3	577:4 611:1	491:17,18,19	359:8 360:7
433:10 471:6	noticed 345:24	491:21,22,25	361:4,21
527:16,19	notified 605:17	492:19,20	362:14,22
533:14 534:12	noting 576:13	493:6,7,16	364:2,3,10,18
535:13 536:1,4	599:9 611:25	495:14,16	364:19,22
558:8 559:22	618:7	497:11 508:2,3	366:23 367:4,8
606:8 609:25	notion 347:18	509:4,8 510:24	367:9 369:11
613:1,6 620:18	novel 501:11	516:7,8,13,17	369:22 370:17
nope 377:14	npv 391:1	517:22 528:24	371:8,15,16,18
normal 414:22	414:9	530:14 533:14	373:4 398:20
normalize	number 347:24	541:16,19	408:2 418:1,5
518:16	353:6 354:10	545:25 546:5	433:11,13
normally 402:4	355:4,19 356:2	547:3 555:10	435:15 436:8
499:9	366:1,2,3	557:12 575:15	436:13 451:20
north 489:22	370:11 374:5	581:16 602:25	469:17,18,20
516:25 518:23	376:16 383:12	606:20	469:22,23
518:25 519:12	386:3 389:18	number's	470:4,8,12
519:22 520:4	390:15 397:11	467:22	471:5,10 474:5
550:23 551:2,4	398:1 403:8,20	numbers 395:9	474:9 516:6
551:7 570:20	405:5,21 409:7	396:16 403:21	0
571:6	413:7 439:5	407:5 408:25	o 333:1 337:11
northern 486:4	440:9 443:16	409:2,16	337:11 339:25
northwest	443:24 453:10	442:21 463:22	342:17 522:25
535:19	457:20 460:9	467:23	582:17 584:23
notably 550:15	460:17,20	numerous	584:24,24
notary 622:19	461:6 462:25	534:14 610:23	587:20,20
note 363:1	464:6 466:20	nurse 338:2	o'clock 580:1
424:19 488:9	466:21 468:2	nykiel 321:16	580:22
521:15 551:25	472:11,22	321:20 330:4	o'grady 321:6
579:10 593:22	474:13,18	346:22 347:7,8	328:13 330:10
599:19	478:13 481:2	348:6,17	522:14,15,16

[o'grady - ocd]

	T	T.	1
522:20 523:9	oath 333:11	529:13 530:17	occur 451:12
523:15,16,19	obey 336:13	531:9,25	556:3
524:7,14	object 433:14	543:18 560:3	occurs 548:17
525:12,15,20	443:3 451:21	562:6,15,25	599:23 605:9
525:24 526:15	576:5,6,22	564:6 565:16	ocd 331:21
528:25 530:2	598:25 601:6	566:3 567:4	362:17 364:25
531:10 533:16	603:8	575:12 607:5	365:6 366:2,11
534:10 536:6	objecting	612:4,5,21	367:12,14
536:17 537:5	345:12	observable	377:20 380:23
538:2,21	objection	533:13	383:4 387:7
540:23 543:9	346:11 579:5	observations	388:11 400:18
545:11 546:23	579:10,13	347:10,14	401:23 458:17
548:25 549:20	598:22	observe 355:3	458:18 464:1,6
551:19 553:6	objections	390:14 427:17	465:2 467:6
553:25 555:9	347:16,17,19	447:13 499:24	468:9 477:22
556:23 558:9	347:20	517:9	477:23,24
561:11 563:1	objective	observed 377:1	486:16 503:12
563:18 564:12	483:13 509:15	390:15 438:7	510:4 526:13
564:20,21,22	509:18,19	463:4 500:8	527:24,25
567:25 569:5	objects 616:21	517:22 535:5	528:14 529:21
570:10 572:8	obligated	550:25 570:23	531:5 533:22
574:8 576:4	423:21 434:11	611:4,16	534:4,4,8
579:12,16	563:10	obtain 350:9	536:18,20
580:7,12,15	obligation	351:12 426:10	537:1,3 538:19
581:4 597:17	379:13 389:7	428:18 432:25	539:3 541:1
597:21 598:6,7	418:23 427:3	obtaining	543:24 555:1,6
598:14,18,23	451:10 507:12	612:12	558:16,18,19
598:24 601:5	531:19 538:13	obvious 605:8	559:1,10,15,20
603:8 604:10	538:18 600:17	occ 362:2	560:1 561:3
606:4 607:1,21	600:25	364:25 517:5	562:8,11,16,21
609:7,16,18,19	obligations	occasion	563:2,4,6,15,25
614:16 616:20	388:14 393:19	583:11	564:8 574:9
618:17 619:22	419:9,15,17	occupied	575:1 600:9,14
620:24 621:2,9	470:25 525:10	365:14	600:23 601:2
	526:21 527:9		601:14,19,20

[ocd - oil]

601:24 603:6	offered 333:11	512:8,12	offshore 609:21
603:15 605:20	347:15 358:10	515:19 521:21	610:3,10
605:25 606:2	358:11,12,14	522:1,5,12,19	ogrady 321:12
607:6,8,15	358:16 573:10	522:22 523:6	oh 337:7
608:1 614:11	578:23 614:20	523:11 564:15	341:25 342:10
614:14 617:9	offering 352:2	564:19 576:11	342:13 346:19
617:13,17	397:7	576:21 577:10	397:24 401:24
619:11 620:7,8	offerings	577:20,24	428:3 432:12
620:14,17,21	351:22	578:13 579:11	441:23 450:12
ocd's 335:17	office 324:2,4	579:19 580:8	454:6 457:17
348:20 352:12	325:11 456:10	580:10,14,16	480:14 497:22
363:14 402:9	520:16,18,20	580:20 581:5,6	584:18 585:11
441:15 461:20	608:19 609:2	581:17 582:8	587:12,17
486:11 491:15	officer 320:12	582:12,16,24	592:5,11 595:4
514:8 526:6	333:2 334:6	584:14,17,22	621:4
533:21 539:11	336:20 337:7	585:5,11 587:6	ohio 392:4
547:22 558:13	337:12,18	587:12,15,18	oil 320:2
566:17 573:16	339:15,20	588:1 590:4,7	322:13 324:10
574:1,3 600:7	340:6 341:20	590:14 591:23	325:3,9,17,21
608:12 616:21	342:6,11,14,18	592:11,17,21	326:2,4,12
617:7	342:24 344:16	592:23 593:6	327:10 331:6,9
october 320:10	345:5,22,23	594:24 595:4	331:24 332:6
363:2 364:15	346:4,8,15,23	595:13 596:22	333:3 334:13
367:7 371:12	346:24 373:4,8	597:6,10,18,19	335:18 338:16
407:19 581:1	373:13 398:20	597:24 598:13	339:5,10
odds 362:1	398:22 399:9	599:7 604:18	340:20 341:4,9
offense 360:23	399:13,15	609:9,12 621:1	343:3,8,12,18
offer 333:6,12	416:18,24	621:12 622:2	344:2 357:11
337:3 343:7	433:13,15,22	officers 412:21	361:24 362:2
344:19 351:11	435:15,17	560:6,16 561:4	370:8 379:11
351:17 422:17	436:1,8,11,14	official 604:19	380:15,25
495:12 552:16	455:25 456:1,6	officially	382:7 393:4
568:9 578:1	456:13,20,25	359:21	394:14 395:21
579:25	457:6 469:15	offset 447:9	396:4,13 397:9
	469:19 474:8	533:4 564:7	400:12 402:5

[oil - oklahoma]

403:4 405:2	569:12 570:24	410:8,12,16,25	454:1,6,15,25
406:16 418:21	572:13,17,20	411:16 414:12	457:7 458:3,15
422:20 424:21	588:11,18,24	414:19 415:2,9	458:22 459:2
427:1 437:8	589:3,7,11,20	416:7,21 417:3	459:11,17
439:1 441:19	593:9,14,18	417:16,21	460:12,18,24
442:2,3,10,11	594:8,13,17,19	418:15,19	461:14,23
443:6,11,12,18	594:21 595:20	419:3,8,13,19	462:4,12
443:20 444:1,2	596:7,10,18	420:11,19	463:24 464:10
446:23 453:4	602:15 603:20	421:2,18	464:17,25
453:23 468:24	605:1,22 607:7	422:10,14,25	465:6,11,18,24
469:3,10	611:12 612:12	423:14 424:14	466:13 468:8
472:20,24,25	612:20	424:16,19	469:2,13 471:5
473:7,17 476:3	okay 343:1	425:16 426:13	475:17 476:16
479:21 481:24	345:18 362:22	426:22 427:11	476:18 477:8
487:14 489:21	367:4 374:8,11	427:20 428:3,5	478:12,18,24
489:23 490:16	374:18 375:8	429:2,25	479:4 481:5,21
493:24 501:15	375:25 376:7	430:22 431:5,9	482:12,23
505:4,5,9,11,14	376:10,20	431:20 432:2,8	484:19 486:17
519:23 520:9	378:21 381:2	433:7 434:7,19	492:18 493:15
521:12 523:24	381:18 382:17	434:21 436:14	495:2,13
524:21,25,25	387:20 391:3	436:16 437:10	496:16 503:16
526:15,17,19	391:13,19	437:24 438:10	504:11 509:22
527:5 528:18	392:15 393:6	438:20 439:11	513:18 514:3
531:15,18	394:10 395:3	439:14 440:21	515:5,15
532:18,20	396:17 397:1	441:18,19,23	519:25 520:14
534:12,13,19	398:13 399:7	441:24 442:2,8	521:23 577:20
535:10,17	400:9,17 401:8	442:9,10,20	579:24 581:25
539:3 541:3,4	401:16,22	443:15,24	582:6,14 585:7
545:20 546:15	402:8,13,20	444:4,22,25	587:10 588:4
550:3,6,16,23	403:9,15	446:6 447:1	590:16 592:22
553:21 556:4	404:20 405:7	448:1,9,17	598:16 609:13
556:19 557:19	405:13,23	449:2,19 450:4	609:16 621:11
558:21 559:14	406:7,18,25	450:12 451:7	oklahoma
560:4 565:7	407:4 408:17	451:24,25	352:3,4,10
567:2 568:20	408:23 410:1,5	452:3,6,10,12	

[old - operators]

old 324:5 340:9	511:24 531:4	434:23 435:3	568:6,16
359:17 403:8	551:17 553:3	435:12 436:4	569:21 570:1,4
403:24 590:21	593:21	462:14 463:11	575:2,11,13,22
oldest 337:24	operated	470:15,17	575:24 576:3,7
omit 549:8	462:22 518:5,7	484:25,25	599:2 600:13
omits 613:9	operating	485:2,2 492:20	600:18,22
once 333:12	354:16 438:16	492:25,25	601:1 602:9,14
437:16,19	440:25 471:17	496:1 498:24	602:23,25
438:1 486:10	472:7,17,19,24	502:15 505:22	604:12,13
512:21,23	473:5,17 480:2	506:18 507:14	605:6,10 607:9
513:20,23	480:4 490:16	508:6 519:4	607:9,12,20
533:2 552:7	514:1 531:9	526:7,7 527:17	608:1,2,6,8,14
594:14 614:1,8	532:8 538:14	530:11,11,21	609:6 611:13
onerous 338:22	560:3 576:15	531:7,24 532:2	616:17 618:13
519:14 552:19	576:17 577:19	532:2,5,11,16	619:9 620:18
ones 344:13	578:7 599:10	532:24 533:15	operator's
360:17 375:20	599:12,21	536:13,16	357:19 368:15
377:5 481:12	600:3,6	537:21,22	380:25 421:9
481:16,17	operation	538:9,10,13,17	435:4 533:5,10
487:5,6 488:3	524:19 616:18	542:19 543:10	539:17 560:2
489:6	operational	544:5 546:5,9	561:16,23
ongoing 362:10	531:6	547:24 548:5	562:12,15,17
491:3 533:1,4	operations	548:10,17,18	568:11,11,12
544:11 547:14	331:6 352:25	549:11 552:8	603:5 620:22
onset 484:4	370:8 376:13	552:15,18,22	operators
485:6	382:13 451:5	555:6,10,18,20	336:12 352:24
onshore 378:5	460:10 524:21	556:2 558:8,10	360:21 361:1,8
open 424:8	531:18 556:20	558:15,17,21	361:14,15,16
498:17 608:11	560:21 594:14	558:24 559:11	362:9 368:18
opening 334:18	operator 336:9	559:16,21	370:3,16,20
opens 340:25	336:13 375:2	560:7,14 561:4	371:2,4 379:13
operate 380:19	385:9 386:13	561:13,18,19	380:2,4,5
381:3 436:20	386:19 387:6,8	561:25 562:2,4	383:6 385:1
439:21 473:2	387:17 424:11	562:23 563:6	386:10 389:21
491:11 499:22	424:11 433:5,6	563:17,22	392:19 393:3

[operators - organizations]

		I	
393:11,22,24	531:1 532:7,20	611:24 612:20	opposing 355:4
418:10,23	533:12,25	613:11 614:21	573:7 606:11
419:10,10	539:16 541:10	615:12,17,18	opposition
420:15,24	541:11,20	615:23 616:4,6	354:7 371:22
421:19 422:4	542:10,21,22	616:13 617:20	583:3 603:13
423:17 426:8	543:2,14,18,25	617:23 618:8,9	optical 334:10
427:4 428:16	544:6,10,10,17	618:19 619:16	optimize
429:10 431:21	544:20,21,23	619:20 620:2	362:10
432:4,9,17,24	545:2,3,24	620:15	option 387:17
434:9 437:16	546:6,12	opine 348:18	387:21 388:5,5
438:12 440:1	547:14 548:3	382:24 386:13	388:9,9,13
440:11,19	548:13 550:2	450:23 483:18	424:8 428:17
446:8,16 447:9	551:4,14,21,22	opined 388:22	498:17,19
448:11 453:10	552:6,13,23	451:1	options 360:15
453:15 454:10	553:2,5 555:1	opinion 379:25	386:14,15,18
455:2,6 457:24	555:1,3,4	381:11 413:4	387:1,2,5,14
458:1,5 462:6	556:7 558:14	448:2,13 449:3	388:19 618:22
462:9,18,22,25	559:14,24	449:17 472:19	oral 333:12
463:2,5,21	560:6 561:6,9	494:19 498:7	579:8 581:10
464:6,12 470:2	562:7,19,19	498:10 502:24	orally 581:11
470:13 471:6	565:20,22	opinions 450:9	order 346:12
473:21 480:11	566:1,4,8,15,22	525:25 526:1	346:14 353:13
480:12 484:11	567:3,15 568:3	opportunities	399:5 464:23
485:23 490:18	568:21,25	341:1 605:11	472:25 473:13
490:20 499:22	569:1,2,4	opportunity	473:22 476:9
505:3 511:23	570:9,14	333:6 344:15	485:9 518:16
514:5 517:25	571:13,16,24	485:12 531:6	529:12 607:11
518:6,25 519:3	572:2 575:1	536:2 564:8	607:13 620:20
519:5 524:25	583:4 600:10	583:2 588:5	orders 448:16
525:1 526:13	601:11,12	590:18 597:1,2	559:9 605:14
526:20,25	602:5,6,7	605:18	620:11
527:7,10	604:19 605:15	oppose 584:5	organization
528:23,23	605:18,25	584:13	388:24
529:5,12,20,24	606:7,21,22	opposed 409:3	organizations
530:13,18,24	608:12 609:24	509:20 589:4	360:1 393:13

