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Veritext Legal Solutions

hearing on the applications of Cimarex Energy for a horizontal spacing unit and compulsory cooling in Lea County, New Mexico. Cases number 23448 and 23455 -through 23455.

Also, the applications of Cimarex Energy for compulsory pooling in Lea County, New Mexico. Cases number 23594 through 23601.

And the applications of Read \& Stevens for compulsory pooling in Lea County, New Mexico. These are cases 23508 through 23523.

I have walked through the pleadings in each of those sets of cases from the applications, obviously; so motions for continuance, prehearing statements, exhibits, supplemental exhibits, objections to exhibits, and the self-affirmed statement of four witnesses for Cimarex and four witnesses for Read \& Stevens/Permian.

Is there anything else we should talk
about before we begin the opening statements, presumably, and then the introduction of witnesses?

MR. ZIMSKY: Yes, Madam, Hearing
Examiner. William Zimsky on behalf of Cimarex.
Mr. Rankin and I had discussed and agreed to a procedure whereby Cimarex would go first. They would present their witnesses in order and
they -- we, the attorneys, would ask questions of the Cimarex witnesses regarding the exhibits and testimony of the Permian Resources' witnesses.

And then, that way -- and then, Mr.
Rankin would do cross; and then, we would do redirect and possibly recross.

Now, Cimarex -- or Permian Resources filed rebuttal exhibits late last night. It's 44pages worth or so. And so $I$ think it was at 9 'clock or so. We haven't had a real good chance to review those.

So what $I$ would suggest is that we put off questioning about the rebuttal exhibits to allow our witnesses to get a better grasp of them and put that off until tomorrow, tomorrow morning.

If we get done with the hearing before the end of today with everything else, then tomorrow, pick up with questioning on the rebuttal exhibits.

And I would propose -- and I've proposed this to Mr. Rankin; I don't think he agrees.

But I would propose that the Permian Resources witnesses speak to those rebuttal exhibits; and then we, Cimarex, would do a cross-examination and redirect. And then, we would call back our land, our geology, and our engineering experts to testify about
the rebuttal exhibits.
So and it -- based on the fact that we just got those late last night, we're requesting a limited continuance.

We had two days set for this hearing so that we -- so the request is basically to start -- to put off any questioning regarding the rebuttal exhibits until tomorrow morning or at the end of the regular hearing if it carries over into tomorrow.

MS. ORTH: Mr. Rankin?
MR. RANKIN: Thank you, Madam Hearing Officer.

Yeah. What I had proposed to Mr. Zimsky was that, in order to streamline and limit, you know, the switching back and forth between witnesses -- and I agreed that Cimarex could go first and that they would present their witnesses, as Mr. Zimsky stated, in turn; and then, after adopting their testimony on direct, that they would go right into their rebuttal testimony on exhibits.

And then, in order to save time, I
would then cross on both their direct testimony and rebuttal and get it all done at one time. And then they could do their redirect. And then we can move on to the next witness.

And that way, I thought, was the most streamlined manner of proceeding: to combine both direct and cross at one time -- rather, direct and rebuttal at one time.

Now, that was before, you know, we circulated our rebuttal exhibits at the end of the evening. We put those together in response to Cimarex's new exhibit packets that they circulated, you know, the week before the end of the prehearing order.

And those new exhibit packets, you know, included essentially new exhibits -- not just around the discovery that was made on the fairly limited issue, but basically was a significant reconfiguration of their testimony and exhibits.

And so, you know, we did put together a relatively concise rebuttal -- set of rebuttal exhibits. And we circulated them as early as we could in order to give them an opportunity to review so they could prepare a cross examination.

What I understand Mr. Zimsky's asking for, though, is more time to review our rebuttal -which we provided to them, you know, in advance -- in order to provide -- to prepare surrebuttal. Which is, you know, essentially a further rebuttal to our
rebuttal.
And I guess I don't understand the basis for that. They've had our direct testimony and exhibits from -- I don't know; I haven't added it up, but $I$ think it's almost been a month since the end of July. Maybe three weeks, anyway, since July -- since before the July 20th hearing.

And so I don't really understand why they would need the additional rebuttal from Cimarex.

Our rebuttal is narrowly focused to the issues that they've raised, and I believe it can be addressed through cross. And I don't think it needs to be that we need to go through another round of exhibits and testimony.

MS. ORTH: So the packet -- I haven't had a chance myself, actually, to look at what was filed at 9 o'clock last night.

Is it truly targeted, Mr. Rankin? It seems substantial to me.

MR. RANKIN: Well, Madam Examiner, if you may note that their exhibit packets were -- they submitted four different exhibit packets. The total page count is on the order of just under 1200 pages.

They address a substantial amount of information on their land, their geology, and their
engineering. And engineering is -- you know, went from -- I don't have the page numbers.

But they went from a relatively concise engineering testimony packet to an engineering testimony that is on the order of -- it's 50 or 60 paragraphs, over 60 paragraphs, with a whole additional set of exhibits.

And so -- yeah. I mean, I would say that our exhibits that we filed are directed. Most -- many of them are focused on the engineering side.

Some of our land exhibits do address some of the concerns we have with Cimarex's statements about support; you know, ownership issues; some title issues. We have some geology that is very, very limited; it's only two slides that address the geology. But those feed into and help explain the basis for the engineering rebuttal that we provide.

So I think it is fairly direct.
There's -- some of the pages are, frankly, just pages that address some of the working interest owners who have either changed their positions or reflected a desire to be neutral in the case going forward.

So many of those pages are really just sort of supplements, you know, demonstrating the
position of some of the additional working interest owners.

So I think if you do review it, Madam Examiner, $I$ think you'll see that it's fairly directed.

We also included some, you know -Cimarex issued an investor relations report this week that touches on some of these issues, and so we did include some slides from their investor relations report that came out two days ago.

So you'll see, I think, it's not anything, you know, out of scope. It is directed really specifically to the claims and arguments that Cimarex raises in their direct testimony.

MS. ORTH: All right. I just -- I feel
like the night -- late, the night before the hearing, particularly when we have two days set aside for the hearing, as Mr. Zimsky noted, we have an opportunity to handle the rebuttal tomorrow morning even if we do finish today.

And I'm not sure that we're going to finish today. We do need to wrap it up around 4:30 this afternoon.

One or more of the technical examiners has a work-related reason to have to be pulled away
right around 4:30. So we've not got a lot of time here today. I think we may well be going into tomorrow in any event.

So Mr. Zimsky, let's handle rebuttal tomorrow as you ask.

Is there anything else we need to talk about?

MR. GARCIA: I have a question for the parties.

MS. ORTH: Mr. Garcia?
MR. GARCIA: Do you guys plan on screen-sharing your exhibits due to the large volume of exhibits?

MR. RANKIN: Mr. Garcia, I can respond. I think in some instances, $I$ do plan to share the screen where $I$ think it's appropriate and helpful, where there's details that $I$ intend to point out or walk through.

But $I$ don't always intend to share in every circumstance here. So at least from my perspective, you know, I tend to be sort of selective in terms of what documents or exhibits I intend to put forward.

MR. SAVAGE: And Mr. Garcia, we agree
with that. We would try to identify the exhibits
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within the packet and the page numbers to facilitate their identity and location.

And if there needs to be something that needs to be examined more closely, then we would provide a share of that item. But I think testimony and exhibits are pretty self-explanatory.

MR. GARCIA: I just want to ensure that I'm looking at the right exhibit packets, because there's multi exhibit packets in the files.

So that should work, as long as these are clear on which exhibit packet we're staring at throughout your testimony and cross testimony -- or cross examination, also.

MR. SAVAGE: Thank you.
MR. RANKIN: Madam Hearing Officer, I guess there's one procedural hearing matter that may be worth raising.

And that is, as far as the direct
testimony goes -- and Mr. Zimsky and I and Mr. Savage discussed this a little bit, but -- you know, what I propose is, in order to also save time and because everything has been pre-filed and, in our case, our exhibits have been pre-filed for, you know, on the order of almost four weeks -- that rather than take any time to, you know, summarize or attempt to restate
our relatively lengthy testimony -- that we would just have our witnesses appear; be sworn in; be recognized as experts in their field; and then, essentially, adopt their testimony.

I'm happy to orient the examiners to identify the exhibits, but $I$ don't plan on spending any time summarizing the testimony.

My concern about that is it's an opportunity to -- you know, for either party -incidentally or inadvertently to, you know, confuse the testimony.

And I just think it's appropriate just to stick to what we have pre-filed.

MS. ORTH: Mr. Zimsky, I have certainly done hearings where we did that. What do you think?

MR. ZIMSKY: Yes. We have agreed. I think that's a good proposal. It'll help speed things along.

MS. ORTH: All right. And I did -actually, I printed out all the self-affirmed statement of every witness.

Okay. Anything else? No? Okay. In that case, would you like to open with opening statements? Or shall we go directly to the Cimarex witnesses?

MR. SAVAGE: Madam Hearing Examiner, if we could, we'd like to make an opening statement for this to orient that examiners towards the cases. MS. ORTH: All right. Please go ahead, Mr. Savage.

MR. SAVAGE: Madam Hearing Examiner, Technical Examiners, Counsel, these cases represent two very different views, philosophies, and strategies for developing the subject lands in an area that has both challenging and unusual geology and that presents operators with engineering and regulatory challenges. Permian Resources has been active in this area for what looks like about the past three years, during which time it has drilled a handful of wells in the Bone Spring units and less so in the Wolfcamp, and now suddenly proposes an astounding number of wells to be drilled in the subject lands: 48 in total with -- and $I$ don't think this is hyperbole to say -- with an astounding price tag at costing approximately a quarter of a billion dollars more than Cimarex's plan.

Cimarex, who has been a pioneer and leader in this area of Lea County surrounding the subject lands, has been actively working with other major players since 2010 and is an established
operator with 35 horizontal wells drilled within the basal Third Bone Spring sand; and, over the course of the past 13 years, has verified that the Third sand is the most economic target and really the best target for developing the single reservoir in this area that is located primarily in the third Bone sand.

While we see Permian Resources taking an imprudent shotgun approach by proposing a sudden blast of 48 wells into the subject land, Cimarex currently has proposed 10 wells in the pooling applications for its Loosey Goosey and Mighty Pheasant wells and is taking what we believe to be a precise and methodical approach through proven drilling that allows the collection of data, allowing Cimarex to continuously assess the progress of its development plans; to make adjustments, as necessary, of the development; that will culminate with a total of 30 wells in the subject lands and achieve the same amount of production as Permian Resources' plan, but at half the cost and without having to drill 18 unnecessary wells.
It should be noted that since Permian

Resources has proposed all 48 wells as initial wells, technically, they would have one year to commence drilling of all the wells under an order which raises
a number of questions regarding the practicality and intent of their proposals.

The question of waste, understood by the Oil and Gas Act by its ordinary meaning, becomes paramount in these cases; as is the protection of correlative rights.

Cimarex maintains that it is impossible
to prevent waste and protect correlative rights when you present working interest owners with the kind of price tag that Permian Resources wants to hang around their necks along with the excessive number of unnecessary wells.

There are still a few regulatory challenges to be addressed and resolved during these proceedings, but none of which are insurmountable if Cimarex is provided the opportunity to address them in full.

As part of this effort, Cimarex asks the Division to take judicial notice of its closing statement in related cases 23295 and 22853.

Cimarex can account for all the remaining regulatory matters and show that the subject lands can be developed without massive financial waste, without suffocating costs, and without scarring the lands by the gratuitous drilling of 18 unnecessary
and avoidable wells.
Madam Hearing Examiner, Cimarex thanks the Division for the opportunity to present its cases today.

MS. ORTH: Thank you, Mr. Savage.
Mr. Rankin?
MR. RANKIN: Thank you, Madam Hearing Officer. May it please the Division.

Cimarex, in our view here, is looking to make these cases into a contest of technical testimony and competing expert opinions over geology and engineering. For sure, you're going to hear that today and tomorrow.

But what Cimarex's witnesses are going to tell you is that this acreage is unique, because there are unknown geomechanical barriers or hydrocarbon barriers to flow separating the basal Third Bone Spring sand from the upper Wolfcamp.

Now, those two zones are both hydrocarbon-rich zones, and they're targets in different Division-designated pools. One's in the Bone Spring pool, and the other is in the Wolfcamp pool.

The fact that there's not a barrier between them, however, is not unique. As you'll hear
from Permian's witnesses, it's a relatively common occurrence. The catch is that there's an ownership difference between the pools.

The owners and the ownership
percentages for each of the contested spacing units in all of these cases are not the same between the two pools. Some owners own a greater share in the Bone Spring. Some own a greater share in the Wolfcamp. And two owners don't own an interest at all in the Bone Spring; they only own in the Wolfcamp.

But even the difference in ownership here between the two zones is not unique. It's a relatively -- again, relatively common occurrence for there to be variation in the ownership between formations or pools or even, in some circumstances, in the middle of a Division-designated pool.

At most, these ownership differences represent a hiccup when forced-pooling is required. It can be complicated when ownership breaks occur right in the middle of a pool, but that's something we deal with every day or every week at hearings. It's not uncommon. Or even -- in some circumstances; right -- you know, as $I$ said, in the middle of a pool.

Now, you know, it's not generally a big issue. Now, the only time it can be an issue -- as it
is here -- is when, you know, the target intervals that we've identified -- that both parties -- well, Permian has identified and, at least as to one of the targets, Cimarex has identified -- are right at the pool boundary along an ownership break as we have here between the Bone Spring and the Wolfcamp.

But that still is not an intractable challenge. As you will hear, Cimarex and supporters generally own a greater share of interest in the Bone Spring. Their preference is to drill the Bone Spring only and not drill the Wolfcamp.

Their position is that the Wolfcamp is completely uneconomic in this acreage and that it would be a waste to drill it. Their view is that the Bone Spring can better drain and produce than Wolfcamp.

Cimarex goes as far as to say that the Division should place a buffer, a barrier, in the upper Wolfcamp to keep it from being developed at all. They want to do that, they say, to protect the correlative rights; and who they're protecting is the Bone Spring owners.

But the problem here is that Cimarex is proposing to drill and produce only from the Bone Spring. And they would wall off the Wolfcamp owners
for the benefit of the Bone Spring owners.
That proposal would severely and irreparably harm all of the Wolfcamp owners. All of them. They would no longer have an opportunity to produce their minerals.

That's what's unique in this case, is that Cimarex is essentially disregarding the correlative rights of the owners in the Wolfcamp. What they're proposing here to get around that problem are two options; okay? But besides being impracticable, those two options also conflict directly with the express provisions of the Oil and Gas Act.

Now, those are legal issues for another time. I'm not going to get into them. But while Cimarex is proposing to drill only the Bone Spring; Permian, on the other hand, wants to drill and produce from both the Bone Spring and the upper Wolfcamp.

As you'll hear, the testimony and the evidence demonstrates that that -- those two zones are really independent, separate targets and justify co-development. And from Permian's point of view, I think you'll hear -- as you'll hear, that both those targets need to be developed together at the same time.

Not only is this the most practicable way to protect the correlative rights of owners on both sides of the pool boundary; but developing these targets is the only way, we submit, to efficiently and effectively produce both zones.

So as you heard in Cimarex's attacking Permian's approach as being too expensive, but Permian's more robust plan is intended to provide flexibility and was proposed to counter Cimarex's initial earlier proposal, which we view as more of a cookie-cutter approach that doesn't specifically target or identify or respond to the specific unique -- the different geology in this area relative to other areas and offsetting tracts.

In sum, Cimarex is proposing only the Bone Spring and prevent Wolfcamp owners from producing their own minerals in the Wolfcamp. And we think that's not the correct way to develop this acreage.

There's no factual or legal basis for the Division to endorse or adopt Cimarex's proposal here. Permian's plan is more reasonable, more practical, more efficient and effective, and will protect all the owners' interests.

And so we appreciate approval of our applications over Cimarex's. Thank you.

MS. ORTH: Thank you, Mr. Rankin.
Let's see. Mr. Savage, would you like
to call your first witness, then?
MR. SAVAGE: I would. Thank you, Madam
Examiner. I'll call Mr. John Coffman, who is the landman for Cimarex Energy Company.

MS. ORTH: Good morning. Or -- yeah.
Good morning, Mr. Coffman.
MR. COFFMAN: Good morning.
MS. ORTH: If you would please raise your right hand. Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes. I do.
MS. ORTH: Thank you. And if you would spell your name for the transcript?

MR. COFFMAN: J-O-H-N C-O-F-F-M-A-N.
MS. ORTH: Thank you very much.
Go ahead, Mr. Savage.
MR. SAVAGE: Okay. Thank you.
Mr. Coffman, can you state your full
name for the record?
MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. John Coffman.
MR. SAVAGE: And you are expert witness
in professional land matters who has testified before the division; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: I have.
MR. SAVAGE: And you have made the effort to present Cimarex's 16 cases in digestible packets for the hearing examiners; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes, I have.
MR. SAVAGE: And you have written testimony in each of Cimarex's hearing packets -- and those are one through four -- that varies to some degree; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes.
MR. SAVAGE: And Hearing Packet 1
covers cases 23448 through 2341 for the Mighty Pheasant cases in the Bone Spring formation in which your written testimony is provided in Exhibit A followed by sub-exhibits A1 through A10; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: That's correct.
MR. SAVAGE: And Hearing Packet 2 covers cases 23452 through 23455 for the Loosey Goosey cases in the Bone Spring formation in which your written testimony is provided in Exhibits A followed by sub-exhibits A1 through A8; is that correct?

MR. COFFMAN: That's correct.
MR. SAVAGE: And Hearing Packet 3 covers cases 2352 through 2355 and 2352 through -- and 23594 through 23601 in relation to those cases
describing Cimarex's option one in which your written testimony is provided in Exhibit A followed by sub-exhibit A1; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: That's correct.
MR. SAVAGE: And finally -- and I
apologize for going through this, but there is a lot of information and we need to get it into the record.

Hearing Packet 4 covers Cases 23594
through 23601 for the Wolfcamp describing Cimarex's option two in which your written testimony is provided in Exhibit A followed by sub-exhibits A1 through A7; is that correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes.
MR. SAVAGE: Mr. Coffman, do you
testify that these -- that your exhibits are accurate and correct to the best of your knowledge?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes.
MR. SAVAGE: Madam Hearing Examiner, I
ask that Exhibits -- that Land Exhibits As, all sub-exhibits A1 through A10 as applicable in each Hearing Packet 1 through 4 in Cases 23448 through 23451 and 23594 through 23597 and 23452 through 23455 and finally 23598 through 23601 be admitted into the record.

```
                                MS. ORTH: Mr. Rankin, any objection?
```

MR. RANKIN: No objection.
MS. ORTH: Okay.
Then, let me just ask if there's any objection from anyone else who entered an appearance? No? All right. They're admitted.

Thank you, Mr. Savage.
MR. SAVAGE: Thank you.
And thank you for your patience for all of that. Mr. Coffman, have you reviewed Permian Resource's land testimony and exhibits? Those of Mr. Macha [ph] and any other of their exhibits that relate to land matters?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes, I have.
MR. SAVAGE: And Mr. Coffman, I know that just a few minutes Mr. Rankin said that he would not get into the legal matters of this case.

But that seems to be central to this based on Mr. Mancha's [ph] testimony; do you agree?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. I agree.
MR. SAVAGE: And it looks like Mr. Macha [ph] seems to think, as he testifies in his Paragraph 5, that Cimarex's plan -- option two as well as option one --

MR. RANKIN: Examiner, I object to the form of the question. Mr. Darin seems to be leading
the witness. And I guess I would ask that he just ask open-ended questions for his witness to testify.

MS. ORTH: Yeah. Please, Mr. Savage.
MR. SAVAGE: Thank you. I will do that. I was just trying to get everything in as context.

But Mr. Coffman, looking at Mr. Macha's [ph] Paragraph 5 in this testimony, regarding his claim -- do you have an opinion on his claim that Cimarex does not meet statutory mandate?

MR. COFFMAN: Well, I'm not an attorney. But in my opinion, I think that that is an issue that needs to be addressed by the Division, maybe with additional pleadings by either you or additional counsel on that statutory mandate that he's referencing.

MR. SAVAGE: And he seems to argue that we do not satisfy the allocation statute.

Does Cimarex have a formula in place for its Third Bone Spring well to satisfy the allocation formula --

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah.
MR. SAVAGE: -- apply to the statute?
MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. We do. It's in
our option two.

MR. SAVAGE: Okay. And if Cimarex were asked and needed to provide it, we could provide that to the Division for their review; is that correct?

MR. COFFMAN: That's correct.
MR. SAVAGE: Mr. Macha [ph] goes on.
It looks like that he seems to think that -- in Paragraph 6 of Mr. Macha's [ph] testimony, it looks like he contrasts Permian Resource's plan across ten sections and talks about the extensive position of Read \& Stevens.

Can you -- do you have an opinion? Do you agree with those claims that he makes?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. I think -- I think Travis is referencing Permian's acreage to the south. But $I$ don't know if that encompasses our leasehold that is to the north, which covers around 20 sections. And that's in 19 South 34 East and 19 South 33 East.

I would say that, you know, there's -- their acreage is, like I said, towards the south and ours to the north. So...

MR. SAVAGE: And he seems to suggest that Permian Resources has been more active and has more -- a bit more active in the area of interest; do you agree with that?

MR. COFFMAN: I -- no, not necessarily.

I think there's a lot of communications that happen behind the scenes regardless of, you know, wells being drilled.

I know for a fact I've been working on trying to get a federal unit put together up in 19-34. And those conversations are through email and not necessarily public record.

So you know, the amount of work that goes into filing and getting a federal unit set up -especially with acres that has federal units already on it -- takes a lot of work and a lot of, you know -I hate to use the phrase "stacking hands," but a lot of stacking hands.

MR. SAVAGE: So it's true that you have been active in this area. Can you describe the extent of your activity?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. I think we're trying to, like I said, set up a federal unit on 12 sections, 14 sections, for full-field development directly to the north of this area.