[origin - own]

origin 486:14	349:15,20,21	556:12	overhead
492:16	356:10,17	orth 320:12	387:13
original 458:19	357:12 365:25	ought 589:24	overlay 365:19
477:16 484:17	368:8,10,15	outcome	overlooks
488:15 489:8	378:6 383:13	385:11 388:17	603:14
495:9 541:12	404:23 439:25	389:11,16	overly 519:15
541:12 552:1	440:3,12 451:9	572:3 622:15	overrun 366:17
559:3 600:4	451:9 454:9	623:12	366:24 367:2
originally	455:3,5,13	outcomes	367:21,22,24
407:22 486:15	465:20 468:20	383:22,22	368:12,14
583:9	509:17 524:4	384:25 515:3	369:3,6
origins 459:7	525:4 526:10	518:10 535:22	overruns 368:4
orphan 331:21	526:14 527:15	570:17	368:24 369:7
332:9 349:2,3	527:23 528:3	outlier 379:23	461:17 462:13
349:11,18	528:11 529:15	outliers 617:2	462:24 498:16
356:16 365:23	533:18 536:25	outlined 349:9	oversight
373:23 374:12	541:7 542:8	468:16 510:7	600:14
374:19 376:2	545:19 547:12	outlines 430:24	overstated
383:4 410:13	548:20 554:24	output 550:16	570:9
455:6,15	555:17 564:3	570:24	overstretched
460:21 463:17	564:11 571:20	outrage 343:24	509:2
465:21 466:7	571:23 593:20	outset 437:5	overview
468:16 474:20	601:15 615:2	440:22 564:23	430:11 452:20
491:15 514:9	orphaning	outside 559:18	overwhelmin
529:4,24	356:8 363:8	606:3 620:8	617:23
537:23 539:11	379:16 389:10	outstanding	own 336:14
546:10 550:11	389:15 419:6	563:24	338:5 348:12
552:25 554:8	454:19 528:21	overall 368:5,5	348:15 351:25
554:17,18	542:21 545:23	369:2 383:12	381:23 384:20
557:25 567:20	550:1 555:5,13	397:13 422:20	384:22 411:11
616:17 617:14	556:5 570:13	517:2 526:9	413:23 414:3
orphaned	572:4 601:4	550:3 551:15	415:8 481:14
332:5 336:5	orphans 466:10	551:16	496:1 514:5,7
348:10,20,22	467:21 510:20	overdue 563:23	533:9 544:1
348:23 349:5	546:3 547:25		611:3,13 616:3

[owned - partner]

owned 495:25	package 368:21	pagination	420:14,14
owners 384:11	page 349:10,17	515:18	422:14 427:13
ownership	352:19 359:9	paid 396:13	435:10,24
561:6	360:11 361:22	495:24	440:1 458:24
owns 560:21	369:12 370:19	pain 389:1	459:10 460:25
oxide 534:20	372:9 377:24	palace 321:8	483:3,4 502:7
oxy 323:12	378:4 379:10	paper 412:7,13	510:9 538:6
327:17 416:22	381:10,17,17	412:17,23	560:9 565:20
500:13 559:1,3	392:2,15,22,23	413:14 482:2,7	572:11 586:14
574:8 601:5	393:24 394:3	482:14,15	partial 611:6
603:7 604:11	400:22 407:10	486:3 489:17	-
620:7		510:7 516:20	participants 606:23
	407:17,24 410:2 411:17	510:7 516:20	
p			participated
p 321:1,1 322:1	417:21,23 422:16 424:18	papers 411:7	606:16
322:1 323:1,1		411:12,13	particular
324:1,1 325:1	424:19 427:21	489:13 515:14 517:7	339:8 382:6
325:1 326:1,1	427:25 474:16		412:23 463:9 487:12 489:13
327:1,1 328:1	474:16,18	paperwork	
328:1 329:1,1	515:6,16,19,22	605:12	535:1 583:14
333:1 339:25	516:7,14,14	paragraph	particularly
342:17 522:24	518:2,12	412:2	405:9 510:20
587:19	578:19,20	parameter	528:22 532:17
p&a 410:13	616:22 618:18	478:3	541:11 548:19
514:20,20	619:24	parameters	555:15 556:21
520:19	pages 348:8,19	404:10	557:17 564:4
p.c. 323:5	350:1,15 351:3	paraphrasing	615:5
324:12,19	354:21 356:5	418:24	parties 560:17
p.m. 344:21	356:19 357:9	pardon 364:10	564:24 567:19
621:15	360:9 361:6	pared 376:16	573:6,10
p.o. 322:7	362:16 364:5	376:19	599:18 600:12
323:6,15	369:24 409:20	part 349:3,13	606:11 614:12
pace 394:17	410:4 515:24	349:18 352:11	622:11,14
454:18 455:18	609:20 614:19	361:23 365:5	623:8,11
455:18 518:22	619:5,23,23	383:8 385:10	partner 604:18
551:1		419:23 420:2,5	

[partners - percent]

nontnong 560:6	nov 257:25	noggod 540.9	205.2 6 16
partners 560:6 561:5	pay 357:25 389:8 423:18	pegged 540:8 543:23	395:3,6,16
			396:4,13,23
partnership	425:12 426:1,9	penalty 543:24	397:25 398:2,6
343:6	485:23,24	pennsylvania	399:4 403:11
parts 384:23	506:13 510:17	392:5	403:12,16,18
392:5 556:25	521:10 527:5	people 361:16	403:19,23
589:19	539:5,10 540:2	383:7 384:2,3	404:17 407:12
party 387:5,7,7	548:10 563:9	384:6 398:7	407:13 408:11
389:8 458:23	563:10 569:20	508:24 589:24	408:14 433:6,8
470:1,5,9	572:24 574:5	people's 429:6	434:9,23 435:5
505:19,22	583:5 609:3	594:18	437:12,16,19
507:15,16	613:19,23	perceive	437:20 438:1,4
533:8 614:11	615:10 618:8	552:15	438:11,12,14
paso 343:5	618:10,14	perceived	438:15,21,22
pass 362:22,23	paying 495:18	347:19 567:16	438:25 439:5
399:7 527:11	506:5 510:10	perceives	439:12,19,20
535:10 564:16	510:13	552:21	440:18 441:9
passed 364:13	payment	percent 339:6	442:23 443:12
367:5 371:10	396:14 611:5	340:22 344:6	444:6,7,17
527:2 565:24	payments	353:7 354:16	446:9,17,23
passing 363:5	612:10 613:18	363:13,15,16	448:18 452:15
past 354:1	615:7	363:21,23,24	452:17,25
356:16 382:4	payout 331:11	363:25 367:3	453:1,3,6,7,8
559:21 561:4,5	359:15 415:21	367:25 370:22	453:13,14,15
605:7	481:25	370:23 371:23	454:16 458:5
paths 516:4	pays 594:2	371:25,25	458:13,16
patience	pdf 515:24	372:2,3,21,24	459:14,23,23
361:19 598:19	516:7,10	376:1,9,10	460:9,13,16
pattern 369:6	pdp 504:19	377:19,21	463:20 465:15
499:10,22	peak 354:1	378:5,9,13,19	465:20,25
paul 328:21	peaked 565:10	378:22,22	466:6 468:25
581:21,22	pecos 320:13	381:24 382:13	471:24,24,25
587:10,22	peer 391:25	383:5 389:3	472:2 473:3,6
588:4	411:3,7,8,12	393:22,23	473:8,17,19,20
	558:3	394:4,6,7	473:22 480:25

[percent - plan]

481:1,3,4	periods 421:16	persons 560:7	604:25
492:21 493:1,3	541:22 615:20	perspective	phrases 576:18
493:7,10,12	permanent	362:1 385:12	599:13
506:10 517:8	396:18 504:13	pertain 365:11	picked 443:16
517:10 518:5,5	521:8	pertaining	pictured 476:4
518:6 519:2,5	permian	561:25	pieces 369:8
534:1 542:4,4	331:12 332:10	pertains 461:16	413:4
543:10 544:22	343:16 355:10	471:19,22	piloting 501:3
547:22 550:12	363:14,16,21	483:4	pinch 544:24
551:6,25 552:2	370:21 371:24	pervasively	pink 368:2
560:8 566:11	370:21 371:24	368:21	pipe 478:9
617:1,14	473:6 478:25	peter 330:9	pipeline 405:25
618:15	479:3,9 505:10	522:17 523:2	pipelines
percentage	565:10	523:18	406:14,21
369:14 371:3	permission	petition 458:19	556:8,18
379:2 389:19	582:7 598:17	petitioner	pipes 343:18
435:3 441:10	permit 560:20	458:17	place 340:18
448:19 492:25	563:4	petroleum	341:9 406:15
533:17 545:24	permits 558:7	322:2 325:15	406:24 431:24
546:6,8	perpetuity	327:8 328:2	463:9,9 513:23
percentages	506:10	359:22,23,25	526:11
452:21	perrotte 329:6	411:14 412:18	placed 484:24
perfect 454:4	341:25 342:10	412:20 493:20	529:6
580:15 598:20	342:13,16,17	493:23 519:13	placeholder
perfectly	342:20 343:1,4	ph.d. 588:7	461:8
352:16 598:11	person 336:22	phase 537:2	places 366:19
perform 390:13	408:24 579:20	565:9	439:4 463:4
462:5 496:8	581:15 595:21	phased 542:9	484:6 557:20
612:3	personal 362:6	philana 328:4	plain 434:20
performance	415:6 521:14	phillip 326:8	435:9 616:7
499:10 618:20	593:12	phone 341:23	plainly 562:4
performing	personally	phrase 576:14	plan 393:7
460:2	343:16 400:14	576:17 599:10	418:10 419:10
period 420:24	486:1	599:12,21,22	420:15 537:2
541:5,12		599:23 600:3	561:21 562:3

[planned - plugging]

	T	I	
planned 405:4	582:5 585:6	381:8,24	492:23 498:17
499:15	587:3 588:2	455:15 460:21	504:13 506:1,7
planning	593:7 594:20	462:16,17	507:21 508:3,4
358:16 359:7	595:13 597:25	465:21 466:9	509:16 514:7
379:13 403:20	598:9,15	467:21 468:17	526:4,11,12,17
405:11 418:24	609:15	516:4 527:17	527:1,3,5
427:4 586:24	pledge 552:6	527:18 528:13	529:6,11,15
plans 392:19	plot 487:3	530:17 531:17	530:15,17
393:15	plotted 462:13	535:24 546:7	531:9,20 532:1
plants 589:18	plug 380:3,8,16	552:7 584:11	532:9,11,25
platform 333:8	386:16,17,17	586:13,13	533:3,6,17,23
336:25 337:3	386:25 388:9	594:17 603:3	534:1,11
341:24 344:18	422:4 475:1	616:6	536:12,20,21
345:7 456:8	476:24 504:15	plugging	536:22,25
579:21,23	505:3,8,12,13	331:23 332:15	537:3,6,17,25
580:6,18 582:4	509:20,25	335:23 336:6	538:13,20
596:25	526:14 527:20	353:15 365:13	539:4,6,10,13
play 359:5	527:25 528:3	369:2 374:23	539:15,21
565:22	529:12,25	375:15,15,23	540:2,3,10,16
played 595:17	531:4,19	375:24 376:3,4	541:9 542:24
please 333:20	536:18 537:10	378:23,24	543:3,12,18,21
336:18 337:9	539:11 542:12	381:25 383:18	543:24 544:3,6
339:22 341:14	546:13 547:14	387:2,4,11,14	544:13,25
342:15 345:22	548:3 566:7,23	387:16 404:11	545:8 547:23
362:23 364:11	572:7 586:6	406:1 423:8	548:1,13
364:22 371:8	601:18,19	428:10 432:5	553:10,12,23
377:9 381:14	615:16 617:10	435:1 461:2,8	554:13,16,18
404:4 410:21	617:15	461:9,10 462:8	554:24 555:2,3
411:17,25	plugged 332:9	465:14,21	555:7,20,24
412:9 427:25	353:24 364:25	466:7,14,16,22	556:2 557:12
445:12 457:15	366:10,14	466:25 467:1	557:13 558:5
462:10 464:19	367:14 368:3	467:14 468:3	560:10 561:20
476:11 517:5	368:16,20	468:10,16,17	562:3,5,9,15,25
522:21,23	377:20,25	474:19 478:4	563:7,23 564:5
523:16 581:23	378:6,6,13,19	488:17 491:15	565:15 566:2

[plugging - potential]

	I	I	
566:13,17,20	391:21,22	534:15,20,22	543:16 552:23
566:24 567:4	393:11 401:25	535:6,14,17	567:3
568:22,23	403:22 405:9	pollute 535:8	posed 545:23
569:21 570:12	421:5 422:15	polluting	557:4
571:25 572:16	429:2 458:12	335:21	poses 548:16
572:23,25	466:15 468:25	pollution 536:3	548:21,23
573:12,16	473:2 477:9	536:4	568:16 608:7
574:2,3,4,6,16	484:7 486:2	poor 457:16	position 412:20
574:18 575:3,6	487:1,12	poorly 334:20	422:23 436:10
575:7,10	488:13 500:20	pop 596:15	452:4 523:20
594:20 601:4	506:16,21	population	524:17 577:18
601:15 603:1	516:4 517:6	366:6,13 371:4	594:7 604:22
608:9,15	519:17 531:19	383:5 455:13	positive 358:8
612:21 615:5,8	532:1 536:5	455:14,19	possibility
615:10,14,20	579:7 595:2	542:4	358:4 365:2
616:2,3,10,15	613:24 620:1	portfolio	500:13
616:21 617:7,8	pointed 359:18	356:15 392:20	possible 335:1
618:5 619:15	points 353:13	429:15 433:8	471:3,16
619:21	353:13 382:9	434:10 437:20	500:14 501:11
plugs 477:3,5	454:24 459:20	438:5 452:11	594:20 619:21
548:5	460:4,7 505:17	452:15 458:6	possibly 338:17
plus 338:4	516:15 576:18	portfolios	post 383:18
387:13 403:12	599:13	424:25 429:1	385:19 392:12
403:16 467:11	policies 508:19	438:1 459:4,14	513:17 532:7
537:13 539:25	517:1 534:11	460:3 481:15	577:5
573:11	policing 606:19	portion 398:11	posting 343:9
pocket 545:6	policy 344:10	398:12,14,18	551:23
613:18 618:9	348:10 362:6	398:25 399:4,6	potent 535:4
618:14	392:10 518:2	423:6 436:21	potential 371:1
point 356:10	523:21 527:14	443:12 444:2	371:2 447:7,9
357:4,6,18	544:19 550:17	444:17 504:12	464:22 490:23
358:5,5,6	550:18 570:25	portions 565:1	490:25 491:1
360:12,24	571:1	576:20 599:15	500:16 531:22
372:19 376:11	pollutants	pose 526:23	546:2 554:11
382:11 386:4	334:13 534:14	535:3 541:6	578:24 601:25