You know, these things take time, especially from a federal-unit standpoint. So we've been, you know, reaching out to other working interest owners in this area.

Not everything is, you know, fifty-
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fifty, everybody on at a hundred percent in the section anymore, so -- especially up in this area. So it's pretty -- it's pretty hairy.

MR. SAVAGE: And you have been -- how
have you been working with the other major players? Have you been working well with them?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. I think there's a lot of smaller individual owners; you know, medium-sized companies; and the larger companies that we've been working with that are pretty open to negotiations and moving forward with a reasonable plan of development.

I think trying to work with Read \& Stevens has been the hardest in this area, you know, in the last years that I've been working on this. So it's -- I would say that Read \& Stevens was extremely difficult to work with.

But I'd say Permian Resources has been much more responsive, but nothing has come out of the meetings that we've had on a -- you know, a trade situation or anything like that.

So we -- I'd say that for these four sections, we've tried to operate within, you know, a proven operator -- how a proven operator would. I think it's just been a difficult road to -- trying to
get something resolved and get this acreage drilled.
MR. SAVAGE: It looks like in some of Permian Resources' exhibits that they give a history of Read \& Stevens prior to Permian Resources being involved.

How has that history been with Cimarex?
Has there been obstacles? Or has it been smooth?
MR. COFFMAN: No. There's -- there was a highly contentious operatorship battle that went over on the majority of these plans covered the south half of Sections 4 and 5 and all of Sections 8 and 9. They're under a 1979 operating agreement.

We went to court on that with Read \& Stevens, and the court said that there was a lack of operatorship vote. So we had sent out our elections for operatorship to the parties under that operating agreement.

And we received the majority of support. And we sent a letter to Read \& Stevens showing that, and they ignored it and refuted it.

And then, I think a couple years ago, they had apartments that were about to expire. So they -- without proposing wells to anyone under that operating agreement -- spud and set surface casing on three wells in Section 9.

So that's also an obstacle we've been trying to deal with, is how do we develop when -- how do we develop as a prudent operator within an area where people are spudding wells out of one mile in the middle of the section?

MR. SAVAGE: Okay. And one of the seven factors that the Division considers in their evaluation of competing applications is good faith negotiations. Do you think that this plays -- these interactions with Read \& Stevens plays a role in that evaluation?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes, sir.
MR. SAVAGE: Okay. Could you elaborate on that a little bit?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. I think -- like I said, I think the original Read \& stevens discussions we've had with them -- I mean, we tried to get in front of them and, you know, offered to go to New Mexico to Roswell to meet with them.

And then, you know -- oh, they were in Fort Worth that weekend or that week. So we offered to go to Fort Worth; and it -- you know, the plans just never matched up.

And it was just tough to get ahold of or at least, you know, in some sort of discussion with
them, you know, on getting this acreage developed.
But I would say, Permian, they are much more responsive. You know, I've talked with Travis. I think we've had -- shoot -- four, five meetings; you know, discussions about, you know, just how do we move forward.

I don't think, from the Permian side, that it's been nearly as contentious. But we just haven't been able to come to a, you know, trade or deal. And that's -- virtual connectivity error -from our side.

MR. SAVAGE: Okay. And in Mr. Macha's [ph] Exhibit C5 and testimony, he seems to claim that there is acreage that supports Permian Resources' development plan. But $I$ don't see any acreage percentages listed; do you?

MR. COFFMAN: No. Not in C5. No.
MR. SAVAGE: Okay. And I guess part of that larger package of 44 pages -- plus pages, there may be some exhibits in there that address.

But can you talk about the kind of working interest support? In rebutting Mr. Macha's [ph] claims, can you describe the kind of working interest support that Cimarex has garnered?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. I would say for
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each proration unit in the Loosey Goosey and Mighty Pheasant developments and for both Bone Spring and Wolfcamp, we have the majority of support from owners that own in the Bone Spring and own in the Wolfcamp in all except for the west-half west-half of Sections 5 and 8 in the Wolfcamp.

I think that is mainly in pause due to Read \& Steven's entities owning almost 50 percent in that Wolfcamp west-half west-half proration unit. But I mean even in the Wolfcamp developments and the Bone Spring developments, for every proration unit, we have the majority support from all working interest owners there.

MR. SAVAGE: Okay. And in rebutting Mr. Macha [ph], do we have exhibits and tables that the examiners can look at that show that majority?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes. Yes, we do.
MR. SAVAGE: On the Hearing Packet 1 -- and this is page 175 -- I'm looking at Exhibit A9. Is this an example of an exhibit that demonstrates this? What you just described?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes. That's correct. And $I$ would say that even with regard to the addition of Challenger's letter and Matador and Foran being neutral, we still have the majority interest of
support in both the Bone Spring and the Wolfcamp except for that west-half west-half proration unit in the Wolfcamp.

MR. SAVAGE: Okay. And those items you just described are part of that last-minute exhibits that we will look at, hopefully, tomorrow in more detail.

But as you're saying -- as I understand, even with those adjustments, you still have majority support?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes. That's correct.
MR. SAVAGE: Can you look at Exhibit A9 and describe how the exhibit table shows this in terms of just, you know, a general description of how it's labeled?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. So we're using -- this is coming from our ownership report, our title opinion that we had rendered in June of 2023. So these are using those numbers.

I know the Permian numbers are different compared to ours. But we do, later on, use Permian's numbers and still show that we are the majority. We have the support of the majority in there.

So in blue is $P R$ support or $P R$-owned,
and that shows Permian Resources in the west-half west-half Sections 5 and 8. And then yellow is Coterra support or Coterra-owned. And then white is neutral; so those -- they are not being credited towards anyone on Exhibit A9.

MR. SAVAGE: Okay. And this
exhibit -- there's exhibits like this in each of the hearing packets for the different cases; is that correct?

MR. COFFMAN: That's correct.
MR. SAVAGE: So Hearing Packet 2 would address the Loosey Goosey and it would have a table like this; and then Hearing Packet 4, which addresses the pooling of the Wolfcamp, would have a table like this for the Wolfcamp as well; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: That's correct.
MR. SAVAGE: Okay. So these are all readily available to the examiners to be used?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes, sir.
MR. SAVAGE: Okay. I'm looking at
Exhibit A10. This is in regards to Mr. Macha's [ph] claim that they have the superior development plan.

What exactly is this exhibit
describing?
MR. COFFMAN: This shows the comparison
between total Permian Resources development cost, their net cost per working interest owner; and then our development cost and the net cost per working interest owner; and then the difference between developments which comes out to be $\$ 256$ million and some change.

And I would just like to point out that -- aside from Northern, Matador, Cimarex, and Permian Resources -- a lot of these folks are small. You know, they're small companies that are not used to operating within the hundreds of millions of dollars.

So I know, like, the Hudson group which would be Javelina partners and Zoro partners. I'm not speaking on their financial basis, but $I$ would find it hard for them to probably, you know, come up with $\$ 30$ million for a, you know, Permian Resources development. That'd be difficult.

MR. SAVAGE: And what would that have to come up with for Cimarex?

MR. COFFMAN: Half. Half of that.
MR. SAVAGE: Okay. And Mr. Macha [ph], in Paragraph 5 of his testimony, he makes claims that correlative rights would be undermined if Cimarex's plans were adopted even though, it looks like, it's half the cost.

Can you explain? Talk a little bit about -- it seems like correlative rights are a major here. Can you talk a little bit about how Cimarex would uphold correlative rights?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. I think just by having the support of owners that are in the Wolfcamp and the Bone Spring shows that our development is, you know, more appealing to protecting their correlative rights across both formations. I think that shows that pretty clearly.

Another thing to note would be -- I know it'll come up, so -- CLM Production and Warren \& Associates. You know, they own in that west-half west-half of Sections 5 and 8 in the Wolfcamp. We offered -- at our detriment, Coterra's detriment -- to assign them a like-for-like interest in the Third Bone Spring so that they would have, you know, an opportunity to share across formations at -- each would be a half-a-percent working interest in there. And they refused.

We were not looking for a change of support. We knew that they were going to support Permian on their development regardless, but that was something we did, you know, to make it like-for-like across third Bone and the Wolfcamp.

MR. SAVAGE: Well, I'm looking at these numbers and it looks to me like the owners would benefit. Even if they were just paid on the Bone Spring, they would benefit far more under Cimarex's plan than Permian Resources' --

MR. RANKIN: Madam Officer, you know, I'm trying to just object and ask Mr. Coffman --

MR. SAVAGE: I'll rephrase. I'll rephrase the question.

MR. RANKIN: Thank you.
MR. SAVAGE: Looking at this exhibit, do you think that the owners would benefit more under Cimarex's plan or Permian Resources' plan? And why?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes, I do. And I think Eddie has a good amount of slides in his exhibits that show the nitty-gritty numbers of that.

But just on a layman landman basis, you know, if you were to stand to make $X$ amount of money regardless and you could pay $\$ 283$ million for it or $\$ 539$ million for it, I think most people would choose the lower cost for the same outcome.

MR. SAVAGE: And when you refer to Eddie, who are you referring to?

MR. COFFMAN: Eddie Behm, our reservoir engineer.

MR. SAVAGE: Mr. Coffman, I thank you for your time. That's all the questions $I$ have at this point.

MR. COFFMAN: Thank you.
MS. ORTH: Thank you, Mr. Savage.
Mr. Rankin, do you have questions of
Mr. Coffman based on his testimony?
MR. RANKIN: Thank you, Madam Hearing Officer. I do.

I guess one thing I just want to bring up is a housekeeping matter. I understood the questions directed to Mr . Coffman were in the nature of rebuttal; and so $I$ understand that, as far as Cimarex's rebuttal, that that would have been incorporated in Mr. Coffman's testimony.

MS. ORTH: Right. So I think you can question him about anything he just said --

MR. RANKIN: Yeah. I --
MS. ORTH: -- and anything that was filed in his self-affirmed statement.

MR. RANKIN: Yeah. Understood. I appreciate that. I just wanted to make sure. I wanted to make sure $I$ understood that Cimarex is putting on its rebuttal case today, and I'll be crossing on both direct and their rebuttal.

MS. ORTH: Mr. Savage, any
clarification there?
MR. SAVAGE: If Mr. Rankin could repeat
that, I'd appreciate that.
MR. RANKIN: I just -- I was a little confused by Mr. Zimsky's request. But I guess, based on your presentation with Mr. Coffman, I understand that Cimarex is going to proceed to present its witnesses on the direct testimony and as a rebuttal to Permian's direct testimony today.

MR. SAVAGE: Well, Mr. Zimsky --
MS. ORTH: So Mr. Zimsky, I did hear Mr. Savage lead Mr. Coffman through a number of rebuttals to Mr. Macha's [ph] self-affirmed statement in particular.

MR. ZIMSKY: Yes. So I think -- my impression was that was the agreement that we had with Mr. Rankin to speed things along; that we would get through our witnesses, and they would testify on direct to rebut the package of exhibits and testimony that were submitted, I think, on July 14 th by Permian but not the rebuttal exhibits that were filed last night.

MS. ORTH: All right. Are we on the same page, Mr. Rankin?

MR. RANKIN: I think so. I think so. I mean, I'll reserve my response, I guess, you know, about their ability to file additional exhibits or have additional testimony on our rebuttal.

But I just wanted to make sure I understood that they're putting forth their rebuttal towards our direct testimony today, as well. That's all. I appreciate the clarification.

MR. ZIMSKY: Yes. That's correct.
MS. ORTH: Thank you.
MR. RANKIN: Yeah. Thank you, Madam Hearing Officer.

Good morning, Mr. Coffman.
MR. COFFMAN: Good morning.
MR. SAVAGE: So I'm going to do my best to keep myself organized here. I'm going to try to focus on one of the exhibit packets. I know that your testimony is generally the same, but there is some variation. And I think, as I understand, really the only testimony that caries between the exhibit packets is yours; is that correct?

MR. COFFMAN: I'd have to -- I'll take your word for it. There's a lot of hearing packets.

MR. RANKIN: there are a lot of hearing packets. Okay. Well, we'll figure that out, I guess,
as we go forward.
Now I'm going to start off with the first hearing packet, Hearing Packet number 1; which, as I understand, addresses the Mighty Pheasant Bone Spring cases; is that correct?

MR. COFFMAN: That's correct.
MR. RANKIN: Okay. And I'm going to ask -- I'm going to direct your attention first to Paragraph 29 of your statement.

MR. COFFMAN: Okay.
MR. RANKIN: And this goes to the discussion around the relationship between Read \& Stevens and Cimarex. And you discussed this to some extent in your rebuttal, in your dialogue with Mr. Savage.

And I understood you to essentially distinguish between the time in which -- the time before Read \& Stevens acquired -- sorry -- the time before Permian Resources acquired Read \& Stevens's interests as to the status of your relationship or ability to communicate with Read \& Stevens.

In other words: prior to Permian
Resources acquiring Read \& Stevens's interests, that relationship was difficult; is that fair to say?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes. I'd agree with

| 1 | that. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MR. RANKIN: But after Permian |
| 3 | Resources acquired it, it was a cordial relationship. |
| 4 | And you were able to have good communications, but you |
| 5 | just weren't able to reach agreement; is that fair to |
| 6 | say? |
| 7 | MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. I agree with that. |
| 8 | MR. RANKIN: So the issue that you're |
| 9 | raising about whether or not -- whether, you know, |
| 10 | Read \& Stevens's behavior towards Cimarex should |
| 11 | implicate good faith negotiations was all behavior |
| 12 | that occurred prior to Permian Resources' acquisition |
| 13 | of Read \& Stevens; is that correct? |
| 14 | MR. COFFMAN: That's correct. |
| 15 | MR. RANKIN: And in fact, the specific |
| 16 | issues that you raised -- that you suggested |
| 17 | reflected, you know, negatively on good faith |
| 18 | efforts -- involved activities outside of the four |
| 19 | sections at issue in these cases; correct? |
| 20 | MR. COFFMAN: Outside of the four |
| 21 | sections? |
| 22 | MR. RANKIN: Is that true or not? |
| 23 | MR. COFFMAN: Could you repeat it one |
| 24 | more time for me? |
| 25 | MR. RANKIN: Yeah. Did the activity |
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that involved Read \& Stevens, were they outside of the four sections at issue in these cases? Or were they involving some of the acreage here?

MR. COFFMAN: It was solely this
acreage here.
MR. RANKIN: Now -- okay. Now, I'm on
that paragraph that $I$ directed your attention to, Paragraph 29 in your statement. This is where, I believe, you start referencing that 1979 operating agreement.

That 1979 operating agreement covers, as I understand, the south half of Sections 4 and 5 and all of Sections 8 and 9; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: That's correct.
MR. RANKIN: And I'm just going to refer to it as you do here, which is -- I'm just going to call it the "1979 OA"; okay?

Now that includes essentially everything at issue in these contested cases except for the north half of Sections 4 and 5; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: That's correct.
MR. RANKIN: Now Cimarex has contended that it's the operator under that $O A$; right?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: But it doesn't include all
the acres at issue in these contested cases?
MR. COFFMAN: That's correct.
MR. RANKIN: And as a consequence, you have provided in your exhibit packet a copy of -- for both sets of cases, the Mighty Pheasant and the Loosey Goosey -- the front pages of a proposed joint operating agreement that would cover this acreage entirely; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: That's correct.
MR. RANKIN: And just so I'm clear, the reason that you've done so and the reason you proposed a JOA that would cover all the acreage is because that 1979 operating agreement addresses only the development of that contract area, being the south half of Sections 4 and 5 and all of Sections 8 and 9, but excludes the north half of Sections 4 and 5; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: That's correct.
MR. RANKIN: So there's currently no agreement among all the working interest owners to combine their interests in Sections 4 and 9 for the Loosey Goosey or Sections 5 and 8 for the Mighty Pheasant; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: I would say that the 1979 OA is still in effect. So for the north half of 4 and

5, I would agree that there is not an operating agreement that covers 4 and 9 and 5 and 8 .

MR. RANKIN: But Mr. Coffman, you
didn't just propose an operating agreement that only covers the north half of those tracts.

You proposed an operating agreement that's going to supersede and cover the entire acreage; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: That's correct.
MR. RANKIN: And the reason you're doing that is because your operators don't currently have an agreement in place to combine their interests for the entire acreage; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: That's correct.
MR. RANKIN: And the only way to do that is to propose a new JOA that covers all the acreage; fair to say?

MR. COFFMAN: That's correct.
MR. RANKIN: Thank you. Now I'm going to come back to the JOA, but $I$ just wanted to touch on that as a framework for our discussions.

Now in the original exhibits you filed when this case was originally going to go to hearing in July, at the end of each of the individual spacing unit working interest breakdowns for each case, you
prepared a complete list of the parties that were going to be pooled; do you recall that?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: And it appeared to me that that list was actually all the working interests in each spacing unit; is that correct?

MR. COFFMAN: That's correct.
MR. RANKIN: And I take it that, upon reflection and reviewing your updated exhibits, you intended only to identify in that summary list the parties who you're seeking to pool which is only those who remain uncommitted; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes. That is correct.
MR. RANKIN: Okay. So you made that adjustment in the updated exhibits?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes. That is correct.
MR. RANKIN: Okay. Now so I kind of want to walk through that with you on the updated exhibits, because you've identified as being committed to Permian -- I mean, rather, Cimarex's proposal.

And I'm going to start -- I guess it's at Exhibit A-2.1 in your Hearing Packet number 1. That first page is a copy of -- let's see; I'm not sure if it makes sense -- I guess I could pull this up here. Let's see.

MR. COFFMAN: If you could give me a page number, that would be awesome.

MR. RANKIN: Well, unfortunately, your exhibit packets weren't paginated from the beginning. And so I guess I could do it on a PDF-page basis.

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. That'd be great.
MR. RANKIN: Looks like it should be PDF page 65.

I will go ahead and, if it's okay, share my screen. Let me know when you can see my screen, Mr. Coffman.

MR. COFFMAN: Yep. I can see it.
MR. RANKIN: Great. Okay. So this is the first working interest ownership breakdown for the Mighty Pheasant cases, and it's east-half east half.

And on this land ownership plot, you've identified different tracts; and by color, identified the leases associated with each one.

And then on the subsequent pages, you've identified for each tract the ownership interests and the net acres associated with those owners; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: That's correct.
MR. RANKIN: And then on the far-right column, you've identified whether they've committed to

Cimarex's development plan or not; right?
MR. COFFMAN: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: Now when you say
"committed" or "uncommitted", what do you mean by that? What does that mean?

MR. COFFMAN: So "committed" is they have either signed a letter of support for us; I have either had written or verbal communication with them; or they have signed our operating agreement.

MR. RANKIN: You've indicated here on your list that -- even though you don't have a JOA -but you either got an email or letter or you verbally got their confirmation that they're going to join your JOA, you've marked them as committed?

MR. COFFMAN: That's correct.
MR. RANKIN: Now I'm going to scroll down through these, because $I$ just have a couple questions. And I got a little confused when $I$ was trying to go through all these to sort it all out.

And I know there's a lot here and there's a lot of owners. And it's -- you know, I don't -- you know, it's not easy to keep track of; and that was what $I$ was trying to do, was keep track of it.

> So especially with respect to the
ownership support that you reflect, I just want to make sure $I$ got this straight.

So I'm looking at this page here. I
scrolled down. You noted yourself in your rebuttal testimony -- I'm going to stop here at Challenger Crude.

If you would just clarify for the examiners, when you refer to Challenger Crude very lately, very recently changing its position -- if you would just explain for the examiners what occurred and what you understand Challenger Crude's position is at this point?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. And that'll be shown in the rebuttal tomorrow on those exhibits.

But Challenger sent that letter -- and I think everyone's seen it -- that says that they would join whoever prevails in this hearing.

But at the time when $I$ had put them as "committed," they had signed up under our operating agreement.

MR. RANKIN: Right. And they actually
indicate that in the letter: that they had signed the JOA, but given the nature of the contested case -correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Coffman, as I paraphrase -- but they indicated that, for purposes of
this hearing, they're going to stay neutral; is that correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. That's correct.
MR. RANKIN: They're no longer
supporting either party. They're going to be neutral. Okay.

So for every instance where we see Challenger Crude in each tract, that should be changed from committed to uncommitted; right?

MR. COFFMAN: That's correct.
MR. RANKIN: Okay. Now I just want to make sure I understood. And I scrolled through here. I wasn't quite sure what the status of this trustee -trust interest is.

You mark it as committed; did that interest sign a term assignment over to Cimarex? What's the status of that interest?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes. Yes, they did. They term-assigned us their interest.

MR. RANKIN: Thank you. I just wanted to make sure $I$ understood that.

Now continuing to scroll through here, I note that you've indicated here that Chase has -- is a committed interest.

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah.

MR. RANKIN: And this is one where I'm a little confused. Because I think depending on what tract I look at or what exhibit I have, they're either committed or uncommitted.

So I guess my -- and as you probably have seen in our rebuttal exhibits, Chase has submitted a letter indicating that they have -- like Northern -- have concerns about the development of interests across Bone Springs and Wolfcamp.

And I guess I just want to make sure I understand that you've indicated here they're committed; but is it, in fact, the case that they remain uncommitted?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. We can -- we could change them to uncommitted.

MR. RANKIN: So in every instance where Chase shows up, it should be an uncommitted interest; right?

MR. COFFMAN: Yep. I agree with that.
MR. RANKIN: Okay. Now similarly, you know, I'll note on this same tract; okay? As I scroll down past Chase, I see the Mark's Oil interest here; okay?

And I know in your summary you've got them as uncommitted, and you've got them here as
uncommitted. But in certain instances, as I scroll through -- in particular, the very next tract -- I see that they're marked here as committed.

MR. COFFMAN: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: In the same spacing as -so again, $I$ just want to make sure $I$ understand that in every instance where we see Mark's, they should be actually noted as uncommitted?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. They're shown as a party to be pooled on the recapitulation down below, as well. So that's simply just a typo of Mark's Oil.

MR. RANKIN: And then, I also see that you've got Union Oil listed as committed. And I see that that's the case in certain of your exhibits, that you've got them listed as a committed interest; is that your understanding?

MR. COFFMAN: It was until the email that was submitted last night came about. But we can change them to uncommitted as well based on Robert's email.

MR. RANKIN: But you don't have a joint operating agreement signed with Union Oil at this point?

MR. RANKIN: No. That -- we listed them as committed just based on either verbal or email
or some understanding that they were going to be committed to your plan; right?

MR. COFFMAN: That's correct.
MR. RANKIN: So in every instance, then, where we see Union Oil and Gas, they should be switched from committed to uncommitted; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: That's correct.
MR. SAVAGE: Madam Hearing Examiner, I believe Mr. Coffman would stipulate and we would stipulate that any typo or variation based on an email or a confirmed letter would be adjusted.

I don't know if it's useful to go through every single one of these. Some are typos. Some are based on, like, rebuttal letters.

But can we stipulate that they would be adjusted accordingly when we get to the rebuttal part?

MR. RANKIN: Sure.
And Madam Hearing Officer, I just have a couple more to go through because there's a few that remain, you know, I'm -- concerns about title and some other parties who don't appear to be included here.

I just want to make sure I got -- I'm on the same page as Cimarex.

MS. ORTH: All right. Go ahead.
MR. RANKIN: Thank you.

Now Mr. Coffman, I think -- in order to save time, I think I heard you mention also during the rebuttal testimony that you understood Matador is indicated that its intent is to be neutral here in this case; is that right?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. Matador and Foran.
MR. RANKIN: Because in the interests ownership breakdown, you had identified that they were committed. But just to be clear, you understand at this point their intent is to be neutral?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: Okay. And again, so every instance where they're identified would be an uncommitted interest?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: Okay. And then, you mentioned Foran. Now of course, when I look at your working interest breakdown and I look at your exhibits in -- let me see what it is -- A9, I think it is.

Yeah. A9. I don't see them, I don't think, on there. So I don't see Foran on there for either the Mighty Pheasant or the Loosey Goosey. And I don't think $I$ saw them in the Wolfcamp, either.

But on A10 where you've assessed the costs for full development under both Permian and

Cimarex's plans, I do see Foran listed. And I see you assigned them a cost of approximately $\$ 5.6$ million under your plan.

But $I$ don't see them in any of the working interests breakdown so I don't know where they are in terms of working interest ownership; were they a party that you provided a law proposal to?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes. So under my Exhibit A9, they're actually shown fourth from the bottom owning in the east-half west-half of Section 5 and 8 in the Mighty Pheasant Bone Spring proration unit, MRC Permian. Or are you specifically referencing Foran? MR. RANKIN: I'm referencing Foran. MR. COFFMAN: Okay. Yeah. So for my Exhibit A10, rather than argue -- have our title attorneys argue on who's correct and who's incorrect, I thought it'd be prudent to use y'all's interests that were provided in a comparison between net cost per working interest owner.

I think, you know, we have our title up-to-date from up to June 2023. I'm not -- I know -I think Travis's exhibit mentions that theirs is up-to-date from 2023, too. So that, I mean -- that's obviously something that we're going to have to get sorted out.

But for the comparison of Permian Resources' development and Coterra's development, I used the interests that were provided by Permian just as a quick look for the differences in cost.

MR. RANKIN: Right. So just so I understand: At this point in time, your title doesn't show Foran as owning in any of Cimarex's units; is that right?

MR. COFFMAN: That's correct.
MR. RANKIN: Okay. But you acquired a change-of-title opinion that covers all of Sections 4, 5, 8, and 9 in these cases; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. That's correct.
MR. RANKIN: And that was updated as of June 2023?

MR. COFFMAN: That's correct.
MR. RANKIN: Did that -- when you -now just to be clear -- and I don't think -- I don't know that $I$ 've got many questions on this, Mr . Coffman; but $I$ just want to, you know, make sure $I$ understand. Because I think if the examiners are looking at our ownership interests and breakdown, they may have questions about why there's not an alignment -- okay -- as we both have updated title.

I understand, based on Mr. Savage's
initial objections to our exhibits, that Cimarex has prepared its ownership representations on a contractual interest basis; is that correct?

MR. COFFMAN: That's correct.
MR. RANKIN: And just so I'm clear when
I say "contractual interest" and when you say "contractual interest", will you explain what you mean when you say that you prepared your ownership breakdowns on a contractual interest basis?

MR. COFFMAN: So we have to take into account the 1979 OA that we referenced that is still in effect. So when we supersede those, you still have to take the contractual interest of that 179 OA that covers the south half of Sections 4, 5, 8, and 9; and then take the leasehold ownership or whatever contractual interests are in the north half of 4 and 5 and, you know, make those three twenties in a contractual basis. If that answers your question?

MR. RANKIN: I think for purposes of right now, it does. And I think essentially, then -- I think if $I$ were to just follow-up on that.

Essentially, what you're saying is that the leasehold interests -- the pure, record title leasehold interest that each owner has in each space unit is being adjusted in accordance with their
contractual rights under that 1979 JOA that partially overlaps the proposed spacing acreage?

MR. COFFMAN: When you mean "record title", what do you mean by "record title"?

MR. RANKIN: Well, I mean if you're looking at a spacing unit, who is the owner of the mineral interests within the spacing unit?

I would say a leasehold owner in a spacing unit is a record title owner of that mineral interest.

MR. COFFMAN: Okay. Could you repeat your question? Sorry.

MR. RANKIN: It's okay. I guess my question is, then, just to confirm what you -- I understand -- had done; is that you have adjusted the record title leasehold interest ownership in each spacing unit to reflect their contractual interests, to the extent they have any, under that 1979 operating agreement?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. That's correct.
MR. RANKIN: Are there other JOAs that
you're aware of in this acreage that partially overlap?

MR. COFFMAN: I think -- I believe there's some in the north half of 4 .

MR. RANKIN: Do you include those contractual interests in your representation of the ownership in your ownership breakdown?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: And do you agree that, as far as you can tell, that Permian did not include contractual interests in its ownership representations?

MR. COFFMAN: I think it would depend on which ownership representation. I think on -- I'd have to -- let me find it real quick.

I think he splits it out by contractual and by leasehold ownership.

MR. RANKIN: Okay. So in the -- okay. Good point. Thank you, Mr. Coffman.

So in the initial exhibit packet that Permian submitted or Read \& Stevens submitted, those -- would you agree that those are all just record title ownership breakdowns not influenced by contractual interests?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. I'd agree with that.

MR. RANKIN: And you would agree that the ownership between the Bone Spring and the Wolfcamp in this acreage -- when $I$ say "this acreage", I mean
those four sections -- is not uniform?
MR. COFFMAN: On a leasehold basis?
Based on what Permian --
MR. RANKIN: Let's do it two ways. So initially, would you agree that the ownership is not uniform on a leasehold basis between the Bone Spring and Wolfcamp?

MR. COFFMAN: I would agree with that.
MR. RANKIN: Would you agree that it's not uniform on a contractual basis between the Bone Spring and Wolfcamp?

MR. COFFMAN: I would say that the 1979 OA covers from 5,000 feet to -- and below, which would encompass the Wolfcamp; and if you had contributed your leasehold interest to that operating agreement in 1979, that your interest would be indeed uniform across the south half of 4 , south half of 5 , and all of 8 and 9 unless you did break the maintenance of uniform interest that exists in that operating agreement.

MR. RANKIN: And what $I$ think $I$ heard you say, Mr. Coffman, is that -- if $I$ were looking at the spacing units which are oriented north-south, within a spacing unit basis would there be uniformity between the Bone Spring and Wolfcamp zones?

MR. COFFMAN: In ownership?
MR. RANKIN: Yep.
MR. COFFMAN: For three-fourths of the proration unit that we're proposing, yes.

MR. RANKIN: But there nevertheless would be an ownership break between the Bone Spring and Wolfcamp for all these spacing units whether you're looking at it on a leasehold basis or a contractual interest basis; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Could you repeat that?
MR. RANKIN: So I guess my point is that you indicated that for three-quarters of the proration units, there's going to be uniformity between the Bone Spring and Wolfcamp.

What I'm saying is that on a spacing-unit-wide basis, whether it's leasehold -that you're looking at record title leasehold interests or contractual interests, there's going to be a break in ownership on a spacing unit basis in every one of these cases; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: I'd say it's more so for Sections 5 and 8 than it would be for 4 and 9. But yes.

MR. RANKIN: Thank you. And you agree that there are two owners in Wolfcamp who do not own
in the Bone Springs?
MR. COFFMAN: That's correct. They own
in the west-half west half of Sections 5 and 8.
MR. RANKIN: Right. And that's CLM and
Warren \& Associates, who you mentioned; right?
MR. COFFMAN: Yes. That's correct.
MR. RANKIN: Now you did -- I may have asked this question. I apologize if I'm asking again.

But when you did your -- when you got your title opinion, it was for both the Bone Spring and Wolfcamp; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: No. We only got the Bone Spring.

MR. RANKIN: Okay. And so when I look at your Wolfcamp breakout, it actually follows Permian's ownership representation for the Wolfcamp; right?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. And that kind of goes back to the cost discrepancy. We -- you know, we used Permian's just for ease of comparison.

MR. RANKIN: Okay. But also, you didn't get your own title opinion; right?

MR. COFFMAN: We have title for the Wolfcamp, but it's not up-to-date to June 2023 like the Bone Spring is.

```
MR. RANKIN: Now talk about the law proposals. I think that's your Exhibit A3. Just going to get to that page. I'm going to stop sharing here for a moment. All right.
So your law proposals. These were sent out on August 25, 2022; correct?
MR. COFFMAN: That's correct.
MR. RANKIN: And that's the same date you sent out both Mighty Pheasant and Loosey Goosey; right? At the same time?
MR. COFFMAN: Yes, sir.
MR. RANKIN: Okay. And then for the subsequent pages, you've got your AFEs; right?
MR. COFFMAN: Yes, sir.
MR. RANKIN: And those were prepared -- if I look at them at the top corner, they were prepared on August 17, 2022?
MR. COFFMAN: Yes, sir.
MR. RANKIN: And the first one here I see is for the second Bone Spring sand; correct? I guess just to make it easy, I'll pull it up so we can just, you know --
MR. COFFMAN: Are you referencing the 204 second sand well?
MR. RANKIN: Yes, I am. Thank you.
```

MR. COFFMAN: Okay. Yep.
MR. RANKIN: One moment. I'll make you all real dizzy as $I$ get to that page.

Now, the cost there, you testified to in your statement; right? And you say that the costs are fair and reasonable and comparable to the costs of other wells completed in the same zones; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: And now your engineer witness uses an updated cost on his Exhibit D18; are you familiar with that?

MR. COFFMAN: I'll have to get to it to be able to tell you yes or no. Which hearing packet? Hearing Packet 1?

MR. RANKIN: Hearing Packet 1.
MR. COFFMAN: D18. Yes.
MR. RANKIN: So it looks like for the second Bone Spring sand, he uses an updated as of June current cost which is 9,651,993; right?

MR. COFFMAN: That's correct.
MR. RANKIN: And if $I$ go back to the screen I'm sharing here, it's not much of a difference here for your second Bone Spring as you proposed it back in August; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Correct. Two hundred
thousand's a lot for me. But in the grand scheme things, no.

MR. RANKIN: Yeah. You know, that's true. Me, too.

Okay. Now your next AFE is for the Third Bone Spring sand, and that's for the Mighty Pheasant Fed Com 301H Well; right? And that's a similar cost of 9 million -- I'm just going to say 9.4 million; okay?

MR. COFFMAN: Yep.
MR. RANKIN: But on D18, your engineer has increased the cost to -- I'm just going to say -$\$ 10.6$ million; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. That's correct.
MR. RANKIN: That's a little bit more of a jump. That's $\$ 1.2$ million for that well; right?

MR. COFFMAN: I would agree.
MR. RANKIN: Now that's about -- that's almost 13 percent more -- right -- than what your AFE has; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Correct.
MR. RANKIN: Have you sent out updated AFEs to notify your owners that the costs have gone up based on updated assessments?

MR. COFFMAN: We would under the order.

MR. RANKIN: That time?
MR. COFFMAN: Yeah.
MR. RANKIN: Okay. Now are you
familiar, Mr. Coffman, with the internal -- rather, the investor relations report that Cimarex issued this week?

MR. COFFMAN: I know it happened. But no, not familiar.

MR. RANKIN: So you're not aware that Cimarex identified that its average costs for well bores in Lea County are $\$ 1400$ a foot?

MR. COFFMAN: No. I'm not aware of that.

MR. RANKIN: And that would make a two-mile lateral a little under $\$ 14$ million on average?

MR. COFFMAN: I'll agree with the math and not 1400 .

MR. RANKIN: I guess my question is, Mr. Coffman, we've got different representations of cost here going back to August 2022 that vary in range from $\$ 9.4$ million to $\$ 10.6$ million.

And then two days ago, Cimarex reports that the average cost in Lea County is actually closer to $\$ 14$ million.

So I'm just kind of wondering if we know what the actual proposed estimated costs are for these wells?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. We do. I think 14 million is a little too high for actuals. I would like to push that question to Calvin or Eddie, to people that are more in-tune with the full facilities and, you know, all the costs for those. They could probably hammer away on, you know, the nitty-gritty of the AFEs.

MR. RANKIN: Okay.
MR. COFFMAN: And I think the cost per foot actually gets high due to one-mile developments, not necessarily two-mile developments.

If you were to extrapolate it from one- to two-mile, $I$ think that the cost per foot for a one-mile is obviously going to be higher than the cost per foot for a two-mile.

But like I said, I think we should let Eddie and Calvin talk to the full scope of the AFEs.

MR. RANKIN: Okay. Now Mr. Coffman, you testified -- I don't know what -- I think it was the 20th of July in a case against Pride; is that correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. That's correct.

MR. RANKIN: And the wells in that case were also targeting the Third Bone Spring; is that right?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. First, Second, and Third.

MR. RANKIN: First, Second, and Third. And in that case, you testified about the average costs of wells that Cimarex was then drilling in that case; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Correct.
MR. RANKIN: And weren't the costs for Third Bone Spring wells that you testified to as being fair and reasonable and similar to what other operators are drilling in the area -- I'm going to just round it up to $\$ 11.1$ million?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. That's correct. That's also a single proration unit development so there's not -- we don't get to benefit from the efficiencies of having facilities take away.

You know, we have to increase those costs for trucking, water; $I$ know specifically for that area. So a lot of factors play into that just right next door.

MR. RANKIN: Okay. So the difference between the Pride case and this case is economies of
scale?
MR. COFFMAN: Yeah.
MR. RANKIN: Would you agree -- I mean, do you have any -- sitting here today, do you have any reason to dispute your engineer's representation of the updated costs reflected in his Exhibit D10?

MR. COFFMAN: No.
MR. RANKIN: I'm sorry. D18. I said the wrong exhibit. D18.

MR. COFFMAN: Which costs?
MR. RANKIN: Well, I can't tell because he just gives a total cost. But on his Exhibit D18, Mr. -- your engineer gives a updated costs on a per-well basis.

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. I think the June current costs is accurate.

MR. RANKIN: But you have not updated your -- the working interest owners in any of these spacing units with these updated costs that you're reflecting -- that Mr . Behm is reflecting in his exhibits?

MR. COFFMAN: No. Not yet.
MR. RANKIN: And so I mean, a 13
percent increase in cost; you think that might affect any of their activations in terms of -- you mentioned
that some of these people don't have necessarily or may not have -- be accustomed to spending large dollar amounts on a well.

That's -- a 13 percent jump is a pretty significant jump, but you haven't updated them?

MR. COFFMAN: That's correct. But I don't -- I think it's a little bit different than a 200 percent jump between the two developments.

MR. RANKIN: Okay. Let's take a moment. You're familiar -- you've read Mr. Macha's [ph] testimony?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. That's correct.
MR. RANKIN: Are you familiar with his -- what Permian is proposing through his testimony for addressing costs in terms of a pooling order?

MR. COFFMAN: Do you --
MR. RANKIN: Are you familiar with --
MR. COFFMAN: -- forward me to?
Forward me to an exhibit that you're referencing or is his testimony?

MR. RANKIN: Do you have Permian's testimony in front of you?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes, I do.
MR. RANKIN: Turn to page 12 of his self-affirmed statement and look at Paragraph 25.

And I'll get that up here on the screen just for the benefit of everybody so we're all, again, on the same page.

Do you see how Mr. Macha [ph] discusses a proposed modification to the standard pooling language?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes, I do.
MR. RANKIN: So your testimony -- now, just to be clear, I mean Permian submitted this affidavit and the exhibits on July 14th, I believe; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: That's correct.
MR. RANKIN: So you've had some time to review and understand what Permian is proposing in terms of how it's going to allocate costs to pooled working interest owners; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. That's correct.
MR. RANKIN: And what Mr. Macha [ph] is saying here -- and I'm just going to get to that. I'm sorry. It's a lot of pages.

MR. COFFMAN: I'm assuming it's just hanging the 60 days -- 30 days to 60 days before the commencement of drilling of each well?

MR. RANKIN: Let me get to that language. So okay. You're seeing my screen now, Mr.

Coffman?
MR. COFFMAN: Yes, sir.
MR. RANKIN: Okay. So I'll just read it out loud. Mr. Macha [ph] proposes that the language should read: "Operator shall submit the estimated well costs no sooner than 60 days before the commencement of the drilling of each initial well.
"And the owner of a pooled working interest shall have 30 days upon receipt of the estimated well costs to elect whether to pay its share of the estimate well costs or its share of the actual costs to drill, complete, and equip the well or actual well costs out of production from the well."

So Mr. Coffman, do you understand that Mr. Macha [ph] has proposed to offer pooled working interest owners the opportunity to sequentially elect each well only at the time that Permian decides to go forward to drill that well? Is that your understanding of that language?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: So nevertheless, you're telling us that these working interest owners are going to be burned by every single well that Permian has proposed in its application even though what they're actually proposing is that each owner pay only
sequentially?
MR. COFFMAN: That's correct. It
doesn't change the amount.
MR. RANKIN: No. But it changes the burden on each working interest owner; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: I mean if they paid out of production, who's to say that the well will pay out and they'll ever be in the well?

MR. RANKIN: That's true for every well that's drilled -- isn't it, Mr. Coffman? -- under a pooling order?

MR. COFFMAN: Yep. I would agree with that.

MR. RANKIN: Now I'm just -- I'm going to skip through a bunch of stuff, because I think we kind of touched on it. And $I$ want to just kind of move through stuff that $I$ don't need to touch on anymore, which is good.

I want to ask you a little bit about -you testified, rather -- let me back up.

Your colleague -- and I may pronounce this name incorrectly; but is it Ms. Mueller, the geologist?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: Is that the correct

```
pronunciation?
```

MR. COFFMAN: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: Okay. She testified in her self-affirmed statement about some APDs that y'all had already submitted for; right? Are you familiar with that testimony?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: I just want to understand.
I mean, these APDs were submitted between February and March of 2022; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: That's correct.
MR. RANKIN: And that was months before you even proposed the wells to your partners; right?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. That's correct.
MR. RANKIN: Is that normal for Cimarex to file for APDs before they even propose them to the working interest owners?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. For sure. It takes quite a long time to get permits approved so we try to get on permits as quickly as possible.

MR. RANKIN: And in this case, you filed some of these APDs -- some of these APDs are in a potash area; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. That's correct.
MR. RANKIN: And you filed these APDs
before seeking designation of a potash development area?

MR. COFFMAN: That's correct. There's no -- there's nothing that precludes us from filing for the APDs. They just don't get approved unless a development area is in place.

MR. RANKIN: But when you do a
development area as the BLM guidelines suggest, isn't it part of the process you also give notice to each of the other owners that have an interest in that potash area?

MR. COFFMAN: Within the contract area, you mean?

MR. RANKIN: Yes. Yes.
MR. COFFMAN: I guess it would depend on what Jim Rutley provides as a notice area. If it's an existing development area with locations there -- like this, this isn't a drill island.

So the toe end of the wells are going to be in the potash, not necessarily the surface. The surface hole would have a wider notice area than the bottom hole would.

But it's a mile radius of all impacted working interest owners, all impacted owners. That'd be surface, record title, all of that --

```
MR. RANKIN: I guess --
MR. COFFMAN: -- around the --
MR. RANKIN: -- my --
MR. COFFMAN: -- approved development
```

    area.
    MR. RANKIN: So I guess my point, though, is that by filing the APDs first and months in advance, the potentially-impacted owners within that radius weren't apprised of your plans to develop until they received either a well proposal or notification of your subsequently noticed proposed potash development area; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: The amount of people that we notify for development areas -- of multiple people hired and people that we proposed the wells to, I don't think we -- we wouldn't propose the wells to a lessee of record or, you know, a surface owner that's a mile to the northwest. So I guess I'm not --

MR. RANKIN: My own point is -- I guess, Mr. Coffman -- is that because you didn't propose, initially, the potash development area first -- you went ahead and filed the APDs first -- it wasn't until much later that anybody, you know, who might have been affected got notice that you were proposing to drill wells out here; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: That's true for the development, from a development area standpoint and notice standpoint. Yeah. I would agree with that.

MR. RANKIN: All right. Now moving onto another topic here.

In Paragraph 19 of your statement, you talk about, you know, your view or opinion that Cimarex is a top-tier, you know, operator and developer in this area in particular; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: I agree with that.
MR. RANKIN: Yeah. And you say that your basis for that is that Cimarex has the knowledge to know what it takes to drill successful wells in this specific acreage; right?

MR. COFFMAN: That's correct.
MR. RANKIN: And you consider Cimarex to be a prudent operator? It's one of the top producers in the state?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: You would agree that part of having the knowledge necessary to be a top operator includes keeping track of what Cimarex
competitors -- such as Read \& Stevens and Permian Resources -- are doing in the areas where Cimarex has overlapping leasehold interests?