[potential - prevailing]

612:7	precludes	472:2 505:23	presentation
potentially	542:22	507:4 551:24	360:4 362:24
520:2 548:13	predicate	613:18 618:15	371:9 393:12
pouring 336:16	463:25	premiums	393:21 412:14
powell 326:6	predict 390:11	471:17 507:9	465:14 474:15
power 329:6	442:17 447:19	533:1,12	presentations
343:5 576:10	predicted	552:20 568:8	477:23
589:16,17	367:23 528:20	568:14 569:19	presented
599:5	predicting	569:19,23,25	360:5
powerful	386:9	570:3,7 618:11	presenting
541:10 555:4	prediction	619:17	435:23
powerpoint	447:13	preparation	presents
420:20 430:11	predictions	385:10 427:13	471:16
474:15 475:11	570:16	preparations	preserved
practical	preempting	385:2	502:3,4
603:21 619:12	586:18	prepare 362:20	president
practically	preexisting	364:4 371:5	519:12
366:12	472:6	373:23 375:21	press 341:24
practice 359:10	preexists 431:3	383:9	581:19 592:1
380:22 529:18	preferentially	prepared 338:2	592:13
555:5 565:18	481:14 511:19	349:1,8 360:13	pressing
615:19	preferred	367:11 389:2	592:18
practices	351:8	455:9 623:3	pressures
344:11 525:2	prehearing	preparing	619:20
pre 576:9 599:4	515:6,17	405:17	prestigious
precipitate	preliminary	prescribed	340:11
529:3	345:3	358:12	presumably
precise 346:1	premature	prescribes	472:9,13
375:3 404:19	451:2,3,6	404:9	presumed
405:10 413:6	570:12	present 325:2	542:3
439:8	prematurely	331:25 332:12	pretty 396:5
precisely	505:3	356:7 358:8	403:16 493:13
360:12	premises 565:3	412:11 482:8	511:13 588:12
precision 404:5	premium	506:11 529:3	prevailing
404:7 439:7	471:24,24	590:18	565:12

[prevent - producing]

4 422 17	• 401 17	710.1	47624706
prevent 432:17	prior 431:17	510:1	476:3 478:6
449:15 450:6	518:16 524:16	problem	487:4,13,14
451:10,17	532:7 551:12	345:15 356:21	493:25 502:14
526:10 557:9	571:11 600:6	356:24 357:5	541:3 572:15
557:25 559:23	622:5	384:8 409:12	producer 489:2
562:4 612:11	priorities 613:3	427:19 430:8	489:6
preventing	prioritization	475:16 495:8	producers
499:6 576:7	332:4 365:7,8	523:24 547:17	338:16 341:10
prevents	366:21 367:12	548:21,23	489:10 490:8
538:12 560:11	prioritize	problems 525:3	491:3 499:2
599:1	565:23	531:13 550:10	518:4 550:6,9
previous 466:6	prioritized	552:25 565:6	550:21 565:19
492:1 560:9	365:13,21	578:25 619:8	571:4
previously	prioritizes	proceed 538:9	produces
347:3 413:22	532:11	proceeding	541:16
466:13 607:16	priority 365:10	399:20 621:16	producing
price 357:20	365:18 366:1,3	623:4	334:25 355:21
443:17 470:21	366:4,6,8,11,14	proceedings	358:3 398:8,9
553:23 588:20	368:8	474:24 622:3,4	478:9 502:13
prices 382:8	pristine 338:10	622:6,8 623:6	504:20 518:8
414:22 532:20	private 408:20	process 501:2,3	527:16,19
532:22 545:5	520:10 528:17	501:5 511:4	528:18,21,24
591:8,14,16	prms 359:23	560:24 572:5	529:19,23
primarily	493:19 494:10	584:4 586:19	531:17 533:14
507:14 518:8	501:1	601:24 605:10	534:12 535:13
primary	probability	produce 335:21	535:14 536:1
347:13 370:14	336:10 390:17	387:23 388:6,8	541:19 542:20
501:15 502:14	403:23 404:17	446:23 487:9	543:4,6 544:22
518:2 540:9	498:15,16	495:18 531:22	545:3 546:16
557:4	probably	536:3 541:8	548:4,15
principle 420:2	345:17,24	545:7 562:14	555:16,22
420:4,14	449:12 472:12	615:4	556:6,22 557:5
principles	476:20 489:22	produced	565:18 571:17
399:6 475:24	499:19 502:7	335:18 394:14	573:20 594:15
	502:13 505:13	398:7 446:16	615:2,13

[product - proposal]

product 351:12	541:8,13,16,18	527:6	prologue 382:4
615:3	541:21 542:5	program	prominent
production	542:13 550:3	352:12 368:22	595:17
331:14,24	550:15,19,19	369:2 376:13	promise 385:18
353:25 354:9	551:3,5,16	396:14 412:14	promote
355:15 369:20	555:19 556:11	412:25 468:17	534:11 589:20
370:2,10 382:7	562:12,18,21	524:12 537:1	prompt 534:11
386:22 393:19	565:8,10 569:3	554:19 556:19	612:17
393:22,23	570:21 571:2,3	557:3,11,24	prompting
394:7,7 397:4	588:23 589:12	558:22 605:16	568:17
398:9 400:24	602:18 603:3	620:23	proof 335:24
401:18 402:7	613:16,21,23	programs	384:8 427:18
418:12 422:20	614:13 615:20	455:15 465:22	532:3
437:8 439:16	productive	532:12 619:14	proper 363:7
441:11,14,16	335:21 398:6	prohibited	508:24 583:16
441:17 442:11	541:22 613:13	432:24	583:22
443:13 445:6,7	products 591:5	prohibition	properly 531:3
446:9 451:2	591:7	607:3	619:13
453:4 457:25	professional	prohibitively	property
464:13 468:24	359:21	601:11	357:18 578:6
468:25 469:3	professor	prohibits	proportion
469:10 470:6	593:10	560:20 563:22	370:9,10
470:20 473:23	profiles 479:14	project 331:9	372:20 398:18
473:23 478:14	479:16	338:18 481:24	427:18 437:6
479:14,16,21	profit 355:21	494:4,10,14,14	543:15,19
480:5,11 481:1	401:4 567:13	501:2,5	proportional
481:2 489:21	569:24 594:13	projected	389:18
489:24 491:10	profitable	495:17 537:13	proposal
494:2 496:18	541:12 545:6	projection	361:13 401:5
497:2 498:24	565:19 613:16	471:11	419:20 420:5
498:25 500:18	618:2	projects 338:17	423:10,11
502:12 513:16	profited 529:20	338:21,24	429:17,20
517:2,8,24	555:19	341:10 505:5	430:12,24
518:24 519:1,3	profits 343:20	596:15	435:24 445:2
519:6 529:20	343:25 358:1		459:7 483:4

[proposal - provider's]

486:14 494:24	469:25 470:14	607:2,14,17	proves 361:25
495:9 497:21	471:12 477:10	608:3 609:4	provide 349:12
509:8 510:9	479:20 486:5	612:24 619:25	351:5 361:9
513:5 537:3	487:25 492:19	620:5	405:24 406:3
542:5 559:3,4	512:24 526:2	proposing	431:16 432:5
574:13,17	529:25 530:6	423:7,9 431:11	432:21 435:1
579:3 603:14	530:12,15,23	433:19 435:10	482:18 492:23
603:17 604:14	537:13 538:9	485:15,17	502:23 505:17
604:17,24	538:24 540:18	524:5	525:25 526:1
614:24 616:11	541:1,2,14	proposition	526:11 529:11
proposals	542:9 543:4	459:13	543:2,11
407:11 408:10	545:1,17	protect 336:18	544:20 548:2
529:22 530:3	546:14,23	343:19 344:9	553:7,21
531:11 538:3	547:1 549:3,16	385:20 389:12	561:20 575:14
568:1,4	551:10,13	390:5 431:24	580:5 601:2
propose 530:3	556:25 557:5	432:20,21	604:21 605:23
538:5,7,22	558:23 560:5	490:22 542:8	607:14 608:13
545:14 549:1	561:2,6,14	544:1,3 567:18	613:11,15
553:7 555:9	562:11,22	602:12 612:23	614:2 619:15
558:12 561:12	563:20 564:8	616:8	provided
563:19 574:19	565:4,5 568:24	protected	346:12 406:8
575:1	570:12 571:9	385:22 447:15	409:2 415:19
proposed 320:4	571:20 572:9	protecting	421:19 452:9
333:3 351:5	573:2,7,25	343:11 553:4	452:20 459:5
354:25 355:5	574:11 576:5,6	protection	482:22 512:16
369:25 383:17	576:19 583:4	384:23 386:7	538:15 547:24
400:18 401:7	594:16 598:25	447:14 614:9	552:2 580:24
402:10 417:9	599:3,14,16	protections	596:7 600:17
417:18,24	600:8 601:6	400:16 544:9	604:8 615:18
418:9,15 419:8	602:1,1,4,21	proud 340:24	provider 533:9
422:11 423:2,4	603:10,14,24	prove 503:12	552:16 566:9
428:9 435:23	603:25 604:11	proved 501:8	611:22
440:22 443:7,8	604:16 605:21	proven 500:21	provider's
449:15 454:17	606:1,5,6,8,12	618:19	610:7 615:25
458:4,7,12,18	606:15,21		

[providers - purvis]

	I	I	
providers	485:1 496:18	448:11 449:9	purely 402:3
533:11 551:24	498:1,5 501:18	451:16 470:22	540:17 605:24
552:5,12,13	503:1 504:1	471:6 525:3	620:14
557:16,17	561:3 576:16	527:12 545:9	purple 355:13
567:12 568:19	576:20 599:11	577:4 579:14	372:15
569:13 570:8	599:15 603:9	579:18,21,25	purpose 362:2
610:12 612:18	604:7	580:17,22	403:22 418:17
612:19 613:5	provisions	581:12 594:2	420:14,23
619:19	419:21 429:14	595:25 596:25	421:4 422:3
provides 339:6	430:25 434:14	621:14 622:19	432:16,20
358:25 426:19	483:21,22	publication	530:5 558:11
427:12 431:14	505:16 527:8	413:2	586:11 600:19
531:5 549:4	531:5 537:18	publicly 365:6	615:11
558:18 566:13	556:20 558:10	470:20	purposes
589:12 602:23	606:6,9 607:25	published	345:19 350:24
603:15 604:19	608:3 614:17	350:6 359:24	449:21 493:16
605:4 620:14	616:14	392:3 413:14	493:18,19
providing	proximity	413:15,16	495:4 501:11
507:7 526:3	365:14,15,15	415:17 486:3	530:8 535:12
542:25 544:4,5	365:16 535:20	pull 380:25	583:7 607:20
557:18 569:11	535:20 594:19	407:19 411:23	615:7
577:8	proxy 473:6	417:22 440:10	pursued 464:1
province 546:1	public 325:23	441:14 454:7	purvis 330:3
546:9	326:14,16,19	515:7	333:18 346:17
provinces	326:20,22,24	pulled 441:15	347:2,8,12
546:11 556:13	327:2,4,12,14	441:16 504:14	348:13,25
provincial	327:15,19,24	504:14 596:2	350:5 351:10
556:9	328:4,6,8,11,15	pulling 380:14	352:7,9,23
provision 423:3	328:16,21,23	pulmonary	353:11 355:2
424:7 426:14	329:2,4 333:7	535:23	356:9,22
428:19 431:6	336:2,19	purchase	357:14 359:12
431:14 432:2	344:19,20,20	357:20,20	360:22 361:11
433:1 435:9,11	350:13 351:21	pure 381:11	362:4,21 363:5
435:21 471:4	378:1 379:7	531:21 569:23	364:3,8,10,20
481:18 484:21	397:16 421:10		364:23 367:1

[purvis - purvis]

367:10 369:16 370:4,19 371:7	401:14,20,24 402:12,17,25	429:13,19,24	458:14,20,25
370:4,19 371:7	402:12,17,25	100 0 0 1 1 1 0	
		430:2,6,9,14,18	459:6,10,16,21
371:17,19	403:7,13,18	430:22 431:3,8	459:24 460:6
373:17,18	404:5 405:1,12	431:12,19	460:15,19,23
374:1,4,9,16,21	405:14 406:3	432:1,7,12,20	461:4,11,16
374:24 375:17	406:10,24	433:2,12,25	462:3,10,23
375:19,22	407:1,7,15,21	434:2,13,18	463:15,18,22
376:5,8,11,18	407:24 408:6	435:7,17,19	464:3,8,15,24
376:21 377:22	408:13,16,20	436:3,18,22	465:5,7,9,17,23
378:2,8,14,18	409:5,13,19,25	437:9,14,23	466:2,4,11
379:1,6,17,24	410:3,11,15,16	438:6,14,19,23	467:3,17,24
380:4,9,17	410:20,24	439:2,9,13,17	468:6,12,19
381:1,4,14,18	411:1,5,11,16	439:22 440:4,6	469:1,6,12,14
381:20 382:2	411:21,25	440:8,14,17,20	469:23 470:3,7
382:19,24	412:5,10,13,25	441:1,5,12	470:11,16
383:8,19 384:5	413:8,12,13,24	442:6,14,18,25	471:9,14
385:15,23	414:10,16,25	443:3,10,14,22	474:11,21
386:12,17	415:5,10,14,23	444:3,9,12,15	475:3,16,21
387:20,25	416:3,11,17	444:20,24	476:4,8,11,14
388:12,17,22	417:4,5,11,14	445:5,15,21	476:18 477:2
389:14 390:8	417:19 418:14	446:3,11,19,25	477:14,20
391:2,5,11,17	418:18 419:2,7	447:5,12,19,24	478:5,17 479:2
391:20 392:1,7	419:12,18,22	448:4,7,14,21	479:5,18,22
392:11,21,25	419:25 420:3,9	448:25 449:5	480:1,13,24
393:5,8,10	420:17 421:1,6	449:16,25	481:6,13 482:3
394:1,9,12,16	421:14,21,24	450:8,14,20,22	482:10,13,20
394:22 395:5,8	422:6,13,21,24	451:13 452:12	483:2,9,17
395:13,15,17	423:9,13,20	452:17,23	484:5,13,16,20
395:20,23	424:2,6,13,16	453:2,5,12,17	485:7,18,25
396:1,6,10,15	425:3,10,15,18	453:21,25	486:13,19,24
396:20,25	425:22 426:3	454:12,18,23	487:20 488:8
397:6,20 399:2	426:12,14,21	455:5 456:4,14	488:18 489:11
399:3,18,22	427:9,15,25	456:23 457:3	490:1,12 491:9
400:3,7,10,14	428:3,5,12,20	457:11,12,17	491:20,25
400:20 401:2	428:25 429:5	457:23 458:2,8	492:5,8,14
		,	

[purvis - questions]