MR. COFFMAN: That's correct.
MR. RANKIN: And as a top-tier operator who's operating prudently, that's something that Cimarex does? You keep track of what your competitors are doing?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah, within reason. I don't think there's -- you know, we can't -- we don't have access to emails or things that are going on between teams. But you know, we see proposals that come around; APDs that are filed; you know, everything that's public that everyone else gets to see.

MR. RANKIN: Sure. So public filings, pooling cases, APDs, that sort of thing; right?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. That's correct.
MR. RANKIN: And you would agree that by tracking your competitors, you know, Cimarex is going to gain insight about an understanding of what competitors' strategies for how they're going to develop your proposed acreage; right?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. I agree. Nearby. I mean, you have to take into account -- like, nearby; right? Like, I don't think we're going to -- yeah. Within the relative area. Yes.

MR. RANKIN: And by doing so, you've got some idea of what their competing plans might be;
right? If it comes to a situation such as this one where you're going to have, you know, a contested operatorship?

MR. COFFMAN: I think it's a
case-by-case basis. I think people do a lot of different things when you would expect them to do something based on past performance. I'd say future performance is not indicated by past performance. MR. RANKIN: Okay. Now Cimarex filed this -- or it, rather, issues well proposals first; right? We talked about that August 25 th, $I$ think, 2022. So you issued your well proposals before Permian did?

MR. COFFMAN: That's correct.
MR. RANKIN: And then, Cimarex filed its applications in both Mighty Pheasant and Loosey Goosey on March 7th; right?

MR. COFFMAN: That's correct.
MR. RANKIN: Now what I want -- what I'm kind of getting at here is in your Exhibit Packet 3 -- okay -- you say that Cimarex was surprised; okay?

And the place I'm going to direct you
to is Paragraph 5 of Hearing Exhibit Packet 3 which deals with option number one under your proposal.
You say that you were -- you know,

Permian's approach to filing not just the Bone Spring but for the Wolfcamp was a surprise to Cimarex and was unexpected; right?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. Which page?
Hearing Packet 3. What PDF page?
MR. RANKIN: Well, it's -- actually, this one is marked as page 2. But I have a hard copy. And if $I$ open up every $P D F$ on my screen, my computer will freeze up. Sorry.

MR. COFFMAN: No, no. That's fine.
Let me just find it real quick.
MR. RANKIN: Is that -- yeah.
MR. COFFMAN: Okay. Sorry. I'm here.
MR. RANKIN: Okay. So in that
paragraph you say that basically a month after you filed your applications -- which would have been in April; right?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah.
MR. RANKIN: Cimarex was surprised that Permian had filed for both a Bone Spring and Wolfcamp spacing units; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: I think we were surprised on the Wolfcamp applications, not necessarily the Bone Spring applications.

MR. RANKIN: You received Permian's

Page 82
well proposals that included Wolfcamp wells and full upper Wolfcamp development that were dated February 17th for its Bane wells and March 17 th for the Joker wells; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: That is correct.
MR. RANKIN: So you knew at least as of, you know, late February/middle late March that Permian had proposed Wolfcamp wells in this acreage?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. I think there's a historical idea that a lot of operators do where they propose the entirety of whatever they think that they are going to drill ever to their working interest owners.

I don't think we do that. I think we try to keep them updated with things that we're going to drill in the near term, not necessarily long term.

So I think having the Wolfcamp
proposals are not necessarily unexpected or surprising, but the pooling that came after that for the Wolfcamp I think is what surprised us.

MR. RANKIN: So but $I$ think we talked about this a little bit. But I mean, basically because Permian is a competitor in your area and expressly over this acreage, I mean you would have been tracking not just the well proposals but other
activities that Permian was undertaking in this area, including APDs and pooling cases; right?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. For sure.
MR. RANKIN: Okay. So in addition to the well proposals which identified the Wolfcamp, I'm going to ask you a couple more questions here.

Because in your statement -- and it's still in the same packet, the next paragraph -- in Paragraph 6, you go on to say that, you know, basically Permian is following what $I$ understand Cimarex's position is which is that there's a consensus around developing only the Bone Spring. And you point to Permian itself as having filed 11 applications in the area. Ten of which are for Bone Spring and only one of which is for the Wolfcamp; right?

MR. COFFMAN: That is correct.
MR. RANKIN: But you prepared this self-affirmed statement on August 1st; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Correct.
MR. RANKIN: And you reviewed Permian's exhibits that were filed on July 14 th; right?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: And if I pull up those Permian exhibits and look at Exhibit C14, Mr. Macha
[ph] has put together kind of a nice little outline of all the different activities that Permian has undertaken in recent times, including 17 different pooling cases focused on the Wolfcamp.

MR. COFFMAN: None of which we are in. So we're not in any of those as a working interest owner or as an affected party.

MR. RANKIN: Right. But I guess my question is, $I$ mean, this is right around your area and you're seeing other operators doing different developments.

You know, I thought that Cimarex might be aware -- especially after the exhibits were filed -- that it actually had been developing and targeting the Wolfcamp and that the -- I guess, Permian meant what it had said when it was proposing wells in the Wolfcamp in February and March of 2022 -or 2023. Sorry.

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. I would agree with that. But like I said earlier, I mean, the majority of our acreage is to the north. We don't have anything to the south.

So I think it'd be not necessarily the best use of my time looking across the entirety of Lea County for pooling that might happen up near the shelf
to, you know, look at competitors.
I know this is right next door, but I guess we try to be focused on where our acreage is to the north as a whole and around that area. But I see what you mean. It's nearby.

MR. RANKIN: Well, I mean, I guess my point is simply that in facts, there's a two-section tract to the east and tracts to the southwest and a total of 17 different Wolfcamp pooling cases which, you know, were in our exhibit packet. And even after that, you said there's only one Wolfcamp application.

So I just was -- I mean, I guess as an operator who's focused on its acreage and understanding what competitors are doing and understand the trends in development, not to be fully aware of what's happening on both sides of your acreage here, $I$ just -- I wasn't -- I just wanted to make sure I understood, you know, where that was coming from.

MR. SAVAGE: Madam Hearing Examiner, could Mr. Rankin point to that exhibit with the $17 ?$ MS. ORTH: Yes. Please.

MR. RANKIN: I'll pull it up on the screen.
Mr. Coffman, this is the exhibit I was
referring to then. I guess you had it on your hard copy here.

But this is Exhibit C14. It was filed on July 14 th and served to Cimarex's counsel.

And you'll see that it identifies the different tracts in which Permian has identified different pooling orders it has obtained as to both the Bone Spring and Wolfcamp pools. It identifies the orders applicable to each one.

And so if you were to go back and look at and pull up those orders, you would see that -- as the Call Offs state -- they apply to not only the Bone Spring but the Wolfcamp.

And when you add them all up, it's not one Wolfcamp pooling case but I believe the number is seventeen.

MS. ORTH: Okay. Mr. Rankin, would you estimate the remainder of your cross-examination, please?

MR. RANKIN: Yeah. I guess I have some questions about -- the last section that I need to ask him about are the options. Cimarex has proposed two different options.

And I'm -- you know, I know probably people are hungry. I don't mean to drag this out. I
really don't. But $I$ do want to make sure I'm --
MS. ORTH: I -- no. I understand. I don't feel like you're dragging it out. It's just we've been going nearly two hours.

MR. RANKIN: Yeah. Thank you.
MS. ORTH: And I think we need a break.
MR. RANKIN: Yeah.
MS. ORTH: And I'm wondering if this is a good time for a lunch break and if we should just break until 1:30.

MR. RANKIN: Let's do that, Madam Hearing Officer.

MS. ORTH: All right. We will see you all at 1:30.
(Off the record.)
MS. ORTH: Mr. Rankin was near the end of his cross-examination of Mr. Coffman.

So Mr. Rankin, if you would, please?
MR. RANKIN: Thank you, Madam Hearing Officer. Lunch break was well-timed. Thank you very much.

Mr. Coffman, how are you today? I hope you had a good lunch.

MR. COFFMAN: It was great.
Well-needed, as well.
MR. RANKIN: I would like to start off this next section of our discussion, Mr. Coffman, on -- I'm sorry.

I'm having to scroll through to get to it here in the exhibit packet. But what I'd like to discuss is very -- let's see. It's a little -firstly, $I$ think it's in -- let's see. Oh, I know why it's not there.

It's in the Wolfcamp. Let's see. It's
in Hearing Packet 4. I thought $I$ had it all in my head but I didn't. Yeah. Okay. I'm going to pull this up on the screen.

One moment. Sorry. I'm sorry I didn't have this ready. I thought it was in Hearing Packet 1 but it's in Hearing Packet 4.

Just a moment. It's a large file so it
takes a little bit of time, since I'm not at my office, for things to load.
Mr. Coffman -- as I wait for this to
load and for this to appear on my screen -- by way of introduction, I'm talking about the June 15, 2023 letter or actually letters that you sent out as a supplement to the proposal to drill for both the Loosey Goosey unit wells and the Mighty Pheasant unit wells.

Are you familiar with those letters?
MR. COFFMAN: Yes, I am.
MR. RANKIN: And I understand that these letters were written. And the reason they're in the Hearing Packet 4 case, $I$ understand, is that in that set of cases or that hearing packet, it's under option two.

And option two is where Cimarex is seeking to pool the Wolfcamp formation and its spacing units in those cases under that option; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Correct.
MR. RANKIN: And the reason these letters are in there is because you're explaining to your working interest owners that you intend to dedicate those Bone Spring wells to Wolfcamp spacing
units; is that correct?
MR. COFFMAN: That's correct.
MR. RANKIN: And let me get to that page real quick. I apologize. Now that I have it up, I need to scroll down to it. It's going to take me a little while. Just a moment.

Okay. I found it. Great. I'm going to share my page real quick just so that we can get a visual. Let me know when you can see my page.

MR. COFFMAN: I can see it.
MR. RANKIN: Okay. So in this exhibit packet, I didn't see -- I saw the letter referencing the Loosey Goosey development. I don't think I saw one for the Mighty Pheasant.

However, you did send one supplement for each spacing unit; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: That's correct.

MR. RANKIN: Now as I review this, the first paragraph I think explains a little bit about the intent here.

First of all, this was sent out June

15th -- right? -- in 2023, both of these letters?
MR. COFFMAN: [No audible response.]
MR. RANKIN: Is that correct?
MR. COFFMAN: Yes. That's correct.
MR. RANKIN: Okay. And you addressed
it to all of the working interest owners in both those spacing units; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Correct.
MR. RANKIN: Okay. Now looking at the first paragraph, you agree that the intent of the letter was to update the initial well proposal in each of the spacing units to "clarify the extent and scope of projected production from the wells given their respective depths and locations described in the original proposal"; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Correct.
MR. RANKIN: Then the second paragraph goes on to say that the Bone Spring wells were originally proposed for production from the Bone Spring formation; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Correct.

MR. RANKIN: And then in that same second paragraph, you go on to say -- I'll highlight it here -- that your geologists and engineers have thoroughly evaluated the Bone Spring formation in relation to the Wolfcamp formation in the above-referenced lands and have determined that, due to the extensive communication between the Bone Spring and Wolfcamp, the wells as proposed will produce the primary concentrations of hydrocarbons in the Wolfcamp -- those being in the upper Wolfcamp

And Cimarex believes they will do so more optimally given their current location within the Third Bone Spring. That if additional wells -- and that additional and unnecessary wells were drilled into the Wolfcamp itself.

Did I -- other than almost mangling that last bit, did $I$ correctly state that sentence? MR. COFFMAN: Yes. Yes.

MR. RANKIN: Okay. Now at the end of the second paragraph, then it goes on to say that because these wells, these Bone Spring wells, will
produce hydrocarbons, the primary production from the Bone Spring and the Wolfcamp -- it goes on to say that Cimarex doesn't believe that there would be a need for any upper Wolfcamp wells, because its Third Bone Spring wells will effectively develop both the Bone Spring and upper Wolfcamp.

Is that a fair paraphrase of that last bit of that paragraph?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. I would just say that the incidental production from the upper Wolfcamp.

MR. RANKIN: Now does the letter say incidental production from the upper Wolfcamp?

MR. COFFMAN: No.

MR. RANKIN: Okay. But you told the owners that you were going to produce the primary production from the Wolfcamp; right? The upper Wolfcamp?
"As proposed, will produce the primary concentrations of hydrocarbons in the Wolfcamp, those being in the upper Wolfcamp"; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Correct.
MR. RANKIN: Okay.
MR. COFFMAN: And I think we clarified with a motion. I'd have to refer to Darin on that. I think we clarified those supplements.

MR. RANKIN: Okay. Well, I just want to make sure I understood. I mean, this is in your exhibit packet. You sent this out to your owners, your partners in the wells.

I just want to make sure I -- I mean, this is what your, you know -- did you send a supplement to these folks explaining that you think it's going to be only incidental production?

MR. COFFMAN: No. This is all we sent.
MR. RANKIN: Okay. Now in this letter, you say also that you worked with your geologists and engineers -- right -- to confirm these statements; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Correct.
MR. RANKIN: And was one of the geologists Staci Mueller?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: And was one of the engineers Mr. Eddie Behm?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: So now you're familiar with the legal arguments -- you just mentioned them, I think -- that your legal counsel made and submitted to the Division on July 26 th about incidental drainage versus production?

MR. COFFMAN: Am I familiar with that?
Yes.
MR. RANKIN: Yeah. Okay. So Do you understand that one of the arguments that Cimarex is making is that Cimarex will not be "producing" from the Wolfcamp? That it will be only incidentally draining the Wolfcamp?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: Okay. That's your understanding of what Cimarex's current position is?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: Okay. Now in that same
legal brief, Counsel discusses Cimarex's anticipation or estimate that anywhere from 5 to approximately 26 percent of production in its Third Bone Spring wells will be contributed by the Wolfcamp; is that your understanding?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes. I'd have to refer to Staci and Eddie on that percentage, which they can touch on. But from my understanding, yes.

MR. RANKIN: Okay. So based on -- I mean -- yeah. I mean, I haven't talked to them yet. I'm just going off the motion and the language in the memo, but basically -- yeah.

You and I are on the same page here that it states somewhere between 5 percent to 26 percent is going to be pulled from the Wolfcamp through these Bone Spring wells that Cimarex is proposing; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Correct.
MR. RANKIN: Okay. But in that same legal memorandum, Cimarex is saying -- and tell me if you understand this to be the case, too -- that the
exact amount of drainage is uncertain; correct?
MR. COFFMAN: Correct.
MR. RANKIN: Now in this supplemental letter that I've got up here on the screen, you refer to what's going to be happening here as production -okay -- from the Wolfcamp. You don't say it's going to be drainage or incidental.

But as I understand it, one of the points of this letter is to explain to the working interest owners that Cimarex's Third Bone Spring wells are going to so effectively produce, develop, drain -- whatever you want to call it -- the upper Wolfcamp that it would be wasteful to drill separate wells in the upper Wolfcamp; do you agree?

MR. COFFMAN: No. I disagree.
MR. RANKIN: Okay. So tell me what you understand the point of this letter to be.

MR. COFFMAN: I think our intent was to -- and Eddie will get into this in his portion. But as I understand it, packs travel upward.

So in this, we're trying to explain
that the upper Wolfcamp wells would trespass into the Third Bone Spring and produce 75 percent from the Third Bone Spring.

And 25 percent of that would be Wolfcamp; anywhere from 5 to 25, as you referenced. So that was our intent, to share that here.

That since the concentration would in the Third Bone Spring and that incidental production from the Wolfcamp may happen, but the upper Wolfcamp would produce and trespass the Third Bone Spring.

MR. RANKIN: Now --
MR. SAVAGE: Madam Hearing Examiner --
MR. RANKIN: -- I got to try to sort this out a little bit.

MR. SAVAGE: Madam Hearing Examiner --
MR. RANKIN: I think it's --
MR. SAVAGE: Could I just interject one comment? These are very complicated -- excuse me.

These are very complicated questions of mixed law and fact. These are unresolved legal issues that have not been addressed and resolved.

I think this is a line of questioning that is inappropriate and difficult for a landman to fully address and clarify.

I don't know how to separate those two without resolving the legal or having some commentary or a motion hearing or something like that. But I --

MR. RANKIN: Madam Examiner, if I may --

MS. ORTH: Yeah.
MR. RANKIN: This is a letter from Mr. Coffman that he wrote in which he states that he -that their geologists, Ms. Mueller and Ms. Behm [sic] who I will have a chance to cross here shortly, thoroughly evaluated the Bone Spring formation in relation to the Wolfcamp; and determined, due to the communication between the two, that their proposed Bone Spring wells will produce the primary concentrations of hydrocarbons not in the Bone Spring, but in the Wolfcamp. And they say it twice: "in the Wolfcamp", "those being in the upper Wolfcamp"; okay?

And so Mr. Coffman signed the letter.

This is not a legal issue. It's a factual question about what he understands the letter to mean and the purpose behind it.

MR. SAVAGE: Madam Hearing Examiner, if
I can just make one more comment on that?
MS. ORTH: Sure.
MR. SAVAGE: Thank you. So the
proposal letter is part of a requirement of the pooling procedure. You have to do a proposal letter to initiate a pooling. That's why it's in the packet.

A pooling procedure is a legal and administrative matter. That -- the two options distinguish between drainage and production.

And once you get into the arena of pooling, under the pooling statute, drainage becomes reclassified to production.

And this letter is related to that process. And it is very much a legal matter.

MS. ORTH: All right. So I'm going to handle it this way.

This is a letter written by Mr.

Coffman. I think questions about the statements that Mr. Coffman has put his signature to here are definitely fair game.

But I'll instruct the witness to -- if, in fact, you believe that one of Mr. Rankin's questions is asking you for a legal conclusion, to note that.

And I don't believe you're a lawyer. So to the extent that you're answering these questions, you're answering as a landman not as a lawyer.

Just seems like your own counsel is prompting you to remember the distinction here -between geological questions, for example, and legal questions. And you are certainly invited to draw that distinction yourself with further questioning.

Go ahead, Mr. Rankin.
MR. RANKIN: Thank you. And I'll do my best to avoid all legal issues. I am referring occasionally to the briefing simply because that's, at this point, my understanding of some of their
positions. So but $I$ will be careful not to encroach upon any legal issues here.

Now Mr. Coffman, I think I heard you say in response to my question that the intent here was to inform the working interest owners that what Cimarex believed was that it's actually going to be producing primarily from the Bone Spring formation, that the majority of the production would be from the Bone Spring formation. Is that what I understood you to say?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes. That's correct.
MR. RANKIN: Okay. But notwithstanding
that and notwithstanding the positions Cimarex has taken in the briefing subsequent to this letter, as $I$ read this letter the plain language states that your geologists and engineers have evaluated the Bone Spring in relation to the Work Camp; and that the wells -- those being Cimarex's Bone Spring wells -will produce the primary concentrations of hydrocarbons in the Wolfcamp, the upper Wolfcamp.

> Is that -- that's what the language
says; correct?
MR. COFFMAN: That's what the language says. I'd have to refer to Staci and Eddie on how extensive that communication would be and to get into the technical aspects of that. But that is what the language says. Yes.

MR. RANKIN: All right. That's fine.
I just wanted to -- I mean, I just -- okay.
So now as I understand it, this letter
was sent out in order to make the basis that the Wolfcamp will produce by these wells so that you can go forward with the pooling application for the Wolfcamp for each of these spacing units; is that a fair statement?

MR. COFFMAN: Could you repeat it?
MR. RANKIN: Sure. I mean as Cimarex stood, you had well proposals for Bone Spring wells that were going to produce from the Bone Spring as the first paragraph says; correct? I'm sorry. As the first sentence of the second paragraph says?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes.

MR. RANKIN: Okay. So you had Bone Spring wells that were proposed for the Bone Spring. You had Bone Spring pooling applications; okay?

As I understand it, after you became surprised by Permian's Wolfcamp applications, Cimarex sent out this supplemental proposal letter; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Correct.
MR. RANKIN: And in this letter, you state the primary concentrations of hydrocarbons in the Wolfcamp, in the upper Wolfcamp, will be produced by those Bone Spring wells.

That's what the language of the letter says; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: That's correct.

MR. RANKIN: And part of the reason for saying that is because you need to demonstrate that the Wolfcamp's going to be produced if you're going to pull the Wolfcamp; agree?

MR. COFFMAN: Correct.
MR. RANKIN: Okay. Now you know, that's -- I just want to make sure that you're on the
same page, because I think that's what I get out of this letter; okay?

Now, the next part of it was -- okay -as I understood -- this last bit here I'm going to highlight with my cursor -- is that Cimarex has determined that "drilling new wells in the Wolfcamp would be an improper use of resources and result in significant financial waste.
"In developing the most prudent manner,
the hydrocarbons contained within both formations underlying the subject lands" -- I'm going to stop there.

And my understanding is that when this letter says "both formations", its referring to the Wolfcamp and the Bone Spring; is that your understanding, as well?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. I would say "Third Bone Spring". But yes.

MR. RANKIN: Okay. So even if -- okay.
Say Third Bone Spring and the upper Wolfcamp to be more specific; is that fair?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah.
MR. RANKIN: Okay. And that goes on to refer to the recent historical development of wells in the surrounding area as justification for that position; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: Okay. I guess what I take away from this, though, is Cimarex's position is that Cimarex's Bone Spring wells are going to sufficiently and effectively drain both the Wolfcamp and the Bone Spring in order to pool the Bone Spring; is that fair to say?

MR. COFFMAN: Like I said, I'd have to resort to technical on that.

MR. RANKIN: That's fine. I
understand. That's good enough. I understand. I don't mean to push you into areas you don't -- you know, that are technical.

All right. So $I$ guess what $I$ want to do now is pivot to the options; okay? Cimarex has now proposed options.

And this letter, $I$ think, in this hearing packet relates to one of the two options; okay?