493:5,23 495:6	388:10 389:7	482:16 591:18	397:20 408:7
495:21 496:15	395:9 433:9	quantification	409:14 415:24
496:20 497:6	482:6 483:8	350:22 354:17	416:8,14 420:4
497:13,20	488:25 491:4	371:21 373:2	432:13 433:25
498:7,11 499:4	498:1,5 502:22	quantifications	434:17 446:12
499:13,16,23	508:11 514:16	347:23	451:22 461:15
501:20 502:9	521:7 538:19	quantified	462:9,24
502:20 503:5	565:15 577:21	444:20 448:8	463:19 468:23
503:13,16	588:17 596:9	448:15 449:1	474:23 475:18
504:5 505:15	618:6	470:1,5,9	477:10 479:13
506:24 507:25	puts 343:20	479:23	480:10 483:3
508:8,17,23	500:5	quantifies	483:23 492:2
509:7,19 510:5	putting 409:10	386:1	507:13,14
510:15 511:6	451:8 489:5	quantify	508:1 512:19
511:10,17	q	349:22 355:4	567:23 572:1
512:2,18 513:3	quadrupled	385:15,21	598:21 615:14
513:9,25	382:8	398:14,23	615:15 617:11
514:12,22	qualifications	399:3 452:2,5	questioning
515:4,9,12,25	558:20	495:19	346:19 373:11
516:21 517:6	qualified 388:7	quantitative	questions 354:6
517:15,18,19	569:15 622:7	349:1 350:17	373:6 384:1
519:9,24	qualifies 389:4	372:5 519:19	399:25 402:21
520:12,24	513:12 575:24	quantitatively	416:16,21,21
521:14,18,20	614:13	514:24	436:10,21
522:6,8	qualify 355:13	quantities	451:25 455:23
purvis's 369:13	355:22 487:11	495:18 528:18	456:3,5,11,13
373:5 541:25	487:15 568:6	531:17	457:3 460:25
push 484:1	618:21	quarter 566:17	463:16,17
536:13	qualifying	question	464:20,21
pushed 551:14	425:1	347:13 362:11	469:24,25
pushes 618:1	qualitative	362:11 363:8	474:6,6,11,13
pushing 484:15	354:14 460:17	363:10 365:3	475:13 478:20
485:22	461:17	383:20 384:25	517:4 521:19
put 343:14	quality 335:2	385:16 390:3,9	522:2 562:23
386:24 387:19	352:14 404:6	390:10,20	

[queued - rational]

	5.00.0.570.12	405.0 11 16 00	150.4.10.15.16
queued 402:4	568:2 579:13	425:8,11,16,20	450:4,12,15,16
quintupled	595:16 597:5,7	425:24 426:7	450:21 451:7
382:8	raises 562:23	426:13,16,21	451:17,23,24
quite 439:8	ran 442:21	426:22 427:11	452:13,19,24
474:13 486:25	random 363:8	427:20 428:2,4	453:3,9,13,19
487:22 509:2,9	randomized	428:6,14,21	453:22 454:1,2
586:18	362:19 363:6	429:2,8,16,20	454:4,5,6,15,20
quote 361:22	range 360:14	429:25 430:3,7	454:25 455:22
361:25 381:11	403:11,14,17	430:10,16,19	456:2 458:8
391:14 394:8	404:24 406:7	430:23 431:4,9	468:23 469:23
515:16 516:20	409:10 442:16	431:13,20	471:11
519:12	471:16,18,23	432:2,8,16,23	ranking 585:8
r	472:10,17	433:3,4,16,18	ranks 397:16
r 321:1 322:1	473:11 527:21	434:6,7,16,19	rapidly 367:19
323:1 324:1	535:21 552:1,3	435:8,20	rare 380:18
325:1 324:1	569:11 604:22	436:15,17,18	482:13,14
327:1 328:1	ranged 372:21	436:23 437:10	rate 396:3,3
	ranges 404:18	437:15,24	400:24 402:3
329:1 333:1 339:24 342:16	406:13 472:14	438:10,17,20	466:7 473:19
	472:15	438:24 439:3	473:23 506:11
342:17,17	rank 480:16	439:11,14,18	540:22 550:12
522:24,25	ranked 341:3	439:23 440:5,7	rates 331:14
584:23 587:20	rankin 323:13	440:10,15,18	355:21 402:4
587:20 590:5,5	330:7 416:22	440:21 441:3,7	rather 350:22
592:24,24	416:23 417:2,3	441:13 442:8	365:13 419:15
595:5	417:6,13,16,21	442:15,20	425:12 436:6
rachael 327:4	418:3,6,7,8,15	443:1,5,11,15	456:16 500:1
rachel 623:2,15	418:19 419:3,8	443:23 444:4	504:9 511:20
raimi 471:25	419:13,19,23	444:10,13,16	529:25 542:24
566:12	420:1,6,11,19	444:22,25	554:3 563:21
rainbow	421:2,11,18,22	445:13,14,16	589:21
321:18	422:2,10,14,22	446:1,6,13,20	rational 398:1
raise 341:24	422:25 423:11	447:1,6,16,21	424:11 613:24
577:5	423:14,23	448:1,5,9,17,22	614:2
raised 340:10	424:4,10,14,17	449:2,10,19	
347:25 348:4			

[rationale - recognition]

rationale 562:1	572:6 616:7	610:18	468:12,23
raton 463:10	reallocate	reasons 614:5	486:14,15
463:11 472:12	518:3	rebecca 329:4	496:14 497:4,6
472:13	reallocated	591:25,25	recap 519:21
razatos 327:6	550:20 571:4	592:2 595:1,9	receive 548:6
rex 330:2	really 334:16	595:15	received 495:7
rdx 330:2	334:22 424:4	reboot 457:22	549:13 577:2
reach 437:16	433:4 475:12	rebuttal 346:1	598:21
reached 583:21	475:14 478:3	346:13 347:11	receives 396:12
620:13	481:6,12 482:1	347:15,25	receiving
reaching	487:17 489:6	348:4,7,18	431:15
390:18 579:23	490:2 503:25	349:8 350:1	recent 397:11
reacting 611:10	505:3,11	351:3 352:19	441:16 500:10
read 369:16	507:22,23	353:9 354:11	537:3 552:3
381:20 392:22	508:6 509:6	354:21 356:5	553:17 576:12
394:12 407:2	512:1 589:6	356:19 357:8	599:8
412:2,8 422:22	597:25 598:18	359:9 360:8	recently 332:9
425:2,3 434:20	reason 376:18	361:6,22	460:21 467:7
434:22 435:6	385:1 404:13	362:15 363:18	527:14 607:18
441:2 486:6	483:7 492:15	364:5 369:12	recipient
495:8 507:2	498:3 513:2,3	369:18,23	431:23
519:9	584:13	370:18 381:11	reclamation
reading 381:15	reasonable	393:24 411:5	331:5 466:18
381:16 428:1	383:15 460:8,9	418:1 475:6	466:23 467:8
453:24 462:14	461:1,9,11	511:11 525:16	468:11 509:25
578:2	462:1 467:13	564:14 566:21	510:13,15,19
reads 453:6	484:8 493:7,9	609:8,21	528:5 532:15
ready 455:9	539:14 616:5	614:19 616:22	533:21 539:23
568:23	617:18	618:18 619:25	554:2,3,6,9,23
real 430:20,20	reasonably	recall 377:22	558:4,6 583:6
430:21 492:17	495:17 539:5	383:8 440:4	583:17 584:8
578:6	539:10 540:1	457:23 460:21	585:15,25
realistic 343:10	572:24 574:5	463:17,19	recognition
reality 344:5	reasoning	464:21 465:16	608:25 618:24
404:8 531:23	489:12 513:10	465:17 467:24	

[recognized - regulations]

recognized	recover 505:5	519:2 551:3	568:3 593:12
415:3 546:17	555:3 570:2	617:7	605:25 619:1
553:9 556:5	recoverable	reevaluate	620:15
	534:7	345:18	regardless
recognizes 542:5	recovered	refer 356:1	569:20 571:23
recognizing 542:19	533:23 534:1,4	360:8,19 515:6 reference	regards 475:20
	recovery 445:3		485:22 491:13
recollection	445:19 447:8	348:16 531:5	regime 510:6
469:6	449:13,23	605:13,22	registered
recommend	450:24 451:1	608:23 611:8	435:3 462:17
510:8	471:12 505:5	referenced	462:21 464:12
recommendat	533:25	419:14,16	492:24 602:25
576:13 577:11	recuperate	420:7 566:6	609:1,6
599:8 619:8	584:9	references	registration
recommendat	recur 604:15	549:6	526:7 530:11
427:13 510:3	red 355:14	referencing	558:14,25
526:9	367:24 459:3	426:17	559:11 561:25
recommended	599:25	referring	604:12 608:1
484:7	redeemed	424:14	620:1
recommends	534:5	refers 400:23	registrations
618:18,23	redid 517:13	reflect 412:19	561:19
record 350:14	redirect 469:16	473:5	regularly 531:1
399:12 456:24	469:21	reflected	556:3
516:12 522:11	redlinger	382:12 542:6	regulation
558:8 561:23	515:11,13	599:17,19,25	387:18 519:1
579:10 597:23	516:23 518:13	602:22	549:5 551:4
622:9 623:5	518:14 570:18	reflection	560:18 573:8
recorded 622:6	reduce 556:14	418:25	596:9
recording	reduced 544:24	reflects 369:13	regulations
622:8 623:4	550:11 618:21	refuge 559:24	333:4 338:13
records 470:13	622:6	regard 414:19	338:14,18,22
551:18 618:20	reduction	614:16	339:13 341:9
recourse	353:5 405:18	regarding	341:16,19
530:19 600:24	445:2,18 447:8	461:1 526:5,6	400:12 402:1
614:9	449:13 518:24	559:2 561:15	436:6 518:23

[regulations - repair]

Г	I	I	
525:8 526:16	556:19 557:24	relevant 359:20	remains 370:21
526:19 529:3,5	561:3 602:8	362:24 364:12	379:3 455:2
529:17 530:20	607:20 616:14	371:9 376:6,14	509:11 615:14
533:17 536:15	reinsurance	377:15 406:16	615:15
537:7,11	610:25	450:9 472:4	remediating
546:15 547:20	reject 529:22	481:7 490:20	541:9
549:8 550:23	rejected 482:14	490:22 514:15	remediation
551:2 571:21	rejecting 596:9	521:1 572:11	387:12 404:11
572:2,4 573:4	related 459:3	572:17,21,22	466:19,24
589:3,4,11,22	473:10 525:10	601:17 603:23	467:8 528:4,7
591:14,16,21	540:10,12	610:24	529:16 554:14
596:12 605:1	541:15 576:18	reliability	563:24 564:5,5
605:22 607:8	599:13 603:19	533:10	566:14
607:19 609:22	616:18 622:11	reliable 351:6	remember
610:10 612:17	623:7	357:11 377:3	421:14 440:9
612:23	relates 541:18	472:1	463:22 473:8
regulator 532:2	relations	reliance 463:16	476:20
532:4 548:21	327:19	relied 352:5	remind 381:14
569:22	relationship	412:23 477:16	427:25
regulators	475:22,23,24	relies 339:9	removal 387:11
351:13 532:6	476:1 492:13	rely 348:14	405:25 406:21
536:7,10,14	573:12	432:10 477:15	remove 576:15
545:22 549:24	relative 390:10	554:2	599:10
556:4,9 558:7	390:10 480:15	relying 432:17	removed
559:25 567:17	480:17 519:1	554:23 574:3	406:14 504:16
568:18 620:13	551:5 622:13	594:8	removing
regulatory	623:10	remain 452:6	617:1
379:22 380:14	release 530:10	501:12 571:17	render 545:5
388:10 427:7	614:12,14	remained 586:5	renew 613:6,25
489:15 519:15	released 529:13	remaining	renewables
523:25 524:1	533:2 552:7	434:12 435:14	589:14
524:24 525:1	releases 569:22	541:8 545:7	repackage
527:8,22 530:9	relevance	548:12 555:23	351:14
531:2 533:13	481:9	567:23 568:10	repair 335:5
553:14,20		615:9	

[repeat - requirements]

repeat 366:24	490:16,17	reproduces	571:7 574:11
repeated	527:24 533:21	519:11	575:7,19 576:2
612:25	609:4	reproducible	576:8 599:2
repeatedly	represent	350:3	601:2 602:8
610:6	356:13 366:5,9	reproductive	604:21 608:13
replace 540:19	372:11 397:9	534:24	609:4 617:21
replacement	544:13 546:18	republicans	618:8
614:3	552:22	585:10,22,23	requirement
replaces 604:17	representation	repurposing	424:24 483:1
605:1	454:14 519:18	500:17,19	518:4 540:7
reply 578:20	representative	reputation	542:14,22
report 348:10	328:19 362:19	384:2	550:8,11,14
350:2,6,9,11,12	363:22 382:15	require 333:10	562:3 574:15
350:25,05,11,12	461:21,22	392:9 402:18	615:25 616:14
378:11 397:8	462:8 466:16	428:10 477:3	620:1 621:10
403:8,10	512:13 520:16	504:8 505:19	requirements
405:17 407:2	585:8,17,18	505:20,23	392:13 517:23
409:25 410:2,3	587:7	507:8,15,18	520:9 524:2,3
410:4 467:23	representativ	543:2,10	524:24 525:2
467:25 490:15	363:7,9,11	544:14 552:5	526:4 529:10
527:15 545:25	represented	557:21 558:1	530:15,25
553:11	461:6 469:4	561:3,9 573:15	531:3,12 533:2
report's 409:20	551:11 571:10	574:10 600:5	533:7 536:12
reported	representing	612:9 614:25	538:22 547:13
320:16 335:2	393:22 399:20	616:11	549:18,21,25
352:25 442:16	461:1 518:8	required	550:6,24
464:13 536:20	545:21	338:15 358:18	551:12,23
537:1,3 601:20	represents	424:3 429:22	553:8,14,21
610:20	366:2,4 367:14	432:4 504:13	554:1,4 555:2
reportedly	367:22,24	505:18 513:14	556:15 557:6
487:10,14	368:7 369:1	538:11,15	558:5,21
reporter	453:16 459:14	545:12,16	560:10 566:10
327:21	531:21 543:5	547:15 551:8	567:14 570:22
reports 477:21	617:9	552:20 556:25	571:11 573:3
477:22,24		557:8 559:13	574:14 593:17

[requirements - retiree]

602:7,9,11,12	resolved 464:1	response	responsive
602:14 605:17	resource	348:24 350:4	578:12
607:23 608:9	493:23 560:18	351:9 352:22	rest 598:11
608:16 613:2	resourced	356:8,21	restarting
618:11 619:18	527:10 528:22	357:13 359:11	598:8
620:23	529:24 542:20	360:18,21	restate 598:20
requires 387:7	565:19	361:10 362:3	restaurants
424:7 427:24	resources	369:15 370:3	596:15
477:4 539:3	322:17 323:2	386:9 398:24	restoration
542:7 560:5	325:14,20	458:18,18	387:12 553:12
561:15,19	326:7,9,11,18	461:15 569:8	restores 530:16
568:14 595:22	327:7 455:10	570:15 572:10	restrict 525:9
606:2 620:8	501:6 511:12	574:12 576:10	546:24
requiring	524:13 525:8	578:2 599:5	restrictions
338:16 402:14	526:14 531:8	601:13 603:12	558:2
530:16,24	532:15 562:5	606:10 607:5	restrictive
532:7 543:22	562:24 566:3	607:24 610:1,8	567:10 611:19
546:20 609:5	619:11	612:15,17	614:6
616:8	respect 397:18	614:23 617:3	result 388:21
research 520:7	398:15	619:3 620:4	445:2 446:14
521:1	respective	responses	526:21 539:20
researched	570:18 619:25	475:13	553:11
486:20	respectively	responsibilities	resulted 536:23
researchers	348:8,20	361:18	591:9
535:5	354:22 357:10	responsibility	resulting 525:3
reserve 500:11	360:9 361:7	343:22 385:6	results 518:21
reserves 415:7	362:16 364:6	386:20 527:1	547:18 550:25
568:12	369:24 408:19	563:7	resume 525:13
reservoirs	525:18	responsible	621:13
500:11	respond 471:11	340:22 341:5	retailers 339:2
reside 424:25	482:19 536:16	343:9 344:10	retained
resident 337:21	611:23	381:8,25 394:4	512:25
residents 544:2	responding	451:5 569:1,2	retired 338:3
591:17,21	610:13	570:9 601:3,15	retiree 588:17
		606:18	

[retirees - right]

220.7		275 0 10 24 25	442.2.5.7.0.12
retirees 338:7	reviewed	375:8,10,24,25	443:2,5,7,9,13
retirement	391:25 411:4,7	376:6,15 377:4	443:21 444:6,8
523:22 526:21	411:8,10,12	377:10,14	444:14,19,23
return 344:25	412:17,23	378:16 379:9	444:23,24
346:16 359:14	413:1 426:20	379:18,19	445:4 446:10
416:1,4 542:13	482:6 551:8	380:1,19 381:6	446:15,18
597:15	558:3 571:7	384:16,18	447:1,4,22,23
returned	reviewing	386:4 388:15	448:13,20
530:19	536:19	389:9 393:2,9	449:4,20,22,23
returning	revise 515:25	394:19,21,22	449:24 450:7
562:20	revisions	395:21,24	450:19,20
reusing 500:17	359:22 392:12	396:2,6,8,25	451:11,12
reveals 608:14	revisit 517:10	399:9 400:19	452:15,16,19
revenue 335:22	517:12	401:12 403:17	452:22 453:4
370:9 396:9	revolution	404:25 408:12	453:20 454:7
397:4 418:11	594:2	408:19 409:24	454:17 455:1,3
464:22 470:10	rh 591:25	410:10,22,24	456:9,20
531:20,22	richard 324:3	415:12,15	458:13 466:3,4
541:7,18	rid 386:20	416:15 419:24	466:5 468:21
543:20 544:11	589:5	420:1,2,6,11,11	478:22 479:1,2
545:7 555:23	ridgeway 332:6	421:22 422:2	479:7 484:4
562:14 564:7	365:25 368:1	424:4 425:9,21	485:6,6,16,24
565:14 568:10	ridgeways	425:25 428:16	487:13 491:3
615:4,6,9,13	383:6	428:19,22	503:20 507:3
revenues 397:2	rig 332:10	429:4,8,9	508:14,21
414:21,21	370:22 372:6	430:1,5,6	511:2,5 516:13
528:20 544:24	372:11,22	431:6,11,18,25	519:25 522:5,7
594:8	right 337:1	433:22 436:11	522:12,22
review 412:15	340:13 343:12	437:1,13,22,25	557:7 578:19
424:18 427:12	344:25 346:8	438:3,5,24	580:2,10,21
427:13 482:7	346:17,20	439:1,7,8,15,19	581:17 582:1
501:23 526:6	349:16,17	439:21 440:16	583:24 584:18
527:24 577:2	350:8 366:3	440:19 441:3,4	587:2 590:2,7
600:14 602:24	368:2 372:9	441:7,8,10	592:3 597:10
603:6	373:19 374:25	442:13,17,24	597:12 609:15

[right - rules]

621:12	568:16 569:3	rough 462:7	rule's 420:14
rights 451:15	571:12 588:20	roughly 465:12	rulemaking
righty 456:25	607:22 608:7	535:24 609:10	361:8 363:1
579:11,19	608:10 611:12	round 366:10	364:15 371:12
rigorously	611:20 613:6,9	row 349:10	376:14 382:22
518:20	613:10,19,23	377:6 445:16	383:17 385:4
rigs 370:23,24	614:7 615:1,3	rows 471:23	385:10,19,22
372:2,3,7,16,20	616:15,17	royalty 396:13	386:5 387:24
372:22,24	617:17	396:18 470:21	388:3,4,8,21
rise 553:12	riskiest 568:25	615:7	389:1,20 390:6
600:25 616:7	risking 565:22	rule 336:11,18	553:17 557:1,7
risk 336:8	risks 344:12	364:1 414:25	578:11 579:1
343:20 356:7	557:4 567:16	415:6,10 417:9	584:2,2 586:14
356:15,17	616:18	417:18 420:2	rules 333:10
357:6 360:16	risky 336:12	422:4,11 423:6	335:2 341:8,15
365:8 379:16	rmoore 324:7	427:24 428:9	341:19 344:4,8
381:13 387:6	road 572:3	429:17,23	344:13 351:5
391:1 397:14	robert 327:8	431:7 434:8,21	354:25 358:13
419:6 437:7,7	robust 482:22	436:19 437:21	363:13 370:1
451:8 487:23	569:9	443:8 444:18	371:22 379:10
502:21 505:22	rod 328:19	445:19 449:15	379:12 384:13
506:23 507:5,9	584:19 585:1,8	450:6 452:14	384:23 400:6
507:18 528:21	roi 414:9	452:17 454:17	417:24 418:9
532:4 533:8	415:20	458:4,13,24	418:21,23
535:3,22 541:7	role 531:12	460:5 477:10	419:9 423:3
542:6 544:13	553:18 565:22	481:11 488:5,6	427:1,3,5,8
544:18 545:10	595:17 600:9	488:9,10,16	432:15 433:19
545:19,22	roles 418:16	496:11 505:23	434:3 440:22
546:18 548:16	romero 327:10	509:3 512:24	445:11 450:18
552:14,16,22	room 333:7	513:4 574:12	450:18 458:10
552:23 553:4	336:24 579:25	576:24,25	458:10 469:25
555:12,16	597:11	577:9 579:3	470:2,6,10,14
556:5,11,14	rosa 327:10	610:13 611:9	471:12 479:16
557:17 565:24	roswell 322:8	611:23 612:15	479:20,20
567:3,11,15			481:15 483:20

[rules - screen]

100 2 504 15	224200	4.0.	• 4066
490:2 504:15	334:2,8,9	satisfying	scenarios 406:6
505:18,19	336:21	565:15	406:12 471:19
513:13 517:11	sacred 343:11	sauce 345:14	605:19
517:12,14	safeguards	345:15	schedule 564:1
519:13 529:1	488:1 492:20	save 594:10	scheduling
529:11 530:9	safety 618:20	saved 393:18	346:12
542:2 555:10	sake 383:20	saving 335:23	schematic
565:24 567:2	sale 600:10,11	savings 486:1	481:23
569:8 572:9	607:19	saw 335:3,7	scheme 332:4
594:16,20	salida 321:19	405:14 493:18	365:7,18
603:10	salsas 591:5	500:12 591:8	366:21 367:12
rulings 610:24	salvage 533:25	sayer 323:4,5	368:8 600:16
run 467:10	sample 363:12	416:20,21	school 335:11
514:10	363:22 366:16	saying 345:10	338:1 340:15
running 559:25	376:23 389:16	405:1,10	358:20 359:4
589:18	416:6 461:19	421:14 422:3	524:11 595:25
runs 350:15	samples 369:5	438:7 444:6	schools 334:23
467:8	san 334:18	450:21 475:1	341:3,11 596:2
rush 505:12	363:17,20	489:18 498:3	science 524:11
rust 534:16	476:1 478:25	504:7 506:22	scoot 369:17
ryan 320:16	479:3,8	511:22	scope 348:23
327:21 622:2	santa 320:15	says 336:2	351:23 397:21
622:18	321:9 322:19	371:23 452:17	429:21 467:5
S	323:16 324:5,6	472:15 513:4	486:7 494:1
s 321:1 322:1	324:14 340:10	516:14,14	506:2,7 538:6
323:1 324:1	340:12,14,17	603:17	578:11
325:1 324:1	340:24	scale 349:11	score 366:8,11
327:1 328:1	satisfied 495:10	391:17 500:7	563:13
329:1 331:1	satisfy 551:22	539:22	scoured 490:17
332:1 333:1,23	560:3 562:5,14	scaled 540:19	screen 349:6
582:17 587:20	562:24 566:3,9	scales 478:16	373:20 374:2
590:5 592:24	570:8 573:2	scenario 387:3	411:24 414:17
s&p 351:19,20	575:11 608:8	398:2 406:13	430:16 457:7
sackett 328:14	608:15 615:24	538:16 562:4	457:15 479:9
333:16,22,23	620:23	613:14	522:21 533:11

[screen - serves]

	I	I	I
598:15	568:3 600:23	580:12,20	send 611:1
scroll 362:24	618:11	581:19,21	senior 358:20
364:11 371:8	secured 504:7	582:3,17	359:4
375:21 441:21	secures 575:22	587:19 592:4	sense 354:14
scrutinize	securing	592:16 596:4,5	
529:22	617:20	596:18 597:4,8	415:16 423:24
search 377:12	security 386:6	598:4,4	498:18 543:5
second 333:6	498:19 502:23	seeing 580:19	543:25 556:1
345:11 349:10	503:1 504:24	seek 555:1,2	612:1,22
350:8 353:16	596:19	seeking 559:24	sent 580:3
358:24 365:8	see 334:18	560:14 594:9	sentence 391:4
374:1 383:20	335:24 336:16	605:25 620:15	418:13,20
384:24 411:21	337:2,2 339:17	seem 486:15	422:16 426:25
412:4 426:25	341:22 346:18	498:2 508:14	538:8
430:14 445:12	355:18 363:10	seemed 577:14	sentences 412:2
471:23 500:7	365:20 366:11	seems 357:5	412:8
529:9 530:23	366:15 368:2	408:23 409:1,7	separate 354:8
532:23 591:2	368:11,19,20	451:4 519:3	363:19 406:1
619:13	368:23 369:1,3	seen 366:19	406:13 504:25
secondary	372:15 392:25	385:24 455:2	550:22
499:1 501:16	398:5 412:7	479:16 482:15	separately
secondhand	416:20 430:17	519:15 520:3	406:4
393:17	437:25 439:19	594:4 595:20	separation
secretary 584:1	440:11 441:17	select 377:14	555:18
608:18,24	442:21 445:13	selected 377:18	separator
609:1	475:10 479:11	412:14	335:10
section 428:7	479:15 487:8	selection	sequence
488:3 530:5,7	499:20 500:16	364:24	346:13
558:11,13,19	503:13 510:8	self 335:22	serious 534:24
576:18 599:13	511:24 512:14	411:3 588:12	605:8
604:9	513:2,3,9	606:19	serve 619:19
sections 604:16	518:1 521:9,15	senator 328:18	served 482:10
secure 451:5	522:9,14	582:3,8,16	482:20
530:21 542:15	567:15 571:5	584:15 585:13	serves 335:11
552:19 553:2	571:13 579:24	587:4	353:5 374:24

[serves - signal]

375:22 467:10	settlement	sheet 333:16	showed 290.17
			showed 389:17 416:5 447:3
476:9 480:14	559:9 605:14	sheila 325:9	
service 338:4	620:11,21	579:22 580:2	491:16
351:11 530:19	seven 397:3	581:12,14,21	showing 355:8
session 344:20	585:22	582:2 584:17	357:16
344:21,21	several 344:22	587:9 596:24	shown 368:1,6
580:1,22	459:19 461:19	598:14	473:3 478:15
586:24	549:8 557:9	shelton 327:12	487:5 594:18
sessions 580:23	severance	sherry 328:23	shows 361:7
set 350:8	396:3,3,9,18	581:15 590:1,8	363:18 365:24
365:23 369:5	shades 366:9	590:10,17	366:1 369:5
418:16 419:9	shale 500:11	592:5	372:1,7 437:12
440:22 473:4	565:10	shift 342:4	455:17 473:11
477:4,12,14	shallower	532:10 533:8	480:16 512:2
488:10 490:2	476:17 489:2	581:20,25	609:22
492:15 494:2	535:11	582:9 592:2,13	shut 502:16
504:14 523:10	shanor 322:6	592:18	517:23 518:7
529:10 533:12	share 349:6	shock 409:2	598:8
536:10 539:1	373:20 374:2,7	shocking	shutting 550:21
540:21 543:23	377:8 457:7,15	334:17	571:4
544:2 552:13	457:15 459:18	shops 596:16	side 338:5
566:1 571:24	479:9 487:2	short 399:5	353:17 368:11
594:20 602:1	522:20 550:10	430:4 437:6	372:8,9 404:24
604:4 615:9	598:15 612:21	522:13 541:22	404:25 450:15
616:4	shared 363:2	557:8 594:8	450:17 467:10
sets 352:21	364:15 367:5,7	598:1	472:3,3,20,21
515:2	371:12 460:19	shorter 436:24	472:22 479:2
setting 349:10	sharing 375:5,6	shortfall	487:13 496:17
459:13 474:1,2	377:11	510:18 537:24	sierra 328:9
475:7 512:1	sharpe 381:23	554:3,6,22	524:18
538:5 540:6	384:1	show 349:7	sight 468:20
546:18 556:14	sharpe's 381:7	369:6 372:5	510:19
568:22 615:19	383:24	383:10 437:22	sign 403:19
619:7	sharply 518:10	447:17 480:14	signal 552:21
		514:6 610:12	