As I understand, the two options are as follows: option number one would be to drill and pool only the Bone Spring; right? And then to create a buffer to prevent drilling by anybody of the upper Wolfcamp.

Is that a fair representation of option
one?
MR. COFFMAN: I think -- yeah. I'd just like to clarify.

I think the buffer intends to make sure that the production only comes from the upper Wolfcamp and that the production isn't produced from the third sand by where they're landed currently on the AFEs. Does that make sense? MR. RANKIN: No. Say that again. Sorry.

MR. COFFMAN: So I think the buffer is intended to protect third sand rights, not prevent
upper Wolfcamp rights.
They lowered their well bore to produce only upper Wolfcamp and not -- and far enough away so as to not produce Third Bone Spring. I think that's option one.

MR. RANKIN: All right. Now you're not an engineer and you don't know what the drainage rate of this is. And so we can't --

MR. COFFMAN: Right.
MR. RANKIN: I can't get into it with you about what that business would be and whether there would be any way of actually ensuring that, in doing so, those owners would nevertheless still be able to develop fully their Wolfcamp minerals; right?

That's not something that you and I can talk about?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. I can give you the footages.

MR. RANKIN: Now but under this option -- okay -- under option one that we're just discussing, production -- as we've discussed -- would
be allocated to owners within each of the Bone Spring spacing units; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Correct.
MR. RANKIN: And that would be done in accordance with the statutory requirements which are incorporated into the standard pooling language; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: That might be getting into --

MR. RANKIN: I mean you understand basically, Mr. Coffman, like if there's a pooling order, the pooling order --

MR. COFFMAN: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: -- dictates how allocation's going to be done; right?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes. Correct.
MR. RANKIN: Okay. So in this specific circumstance, when you pool the Bone Spring under option one, the production would be allocated to those pooled working interest owners in accordance with the pooling order; right?

```
    MR. COFFMAN: Correct.
    MR. RANKIN: And that would be to the
    Bone Spring owners only; correct?
    MR. COFFMAN: Correct.
    MR. RANKIN: Now so whatever
    hydrocarbons -- whether it's 5 percent or 26
percent -- are produced from the Wolfcamp.
    That would be deemed, under this
option, to be incidental drainage; correct?
    MR. COFFMAN: Correct.
    MR. RANKIN: And that would mean that
    those Wolfcamp owners would not see any of that
    production allocated to them in accordance with their
    ownership percentages in the Wolfcamp; correct?
    MR. COFFMAN: According to their
    ownership interests in the Wolfcamp, no. But
    that's -- yes. I agree with what you're saying.
                            MR. RANKIN: Yeah. It would be based
        only on their ownership interest in the Bone Spring;
        right?
            MR. COFFMAN: Right.
```

MR. RANKIN: Okay. Now under this option, option one, there's no mechanism for owners in the Wolfcamp to share at all in this production under their ownership percentages; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: I would say that we offered that to the owners that only own in the Wolfcamp and did not own in the Third Bone Spring, being Warren \& Associates and CLM Production.

We offered an in-kind, straight-up
assignment of interest out of Coterra's interest in that proration unit for the Third Bone Spring.

MR. RANKIN: And that would be as to those two owners who don't own at all in the Bone Spring; right? You made that offer to them? Okay. MR. COFFMAN: Correct.

MR. RANKIN: I'm talking about owners that own in both the Bone Spring and Wolfcamp; okay? But they have a different ownership proportion between the two.

## MR. COFFMAN: Right.

MR. RANKIN: And I think you and I were
just talking about this. I think we're on the same page that under this option one, Bone Spring owners would get their share of production from these Bone Spring wells only in accordance with their interests in the Bone Spring?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. That's correct. And we have the majority of support from owners that do own a differentiating interest in the Bone Spring and the Wolfcamp.

We have that majority, including interest owners that own in the Wolfcamp and the Bone Spring. So --

MR. RANKIN: Right. Yeah. We can -- I mean, $I$ think -- well, there's some -- I understand that that's your position. I understand.

But there's some owners that own a greater share of interest in the Wolfcamp who are not supporting your position; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. I'd agree with that.

MR. RANKIN: Now that's option one.

Now I want to talk a little bit about option two. Option two, as I understand, is that same wells are being drilled in the Bone Spring; right?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: Only difference here is that rather than dedicating those wells only to the Bone Spring spacing units, you're going to also dedicate them to Wolfcamp spacing units; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Correct.
MR. RANKIN: And in this case, in this option, then you would not need to institute a buffer of any kind because Cimarex would be controlling the operations in the Wolfcamp; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Correct.
MR. RANKIN: And Cimarex, obviously, is not going to drill upper Wolfcamp wells in that circumstance; agree?

MR. COFFMAN: In that circumstance, no. MR. RANKIN: Okay. So you -MR. COFFMAN: I'd have to -- I mean,

```
I'd have to --
```

MR. RANKIN: So --
MR. COFFMAN: Saying that we would never drill an upper Wolfcamp well, no. But for the -- I mean in this area, we take in -- we're constantly moving. We're not doing our -- like you said -- "cookie-cutter" development.

If things change, $I$ don't want to make a broad statement that says we're never going to drill an upper Wolfcamp well.

MR. RANKIN: Well, in these four
sections, if you drill your Third Bone Spring at the base of the Wolfcamp, are you going to come in and drill an upper Wolfcamp well?

MR. COFFMAN: Under option two, no.
MR. RANKIN: Right. Because that's essentially what Mr. Behm is saying happened in the Black and Tan; right?

MR. COFFMAN: Correct.
MR. RANKIN: Yeah. You wouldn't do that. Okay.

So under option two, that upper
Wolfcamp is not going to be developed; agree?
MR. COFFMAN: It'll be -- it'll be pooled. And --

MR. RANKIN: But okay. So it'll be pooled. But as I understand and you and I discussed, only 26 percent of that Wolfcamp production is going to be attributable to those Bone Spring wells; agree?

MR. COFFMAN: Okay. Yes. I agree with that.

MR. RANKIN: Okay. So some portion, potentially, of the Wolfcamp is not going to be produced by those Bone Spring wells; agree?

MR. COFFMAN: Upper Wolfcamp or Wolfcamp in general?

MR. RANKIN: Upper Wolfcamp.
MR. COFFMAN: No. And I'd have to rely on Eddie and Staci.

MR. RANKIN: Okay. That's fine. I understand. Okay.

So now we've been talking about the
upper here, upper Wolfcamp. But I guess my question, too, is then: Under option two, does Cimarex have any plans to develop lower benches in the Wolfcamp?

MR. COFFMAN: I'd have to rely on Staci and Eddie for future developments.

MR. RANKIN: Has Cimarex drilled any lower Wolfcamp benches in the area of interest that Mr. Behm has put together?

MR. COFFMAN: Area of interest being Lea County?

MR. RANKIN: Well, Mr. -- I guess I'm going to, you know, defer to you on that. Whatever Mr. Behm's area of interest is, you know, that he refers to in his study.

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. I -- that would be a question for Eddie.

MR. RANKIN: Okay. But as you sit here today, are you aware of any lower Wolfcamp wells that have been drilled Cimarex?

MR. COFFMAN: Lower Wolfcamp, no.
MR. RANKIN: Mr. Behm, at the outset
when you were testifying under questioning from Mr. Savage, you talked about a Read \& Stevens well that they had drilled in Section 9 in an acreage -- under contract acreage that at the time, I think, Cimarex contested as Cimarex being the operator. Do you recall that testimony?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: And you used that as a basis to suggest that at the time, prior to Permian's acquisition of Read \& Stevens, that maybe Read \& Stevens, you know, didn't operate under -- in good faith manner; fair?

MR. COFFMAN: Correct.
MR. RANKIN: But subsequent to Read -rather, Permian Resources' acquisition of Read \& Stevens, isn't it true that Read \& Stevens went ahead and plugged any of those wells that Read \& Stevens had drilled?

MR. COFFMAN: Could you repeat that?
MR. RANKIN: Isn't it true that Read \& Stevens -- I'm sorry -- that Permian went ahead and
plugged those wells that you referred to that Read \& Stevens had drilled?

MR. COFFMAN: That may be true. We never received proposals on them. And --

MR. RANKIN: Okay. But you don't know that? Okay. That's fine.

I think at this time, Madam Hearing Officer, I have no further questions for Mr. Behm. I'm sorry. Mr. Coffman. Sorry.

MS. ORTH: Thank you, Mr. Rankin.
Mr. Savage, do you have any redirect?
Oh, wait. Hold on one minute.
I'm going to pause for a moment in the event any counsel who has entered an appearance on behalf of another part in this matter -- Mr. Bruce, for example, or Mr. Jones -- has a question of Mr . Coffman. I'll just pause.

No? I hear nothing. Oh. There. I see somebody.

Mr. Jones?
MR. JONES: Yeah. Pardon me. Good
afternoon, Madam Hearing Examiner.
I just wanted to state my appearance for the record. I was having some technical difficulties as we got started this morning and didn't want to interrupt.

But Blake Jones with Steptoe \& Johnson on behalf of Northern Oil and Gas. No questions, though. Thank you.

MS. ORTH: Thank you very much. All right.

Mr. Savage, if you have redirect for Mr. Coffman, this would be a good time.

MR. SAVAGE: Thank you, Madam Hearing Examiner.

Mr. Coffman, you mentioned and Mr. Rankin asked some questions about your history with Read \& Stevens and pointed out that things may have changed with Permian Resources.

But that is still a history of negotiations and interactions with Read \& Stevens in the past that has brought us to this point of a
contested hearing; is that correct?
MR. COFFMAN: Yes. That's correct.
MR. SAVAGE: And when a company like Permian Resources acquires a company like Read \& Stevens, they acquire the good stuff along with the bad stuff; is that correct?

MR. COFFMAN: That is correct.
MR. SAVAGE: So do you agree, then, that there's a certain amount of accountability for those past negotiations and that past behavior that has come to fruition in the present?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. I'd say so.
MR. SAVAGE: Okay. Mr. Rankin asked a number of questions about the 1979 operating agreement. And if you have an operating agreement in place that covers parts of the subject land and then you have a proposing new operating agreement for owners that would incorporate other parts that were not covered, is it true that the former operating agreement is still fully binding and in place?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes. You can supersede
an existing operating agreement, but that does not nullify the contractual obligations under that operating agreement.

MR. SAVAGE: So members -- okay. So if
I -- I mean, it sounds very complicated.
So members of an old operating agreement, a 1979 operating agreement, they want to participate under -- in the new unit that still includes parts of lands of the old operating agreement.

They sign a new JOA. Now they're part of the new JOA and the 1979 operating agreement?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes. That's correct.
MR. SAVAGE: Okay. Can you explain that?

MR. COFFMAN: So they would contribute their contractual interest under that '79 OA to the new superseding OA.

MR. SAVAGE: And then how would those -- how would that affect the overall manifestation of their interests?

MR. COFFMAN: They would -- I mean, they would be in the wells based on their contractual interests across what the original OA covers.

MR. SAVAGE: Okay.
MR. COFFMAN: In addition to the north half of 4 and 5.

MR. SAVAGE: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Coffman. And in the next series of questions that covered a bit of time, Mr. Rankin asked you about various designations of commitment and uncommitment.

And it is true that a number of those were typos?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes. That's true.
MR. SAVAGE: And you would revise those promptly once identified?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah.
MR. SAVAGE: Okay.
MR. COFFMAN: There was a lot of
committed and uncommitted going through all of these hearing packets. And it gets lost. But yes. Typos.

MR. SAVAGE: And then that Foran -- you
know, we do not have Foran. But Foran is closely allied with MRC; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes. That's correct.
MR. SAVAGE: And you've received
information that Foran has laid notice and notice has been satisfied; is that correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes. That's correct.
MR. SAVAGE: So there is really no issue there. So given all the adjustments that Mr. Rankin had mentioned, how does that affect the overall interest -- balance of interest between Permian Resources and Cimarex?

MR. COFFMAN: Minimal. I think one of the changes, as well, was adding the Josephine Hudson Trust as a Cimarex or Coterra interest. So that increases our support in both the Bone Spring and the Wolfcamp.

But the changes that are made with parties that have gone in neutral does not change the outcome of support, winning the majority of support for Cimarex in the Bone Spring and the Wolfcamp except
for that west-half west half of Sections 5 and 8.
MR. SAVAGE: So overall, Cimarex still
owns a majority interest?
MR. COFFMAN: Yes.
MR. SAVAGE: And that's even based on
Permian Resources' own title evaluations?
MR. COFFMAN: Correct. Ownership and support. Yes.

MR. SAVAGE: Then next, Mr. Rankin talked about the AFEs and pointed out what he thinks are, you know, some discrepancies regarding price and cost in various places.

An AFE, that's basically an estimation;
is that correct?
MR. COFFMAN: Yeah.
MR. SAVAGE: And it always fluctuates a
little bit based on the market?
MR. COFFMAN: Yes.
MR. SAVAGE: And then the working owners, they all understand that?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes. That's correct.

MR. SAVAGE: And you will send out updated AFEs at the time of the order?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes, sir.
MR. SAVAGE: Okay. And the fluctuations really, in the scheme of things, are not significant; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. I mean I would say minimal inflation. But Eddie could fine-tune those in his explanation.

MR. SAVAGE: So Mr. Behm has some good information to provide for that?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes, he does.
MR. SAVAGE: Another area that Mr. Rankin talked about -- and this confuses me a little bit. He pointed out -- he pointed to some edited language in the order and it looks like he gave the working interest owners an extra 60 days to consider whether or not to participate in the well or not. And therefore, he makes the extrapolation that they're not going to be burdened by the overall very massive costs of the development plan that Permian Resources is
presenting; is that correct?
MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. That's correct.
MR. SAVAGE: But isn't it true that Permian Resources presented this plan as a package with all the wells; is that correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. It's a co-development, at least in the Third Bone Spring and upper Wolfcamp. Yes.

MR. SAVAGE: And so ultimately, the owners are subject to the ultimate burden of the plan as a whole; is that correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes. That's correct.
MR. SAVAGE: So really, the only
way -- I don't know if Mr. Rankin was implying this, but the only way that a working interest owner would not be additionally burdened or their burden would be lessened is if on a case-by-case basis as they came to the individual wells that Permian Resources itself decided whether to develop the well or not; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Correct.
MR. SAVAGE: So they proposed --

| 1 | Permian Resources proposed wells in the Bone Spring. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | And then, they proposed the wells in the Wolfcamp. |
| 3 | Now if they're evaluating whether to |
| 4 | drill these on a case-by-case basis, they could -- for |
| 5 | example -- go through and decide to drill the Bone |
| 6 | Spring. |
| 7 | But then when they come to the |
| 8 | Wolfcamp, they may decide individually not to drill |
| 9 | the Wolfcamp and that would not burden the working |
| 10 | interests. |
| 11 | That would be a much less burden on the |
| 12 | working interests; correct? |
| 13 | MR. COFFMAN: That is correct. |
| 14 | MR. SAVAGE: But the overall result of |
| 15 | that would be that they would have, basically, |
| 16 | developing the Bone Spring and not the Wolfcamp; |
| 17 | correct? |
| 18 | MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. That would be like |
| 19 | our development. |
| 20 | MR. SAVAGE: Like Cimarex's? |
| 21 | MR. COFFMAN: The Bone Spring only. |
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MR. RANKIN: Madam Hearing Officer, I'm hearing a lot of leading questions and I'd prefer to hear Mr. Coffman testify.

MS. ORTH: Yeah.
Mr. Savage, that is how it's been going.

MR. SAVAGE: Okay.
MS. ORTH: Turn it around.
MR. SAVAGE: Thank you.
You heard Mr. Rankin present his
exhibit on all the wells -- additional wells that he wanted to show you; is that correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. With regard to their pooling orders in the Bone Spring and Wolfcamp.

MR. SAVAGE: Yes. So is it your opinion that he is claiming that Permian Resources is developing more Wolfcamp wells than we show in our example of cases --

MR. COFFMAN: I think we --
MR. SAVAGE: -- or courses?

MR. COFFMAN: I think we took ours from

Travis's testimony which references in the last 36 months that they drilled four Bone Spring and one Wolfcamp wells.

MR. SAVAGE: And where in his testimony
is that?
MR. COFFMAN: That'd be in Paragraph
31.

MR. SAVAGE: And what does he say in that paragraph?

MR. COFFMAN: He says: "As noted on the exhibit, Read \& Stevens/Permian has been the most active operator in this area over the last 36 months, drilling four Bone Spring wells and one Wolfcamp well in that time with plans to spud at least an additional eight wells in the Bone Spring and Wolfcamp formations by the end of 2023.
"In comparison, Cimarex has drilled a single one-mile well in 20 South 34 East and two two-mile wells in an adjacent township to the north in the same timeframe."

MR. SAVAGE: So 36 months, that's 3
years. Is that -- is it your understanding that's how long Permian Resources as a company has been involved and active in this area?

MR. COFFMAN: Permian Resources, yes. MR. SAVAGE: Okay. So would it not be fair to assume based on their landman's statement that Permian Resources really is focusing on the Bone Spring and has very little in the Wolfcamp?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes.

MR. SAVAGE: And then you -- we -- you know, Cimarex provided some examples of other cases; is that correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. We searched the OCD for Permian Resources and that's where we got that 11 cases figures.

MR. SAVAGE: And that was just a sample -- an example based on a search of the OCD databases?

MR. COFFMAN: Correct.
MR. SAVAGE: The last part of Mr.
Rankin's questions dealt with the options one and the
options two.
You've heard your geologists talk about the communication between the formations; is that fair to say?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes.
MR. SAVAGE: And as you understand, do these communications occur on all units, Bone Spring units in this area of interest surrounding the subject lands?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. I think the -yeah. The communication is like -- Eddie will get into fractures growing upward from the upper Wolfcamp into the Third Bone Spring sand.

MR. SAVAGE: So any operator -- Permian Resources, Pride Energy -- who develops a unit of the Bone Spring in this area, would they experience drainage? Would they be draining the upper Wolfcamp in some capacity?

MR. COFFMAN: Could you repeat that again? Sorry.

MR. SAVAGE: Any operator who drills
and develops the Bone Spring formation in this area of interest, would they drain from the upper Wolfcamp because of the communication as you understand it?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. There'd be
incidental production from the upper Wolfcamp.
MR. RANKIN: I'm sorry. I couldn't get my mute off.

But I think Mr. Coffman has explained pretty clearly he's not a technical witness. And I'm not sure how that is an appropriate question for Mr. Coffman about drainage.

MS. ORTH: Yeah. It sounds as though we need to have that discussion with the geologists.

MR. SAVAGE: Ms. Orth, that's why I prefaced -- if I may, that's why I prefaced that he has heard from the geologists that the communication is a fact for this area.

I tried to limit the technical aspect as much as possible. But --

MR. RANKIN: Well, $I$ think an engineer can hear -- can rely on hearsay testimony for his
opinions.
But a landman can't rely on hearsay testimony for his engineering, you know, opinions. Because he's not an engineer.

MR. COFFMAN: Have we run into this situation in other cases? Yes.

The Chauvez [ph] case that was held, I think, is what Darin is trying to ask me with the same -- same somewhat facts.

Is that right, Darin? I'm
paraphrasing. Sorry.
MR. SAVAGE: Well, is it your understanding then that option one would result in production from the Bone Spring and incidental drainage of the upper Wolfcamp of whatever percentage that might be?

MR. COFFMAN: Correct. Yes.
MR. SAVAGE: And that, as you
understand, is the nature of just about basically every Bone Spring unit that's developed in this area of interest; do you agree?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes. Correct.
MR. SAVAGE: And that would include
Permian Resources' Bone Spring units; correct?
MR. COFFMAN: Correct.
MR. SAVAGE: Okay. So option one, in your understanding, is a viable option?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: Maybe Mr. Savage can just ask him what he thinks about option one, and Mr. Coffman can testify to it.

MS. ORTH: Yeah. You've gone back to leading, Mr. Savage.

MR. SAVAGE: These are -- Madam Hearing Examiner, these are complicated questions and this is an expert witness. I believe I can establish some foundation for the question so that he can understand what the nature of the question is.

I mean, you know, it looked like Mr. Rankin was -- would set up a question in the same manner. And I -- you know, he's probably a little bit more sophisticated at doing that, because he's done it
for a longer time.
I respect his skills and abilities.
But I believe I'm basically doing the same kind of foundation.

MS. ORTH: Yeah. But it sounded more
like an ultimate conclusion. And the question was not "Do you consider option one to be viable?" which would have been a great question. It was rather: "You consider option one to be viable; right?"

MR. SAVAGE: Well --
MS. ORTH: So just turn it around. That's all.

MR. SAVAGE: I hear you. I hear you. It's good nuance. It's a good point. Thank you.

Do you consider option one to be viable issuant under the Oil and Gas Act as you understand it?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes, I do.
MR. SAVAGE: Okay. So Cimarex could produce the Bone Spring and then be allowed to drain a certain percentage from the upper Wolfcamp; do you

| 1 | agree with that? |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MR. COFFMAN: I do agree with that. |
| 3 | MR. SAVAGE: Okay. But there's another |
| 4 | option under the Oil and Gas Act. Do you think there |
| 5 | is another option under the Oil and Gas Act? |
| 6 | MR. COFFMAN: Yes. I think we're -- |
| 7 | yes. I think that's our option two. |
| 8 | MR. SAVAGE: Okay. So that would be |
| 9 | the option two, as you point out. |
| 10 | How do you make the transition from |
| 11 | option one to option two? |
| 12 | MR. COFFMAN: I think that would be up |
| 13 | to the commission to decide. |
| 14 | MR. SAVAGE: Wouldn't the commission |
| 15 | have to pool the Wolfcamp to arrive at option two? |
| 16 | MR. COFFMAN: Yes. |
| 17 | MR. SAVAGE: Would you have to submit a |
| 18 | proposal letter as a requirement -- |
| 19 | MR. COFFMAN: Yes. |
| 20 | MR. SAVAGE: -- to pool? Okay. |
| 21 | Madam Hearing Examiner, at this point, |
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there is a lot of legal questions about how you make that transition under the Oil and Gas Act. It's very complicated.