[signature - small]

signature	simply 425:8	573:22	459:18,19
622:17 623:13	544:20 554:5	sites 334:22,24	462:2,7,12
significance	619:12	335:2,20	469:3 478:13
354:15 359:18	simultaneous	525:11 559:17	481:22 482:24
372:25 481:7	544:23	sits 498:15	483:25 486:9
610:5	single 392:9	536:1	487:25 492:18
significant	423:25 424:23	sitting 336:4	493:16 495:13
358:25 372:14	425:12 427:23	385:18 387:17	497:11 508:3
397:22 481:9	428:8 429:14	421:16 434:8	510:24 598:20
483:21 504:12	430:5 482:25	448:10	599:19,25
504:17 509:10	483:4,15 504:9	situation	slides 349:21
509:11 541:6	506:12 512:23	338:23 382:3	353:12
543:15 551:11	512:25 513:17	387:9 472:5	slightly 500:12
565:1 571:10	537:11 539:11	538:12	589:9
573:18 610:21	540:21 548:24	six 478:14	slow 395:15
612:19 617:6	573:5,9 575:4	479:5,6,6	sm 592:4,5,5
significantly	575:4,12,17	585:21	small 336:12,13
405:16,21	614:17 616:8	sixteen 376:10	341:9 354:3
463:10 537:19	617:5	size 369:15	360:20 361:1,1
539:22	sir 373:18	429:1 480:16	361:8,14
similar 383:9	374:21 392:7	480:17 572:9	368:18 370:3
536:23 551:13	418:14,18	sizes 370:9	370:16,16,20
572:16 576:12	419:2 435:7	499:22 566:4	373:3 378:22
589:9 599:7,23	453:12 460:23	skills 588:23	379:2 389:5,16
similarly 368:6	474:21 478:17	622:10 623:6	390:17 393:21
553:18 605:13	479:18 483:9	sky 336:16	397:14 398:10
618:23	519:24	368:21	398:11,13,17
simple 395:14	sister 342:1,1,8	slide 349:7	398:18,18,25
395:25 567:7	344:17	353:11 362:24	399:6 427:17
611:16 615:3	sisters 343:4	364:12 371:9	437:8 441:10
simplicity	site 335:7,9,11	420:20 423:4	472:11 473:4
489:13,19	335:13,18	430:11,23	480:8,12,23
simplification	338:19 478:11	433:19 437:10	481:11,13
496:6	504:16 528:4,7	437:11 439:4	484:11 487:9
	532:16 554:13	447:2 452:8	489:2,6,10

[small - specific]

517:22 518:3	sole 349:12	371:1 374:3,7	477:18
518:25 519:3	391:13,18	390:20 395:15	sources 335:8
528:18 549:21	414:12,18	395:25 405:14	350:10 362:10
550:7,9,18	solely 361:16	407:15,17,19	362:13 411:3
551:3,16	573:5,17	409:13 410:1	413:3 472:1
565:20,22	solicit 458:23	412:12 415:23	527:5 535:10
571:2 590:23	solid 367:21	416:13 418:1,3	south 320:14
591:11,12,12	solution 484:8	433:18 441:24	322:18
591:14 594:11	486:5 586:15	445:14 446:11	southwestern
596:10 602:5,5	solutions	465:8 466:20	379:21,22
606:20	351:17 523:25	469:17,19	spacing 517:12
smaller 338:15	524:5 565:5	475:9 476:14	spanish 344:23
339:4 371:2	solve 485:17,19	503:5 507:25	580:2,5,24,24
453:10,10,22	solved 485:5,8	578:17 585:22	581:3
453:23 485:22	solvency	592:6 596:5	spe 412:7,14,24
539:22 601:12	556:16	621:10	482:2
602:7 612:12	solves 485:16	sort 355:14	speak 336:22
smallers 489:2	somebody	357:3 370:4	339:14 487:20
smallest 518:5	408:25 584:3	379:23 438:2	489:12 507:3
smith 327:14	someday 521:9	446:21 447:3	508:21,24
sniff 443:2	someone's	452:20 463:4	590:2
snowball	507:10	471:7 579:8	speaking
338:24	son 588:7	sought 549:11	360:25 465:12
social 362:7,12	sons 337:24	sound 372:1	special 334:12
489:16 518:9,9	soon 532:25	379:16,18	556:10
societies 359:21	613:21	395:4,6 396:5	specialize
society 359:23	sooner 389:10	410:22 568:17	557:18
360:3 411:14	421:13,15,15	sounds 394:21	specializing
412:17,20	421:23 422:4,9	394:22 396:6	545:2
493:21	547:14 572:7	410:24 432:14	species 365:17
socorro 338:1	sophisticated	466:3 486:21	specific 345:25
software 496:7	567:12 569:10	503:2 508:15	376:25 462:6
solar 589:15	sorry 346:19	source 349:12	462:22 464:2
sold 591:6	350:5 352:10	351:4,6,9	528:25 530:3
600:12	360:22,24	372:6 477:16	531:11 538:3

[specific - state]

	T	T	
555:11 558:15	587:19 590:5	stage 349:10	started 585:25
568:1 605:2,4	595:5	stakeholders	starting 381:17
608:13 618:24	spending 537:1	350:4	432:3 466:19
619:9	spent 334:17	stamp 516:8	560:13
specifically	475:14 562:19	stand 384:13	state 320:1
369:21 370:17	spices 591:5	410:13 459:12	324:2,4 325:11
405:5 435:21	spills 514:19	502:1 598:5	339:6,8 340:21
463:1 496:12	563:23	standard 442:6	351:13 352:13
496:18 504:24	spirituality	445:8 474:1	353:23 359:5
545:22 570:23	343:6	573:11	360:11 361:2
608:19 610:13	spoken 360:1	standards	378:7,20
616:23	sporich 325:17	379:22 404:8	380:15 382:12
specified	619:23	standing	385:11,12
448:25 530:14	spotlight	455:20 596:20	388:20 389:9
specifies	348:10 527:14	607:23 608:17	390:5,16
558:16	spreadsheet	608:20,24	392:12,16
specify 561:8	348:21 349:2,4	609:2,6	394:5,6 396:4
specifying	349:12,15,18	standpoint	396:18,23
509:4	365:24 366:1	398:4	397:4,10,15
speculating	373:23 374:12	stands 357:2	402:4,18
492:15	374:20 375:4	373:5 455:21	404:11,24
speculation	375:12,13	509:9	405:6,6 406:5
451:21 565:11	376:3,12	standup 597:14	408:21 410:9
speculative	439:25 440:3	stanford	410:14 414:21
350:3,19	440:13 454:9	524:10	422:20 424:21
382:23 493:18	454:10 455:6	stanford's	428:7 429:11
493:19 494:18	463:17	524:11	431:24 432:21
494:19,24	springs 590:25	star 341:24	432:22 438:12
495:4,9	591:1	stark 531:23	438:22 439:21
spell 333:9,19	spurious 348:2	start 334:7	440:19 441:17
337:8 339:21	st 320:14	335:23 337:19	442:12 445:3
342:14 522:23	322:18	340:7 342:24	446:17,24
581:7	stack 335:9,10	383:18 399:25	453:11 456:9
spelled 339:24	staffing 619:11	474:18 512:17	468:17 470:10
339:25 584:23		513:8 590:14	472:18,25

[state - strengthen]

			,
475:2 479:21	state's 422:18	status 421:17	stay 340:12
481:2 489:21	518:19 550:15	434:24 492:22	410:8
489:23 490:1	552:23 554:11	497:16,23	stefi 328:6
490:22,23,24	554:12 557:20	501:25 502:8	step 438:8
491:1,6,8	570:24 609:1	502:19,22	557:7 594:12
501:14 511:5	613:10	503:7,8,10	596:6 600:14
511:13,24	stated 362:4	504:2,8,11	steps 564:10
512:3,13	518:11 519:13	512:21,24	567:24
520:10 521:5,9	614:4	513:24 529:7	stop 375:9
521:11,13	statement	530:22 543:11	377:11 531:16
523:17 524:2	360:10,19,23	545:14 546:17	594:14
524:23 527:2,4	362:8 401:1	546:19 547:9	stopped 531:20
527:18,19	447:25 461:25	549:7,12,13,14	548:15 573:20
528:2,17	486:23 515:6	549:15 556:17	stops 358:2
529:16 533:8	515:17,25	560:14 564:9	398:8
534:2 542:7	611:8 613:9	601:10 602:17	storage 494:8
544:1,4,18	statements	602:17	500:19,23
545:9,21 546:1	610:11 611:14	statuses 605:3	501:7
546:9 548:1	states 361:23	statute 425:17	straight 345:11
550:3 553:4	392:4,8 408:10	426:17,17,20	straighten
556:9 559:6,7	415:11 471:1	427:12 489:18	584:7
559:10,19,22	472:20 543:1,8	491:21 492:4	straightforward
565:24 566:8	546:10,16	492:16 502:4	496:2
566:24 567:18	556:13 560:23	549:5,6 557:20	strata 535:11
568:17 570:14	565:9 566:4	572:10,12,23	535:14
572:6 594:17	567:5,7 569:16	573:8 574:10	strategic
594:22 595:21	572:12 620:2	608:20 620:3	350:24 403:20
604:25 608:18	statewide	statutes 436:6	strategy 358:13
608:24 612:23	423:15 446:9	501:24 605:22	stratification
613:4,10 614:8	stations 339:2	statutory	616:25
615:2,22 616:8	statistical	424:22 427:7	street 323:22
617:18,19,24	518:22 551:1	527:22 539:2	344:1
618:4 620:19	statistically	540:7,22 573:3	strengthen
622:20	360:25	573:5,9 574:24	525:9
		603:11	

[strengths - sufficient]

strengths	studies 413:17	415:24,25	subsections
524:23	515:10 516:25	416:7,13,19	604:8
stretch 493:8	520:3 551:8	576:21 577:17	subset 366:9
509:6	570:19,20	577:23 578:23	400:7 499:1
strict 493:14	571:7	579:13	subsidence
512:1	study 445:1,17	subcommittee	534:18
stricter 567:14	447:7 471:25	525:7	substantial
strictly 402:7	518:13 520:6,7	subject 412:18	352:20 436:21
strike 466:20	520:8,17,23,25	501:21 532:19	527:6 583:5,14
striking 414:23	521:2 550:13	559:5 577:3	607:22 608:7
string 504:14	550:22,25	601:16 602:6	608:10
stringent	558:3 566:13	602:19 604:6	substantially
519:16 553:14	suazo 324:11	607:11	514:6
stripper 354:2	330:6 345:17	subjected	substantiates
360:3	399:14,17,18	503:3	361:2
strive 594:21	399:19,22,24	subjective	substantive
strong 344:8	400:4,9,11,17	381:12 382:23	347:20 354:18
358:22,24	400:21 401:8	607:24	success 562:17
407:3 477:7	401:16,22	subjectivity	successful
618:20	402:8,13,20	352:21	590:23
stronger 400:5	403:1,9,15,25	submissions	successfully
400:12,15,15	404:20 405:7	407:25	509:16 513:16
strongest 359:4	405:13,23	submit 333:13	534:5
594:20	406:7,18,25	submitted	sudden 452:25
strongly 478:7	407:4,9,17,23	407:22 412:16	sue 532:2
584:5,13	408:8,9,14,17	495:7 558:25	suffer 357:3
structured	408:23 409:6	subparagraph	384:10 473:12
619:13	409:14,15,23	432:4 434:22	481:12,16
structures	410:1,5,12,16	subpart 431:18	489:7 507:9
365:14 604:22	410:22,25	subscribers	suffering
stuck 430:4	411:2,9,16,23	351:15	481:20
students	412:1,9,12,22	subsection	sufficient 532:9
335:12	413:3,9,19	459:4 538:5	532:10 539:5
studied 425:23	414:5,12,19	547:8 604:5	539:10 540:1
484:6	415:2,8,11,18		543:17 544:11

[sufficient - systematically]

556:24 562:14	supplied	surety 506:20	surr 346:13
572:24 574:5	525:16	533:9 551:23	surrebuttal
583:15	supply 362:10	551:24 552:5	345:11 346:20
sufficiently	362:13 365:16	552:11,13,21	347:9 365:3
602:18	support 344:8	557:16,17	373:21 403:25
suggest 460:16	461:13 486:1	566:9 567:1,6	409:20 416:9
463:5 576:14	516:25 576:16	567:7,9,12,16	609:10 621:7
586:22 599:9	595:24 596:6	568:3,6,7,13,15	surrebutting
suggested	599:11	568:19,23	346:2
471:3 493:3	suppose 380:21	569:6,7,9,12,22	survey 490:7
573:7 578:21	supposed 586:1	570:2,6,7	490:11
suggesting	586:10,22	609:25 610:7	suspected
393:3	sure 333:20	610:11,19	534:23
suggestion	345:18 402:21	611:11,16,18	sustainability
517:15	404:5 407:5	611:22,25	593:19
suggests 366:20	408:9 417:19	612:18,19	sustained
600:9	419:22 420:3	613:5,11,17,24	610:24
suit 407:3	426:4 431:21	614:1,2,5,11	swear 581:8
suitable 381:12	432:12,13	615:24 618:12	sworn 334:3
403:21	446:13 456:7	619:18	337:15 340:3
suite 321:8,18	456:16,16	surety's 611:9	342:21 347:3
323:22 324:20	458:9 462:10	612:14 613:9	523:3 582:21
suited 604:20	474:16 483:2	613:22	585:2 587:23
sulfur 534:20	483:17 487:18	surface 466:18	590:11 593:3
sully 384:2	492:2 499:16	466:23 467:7	595:10 622:5
summarizes	509:15 522:24	478:10 535:9	synopsis
365:5 475:6	577:17 582:2	535:15 560:19	518:13
summarizing	594:12	surprise 454:11	system 335:25
428:2,4	sureties 567:13	464:16	336:3,15 339:9
summary	568:9 569:16	surprised	344:5 492:19
564:13,14	569:18,19	359:3 393:3,14	493:24 561:1
609:8	609:23 610:17	464:11	595:25
sump 335:5,9	611:2,22 612:2	surprises	systematically
sunshine	612:4,6,9	392:17	389:2 393:12
327:22	613:14		463:2,3,6

[systemic - temporary]

systemic	567:24 572:6	tank 335:4,14	technology
371:21	577:12 578:13	335:15	338:1 359:25
systems 487:25	583:15 584:3	tannis 321:5	500:21
619:3	586:11 594:12	598:14	tell 334:4 335:6
t	606:2 612:2,22	tapped 521:9	337:16 340:4
t 331:1 332:1	620:8	target 336:12	342:22 347:4
333:23,23	taken 367:1	429:21	353:3 358:19
342:17,17	395:9 491:23	targets 336:12	358:20 383:15
522:24 582:17	513:20 565:14	429:10,12	388:19 390:4
584:24 592:24	583:22 622:3	496:12 602:5	391:3 407:20
592:24	622:12 623:9	tax 396:3,3,9	432:23 434:7
ta 498:22	takes 414:6	397:2,4 402:1	437:17 441:9
501:19 502:8	571:24	402:3 464:22	448:5,19
502:16,22	talk 349:20	510:16 511:11	477:18 489:12
503:7,10	354:24 364:20	511:13,15,17	490:14 501:20
504:11 545:16	390:22 403:1	taxes 396:14	504:5 523:4
546:17,19	407:9 410:17	511:18	581:9 582:22
547:9	437:1 450:1	taxonomy	585:3 587:24
table 438:11	593:18	350:21 404:9	588:3 590:12
452:14 453:5	talked 384:2	494:4	593:4 595:11
471:21,23	393:20 437:4	taxpayer	telling 398:17
473:4,10	440:21 441:8	385:20 389:13	413:20 613:2
tables 349:16	467:18 490:9	510:11 521:10	temperature
350:15 409:21	493:17 512:18	taxpayer's	500:22
tail 369:1	520:5	385:21	temporarily
take 341:14	talking 356:2	taxpayers	387:22 545:13
343:25 353:9	357:24 388:2	336:19 361:10	549:2,6,9,12,13
374:16 390:16	406:17 407:5	390:5 405:6	549:15 601:10
402:25 452:3	407:16 410:2	509:21	temporary
456:18 468:17	414:16 426:8	technical 333:7	386:24 497:7
488:19 489:2	429:16 434:15	344:25 345:14	497:15,23
494:5 522:9	474:17 494:1	494:20	502:5,16 504:7
527:7 529:21	495:25 497:6	technically	504:15 529:7
545:3 562:21	500:2,4 502:12	494:11	530:21 546:22
564:10 567:17	514:14 519:21		