And I would ask that Cimarex be allowed to, at some point, address those questions for the full understanding of the commission since this is a very complicated matter.

And I'm not sure whatever the Division would allow and thinks is appropriate for that. So I'm going to -- and you know, there's a lot of things to explore in this area $I$ think are important.

But in terms of working with the landman, $I$ think I'm going to end the redirect at that point.

MS. ORTH: All right. Thank you very much, Mr. Savage.

I think in terms of laying out the legal arguments that have not already been laid out in the briefing that's already been done, I would typically invite proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law and any written legal argument
you'd like to make in a post-hearing submittal that would follow the submission of the transcript.

I usually don't have that conversation with Counsel until we're at the end of the evidentiary record, though. So maybe we'll have that conversation tomorrow.

MR. SAVAGE: Thank you. I just wanted to -- since it is kind of creating some turbulence with the questioning, $I$ just wanted to make sure that we're -- I understand how we're going to proceed. Thank you.

MS. ORTH: Sure. Anything further, Mr. Rankin or anyone else?

MR. RANKIN: Madam Hearing Officer, I just --

MS. ORTH: Questions of Mr. Coffman?
MR. RANKIN: -- have one question, and that's based on Mr. Coffman's statement about, you know -- he basically said it's up to the commission which option to choose. And I guess that prompted me to add just one question, because it prompted me to
wonder.
Mr. Coffman, does Cimarex itself have a preference between the two options, option one or option two?

MR. COFFMAN: I think option one would be our preference. But we would comply with whatever the commission decides.

MS. ORTH: Is that all, then? All right.

Well, thank you very much, Mr. Coffman. You may be brought back to discuss rebuttal exhibits tomorrow. But if not, thank you very much for your testimony.

MR. COFFMAN: All right. Thank you.
MR. RANKIN: Madam Hearing Officer, I don't know if the Division has any questions of Mr . Coffman?

MS. ORTH: I'm sorry? Oh. The technical examiners --

MR. RANKIN: I didn't know if the --
MS. ORTH: Of course.

Mr. Garcia, I lost the thread there. I'm sorry, Mr. Garcia and Ms. Thompson if you're on. Do you have a question of Mr. Coffman? MR. GARCIA: I do. And it's okay. I thought maybe you were having a panel mindset maybe before.

I thought you were going -- I do have one or two questions. And they are probably pretty repeats of what your counsel and Mr. Rankin have already asked you. Just for my understanding.

And I will try to steer clear, as my counsel has directed, about the legal arguments about option one and option two.

For option one -- we've talked a lot today about, I believe, CLM and Warren who are the interest owners in the Wolfcamp but do not own interest in the Bone Springs; is that correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes. That's correct.
MR. GARCIA: I believe you testified that you had offered them basically that their interest would be projected into the Bone Springs at

Cimarex's expense; is that correct?
MR. COFFMAN: Yes. That is correct.
MR. GARCIA: And they refused that, it sounded like?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes.
MR. GARCIA: Did they have a counter offer?

MR. COFFMAN: No. Their -- it wasn't necessarily an offer. I mean, we had originally asked if they wanted to blend their interest with a Bone Spring interest. They declined that.

And then $I$ offered on behalf of Coterra to just do a straight-up assignment free of charge, and they did not counter that.

MR. GARCIA: So was that two offers, per se I guess, that you made?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes.
MR. GARCIA: Okay. And they just were -- they didn't want to entertain either of those?

MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. I -- yeah. Correct.

MR. GARCIA: Did they give reason? Was it just mainly that they wanted Wolfcamp development? Or did they state why?

MR. COFFMAN: They said they support -they would support Permian's development. But I'm not --

MR. GARCIA: Okay.
MR. COFFMAN: We weren't -- we were not
fishing for their support. So regardless, we were interested in assigning those interests to them.

MR. GARCIA: That works. Let's see
here. I think all my other questions are pretty legal-involved. That's all. I have one more.

The letter that Mr. Rankin pulled up to ask -- that we got confused on are is it technical or was it sent by you. Either way, the letter was sent by you.

Was this letter sent to interests in just the Bone Springs? Or was it sent to interests in Bones Springs and the Wolfcamp? Because it sounds like there's some subtle differences there.

MR. COFFMAN: I think it was sent to -it was sent to everyone in the Bone Spring, I think, except for Warren and CLM since they --

MR. GARCIA: Okay. Since those are the two exceptions?

MR. COFFMAN: Correct.
MR. GARCIA: So option two is basically
compulsory pooling the Bone Springs and compulsory pooling the Wolfcamp.

Did you notify the Wolfcamp of being potentially compulsory pooled?

MR. COFFMAN: With our letters? Are you --

MR. GARCIA: Yes. They need to be served multiple notices as Counsel's aware. You know, certified green cards, letters, JOAs, offers, AFEs, et cetera, public posting.

MR. SAVAGE: Mr. Garcia, if I could answer that because we handled that part. We did a full application for the Wolfcamp. And as part of that application, we sent out letter notices for
pooling the Wolfcamp and we published timely. So -MR. GARCIA: Okay.

MR. SAVAGE: -- all notice would be taken care of.

MR. GARCIA: That's just what I wanted to ensure is they were notified of potential pooling without a well in the Wolfcamp.

MR. SAVAGE: And Mr. Garcia, if I can point out that we did -- in the application, we pointed out that the Third Bone Spring well would be the well dedicated to the Wolfcamp because of the substantial communication.

MR. GARCIA: Yeah. That's interesting. Lots of questions around that, but it sounds like Ms. Orth would like me to save those for tomorrow.

I'm trying to go through my notes and see which ones are not legal or rule interpretation.

Last one I think I have is more of a statement. All Counsel here is aware Mr. -- is it Mr. Coffman -- AFEs is one of our criteria in reviewing compulsory pooling contested cases.

And as Mr. Adam discussed and seemed to confirm by you, there's some slight issues with the AFE currently. So I would like those updated, you know, most of the timelines on that at the end of this hearing depending on what other items we need.

But updated AFEs would be nice and an also updated exhibit where you have committed and uncommitted interest owners as Mr. Savage related you would do.

MR. COFFMAN: We can do that for sure.
MR. GARCIA: I think that's it. Sorry.
Just trying to see which ones I'm -- I have lots of questions for you, Mr. Savage, tomorrow.

MR. SAVAGE: That's great. I look forward to them, Mr. Garcia. We want to flex this out fully.

MR. GARCIA: Yeah. I'm just trying to make sure $I$ get all the ones for Mr. Coffman so $I$ can let him enjoy his day.

I believe that's it for now.
MS. ORTH: All right. Thank you, Mr.

Garcia.
Ms. Thompson, do you have questions of
Mr. Coffman?
MS. THOMPSON: I have no questions.
Thank you.
MS. ORTH: All right. Thank you.
Thank you, Mr. Coffman, again.
And we will move to the next witness.

Thank you.
MR. RANKIN: Madam, I'm so sorry.
MR. COFFMAN: Thank you.
MR. RANKIN: I have a question about the well proposals under this proposal that Mr. Garcia prompted me to --

MS. ORTH: I'm having trouble hearing you, Mr. Rankin.

MR. RANKIN: Sorry. Mr. Garcia's question about well proposals and pooling in the Wolfcamp prompted a question of mine that I think would help the record if $I$ asked it to clarify. MS. ORTH: Okay. Of Mr. Coffman?

MR. RANKIN: Of Mr. Coffman. I
apologize.
MS. ORTH: Mr. Coffman, good. You're still there.

Go ahead, Mr. Rankin.
MR. COFFMAN: I'm here. Yeah.
MR. RANKIN: Mr. Coffman, I think you and I spoke around this a little bit, obliquely. But I think Mr. Garcia's question about well proposals as being an element of pooling prompted me to think again.

My understanding when $I$ reviewed your exhibits is that the intent of the June 15, 2023 letter as a supplement to proposal to drill was that it was intended to serve as a well proposal for pooling the Wolfcamp; is that your understanding?

MR. COFFMAN: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: And as such, you would have and should have sent out such a letter to each owner of a working interest in the Wolfcamp formation that you're seeking -- that has an interest; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Correct. We needed to provide notice.

MR. RANKIN: Okay. But not just notice, but to provide good faith efforts to negotiate what you're proposing to do in the Wolfcamp; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: Correct.

MR. RANKIN: So among those would be CLM and Warren, but also would be Read \& Stevens as well; correct?

MR. COFFMAN: To provide a proposal to?
MR. RANKIN: Yeah.
MR. COFFMAN: Yes. Correct.
MR. RANKIN: Did you provide this update -- supplemental proposal to drill to Read \& Stevens?

MR. COFFMAN: Read \& Stevens or Permian Resources? Because --

MR. RANKIN: Either one.
MR. COFFMAN: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: You did?
MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. I'd have to go
back and look. But yeah. Yes. We know that Read \& Stevens own in the Wolfcamp so we would provide that supplement to them.

MR. RANKIN: Okay. That's all my
questions.
MS. ORTH: Thank you all, then.
Thank you again, Mr. Coffman.
MR. COFFMAN: Thank you.
MS. ORTH: Mr. Savage, your next
witness?
MR. SAVAGE: Thank you.
I would like to call Staci Mueller as geologist for Cimarex Energy Company.

MS. ORTH: All right.
Ms. Mueller, would you please raise your right hand? Do you swear or affirm that you will tell the truth?

MS. MUELLER: I do.
MS. ORTH: Thank you. And if you would
spell your name for the transcript, please?
MS. MUELLER: Staci Mueller. S-T-A-C-I


| 1 | MS. MUELLER: Yes, I do. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MR. SAVAGE: Madam Hearing Examiner, at |
| 3 | this time, I ask that Cimarex Exhibit B and sub- |
| 4 | exhibits B1 through B4 for cases 23448 through 23451 |
| 5 | and 23594 through 23597 and 23452 through 23455 and |
| 6 | 23598 through 23601 be admitted into the record. |
| 7 | MS. ORTH: All right. |
| 8 | Mr. Rankin, any objection? |
| 9 | MR. RANKIN: No objection. |
| 10 | MS. ORTH: We'll pause for a moment in |
| 11 | the event any other party has an objection. I don't |
| 12 | hear anything. |
| 13 | The exhibits are admitted. Thank you. |
| 14 | MR. SAVAGE: And Ms. Mueller, just to |
| 15 | confirm, is your statement in each hearing packet the |
| 16 | same in all four? |
| 17 | MS. MUELLER: Yes. It should be. |
| 18 | MR. SAVAGE: Okay. So the examiners |
| 19 | who are reviewing this would have reference to that in |
| 20 | each case? |
| 21 | MS. MUELLER: Correct. |
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MR. SAVAGE: Okay. Have you reviewed Permian Resources' geologist's testimony and exhibits?

MS. MUELLER: Yes, I have.
MR. SAVAGE: Okay. And have you reviewed any of the other exhibits that relate to geology?

MS. MUELLER: Yes.
MR. SAVAGE: Okay. And you mention in your testimony and exhibits that the geology is unique in the subject lands and surrounding area of interest. Because -- well, why is it unique in the subject lands?

MS. MUELLER: There's no frac baffle present between the Third Bone Spring target and the upper Wolfcamp target.

That's pretty common in many places in the Delaware Basin, and we also see that here.

MR. SAVAGE: Okay. And do you see in Mr. Bradford's testimony discussion of lack of frac baffles?

MS. MUELLER: He doesn't explicitly say
it in his statement. However, in his Exhibit E5, he does show a cross-section with the basal third sand landing in a red dashed line and then the upper Wolfcamp landing in a purple dashed line. And I don't see any evidence of frac baffles between those two landings.

And what $I$ mean by a frac baffle is a very tight formation -- generally, carbonate is what we see -- that might inhibit frac growth.

MR. SAVAGE: So there is direct
evidence of frac baffles in his testimony?
MS. MUELLER: Of a lack of frac baffles.

MR. SAVAGE: Yeah. A lack of frac baffles. Thank you. Okay.

And can you tell me what is the significance of lack of frac baffles?

MS. MUELLER: It means that the -there are two formations. There's the Third Bone Spring sand formation and the Wolfcamp formation. However, there is one continuous reservoir interval.

Because we don't see a separation
between the two landing zones, we would expect
hydrocarbons to come from both the third sand and the upper Wolfcamp.

MR. SAVAGE: Okay. And as I
understand, the Third Bone Spring and the upper Wolfcamp -- do you they have two pool designations; is that correct?

MS. MUELLER: Yes.
MR. SAVAGE: But you're saying that
that does not represent two separate reservoirs; am I understanding that correctly?

MS. MUELLER: Correct.
MR. SAVAGE: So there's a single
reservoir, if $I$ understand?
MS. MUELLER: Between the Wolfcamp sands and the Third Bone Spring sand, I would say that's correct.

MR. SAVAGE: Okay. Do you see anything else in Mr. Bradford's Exhibit E5 that conflicts with your exhibits or testimony?

MS. MUELLER: I think the biggest conflict is the number of wells that Permian Resources plans to put in the Wolfcamp and the third sand.

So my Exhibits B23 and B24 argue that because there's no frac baffle in between the two landing zones and the wells are spaced at a very tight vertical distance of about 95 feet, the Wolfcamp and third sand wells are going to significantly interfere with each other. And Eddie Behm will cover that in his testimony.

MR. SAVAGE: Okay. And Mr. Bradford's
Exhibit E4, have you looked at that?
MS. MUELLER: Yes.
MR. SAVAGE: What does he claim that the Joker and Bane units cover?

MS. MUELLER: He's saying that the
Joker and Bane are geologically analogous to their Batman development.

MR. SAVAGE: Okay. Does he describe the extent of the formations that it covers?

MS. MUELLER: Yeah. So he's mapping
the Phi H of the Third Bone Spring sand in the top map. And then the Phi $H$ of the total Wolfcamp A shale in the bottom map.

However, their landing zone is located within just the very, very upper part of the Wolfcamp known as the $X$ and $Y$ Sands.

And so I think by mapping the entire Wolfcamp A shale, it's a little bit misrepresentative of what they're actually targeting.

Just because when they aim for the very top of the Wolfcamp, they're not going to be draining the Wolfcamp shale below.

MR. SAVAGE: Okay. Does that effect the analogy between the Joker and Bane and the Batman wells?

MS. MUELLER: So I would say Joker and Bane and Batman are geologically analogous. However, I think they're trying to point out that the Black and Tan is not analogous to Joker and Bane.

Which they are slightly different.
There's about a 4 pore/foot difference in the Third

Bone Spring sand and only a 3 pore/foot difference in the Wolfcamp sands.

But both the Black and Tan development and the Joker and Bane are located within a high-porosity third sand fairway with only about a hundred-fifty-foot difference in structure. So I would consider those geologically analogous.

MR. SAVAGE: Okay. And Mr. Bradford seems to indicate in his testimony and the Exhibit E3 that Batman wells, if $I$ understand this, have a thicker bone spring in the Wolfcamp formation than the Black and Tan wells?

And I think you may have talked about this already, but is that true?

MS. MUELLER: Yeah. So that's what I just mentioned about the slight variation in Phi $H$ between the two areas.

However, it -- I don't consider that to be a significant difference as they both lie within the high-porosity third sand fairway that the majority of operators are targeting here within the third sand.

So I would still consider them to be geologic analogs.

MR. SAVAGE: Okay. Mr. Bradford, looking at his exhibits, seems to give a number of examples in E8 and E15 where he believes co-development units currently exist.

In fact, looking at Section 28 and 23 of 20 South 34 East, what is your opinion of those being co-development units?

MS. MUELLER: So I think you're referring to the Little Bear development. And I define that to be landed in only the Wolfcamp, whereas they're saying that they're staggered between the Wolfcamp and third sands.

So because the Wolfcamp sands are so thin in the proximal part of the basin, it's sometimes really difficult to tell where wells have landed versus how they're defined on permits.

And at Cimarex, we use two approaches to define where the wells are landed. We use grids at the top and base of each landing zone. And then, we
also double-check that using offset type logs.
So I'm not sure where the discrepancy is between how Permian Resources might be defining wells versus how we do it. But we're definitely using grids.

MR. SAVAGE: So if I understand that right, you're looking at the geology and not a form that's generated in an office?

MS. MUELLER: Right. We're checking the permitted depths, but we're also looking at the geologic grids to confirm or maybe have a different opinion on where the wells might be landed.

MR. SAVAGE: And so is it the geology that determines waste and correlative rights? Or at least relates to them?

MS. MUELLER: I'm not sure what you mean by that.

MR. SAVAGE: Well, would you have a more accurate assessment of questions like waste if you're looking directly at the geology and taking that into consideration?

MS. MUELLER: As opposed to just going with a number on the permitted form, that's correct. Yeah.

MR. SAVAGE: Also looking at Mr. Bradford's exhibits -- let's see here. So in terms of your answer to the Little Bear not being a truly co-development unit, is there a debate about the number of actual co-development units in this area that's being represented?

MS. MUELLER: Yeah. I would say there are a couple differences in how we're defining where the wells are landed versus where Permian Resources is defining where the wells are landed.

MR. SAVAGE: Okay. Could you give a kind of overview -- a little overview of which ones that you raise questions about?

Or are there additional ones that you raise questions about that $I$ have not mentioned?

MS. MUELLER: I think the Little Bear was the main one. I noticed the other one they had was the War Eagle in Sections 1 and 12 out of 20 South

33 East.
That one just doesn't have a deviation survey yet so I haven't included it on my Wolfcamp map. But once that deviation survey comes in, then I'm able to QC the depths of that well.

MR. SAVAGE: Okay. And what about some of the other units that had been, you know, thrown around, like Riddler and those kinds of wells?

MS. MUELLER: The Riddler unit, those wells are all one-mile Third Bone Spring sand wells that were drilled by Read \& Stevens.

MR. SAVAGE: Okay. Now I'm looking at Mr. Bradford's Paragraph E7 in Exhibit E7. I mean that just looks like a lot of wells.

Why doesn't Cimarex have wells all over the place like that?

MS. MUELLER: So Cimarex proposed wells that lie within lower-risk zones. So I'm showing that in my Exhibit B4, I believe.

Meaning that there's offset production in a geologically analogous area within the first
sand, second sand, and third sand.
And then in Mr. Bradford's statement for Exhibit E7, he's saying that their plan demonstrates that its spacing assumes maximum development of all prospective zones.

Which to me sounds like this development plan is not what Permian Resources intends to realistically drill. So Cimarex is also investigating the upper second sand in this area.

But because it's highly channelized and the offset upper second sand wells are over six miles away to the north, we're not rushing into a development. And we'd like to collect more data on those wells as we drill the Third Sand wells first.

And then we're also actively targeting the Harkey and South lead. But we need to evaluate the maturity of the shale up there and whether it's an economically viable target, especially with co-developing with an established zone such as the lower Second Sand.

MR. SAVAGE: So if $I$ understand that
right, Permian Resources by proposing all these wells -- I believe there's 48 of them -- as initial wells to be commenced drilling if an order is issued in one year, would you feel like they're being rushed?

MS. MUELLER: Yeah. I think the main landing zones that we would have an issue with are the upper Second Sand.

I think more data needs to be collected on that zone, as well as the Harkey and then the upper Wolfcamp being co-developed with the Third Sand.

MR. SAVAGE: Okay. So if I'm looking at this -- you would question the upper Wolfcamp and the Bone Spring; why do you question that?

MS. MUELLER: It goes back to the very tight vertical spacing of just 95 feet. We don't consider that a true stagger.

And it's essentially a flat development within one combined reservoir interval of eight wells per section, which is twice as many wells as the majority of operators have drilled within that reservoir up here.

MR. SAVAGE: Okay. So flat
development. So if $I$ understand this right, you think there's a single reservoir; correct?

MS. MUELLER: Correct.
MR. SAVAGE: What happens if you put two well bores into a single reservoir?

MS. MUELLER: At 95-foot vertical
separation, there would be a significant amount of interference. And Eddie's going to show that later on with the Black and Tan development.

MR. SAVAGE: Okay. So would there be any benefit or not to --

MS. MUELLER: I think it's -- it's a matter of where you're allocating your reserves.

So if you drill a Third Sand well and you drill a Wolfcamp well directly below it, then one well is going to steal from the other.

MR. SAVAGE: Does the reservoir contain
a limited amount of resource?
MS. MUELLER: Yes.
MR. SAVAGE: So how would you describe

Cimarex's approach in general compared to Permian Resources' approach?

MS. MUELLER: I think the best way to describe it is in the gun barrel plot. Let me get to it.

So my Exhibit B4. Cimarex plans to drill four wells per section within the basal Third Bone Spring Sand. That's the established target in the area.

And then, Permian Resources will be essentially doubling that well count within the same reservoir interval by adding in an additional four wells within the upper Wolfcamp.

MR. SAVAGE: And what are -- can you describe the possible consequences of Permian Resources drilling all these wells?

MS. MUELLER: So their development is essentially eight wells per section. It's in a highly porous and permeable reservoir that's been developed across most of the area with half the wells. So I would consider it to be a waste of bore wells,

| 1 | essentially. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MR. SAVAGE: Madam Hearing Examiner, |
| 3 | I'm done with my rebuttal comparison. And Ms. Mueller |
| 4 | is available for cross exam. |
| 5 | MS. ORTH: All right. Thank you very |
| 6 | much. |
| 7 | Mr. Rankin, do you have questions of |
| 8 | Ms. Mueller? |
| 9 | MR. RANKIN: Madam Hearing Officer, I |
| 10 | do. I wonder -- and I apologize -- if I may take a |
| 11 | short facility break before we commence. I apologize. |
| 12 | In order for me to have my attention |
| 13 | appropriately fixated on the questions, I need to take |
| 14 | a short break. I apologize. |
| 15 | MS. ORTH: You know what? We need to |
| 16 | take a break about this time anyway and then go to |
| 17 | 4:30. So let's just come back at 3:05. |
| 18 | It's close to a 15-minute break. And |
| 19 | then we'll go straight on to 4:30. |
| 20 | MR. RANKIN: Thank you. |
| 21 | (Off the record.) |
|  | Page 167 |

MS. ORTH: -- was about to begin his cross-examination of Ms. Mueller.