[ten - thank]

	I I		I
ten 335:2	379:20 444:5	400:22 403:3	620:25 621:6
387:19 393:24	464:15 523:5	405:4,24	testing 501:4
410:22,24	525:6 582:23	410:18,19	texas 332:11
456:18 463:21	585:4 587:25	411:3,6,6	359:5 372:9,17
479:17 485:4	590:13 593:5	413:4,11,21	372:20 398:5
522:9 579:17	595:12	415:19 417:12	489:22 511:23
tens 405:3	testify 361:11	417:20,22,23	516:22 519:22
455:19 510:20	378:11 379:9	418:4,8 419:1	520:4 551:7
term 354:16	428:7 449:14	419:14 420:13	570:20 571:6
355:7 356:3	testifying	421:18 422:3,6	texas's 550:5
401:3,21 402:2	377:22 417:8	424:15 426:24	text 580:3
449:24,25	435:23 622:5	426:25 427:21	thank 334:6
495:10 508:24	testimony	428:6,12	336:19,20
527:23 577:19	346:1 347:9,11	433:23 435:10	337:8,12,18
594:8 608:17	347:15,16,25	437:4 441:4	339:13,15,21
613:25	348:1,4,7,19	459:12 462:15	340:6,8 341:19
terms 354:17	349:8,9 350:1	463:8 465:13	341:20 342:6
484:18 501:17	350:2 351:3	467:6 472:8	342:13,18
504:1 525:24	352:19,24	474:14,24	344:14,16,25
537:12 551:9	353:9,12	475:5,6 476:23	346:8,15,17,21
552:14,17,19	354:21 355:3	477:11 487:12	346:22 347:12
568:9 571:8	356:5,6,9,19,20	487:17 490:18	373:8,12 374:8
579:1 607:22	357:9 359:9	495:8 507:3	381:18,22
612:11	360:9,10,23	523:12 525:16	392:25 399:9
terrific 337:7	361:6,7,22	525:20 552:1	399:14,22
522:6 595:4	362:16,17	558:25 564:13	400:11 408:6
tertiary 501:16	363:18 364:5,9	564:14,24	411:1 412:5,22
test 367:11	364:23 369:12	565:2 566:22	416:17,18,23
369:8 514:23	369:24,25	573:10 576:22	417:5,6 430:18
580:12	370:18 373:5	598:10 609:8	430:22 436:11
tested 365:22	378:14,17	609:21 611:15	436:14 439:13
testified 334:5	379:16 381:7	614:5,19	445:15 450:15
337:17 340:5	381:11,23	615:18,22	455:24 456:1,5
342:23 347:5	383:3,9,10,25	616:22 618:19	456:6,13,23
361:16 377:19	386:1,11	619:1,4,25	457:5,13
	·		

[thank - threatened]

			I
458:11 459:9	thanks 367:4	357:5 366:25	584:20 589:22
460:18 462:4	theme 368:5	376:5 377:6	589:24 592:5
463:14 465:11	themes 354:17	378:17 380:18	598:19 609:12
467:18 468:22	theoretical	382:2 386:8	third 349:17
469:14,15	474:1 514:23	390:8,23	387:5,6,7
471:14 474:5,8	theory 365:22	394:24 397:2	389:8 438:8
474:14 478:23	369:9 380:21	397:15,20	472:4 505:19
479:12 512:6,6	390:22 398:4	398:21 401:15	505:21 507:15
512:8,11 513:5	415:12 544:11	401:17 402:17	529:17 533:7,8
513:9 514:3	557:2	402:17 404:13	537:16 573:16
516:5 517:16	theory's 415:14	409:6,11 410:6	583:19
517:17 520:1	thereabout	410:7 413:25	thirty 403:18
521:3,17,20	476:21,22	414:2,9 415:14	453:13
522:8,19 523:6	thereof 434:25	415:24 416:8	thomas 327:24
564:12,19,20	492:22	416:15 423:20	thompson
580:15,16	thermographer	423:21 424:6	328:4
581:6,13	334:11,15	425:4 428:12	thought 345:12
582:12,13,14	thief 335:3,15	438:6 439:4	365:2 391:8
582:24 583:1	thing 335:20	442:4 447:24	407:20 410:2
584:14,16	355:1 356:25	450:9 456:17	433:3 454:12
585:5,11 587:5	378:12 385:20	456:18 460:16	521:1 578:18
587:6,16 588:1	413:22 415:13	460:24 462:23	thoughts
588:5 589:23	431:9 434:2	466:14 483:25	345:22 488:5,8
589:25 590:15	436:3 438:7	491:14 493:6	494:3 495:15
590:17 591:22	482:1 484:20	494:17,24	thousand
591:23 592:21	519:10 579:9	497:6 498:23	473:14 485:10
593:6 594:23	583:19 597:12	499:23 504:6,6	thousands
594:24 596:20	things 333:8	505:4,9 509:14	336:4 455:20
596:22 597:16	365:14 386:22	510:9 513:4	506:6 510:20
597:19,20,21	410:11 419:20	514:22 515:12	528:10
598:12 609:7	470:24 499:24	517:21 518:1	threat 380:7,9
609:16 621:1	511:12 559:23	519:7 521:22	380:14 543:16
621:10,14	581:7 588:24	522:6 577:4,8	threaten 612:2
thankful	think 337:4	578:20 579:24	threatened
590:21	342:3 345:2,17	583:12 584:5	365:16

[threats - towards]

threats 526:23	334:17 337:19	tinsmith	tools 584:6
three 333:13	340:7,19	340:11	top 355:9 365:5
335:7 347:13	342:25 344:12	tiny 343:14	570:2 578:19
349:2,3,7	345:20 358:7,8	tip 617:22	578:20 617:1
351:16 354:8	375:2,3 382:9	tisdel 321:4,10	617:14
367:16,18	387:3 395:24	titled 414:13	topic 360:4
372:11 388:18	402:11,25	titles 604:23	424:15
397:19 429:13	403:9 411:18	today 339:11	topics 402:23
446:5 453:13	414:21 415:3	339:14 343:20	416:9 417:14
473:22 487:14	421:16 460:21	344:21 399:21	total 331:4
514:1,4,14	465:15 467:11	406:17 449:14	344:7 375:24
529:4 532:14	476:14 477:4	455:14 460:19	376:3 403:3
534:3 549:15	500:3,12 512:6	463:15 486:7	404:23 438:22
553:22 557:19	514:2 534:8,17	512:19 515:9	441:11,17,18
566:11 576:18	541:22 543:3,6	520:22 567:8	441:19 442:11
578:16 581:10	543:20 544:24	583:3,4 609:11	443:7 465:10
590:20 599:13	546:3 553:10	611:17	469:2,3,9
604:15 614:11	553:13 555:22	together 395:9	514:1 534:1
threshold	557:11 572:15	418:22 432:15	541:17 546:6
415:3 437:12	579:13 583:11	572:19 610:15	550:15 554:11
437:16 438:13	583:14 584:9	told 350:12	554:20 570:24
439:19 453:6,7	588:7 590:15	358:22 384:17	575:18,23
459:13 603:4	594:9 596:25	421:11 454:8	totally 338:6
thresholds	timely 422:7	458:8 508:10	touch 402:24
460:2	526:12,17	toluene 534:22	588:17
thumb 414:25	529:12 532:13	tomorrow	touched 478:1
415:6,10	544:6	597:1,2	tour 360:5
tied 619:14	times 343:17	took 442:22	toward 536:13
tier 352:2	345:18 410:18	488:16 517:24	538:19
tiered 423:16	442:23 461:18	tool 352:15	towards 361:13
tiering 423:17	482:21 509:8	358:16 359:7	361:14 364:25
tiffany 327:17	535:25	390:23 405:11	367:13 369:1,9
tilted 617:23	timing 421:8	584:6 613:7	397:3 565:15
time 320:11	572:1	toolbox 380:24	586:15
332:8 333:17			

[townsend - truth]

townsend	484:25 485:2	591:13	tried 356:25
328:18 582:3	525:9 526:8	transported	372:4 390:11
582:11,14,20	527:8 529:23	595:22	398:14 490:15
583:1 584:16	542:20,22	treasury	493:6
585:13 587:4	543:7 555:13	569:13	trigger 429:14
toxic 336:1	556:1,6,7,19,21	treat 568:20	triggered
toxins 343:18	557:4 558:2	treatment	530:18
534:21	562:11,22	606:7	triggers 429:15
track 442:16	563:5,22 564:2	treats 336:8	trimmed
559:16 561:1	607:7 620:1	tremaine	616:24
trackable	transferee	322:14 330:8	trip 477:4
605:5	431:15 556:2	456:11,12,17	tripled 382:8
tracker 400:2,4	transferee's	457:2,4,5,9,10	tripp 322:5
tracking	563:2	457:13,18	trips 334:16
560:16 561:17	transferrable	458:3,11,15,22	trivial 353:7
606:23	494:4	459:2,9,11,17	474:4 519:6
trading 357:19	transferred	459:22 460:1	trouble 341:3
traditional	517:25 528:22	460:12,18,24	342:5 374:7
390:25 412:10	542:19 543:4	461:5,14,23	377:12 412:1
414:8	555:23 562:13	462:4,12	544:12
traffic 408:25	564:9	463:14,19,24	true 419:20,21
trail 324:5	transferring	464:4,10,17,25	482:11,20
trained 334:11	529:18 542:23	465:6,8,11,18	499:13 564:4
transactions	565:18	465:24 466:3,5	613:8 622:9
556:3	transfers	466:13 467:13	623:5
transcriber	555:14,18	467:18 468:1,8	truly 493:13
623:1	556:10 558:16	468:13,22	509:20 578:2
transcript	562:2 607:3	469:2,8,13	trust 343:12
333:9 582:18	translate 405:5	493:3 509:23	392:21 520:10
584:23 587:19	transport	598:3	521:5,12
592:24 623:3,5	380:15,25	trend 463:4	truth 334:4,4,5
transcriptionist	591:1	trends 466:6	337:16,16,17
622:7	transportation	610:16 611:4	340:4,4,5
transfer 431:17	588:9,12	trevor 614:18	342:22,22,23
431:22 471:4	590:24 591:4		347:4,4,5

[truth - under]

502.4.4.5	44 402:7	<i>55</i> 0.1 <i>C</i>	
523:4,4,5	twenty 403:7	558:16	unanimous
581:9 582:22	twice 414:22	typewriting	585:23
582:22,23	599:23	622:7	unanimously
585:3,3,4	two 333:2	typical 497:3	585:20
587:24,24,25	335:14 349:16	601:17	unapproved
588:3 590:12	350:9 363:10	typically 471:7	501:12
590:12,13	363:19 365:3,7	551:25	unauthorized
593:4,4,5	368:12 369:7	typo 439:9	620:3
595:11,11,12	372:20,23	u	unaware 605:6
try 360:25	393:17 394:6	u 587:19 595:6	uncertainty
379:21 457:21	395:3,5,9,16	u.s. 378:5	406:13
470:16 488:23	399:4 402:11	536:24 569:13	unconvinced
489:9 498:1	404:6 406:5,11	590:20	452:6
510:24 583:23	406:12 412:2,8	ultimate 385:3	uncorrected
592:4,15	412:9 423:17	385:5,5 445:3	560:22
trying 338:23	429:4 434:14	445:18 447:8	under 333:11
374:4 385:15	439:4 451:12	449:13 450:24	355:5,7 359:19
394:10 398:16	452:22 468:25	450:25 520:19	359:20 388:3
401:17 402:21	473:2 487:3	563:7 572:22	396:13 406:5
416:13 425:5	489:22 491:17		425:6 426:14
433:19 435:24	496:20,22	ultimately	428:18 429:17
459:18 485:21	497:9 514:4	379:15 385:20	429:23 431:18
488:6 492:12	515:2,10	419:5 445:2	432:3,25
493:18 587:1	516:15 518:15	514:20 569:20	433:10 443:20
589:21	518:16 543:1	un 452:5	445:10 450:17
tucker 323:20	546:22 549:12	unabated	454:16,17
tuesday 320:10	549:14 551:8	560:22	466:11 468:17
tune 489:15	557:15 571:7	unable 389:8	488:2 492:1
turn 366:23	579:24 580:25	452:5 605:16	495:16 497:19
411:17 558:9	583:10 590:22	608:8,15	501:18 502:4
567:25 575:6	619:7	unacceptably	502:18 512:24
580:17	type 445:22	593:23	513:12 528:22
turning 530:2	616:25	unaddressed	529:24 533:16
538:2	types 413:6	563:23	537:10 538:16
	478:15 544:10	unaffected	541:2 542:2,11
		550:16 570:25	

[under - upstream]

542:20 547:1,7	451:13 458:9	unexpectedly	unplugged
547:19,20	459:12 461:24	598:8	394:4 465:7,9
548:5,14	462:9,23	unfair 606:7	465:12,13
552:19 554:18	470:18 480:22	618:1	466:7 498:12
559:4 565:19	483:2 488:2	unfortunately	523:24 526:22
565:23 567:2	491:20 492:2,5	526:18 617:13	528:13 534:13
568:4 572:1	499:23 500:20	unhelpful	534:16 535:2
573:3,14	501:21,21	348:2	535:12,17
574:10,11	504:15 508:1	uniform 511:13	536:12,17
575:13,17	513:13 577:11	unintended	618:3
600:7 607:8	579:4	570:11	unrelated
608:18,19	understanding	unique 595:18	615:8 616:13
611:24 613:14	362:6 401:20	united 560:23	unreliable
617:15	407:6 420:22	569:15	378:17
underfunded	435:8,11	universe 388:4	unrepresented
344:12	439:18 454:8	university	363:23
underground	463:25 469:5	593:11	unresolved
593:15	496:19 501:22	unjustified	559:8,9 605:13
underlying	524:1,23	618:1	605:14
347:17 544:19	understood	unm 337:25	untimely
understand	407:4 497:22	588:8	576:25
386:11,12	500:24 513:5	unmute 337:4	unwilling
390:8 400:5	527:23 577:23	342:1,5 580:3	605:16
401:9,15	underwrite	581:18,20,22	update 561:9
403:10 404:2	545:10	581:24 582:1,4	603:1
406:20 409:14	underwriting	582:9 584:19	updated 552:3
409:18 414:7,7	567:10 588:18	592:1,7,12,17	559:4
416:14 420:4	611:19 614:6	592:19 595:1	upfront 485:24
420:12,18	undiscounted	unmuted 337:5	uploaded 363:1
425:18,22	358:7	342:9 580:7,8	364:14 367:6
426:4 432:13	undo 600:25	580:11	371:11
433:20,23	undrill 601:1	unnecessary	upper 350:7
435:22,25	uneconomical	586:14	479:7
438:25 446:12	593:21	unpack 404:20	upstream
449:12,18		471:15	331:5 403:4