Please go ahead.
MR. RANKIN: Good afternoon, Ms.
Mueller. How are you?
MS. MUELLER: Doing well.
MR. RANKIN: If you can't hear me or if my questions get garbled, just please let me know and I'll restate. Thank you.

I wanted to just clarify a couple of things. I had understood -- based on your crosssection and gun barrel view, $I$ guess, really -- that Cimarex was proposing a development plan of 24 wells per section.

But when $I$ read Mr. Coffman's testimony that was updated, he says that there's going to be 30 wells per section. And I didn't see that in your gun barrel view so I wanted to ask you.

And I understand that maybe those additional four wells might be accounted for by the Second Bone Spring -- upper Second Bone Spring zone,
which you indicated needed some additional evaluation.
Is that the situation there? Where he identified 30 wells as the full development, and you've got 24 in your gun barrel? And the difference is that upper Second Bone Spring zone?

MS. MUELLER: So we have 12 wells per section. So 24 total. And then, the 6 extra would come from a potential upper Second Sand stagger. Correct.

MR. RANKIN: So that would be two wells per section? Oh, no. Sorry.

MS. MUELLER: Three in the upper Second Sand.

MR. RANKIN: Three per section. I'm sorry.

Now would that 30 -well total for both developments, at this point, be -- would you consider that to be Cimarex's full development plan?

MS. MUELLER: That would not be the maximum development plan that we would ever drill. There's still opportunity within the Wolfcamp A shale

```
potentially deeper.
```

But the wells that we've proposed are the ones that we feel confident in drilling in the near future.

MR. RANKIN: You know what your maximum development plan would be for this acreage?

MS. MUELLER: It's hard to say without additional information, including additional offset development, which is why we hadn't proposed additional wells within the Wolfcamp A shale.

But I do see us potentially drilling the upper Second Sand which is why that well count increased to 30 .

I don't -- it'd be very difficult to tell if we would actually stagger the lower Second Sand with the third carbonate like Permian Resources has.

It's a lot like the Wolfcamp and the Third Sand. There's a lot of shared resource there with minimal frac baffles separating the two.

But I think that requires future or
additional research and information, as well.
MR. RANKIN: What I took away from your testimony is that you're not taking anything off the table; but you're saying that Cimarex needs to obtain or acquire additional data, information, more analogous offsetting wells in order to make an educated determination on how to proceed with some of these other zones; is that a fair recapitulation?

MS. MUELLER: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: And so an operator, you know, would -- if they're going to propose certain zones, they would -- as you're suggesting -- would want to have some data information on an offset that they could base their proposals on; fair to say?

MS. MUELLER: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: And you understand that Permian has drilled a pilot hole in its offsetting Batman development plan?

MS. MUELLER: Yes.

MR. RANKIN: And you understand that they took some -- they did some science and core --
took some core data and samples from that pilot hole? MS. MUELLER: Yep.

MR. RANKIN: And that's the kind of thing that you're talking about? That Cimarex would need to do before it made a determination about whether to target the Harkey, the upper Second Bone Spring -- or what is it? Co-develop the Harkey and the lower Second Bone Spring?

MS. MUELLER: Yes.

MR. RANKIN: I want to talk a little bit -- I want to just have a little better understanding about frac baffles.

I think I understood you to clarify that frac baffles are basically -- and in your exhibits, you identify frac baffles, I think, mostly as carbonate.

But I think in your testimony just now, you explained that really, it could be any tight formation that would flow -- low permeability that would impair or impede a frac from propagating; is that correct?

MS. MUELLER: Yes. The most common type of frac baffle we see within the Bone Spring reservoir is carbonate.

However, in the Wolfcamp in many areas -- especially the Wolfcamp A2 down south or in Eddy County -- we see a high amount of clay stone which we would also consider a frac baffle.

MR. RANKIN: These cross-sections, you just identify frac baffles as being carbonates; right?

MS. MUELLER: Right.
MR. RANKIN: But are there no other tight intervening lenses or formations that are not carbonates that you believe would impede or impair frac propagation at all?

MS. MUELLER: Not from what $I$ see on the logs. What I'm trying to identify is where the neutron and density porosity decreases down to almost 0 percent. Or less than 4 percent density porosity is a common cutoff used for frac baffles.

So what I'm highlighting is all I see for formations that reach that low level of porosity
is the carbonate within the third car on my Exhibit B7.

MR. RANKIN: Okay. And so looking at that Exhibit B7, I see you have indicated some frac baffles between the Third Cone Spring and the third carbonate within the Bone Spring; correct?

MS. MUELLER: Correct.
MR. RANKIN: But nothing between the basal Third Bone Spring and the $X / Y$ of the Wolfcamp, and then nothing between the $X / Y$ and the Wolfcamp A; correct?

MS. MUELLER: Yeah. It looks like within the upper part of the Wolfcamp A there are very, very thin-bedded what looks like potential carbonate where you see the density porosity jump down to zero percent.

But I didn't highlight that, because they are so thin-bedded it's probably on an order of five feet or less that a fracture is going to propagate through that.

MR. RANKIN: Right. So part of the
other calculation here in your assessment would be not just the log values but also the thickness; correct?

MS. MUELLER: Correct.
MR. RANKIN: Is there a sort of
thickness that you're looking for, below which you would deem it not to be an effective barrier?

MS. MUELLER: So I'm very careful in my
use of "frac barrier" versus "frac baffle", because it's very difficult to tell when fractures are actually going to be stopped by these carbonates.

I think when a carbonate is less than a hundred feet, two hundred feet, it's very difficult to measure. Fractures will be slowed down, but it's so difficult to tell if a fracture will actually be stopped by that carbonate.

So a very complicated answer of saying the thickness is -- it's very difficult to determine the thickness of a frac baffle that makes it an actual barrier to fractures.

MR. RANKIN: Sounds like it's sometimes a little bit of an art more than a science, huh?

Okay. So as to determining what the thickness would be, let's try to use your terms.

For a baffle, do you have a sense for like what you would determine to be a barrier, a thickness of a carbonate?

MS. MUELLER: Let's see. So on my type log on Exhibit B6, what we see is that there's very limited or no communication between wells landed within the First Bone Spring versus the Second Bone Spring versus the Third Bone Spring.

So it's probably a combination of height difference and frac baffles in between the different landings. But $I$ would say a good frac baffle is probably the Second Carbonate.

MR. RANKIN: On B7, you're talking about that baffle you've identified in the first two well logs going from A to A prime?

MS. MUELLER: That's pretty thin so I would consider that to be a baffle. But because it's not over a hundred feet of solid carbonate, it's -- if one were to land a well within the Third Carbonate,

I'm not sure that we wouldn't see communication between a Third Bone Spring Sand well versus a Third Carbonate well.

MR. RANKIN: Well, $I$ think -- you know, I think -- I guess my bigger point here, though, is that you didn't identify any frac baffles or barriers on your exhibit between the Wolfcamp A or between the X/Y and the Third Bone Spring; right?

MS. MUELLER: Right.
MR. RANKIN: Now I want to kind of get away from frac baffles a little bit, having discussed it with you.

I want to talk a little bit more about Phi height, pore height. And I'm going to refer to -- let's see. Make sure I have the right paragraph. Okay.

Paragraph 15 of your statement, you talk about Phi height, porosity height, in the Third Bone Spring. And you're referring to your Exhibit B10; okay?

And you make a comparison between the

Wolfcamp and the Bone Springs in this exhibit. And on your left is your type log, your well log -right -- that you base your mapping on; correct?

MS. MUELLER: Correct.
MR. RANKIN: And you do two things
here, I think. You map the $X / Y$ across the entire interval based on the log; right?

MS. MUELLER: Right.
MR. RANKIN: And in your Third Bone
Spring Sand, you do the same thing. And you map the entire interval from the top of the Third Bone Spring to the base. And that's the basis for your map of the Third Bone Spring; correct?

MS. MUELLER: Correct.
MR. RANKIN: Now Cimarex is landing its
Third Bone Spring at the base of that Third Bone Spring interval; correct?

MS. MUELLER: Correct.
MR. RANKIN: And Cimarex is doing that, presumably, because that is the zone that's identified as having the best potential for productivity;

```
correct?
```

MS. MUELLER: Correct.
MR. RANKIN: You've mapped the entire interval here and attributed Phi pore height across the entire interval even though you're landing at the base; correct?

MS. MUELLER: Correct.
MR. RANKIN: That's what I think I
heard you comment on in your rebuttal about what Mr . Bradford did in his Exhibit E4; correct?

MS. MUELLER: Correct.
MR. RANKIN: So in your testimony, you said that Mr. Bradford's depiction of the gross Phi height of the $X / Y$ which was across the entire interval when they're landing at the bottom -- towards the bottom of it was a little bit of a misrepresentation of the quality of that zone. Because they're really only landing in the bottom portion of it; correct?

MS. MUELLER: They would be landing at the top of the --

```
                    MR. RANKIN: I'm sorry. Top. Sorry.
```

| 1 | Top. Sorry. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MS. MUELLER: Right. |
| 3 | MR. RANKIN: But except for my |
| 4 | miscommunication on what part of the $\mathrm{X} / \mathrm{Y}$, that was the |
| 5 | thrust of your statement in your testimony; correct? |
| 6 | MS. MUELLER: Correct. |
| 7 | MR. RANKIN: So here, however, it seems |
| 8 | to me you're doing the same thing. You've mapped the |
| 9 | entire interval but you're landing the very bottom of |
| 10 | it. |
| 11 | And it seems to me that's a potential |
| 12 | misrepresentation of the target; is that not a fair |
| 13 | statement? |
| 14 | MS. MUELLER: The point of this exhibit |
| 15 | was to show what percent of the reservoir is the Bone |
| 16 | Spring versus what percent of the reservoir is the |
| 17 | upper Wolfcamp. |
| 18 | If $I$ were to map the total reservoir, I |
| 19 | would map from the top of the Third Sand down to the |
| 20 | top of the A1. |
| 21 | MR. RANKIN: Okay. Now in doing |
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so -- I guess let me ask you this, then.
In doing so, you're -- in this
circumstance, is Phi height the pore height?
Is it -- as I understand your
testimony, it's serving as a proxy, as a substitute, for potential hydrocarbon production; is that fair?

MS. MUELLER: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: But Phi height -- in other words, the measurement of the pore density across the interval -- doesn't tell you anything about what's in those pores; does it?

MS. MUELLER: Right.
MR. RANKIN: So you don't know, looking at this data, what portion of that Third Bone Spring Sand is oil-saturated, water-saturated, or some combination of the two?

MS. MUELLER: Right. And I did look at SO Phi $H$ as well and came up with very similar values. But here, I've only shown Phi H.

MR. RANKIN: Where do you get your -where did you get those values from?

MS. MUELLER: Those were derived from our petrophysics model.

MR. RANKIN: Okay. So it's not actual data that you had to determine that value?

MS. MUELLER: It's actual data taken from a different part of the basin.

MR. RANKIN: Okay. And it's -- I'm not a modeler. I'm not going to pretend to be one.

But it's not data taken from within that four-section area or any immediate offsets?

MS. MUELLER: Correct.
MR. RANKIN: So when you did your analysis here in B10 where you evaluate what portion of the reservoir the Third Bone Spring contributes versus the Wolfcamp, that's simply a measure of the pore space as a proxy for productivity; correct?

MS. MUELLER: Correct. It was the best way $I$ could quantify through mapping which part of the reservoir came from the Bone Spring versus the upper Wolfcamp.

MR. RANKIN: But Cimarex doesn't have
the data itself or any offsetting wells to go any farther than this with its assessment; is that correct?

MS. MUELLER: Not in this area. But elsewhere, we do.

MR. RANKIN: Thank you. Now I guess just one other point $I$ wanted to make on this is -again, I've got a kind of sort of tangent to this.

But your determination, your assessment of the reservoir essentially assumes uniformity across -- and I'm going to say -- both the $X / Y$ and the Third Bone Spring here.

I mean, you're unable to make any distinctions or gradations between any portions of these well -- at least in this assessment, you're not making any distinctions in the quality from the top to the bottom, between the top of the Third Bone Spring to the bottom of the $X / Y$; correct?

MS. MUELLER: I'm not sure what you mean by that.

MR. RANKIN: I mean, in other words,
you know, you're just comparing the kind of gross-scale porosity across these two intervals.

And you're not saying, you know, the upper third is better than the bottom third or anything like that. You're just sort of comparing them on a gross basis?

MS. MUELLER: Right.
MR. RANKIN: All right. Now let's make sure -- all right. I'm going to stay on pore height a little bit more.

Because I heard you talk about
analogizing or considering whether the -- I believe. Let's see if I've got the right map here. One second.

Have to find the right one. Okay.
B10. Okay. Good thing because that's right where we were. Okay.

The Black and Tan -- okay -- is the well that was drilled by Apache, and Mr. Behm addresses it fairly extensively in his testimony.

And he does some analysis of the pore height or the Phi height -- right -- of the interval
where the Black and Tan is located. And that's Section 27, just to the south of the area of interest here.

And I'm going to -- in this situation, going to share my screen just so we can see better. All right. I've got your B10 up on the screen. Can you see it?

MS. MUELLER: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: So on the righthand side is your map of the Phi height or pore height for the Wolfcamp X/Y Sands; correct?

MS. MUELLER: Correct.
MR. RANKIN: And you've indicated here it's essentially a range from 9, 10, to 11 pore height or, you know, pore-foot, I guess.

I'm not articulate on -- but basically, that's the gist here; right? That that's the range of that Phi height here in this area?

MS. MUELLER: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: Now the -- and it's hard to read. It's very hard to read. But Section 27, as

Mr. Behm states, is approximately two miles south, maybe a little bit more.

I can see it on my screen, but it's basically -- it's hard to see. Tell me if you agree that it's this section that I'm circling around with my cursor. Do you agree?

MS. MUELLER: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: Okay. Now in Mr. Behm's testimony, he assigns that section a Phi height of 7; right?

MS. MUELLER: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: And you agree with that? MS. MUELLER: Yes.

MR. RANKIN: And he assigns, I guess, an average value of 10 for the Mighty Pheasant, Loosey Goosey, Joker, Bane areas I've highlighted here with a red circle -- a red outline; yeah?

MS. MUELLER: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: Now that doesn't seem like a big number or a big difference, but what's the percentage difference between 7 and 10 there?

MS. MUELLER: 30 percent.
MR. RANKIN: Pretty good, isn't it? I mean, that's -- actually, well, I mean -- yeah. That's a pretty good number.

And so you're saying that that's an insignificant -- and now let me ask you this. In your testimony, you equate Phi height with productivity of oil and gas; correct?

MS. MUELLER: Correct.
MR. RANKIN: And so a difference of 30 percent in the potential for productivity between the Black and Tan location in Section 27 and the Joker/Bane cases in the sections highlighted, even by your own Phi height analysis, is a pretty potentially substantial difference in productivity as a Phi height is a proxy for productivity?

MS. MUELLER: I would disagree with that for Wolfcamp production.

One of the reasons why I sued Phi H was because for all of the Third Bone Spring Sand production in the area, we have wells in lower Phi H
and higher Phi H.
There's a pretty good spread across this map. And we found a pretty good correlation between well productivity and Phi H.

The Wolfcamp, however, has a very limited number of tests in this area. So it's a little difficult to tell if the Wolfcamp production is on-trend with the Wolfcamp mapping, because a lot of that production is coming from the Third Bone Spring Sand.

MR. RANKIN: Aren't they both one tank? Aren't they both one reservoir? And how would there be a distinction between the two?

MS. MUELLER: I'm saying based on these maps. And I totally agree that these are both one reservoir.

So if $I$ were to look at productivity of both the Third Sand and the Wolfcamp wells compared to a map of both the Third Sand and the X/Y Phi $H$, there would be more of a correlation between productivity and the Phi $H$ map.

But with so few Wolfcamp X/Y data points and just comparing that the Wolfcamp map; because it's -- there's no production over a large area with a large span in Phi H differences, it's a little more difficult to tell.

MR. RANKIN: Your hesitation is that you don't have enough data to make that correlation in the Wolfcamp between Phi $H$ and productivity in the Wolfcamp?

MS. MUELLER: Right.
MR. RANKIN: So you're hesitant to make that further step even though it's your position that the Wolfcamp and $X / Y$ and the Third Bone Spring are, essentially -- function as a single flow unit; agree?

MS. MUELLER: I hesitate in the Wolfcamp, but I'm very confident in the Third Sand contributing 72.8 percent of the reservoir.

MR. RANKIN: I need to make sure I get my screen resized properly.

Now Ms. Mueller, you're familiar with the letter that I -- were you present for my
examination of Mr. Coffman?
MS. MUELLER: Yes, I was.
MR. RANKIN: And did you hear our discussion about the June 15, 2023 letter that he sent out to some of the owners for -- to supplement their previous well proposal for the Bone Spring wells?

MS. MUELLER: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: And you heard our discussion around that letter about how he agreed that in general, the Wolfcamp would contribute anywhere from 5 to 26 percent or so of production from those -to those Bone Spring wells?

MS. MUELLER: I don't remember if that's what it said.

MR. RANKIN: Are you familiar with the briefing that Cimarex's counsel submitted to the Division on the legal issues around these cases?

MS. MUELLER: I'm relatively familiar with the legal aspect.

MR. RANKIN: Pardon my screen for a moment. I'm going to pull up the brief. Because I
want to understand where these numbers came from, and I believe they're related to your assessment of Phi height. And I want to understand; okay?

MS. MUELLER: Okay.
MR. RANKIN: Because I'm not connected to our server directly, everything takes a little more time. Okay. All right. I'm going to, again, share my screen.

Oh, no. Wait. Am I? Yes. Clicked the wrong thing. All right.

This is page 6 of Cimarex's brief; okay? And I've highlighted the section here. And I'm going to just scroll up so you can see that I'm referring to the document that $I$ said $I$ was: Cimarex Energy's Brief Providing the Basis for Evaluating a Single Reservoir; okay? I'm not going to read the whole thing.

Now in this brief -- okay -- that they filed with the Division, Cimarex counsel identifies -says the following: "When an operator pools and spaces just the Bone Spring pursuant to the pooling statutes,
the operator produces hydrocarbons from the Bone Spring.
"However, this production will also naturally drain a certain percentage from the upper Wolfcamp because of the communication between the formations.
"The exact amount of the production attributable to the upper Wolfcamp is uncertain, but can range anywhere from 5 to 10 percent up to approximately 26 percent.
"Such drainage, distinct from production, is incidental to producing the target formation which is the Bone Spring."

Okay. Do you recall ever seeing that language before?

MS. MUELLER: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: All right. Where did these numbers come from? How does Cimarex determine that 5 to 10 percent or up to 26 percent of production in these Bone Spring wells will come from the Wolfcamp?

MS. MUELLER: I believe that's based on both Eddie's analysis of the Black and Tan as well as these Phi H percentages.

MR. RANKIN: Some combination of geology and engineering. Okay. Do you agree with that range?

MS. MUELLER: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: Do you agree that the exact amount of hydrocarbons from the Wolfcamp that would be produced is uncertain?

MS. MUELLER: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: Do you agree it could be more than 26 percent?

MS. MUELLER: Based on the Phi H maps, that's highly improbable.

MR. RANKIN: Okay. And again, that's just a proxy for porosity. You don't know. You have no basis to say in this location -- because you have no data -- how much of that porosity is filled with oil or water or a rough combination; correct?

MS. MUELLER: We have no data to
support a confident oil saturation measurement. Therefore, $I$ can't give an accurate SO Phi H map.

But $I$ am confident in the relationship between Phi $H$ and productivity of offset well.

MR. RANKIN: Only in the Bone Spring; correct?

MS. MUELLER: Correct.
MR. RANKIN: Because you don't -- you just told me you weren't confident about it in the Wolfcamp; correct?

MS. MUELLER: Yeah.
MR. RANKIN: Thank you. Now so you don't know, I mean, standing here today whether it could be less or more; right? It could be more.

MS. MUELLER: Highly doubtful.
MR. RANKIN: Okay. So you're not -- so
you don't know. Now --
MS. MUELLER: I do not know.
MR. RANKIN: Yeah. Now let me ask you
this. Suppose that the Division approves Cimarex's application under option two and pools both the

Wolfcamp and the Bone Spring and dedicates the Bone Spring wells to both formations.

In other words, there's no well drilled into the upper Wolfcamp; okay? And the Wolfcamp pool is being drained only by the Bone Spring wells; okay?

Is it your opinion -- do you have any idea whether the Bone Spring wells will effectively and efficiently drain the Wolfcamp?

MS. MUELLER: I think there will be incidental drainage from the upper Wolfcamp. I don't think the Bone Spring wells will drain the Wolfcamp A1 shale.

MR. RANKIN: You told me that it's
doubtful it will exceed 26 percentage production from the Wolfcamp in the Bone Spring wells; correct?

MS. MUELLER: Correct.
MR. RANKIN: And you're talking about the upper Wolfcamp here; correct?

MS. MUELLER: Right.
MR. RANKIN: So even the upper Wolfcamp is only going to contribute, in your view, doubtfully
any more than 26 percent to production from the upper Wolfcamp; correct?

MS. MUELLER: Correct.
MR. RANKIN: But nevertheless, Cimarex is seeking to pool the entire Wolfcamp formation under option two; correct?

MS. MUELLER: Correct.
MR. RANKIN: Are you aware of any wells that Cimarex has drilled within Mr. Behm's area of review that targe the lower Wolfcamp?

MS. MUELLER: The Perry -- I forgot the number. But Cimarex actually did target the Wolfcamp A shale at our Perry section, Section 22 in 20 South 34 East on one end of the section.

And then we also targeted the Third Bone Spring Sand on the other end of the section.