[upstream - vertically]

106 16 107 10	251 4 21	1 247 10	41 244 6
406:16 407:12	351:4,21	value 347:18	vastly 344:6
408:11	352:11,11,14	357:11,15	vendors 563:11
urge 339:11	352:15,17	358:8,10,12	vent 335:9,10
341:14,17	358:13 373:22	397:14 403:11	531:1
591:20	375:4 376:23	409:3 412:11	venting 517:11
urging 421:4	376:23 390:23	442:22 443:19	530:25
usa 323:12	391:9 392:9	443:25 448:18	verde 476:5
327:17	413:11 477:12	448:22,23	verified 379:17
usage 499:21	498:15 535:12	451:3,3 468:24	verify 562:11
use 334:12	583:6,8	469:9 472:2	version 492:1
342:4,4 364:6	useful 359:7	506:11 552:9	versus 332:8
396:21 401:21	405:11 521:1	values 441:17	401:12 451:10
403:2 405:24	589:6	452:5	460:20 514:8
412:11 413:4	uses 352:2	variable 403:17	vertex 331:7
413:10 415:18	618:4	488:20 540:17	350:2,6 403:8
415:25 416:1	using 341:23	variables	403:10 404:1
418:16 437:18	375:14,20	365:10 518:21	404:10,22
439:5,12 446:5	404:21,22	variance	405:7,23 406:8
450:14 456:16	405:7 469:8	331:22 332:7	407:21 409:18
468:10 474:1	496:1 537:25	460:20	409:25 410:4,6
487:15 494:2	usurp 587:4	variation	410:8,8 490:10
494:17,18,23	v	359:13,14	490:15 520:6
495:3 500:17	va 338:3	416:3 539:13	520:23
501:11 503:12	va 338.3 vague 576:9	variations	vertex's 403:2
504:18 508:8	599:4 607:24	463:1,8	409:24
508:13 527:4	vaguely 496:15	varies 476:8	vertical 331:13
529:8 539:14	valid 348:5	547:3	355:10 370:22
539:19,23	416:1	variety 351:21	370:23,24
542:3 546:11	validated 351:8	556:4	371:3,23,24
546:13,24	validates 373:2	various 382:9	372:15,16,23
575:25 583:17	valuable 444:1	462:18 546:11	373:3 472:24
584:6 615:12	550:19 571:3	varying 504:19	478:16 479:7,8
616:21	valuation	vast 539:15	vertically
used 347:17		606:22	372:21
349:4 350:8	415:20 416:1		

[vetted - way]

vetted 569:14	560:22,23	wade 327:15	warrant 605:19
vetting 606:24	561:1 606:17	waist 358:23	wary 536:10
viability 455:21	606:19	walk 336:11	waste 449:15
500:24 612:3	violator 561:1	388:24 531:25	449:17,18,22
viable 501:9	virginia 392:5	walking 560:12	450:7,9,19
videoconfere	virtual 490:8	walking 360.12	451:11,15,18
321:4,5,6,16	virtually	wallace 327:17	489:16 496:2
322:4,5,14,15	335:18	walls 438:5	517:4,11 520:2
323:3,4,13,20	visited 334:22	walter 329:2	520:3
324:3,11,18	334:24 343:16	580:18 592:9	water 344:9
325:4,6,8,10,12	visualize	593:2,9	365:15 499:5,6
325:14,16,18	334:13	want 339:13	499:6 500:1,9
325:20,22,24	vital 340:21	343:14 364:11	500:14 501:12
326:3,5,7,9,11	voice 341:14,18	375:3 390:7	502:15,17,21
326:13,15,16	volume 402:11	399:24 402:24	534:15 535:9
326:18,19,21	480:6 569:6	407:5 424:9	535:10 536:2
326:23,25	volumes 441:9	437:3 462:19	waving 371:21
327:3,5,7,9,11	445:18 446:17	464:17 474:16	way 341:22,23
327:13,14,16	487:9 493:25	482:1,4 483:17	351:21 352:17
327:18,20,21	volumetric	488:1 495:15	353:1 358:14
327:23,25	450:10	498:17 500:2	372:18 381:5
328:3,5,7,8,10	vote 341:15,18	513:7 514:11	387:19 405:15
328:12,13,14	voting 339:12	568:8 577:4	406:11 420:18
328:15,17,18	vulnerability	586:25 588:5	422:19 426:3
328:20,22,24	546:9	wanted 336:22	429:9 431:20
329:3,5,7	W	345:21 401:24	432:15 433:16
view 414:20	w 582:17	421:19 422:15	436:5 439:7
454:20	592:24	423:24 427:22	448:11 449:23
views 460:13	w&t 609:21	457:7 520:1	450:5 457:22
violate 607:4	610:3,15,20	579:10 585:12	476:12 480:8
violation	611:1,3,21	598:2	483:19 489:17
501:23 531:2	612:6,18	wanting 586:23	490:14 496:2
605:12	w&t's 611:2	wants 333:17	506:24 514:17
violations	612:2	584:1,3	514:23 571:16
559:10 560:12	012.2		574:4 577:21

[way - wells]

585:7 586:9	welcome	365:25 366:6,7	432:9,9,11,19
ways 529:4	411:22 512:13	366:8,10,13,14	433:7,8,10
532:14	well's 402:15	367:13,14	434:10,12,24
we've 366:19	540:1 555:19	368:3,4,7,8,10	435:4,14
377:17 385:18	613:13,16	368:12,13,15	437:20 438:2
387:12 451:25	wellbore 461:2	368:19,22,23	438:22 439:25
464:18 465:13	461:10 462:7	369:1,2,4,7	440:3,24,24
468:15 493:17	466:16,21	370:11,19	445:10 446:4,8
505:4 519:15	467:14 468:3	371:3,24,25	451:9,10
520:3,5 521:7	573:21	371:3,24,23	452:16,16,22
594:4 597:12	wellbores	372:12,13,23	454:9 455:4,6
weak 475:24	535:10	374:19,19	455:8,8,14,14
476:1 478:2	welldatabase	377:2,17,19,25	455:20 457:25
527:8	351:4 352:1,15	378:5,6 380:3	458:6,7 460:21
weaknesses	wellheads	380:8,16 381:8	461:19 462:16
524:23	534:16	381:10,24	462:17,21
wealth 501:14	wells 331:13,17	382:12 383:11	463:12,20
542:14	331:21 332:5,9	383:13,18	464:5,12 465:3
webpage	334:20,25	384:21,22	465:7,9,12,13
361:23	336:1,5,9	386:20 387:19	465:15,20,25
website 362:5	343:13,18,19	388:5,6 389:4	466:1,8,9
413:14,16	343:23 348:11	389:21 390:15	467:19 468:16
416:10,12	348:20,22,23	393:4,25 394:5	471:22 472:9
441:16	349:2,4,11,15	401:6 402:2	472:11,19
weeks 578:16	349:18,23	419:11 421:16	473:4,6,7,21
weighed 387:11	353:6,23,25	422:4 423:3,18	474:3,20
544:17	354:2,3,10,23	423:25 424:24	478:15 479:7,8
weighing 447:3	354:24 355:4,6	424:25 425:9	480:3 481:14
weisburd 328:6	355:10,19,19	425:11,13,21	483:8,11,16
welc 400:18	356:1,2,7,10,20	425:25 426:2,6	484:22,23
407:25 458:23	356:21,24,24	426:8,9,11	485:3,8,10
welc's 402:9	357:1,5,6,11	428:17,23	486:4,25 487:3
407:11 408:10	363:13,15	429:4,10,12,12	487:4,9 488:3
434:16	364:24 365:1	429:18,21	491:10,15,24
	365:16,20,23	431:1,2,15,22	492:21 493:1

[wells - witness]

			1
493:13 497:14	538:23 539:1,6	565:18 566:1,2	westernlaw.org
497:15,18,23	539:11,16	566:7,23,24	321:10,11,12
497:23 498:25	540:20,25	568:11,22,25	321:20
499:20 501:11	541:6,21 542:1	569:3 570:13	wet 472:19
501:18,19	542:2,2,6,12,20	571:18,19,22	white 413:14
502:7,12,13	542:24 543:6	571:24 572:7	wide 424:24
503:10,22	543:11,13,15	572:16,25	428:11,22
504:2,3 505:3	543:19 544:22	574:2,6,18	550:11 569:11
505:7 506:20	545:3,5,7,12,13	575:2,6,14,15	610:23
508:5 509:4,16	545:16,16,19	576:1 584:10	widely 351:6
509:20 510:1	545:23,24	586:7,12	352:15 403:17
510:21 513:14	546:1,2,5,7,8	593:20 594:14	553:9
514:1,7,9,18,20	546:10,13,17	594:17,19,21	wider 391:17
517:12 518:3,5	546:19,25	600:11 601:7,9	wildfires
518:7,8,22	547:3,4,5,8,8	601:9,9,15	593:24
523:24 524:5	547:11,13,14	602:16,18,24	william 325:5
525:4 526:10	547:25 548:4	602:25 604:2,4	328:11
526:12,14,17	548:12,13,14	613:21 614:18	willing 614:2
526:23 527:9	548:19,20,22	614:22 615:1,2	willingness
527:15,16,19	548:23 549:2,6	615:4,9,13,14	560:2 620:22
527:23 528:4	549:10,10,12	615:17,19	win 413:17
528:10,12,14	549:15,17,18	616:2,3,6,12	436:22,22,23
528:17,21,24	551:1 552:25	617:10,11,14	436:23,24,24
529:6,8,12,15	553:18,21	618:3,13	winchester
529:19,23,25	554:8,17,24	wendell 320:13	354:20 361:5
530:14,17	555:6,16 556:6	went 410:17	388:22
531:1,4 532:5	556:7,10,12,17	441:15 484:10	winchester's
532:20 533:14	556:21,22	517:21 519:1	383:3
533:18,23	557:5,13,22	551:4 595:25	wind 589:15
534:12,14,16	558:1,2,15	west 321:18	window 355:20
534:19 535:2,7	559:16 560:4	338:5 392:5	wish 600:13
535:8,13,17,20	562:8,13,13,18	591:2	withdrawn
535:21,24,25	562:20,20,22	western 321:2	482:15
536:3,4 537:21	563:22 564:4,9	321:7,17	witness 325:11
537:23,23	564:10 565:15		325:16,18,22

[witness - yeah]

1	T	
576:5 598:25	537:21 566:5,6	wyoming 392:5
601:6,22 603:8	566:10,16,19	553:23
606:5 607:1,22	586:15 595:19	wyoming's
619:22	615:23 616:1	553:20
wnt 611:5	works 496:6	X
woman 343:7	533:25	x 330:1 331:1
won 359:6	world 360:6	332:1
wonder 521:24	361:24 596:20	xylene 534:22
word 374:16	worries 469:20	
391:9 393:11	worth 384:17	y
400:23 402:6	386:5 469:2	y 584:24 590:5
415:15 451:3	534:8 602:16	yardstick
508:9	617:4 618:7	358:14,25
wording	worthiness	359:13,15
488:19	563:14,16	yardsticks
words 420:12	would've	331:18 391:14
446:13 566:22	454:12 613:14	414:13
work 347:17	wozniak	yeah 346:11,24
348:11,12,14	324:12,19	375:1,7 377:9
362:9 379:20	399:19	394:22 395:10
402:23 410:14	wrap 510:24	395:11,22
413:23 432:15	wraps 521:13	397:6 401:2
445:22 455:17	write 364:8	418:6 421:6
467:12 472:23	434:4 518:14	422:13 428:14
477:21 489:9	writing 333:14	430:3,18,19,19
523:25 524:15	433:23 581:11	431:5 433:15
524:22 537:2	written 434:3	442:7,18
538:20 539:17	483:20 489:19	445:14 451:13
588:16,22	581:12 621:7	451:20 453:25
worked 400:1	wrong 362:18	456:17 457:18
476:15 524:17	391:4	457:18 461:5
589:7 595:19	wrote 388:25	469:18 475:9
596:17	412:7 425:4	477:20 478:22
working	486:3 510:7	479:12 480:21
335:25 336:15		482:4 483:24
	601:6,22 603:8 606:5 607:1,22 619:22 wnt 611:5 woman 343:7 won 359:6 wonder 521:24 word 374:16 391:9 393:11 400:23 402:6 415:15 451:3 508:9 wording 488:19 words 420:12 446:13 566:22 work 347:17 348:11,12,14 362:9 379:20 402:23 410:14 413:23 432:15 445:22 455:17 467:12 472:23 477:21 489:9 523:25 524:15 524:22 537:2 538:20 539:17 588:16,22 worked 400:1 476:15 524:17 589:7 595:19 596:17 working	601:6,22 603:8 606:5 607:1,22 619:22 wnt 611:5 woman 343:7 won 359:6 word 374:16 391:9 393:11 400:23 402:6 415:15 451:3 508:9 wording 488:19 words 420:12 446:13 566:22 work 347:17 348:11,12,14 362:9 379:20 402:23 410:14 413:23 432:15 445:22 455:17 467:12 472:23 477:21 489:9 523:25 524:15 524:22 537:2 worked 400:1 476:15 524:17 589:7 595:19 596:17 works 496:6 533:25 world 360:6 361:24 596:20 worries 469:20 worries 469:20 worth 384:17 386:5 469:2 534:8 602:16 617:4 618:7 would've 454:12 613:14 wozniak 324:12,19 399:19 wrap 510:24 wrap 510:24 wraps 521:13 write 364:8 434:4 518:14 433:23 581:11 writen 434:3 483:20 489:19 581:12 621:7 wrong 362:18 391:4 wrote 388:25 412:7 425:4 wrote 388:25 412:7 425:4 wrote 388:25

[yeah - zoom]

484:2 485:14	479:17 480:25	
485:20 486:8	485:5 497:8	
490:25 498:9	498:12,23	
498:20 501:13	499:18 500:4,5	
502:11 503:9	500:13,22	
503:15 505:1	514:14 518:15	
508:12 510:12	518:16 524:17	
510:23 513:18	528:11 533:22	
513:25 515:1	534:3 546:22	
515:15 516:11	549:14 553:22	
516:19 520:1	560:9 583:7,16	
521:3 522:10	585:16,16	
580:9 590:3	586:12 588:7	
593:6 621:4	590:19,21	
year 359:6	595:16 613:16	
360:3 394:15	yep 352:9	
394:18 403:8	395:19 598:13	
403:24 443:20	yesterday	
469:5 484:23	342:4 345:24	
485:3,10 486:3	357:18 378:11	
486:10 497:8,9	378:15 379:20	
500:3 506:5,13	417:6 496:24	
510:7 514:2	512:19	
515:13 528:1	yielded 550:8	
536:21 585:17	youngest	
586:3 603:2,16	337:25	
yearly 510:4	Z	
511:2	z 339:25	
years 338:4,4	zero 358:7	
338:11 340:9	362:5 372:24	
359:17 367:17	390:18 613:19	
367:18 372:20	zones 489:2	
372:23 382:7	zoom 479:10	
392:14 405:20	20022 177.10	
441:24 468:18		