MR. RANKIN: My understanding of Mr. Behm's testimony on the Perry was that it was not a good well, and it sounded to me like they wouldn't be interested in drilling another one like it; is that your understanding?

MS. MUELLER: It would be a lower-tier reservoir, but we would definitely come back and drill it at some point.

MR. RANKIN: So your understanding is under Cimarex's economics, the Perry well would be something that they would drill again?

MS. MUELLER: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: They would drill it? They would target that Wolfcamp zone independently of the Bone Spring because it's economic?

MS. MUELLER: Yes. It's just lower tier so it would be further out in our inventory.

MR. RANKIN: Now on the Black and Tan, Mr. Behm testifies -- we haven't gotten to him yet, of course; but he testifies that it's the only and best analog to Permian's development plan and is predictive of the likely outcome of Permian's proposed wells in the lower Third Bone Spring and the upper Wolfcamp X/Y.

Do you recall his testimony on that if you reviewed his written testimony?

MS. MUELLER: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: Is that a fair
recapitulation of what Mr. Behm testified?
MS. MUELLER: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: Have you conferred with him over the geology where the Black and Tan wells are landed?

MS. MUELLER: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: I think at this time, Ms. Mueller, $I$ have no further questions. And we'll turn her back over for redirect or questions by the examiners.

MS. ORTH: Thank you, Mr. Rankin.
Now let me pause a moment in the event other parties who have entered an appearance have a question of Ms. Mueller. No?

Do you have any redirect, Mr. Savage?
MR. SAVAGE: I do. Thank you, Madam Hearing Examiner.

Ms. Mueller, the Permian Resources wells, where are they positioning those in the

Wolfcamp?
MS. MUELLER: Bane and Joker, you mean? MR. SAVAGE: Yes.

MS. MUELLER: Those will be in the Wolfcamp Y Sand.

MR. SAVAGE: And in that location, Bane and Joker, would they produce the entire Wolfcamp?

MS. MUELLER: No. They would not.
MR. SAVAGE: So if $I$ understand that, in comparison from the Third Bone Spring and the Permian Resources' Wolfcamp would bear the same; is that correct?

MS. MUELLER: Say that again? Sorry.
MR. SAVAGE: In terms of producing the Wolfcamp, would you say that Cimarex's Third Bone Spring well would be just as effective at producing the Wolfcamp as their upper Wolfcamp wells?

MS. MUELLER: It's hard to say because we're primarily targeting the Third Bone Spring Sand. But we would expect some drainage from the upper Wolfcamp.

MR. SAVAGE: And if that were pooled, that drainage, that would be production; do you agree with that?

MS. MUELLER: Yes.
MR. RANKIN: But Permian Resources'
upper Wolfcamp wells would not produce fully the middle or the lower Wolfcamp; is that right?

MS. MUELLER: That's correct.
MR. SAVAGE: Okay. So they are
potentially analogous in regards to how much they would produce from the Wolfcamp?

MS. MUELLER: You're saying our -- the basal Third Sand wells versus the Wolfcamp Y Sand are analogous?

MR. SAVAGE: That they are going to basically produce about the same amount from the Wolfcamp; is that accurate?

MS. MUELLER: Yes. I would agree with that.

MR. SAVAGE: And once you drill the wells, is it fair to say that you would collect more

| 1 | data? |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MS. MUELLER: Yes. That's our plan |
| 3 | when we go in and drill the Third Bone Spring Sand |
| 4 | wells. |
| 5 | MR. SAVAGE: And based on that data, |
| 6 | you would have an accurate assessment of how much is |
| 7 | being produced from the Wolfcamp; do you agree with |
| 8 | that? |
| 9 | MS. MUELLER: Yes. And I would love to |
| 10 | get a more accurate estimation of oil saturation. |
| 11 | MR. SAVAGE: So at that point, you |
| 12 | would have concrete numbers and firm percentages; do |
| 13 | you agree? |
| 14 | MS. MUELLER: Yes. |
| 15 | MR. SAVAGE: And there's a question of |
| 16 | allocation that has been brought up through this. And |
| 17 | Mr. Rankin, I believe, has alluded to this. |
| 18 | But those firm numbers that you'd |
| 19 | receive in terms of percentages, would those allow you |
| 20 | to do an accurate allocation? |
| 21 | MR. RANKIN: Objection. I didn't ask |
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her about allocation between the different formations for the purposes of pooling.

MR. SAVAGE: I'll --

MS. ORTH: Right.
MR. SAVAGE: I'll strike that question.
MS. ORTH: Thank you.
MR. SAVAGE: I'm finished, Madam Examiner, with the redirect.

MS. ORTH: All right. Thank you.
Mr. Garcia, do you have any questions of Ms. Mueller?

MR. GARCIA: I have a few.
Good afternoon, Ms. Mueller. Looking at your Exhibit B4, PDF page 195. This is my main question so we're on this exhibit because it's easiest to see the comparison, I think.

Just to clarify some other stuff real
quick. Earlier, you said lack of baffle. Are we talking about no baffle exists? Or is it just such a thin baffle that a frac would blow right through it?

MS. MUELLER: In most cases around this
whole area, there's a very minimal baffle. If you go to my Exhibit B24, I actually show all of the control points.

And where the number says zero, it means no baffle exists. And if it's a slightly higher number, it means there's something minimal separating the two formations.

MR. GARCIA: Okay. What logs did you -- do you have for all of the formations on your guys's cross-section from nearby wells? What type of logs?

MS. MUELLER: Are you talking the cross-sections in my exhibits? Or in general, what do we have access to?

MR. GARCIA: I guess I'm just curious on if there's any way -- and this goes to both parties, FYI, Adam -- if the Division could get copies of any logs you guys have; such as like neutron logs, dual lateral logs, triple combos. Just I guess I'm curious on looking at the logs myself, too.

MS. MUELLER: Got you. So we have a
lot of deep vertical control with triple combos. In some cases, we have sonics as well.

And I think we're able to provide copies of well logs that we own. So anything in -any logs in my exhibit, $I$ should be able to provide for you guys.

MR. GARCIA: Okay.
MS. MUELLER: But I can check for specialty log data. But this is pretty much the basis of my exhibits, just triple combo.

MR. GARCIA: I have a personal weakness. I struggle with gamma on formation plots. MS. MUELLER: Right. Which is why we try to use gamma resistivity and neutron density.

MR. GARCIA: Yeah. Yeah. They're just hard to read when they're coded in the exhibits and not the actual log sometimes.

MS. MUELLER: Got you.
MR. GARCIA: You discussed earlier that basically the Third Bone Springs on the top of the Wolfcamp is essentially acting as a reservoir, a
single reservoir.
Have you talked to OCD or any of the district offices about the possibility of renaming this as a single pool?

MS. MUELLER: Not that I'm aware of, but I would highly support that.

MR. GARCIA: Yeah. I'm going to butcher the definition, but OCD calls pools basically a unique source of reservoir, a unique source of oil.

We have some parts of the state that -like up north, I think we have the Mesaverde pools which crosses three separate formations, I think.

I was just curious if you've had any discussions with the Division on this before.

MS. MUELLER: I don't think so but I'd have to refer to Darin.

MR. GARCIA: That's fine. I'm not aware of any, myself.

How thick is the Wolfcamp X/Y here? I might have missed your exhibit on that.

MS. MUELLER: Let's see. About a

```
hundred feet.
```

MR. GARCIA: Okay. Did you guys evaluate any wine rack patterns with the Wolfcamp A, then? Or also stacked patterns, I guess?

MS. MUELLER: You mean what our future development plan might look like when we come back and develop the Wolfcamp A?

MR. GARCIA: I guess initial development plans and future development plans.

MS. MUELLER: Yeah. So I guess our Tier 1 formations in this area are the Third Sand, Second Sand, and First Sand so that's what we proposed.

If we were to come back later on and develop the Wolfcamp A shale, then we would land probably 250 feet-ish below our Third Sand landing to make sure that those wells have minimal interaction between each other. But $I$ don't have an example of that in my exhibits.

MR. GARCIA: Okay. And I guess that kind of leads into my next thing is -- if you come
back in the future, do you foresee any native parent-child effects with those Wolfcamp A wells?

MS. MUELLER: I think we would land as low as possible to avoid parent-child relationships between the Wolfcamp A shale and the Third Sand wells.

MR. GARCIA: Earlier, we spoke to your landman about option one and option two. I believe he said his option one was his preferred outcome, which was completely pooling just the Bone Springs.

I guess do you agree with that option?
Or would you prefer the option two because of potential future Wolfcamp development?

MS. MUELLER: I think I would agree with option one. And we would come back later on and drop our well below any sort of baffle, well into the A1 shale.

MR. GARCIA: Okay. And your counsel's aware if you -- if that was to play out that way, you would most likely have to reapply for compulsory pooling of Wolfcamp if option one was successful. Just a FYI.

Sorry. I'm moving pretty quick through these. You touched a little bit about frac growth. Are you the one I can ask about frac questions and frac height?

MS. MUELLER: I would probably leave that more to Eddie, but $I$ can comment on HFTS2 if that's kind of where you're going. I can comment on HFTS2 microseismic and fiber data showing racks growing up.

MR. GARCIA: I guess I'll ask and, I guess, if anything it'll prep Eddie to -- Eddie is our -- is you guys's production engineer; is that correct?

MS. MUELLER: He's our reservoir engineer.

MR. GARCIA: So there's lots of concern
with Read \& Stevens' plan of feeding into Wolfcamp because of the potential concerns of draining the Bone Springs. Frac heights go upwards is what I believe you guys have testified on today.

Was there any evaluation done on if a
different frac design was used? I think most operators use slick water fracs nowadays which are meant for, you know, high-rate/high-pressure frac length.

Old school, there's thick water fracs which result in lower frac lengths but wider fracs. Would you expect similar issues?

I mean -- because those frac lengths can be half of a slick water frac in some situations.

MS. MUELLER: Yes. I'll comment on the geologic part of that and Eddie can comment on the engineering part.

But I would expect that no matter what frac design you try to go with, we're clearly unable to control frac height growth.

And especially with the distance of 95 feet for vertical spacing and with a lack of frac baffles, $I$ think no matter what frac design you go with you're definitely going to be accessing the Third Sand.

MR. GARCIA: Okay. I think that is all

| 1 | my questions for now. Thank you for keeping up with |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | me. I know I moved fast around that. |
| 3 | MS. ORTH: Thank you, Mr. Garcia. |
| 4 | Ms. Thompson, do you have any questions |
| 5 | of Ms. Mueller? |
| 6 | MS. THOMPSON: I don't have any |
| 7 | questions at this moment. |
| 8 | MS. ORTH: All right. Thank you. |
| 9 | Anything else for Ms. Mueller today? |
| 10 | MR. SAVAGE: Madam Examiner, would it |
| 11 | be possible to provide some comments that might be |
| 12 | helpful to Mr. Garcia based on some of the questions |
| 13 | he was asking? |
| 14 | MS. ORTH: You mean right now? |
| 15 | MR. SAVAGE: Right now or -- yes. If I |
| 16 | could -- |
| 17 | MS. ORTH: Yeah. |
| 18 | MR. SAVAGE: Okay. |
| 19 | MS. ORTH: No, no. That's fine. If |
| 20 | you want to ask Ms. Mueller some follow-up, |
| 21 | absolutely. |

MR. SAVAGE: No. I'd just make some comments regarding Mr. Garcia's questions. I think there's some information that would be useful for him, that would clarify.

MS. ORTH: All righty. Go ahead.
MR. SAVAGE: Okay.
Mr. Garcia, you know that those were very interesting questions. The option one, the question about pooling just the Bone Spring.

We had a case involving Pride Energy just last week; and that's case number 23295.

And that whole issue of lowering the landing zone in the Wolfcamp and trying to see if you could design fracs that would not -- that would produce the upper Wolfcamp and not go into the Third Bone Spring, those were main issues that we discussed in that. So I think that might be useful in that regard.

And then, the other question you asked about could you, you know, do a different pool that would encompass the upper Wolfcamp and the Third Bone

Spring.
As I understand, in this area there's been so much trading because the Bone Spring seems to be the developed area formation.

And there's been a lot of trading trying to get acreage in that Bone Spring over the Wolfcamp. And that seems to account for the -- every place being non-uniform.

So even if you did reevaluate or expand the pool, like doing a WolfBone or something like that, you would still have that ownership severance that you would have to account for.

And under permit interpretations of the statute and regulations, you account for a severance by -- you know, if you want to produce below the severance, you have to do a separate well bore as I am sure you know.

So we still have this issue of how to produce from the -- if you did option two, how to produce from the Third Bone Spring and the upper Wolfcamp.

So I think those -- you know. I appreciate the time to be able to talk about that. MR. GARCIA: No. I mean, you're correct here on the WolfBone. WolfBone has mixed feedback from industry on if it's a good thing or bad thing.

And we do, like in the Mesa formation, have lots of depth severance as you're probably aware. And we have compulsory pooling, standard compulsory pooling cases on those all the time about depth severance where counsel will bring two cases for the entire form at Yeso thickness because of depth severance.

I was just curious if anyone had ever talked to us on it before. More out of curiosity than, $I$ guess, deciding a winner on this. I was just curious on how discussions have taken place with these.
I'm sorry. I'm trying to refrain
myself from the legal questions that $I$ have for you, because you touched on some of them. But I'm trying

| 1 | to be caged today, but -- |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MR. SAVAGE: I look forward to them |
| 3 | very much, you know. I appreciate it. |
| 4 | MR. GARCIA: Yeah. |
| 5 | MS. ORTH: Well, thank you. Thank you |
| 6 | both, gentleman. |
| 7 | And thank you, Ms. Mueller. |
| 8 | And let's see if we can't get another |
| 9 | witness at least mostly done. Mr. Savage? |
| 10 | MR. ZIMSKY: Madam Hearing Officer -- |
| 11 | MR. SAVAGE: Bill Zimsky will be doing |
| 12 | the next witness. |
| 13 | MR. ZIMSKY: Yes. |
| 14 | MS. ORTH: Great. Thank you. |
| 15 | Hello, Mr. Zimsky. |
| 16 | MR. ZIMSKY: Good afternoon. Our next |
| 17 | witness is Calvin Boyle. |
| 18 | MS. ORTH: All right. Thank you. |
| 19 | Mr. Boyle, would you raise your right |
| 20 | hand please? Do you swear or affirm to tell the |
| 21 | truth? |
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MR. BOYLE: I do.
MS. ORTH: Thank you. And if you would spell your name for the transcript?

MR. BOYLE: It's Calvin Boyle.
$\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{L}-\mathrm{V}-\mathrm{I}-\mathrm{N} \quad \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{Y}-\mathrm{L}-\mathrm{E}$.
MR. ZIMSKY: Good afternoon.
MS. ORTH: Thank you.
MR. ZIMSKY: Mr. Boyle, can you hear me?

MR. BOYLE: Yes, sir.
MR. ZIMSKY: There seems to be an echo, at least on my end. But I'll proceed.

Have you ever testified before the OCD as an expert in production facilities?

MR. BOYLE: No, sir.
MR. ZIMSKY: Could you briefly go over your educational background for the hearing examiner?

MR. BOYLE: Yes, sir. I graduated with
a petroleum engineering degree from the University of Oklahoma in 2016, followed by my MBA from Oklahoma State University in 2018.

MR. ZIMSKY: And give us a brief summary of your employment history.

MR. BOYLE: I started with Halliburton as a cement technical professional for about two years, from 2017 to 2019. And from there, I went to work for Cimarex as a field engineer for about a year.

After that, $I$ was a production engineer for Cimarex for about a year. And since then, I've been a facility engineer for a little over two years, since April 2021.

MR. ZIMSKY: And can you briefly
describe your responsibilities as a facility engineer for Cimarex and Coterra?

MR. BOYLE: Generally, I do the planning, designing, and the managing of our production facilities operated by Cimarex and Coterra.

MR. ZIMSKY: And are you involved in the design of the facilities?

MR. BOYLE: Yes, sir.
MR. ZIMSKY: And as part of that, do you have any responsibility for budget? Budgeting?

MR. BOYLE: Yes, sir. I am over the facilities budget for Lea County, currently, or any projects that I'm over.

MR. ZIMSKY: And as far as that, do you have to make decisions on allocating capital?

MR. BOYLE: Yes, sir.
MR. ZIMSKY: And this is -- your resume
is attachment $A$ to your statement; is that correct?
MR. BOYLE: Yes, sir.
MR. ZIMSKY: At this point, I would offer Mr. Boyle as an expert in the field of reservoir engineering and facility engineering with knowledge regarding the design and planning of production facilities, as well as the budgeting and capital costs associated therewith.

MS. ORTH: Any objection, Mr. Rankin?
MR. RANKIN: No objection.
MS. ORTH: All right. I'll pause for a
moment to see if there's any other objection. No?
He's so recognized, Mr. Zimsky.
MR. ZIMSKY: Thank you.

Do you have your self-affirmed statement in front of you?

MR. BOYLE: Yes, sir.
MR. ZIMSKY: And I'm not going to go over it in much detail. Now are the -- is your statement and the two exhibits attached to your statement, are they correct and accurate to the best of your knowledge?

MR. BOYLE: Yes, sir.
MR. ZIMSKY: Madam Hearing Examiner, I
would move to introduce the self-affirmed statement of Calvin Boyle and the two exhibits attached thereto which, I believe, is Exhibit C1 and C2. I'd like to have each of those -introduce those into evidence in case number 23448; 23451; 23594 through 23597; and in cases 23452 through 23455; and finally, in cases 23598-23601.

MS. ORTH: Thank you.
Mr. Rankin, any objection?
MR. RANKIN: No objection.
MS. ORTH: All right. I'll pause for a

| 1 | moment to see if there's any other. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | The exhibits are admitted. Thank you. |
| 3 | MR. ZIMSKY: Now Mr. Boyle, have you |
| 4 | had a chance to review the statement of Davro Clemens |
| 5 | from Permian Resources Operating LLC, Exhibit D to the |
| 6 | Permian Resources hearing packet? |
| 7 | MR. BOYLE: Yes, sir. |
| 8 | MR. ZIMSKY: And I have a few questions |
| 9 | about that. On Paragraph 9, third page, first |
| 10 | sentence says: "Permian Plans to utilize a four-stage |
| 11 | separation process to maximize retention of |
| 12 | hydrocarbon production." |
| 13 | Can you -- is that an unusual design or |
| 14 | proposal? |
| 15 | MR. BOYLE: No, sir. That's pretty |
| 16 | standard across the Basin, including our design. |
| 17 | MR. ZIMSKY: Including your design. My |
| 18 | second question, I'm going to try to share my screen. |
| 19 | And do you see Exhibit D9? Is that |
| 20 | showing up on the -- |
| 21 | MR. BOYLE: Yes. |

MR. ZIMSKY: Okay. And this indicates that Permian is going to have an off-pad -- their essential tank battery is going to be off-pad.

Cimarex's central battery is going to be on-pad; is that correct?

MR. BOYLE: Yes, sir. That's correct.
MR. ZIMSKY: And so what's the implications of being off-pad as Permian Resources is proposing?

MR. BOYLE: So if your facility is off-pad, you're going to have run additional flow lines off of -- off of the pad that it would be extended from.

So for ours, since we have a pad extension where the facility actually connects to one of the pads, we'll run flow lines on the pad. Rather than, if it's off-pad, you have to run additional flow lines off-pad to the battery.

MR. ZIMSKY: So would you -- would they have to do flow lines for each well?

MR. BOYLE: It depends on their design.

From what I can tell from the Permian Resources design, looking at Exhibit D3, it would appear that they're running individual flow lines back to the battery for every well.

Compared to our design where we have satellite separators, where we're putting them up on-pad and running a single set of flow lines.

So when we come back, we'll only be setting on-pad equipment. We will have no further environmental impacts or disturbance. Once we've set the first four pads, we won't have any more disturbance.

Compared to Permian's, where they're going to have to run flow lines every time they come back. And that includes crossing the highway, 62/180, every time they come from the east two pads.

MR. ZIMSKY: Now they indicate in this exhibit that they plan to use one CTB. So what you're saying is if they use the Joker CTB, will -- what will the flow lines from the Bane -- what will those traverse?

MR. BOYLE: They're going to run along -- I think it's a yellow line there. They're going to run all the way over to the Joker CTB.

So from the Bane section, they would need to cross 62/180 with every well that they drill going to the Joker CTB.

And if it was the opposite of that and they were using the Bane CTB, it'd just be the -- it'd be the exact opposite where they've got to cross with all the Joker wells.

MR. ZIMSKY: Okay. And my cursor is going along a diagonal line there. Is that the highway you're speaking of?

MR. BOYLE: Yes, sir. That's correct.
MR. ZIMSKY: Okay. I'm going to move to discuss -- there was someone questioning earlier today about the cost of an average well that Cimarex/Coterra is drilling in Lea County as part of the investor presentation; do you recall that testimony?

MR. BOYLE: Yes, sir.

MR. ZIMSKY: And I believe indicated it was a \$14 billion average; do you recall that?

MR. BOYLE: Yes, sir. I believe it was \$1400 a foot.

MR. ZIMSKY: And Mr. Rankin pointed out that the proposals in Exhibits B18 -- and let me get that shared. Okay. Can you see the D18?

MR. BOYLE: Yes, sir.
MR. ZIMSKY: And the June current cost, do you know how those were calculated on the capital plan comparison for Loosey Goosey and Mighty Pheasant?

MR. BOYLE: Can you repeat the first part of that question?

MR. ZIMSKY: The June current cost, do you know how that was --

MR. BOYLE: Yes, sir. Those -- yes, sir. Those are our current costs that we're using to develop this acreage. It's what we would use if we going to drill these wells tomorrow. They're going to be the -- our new AFE would be very similar to those numbers.

MR. ZIMSKY: And if you drilled your wells six months from now, those costs would change; correct?

MR. BOYLE: Yeah. They could -- they could change somewhat, but $I$ wouldn't expect them to change a lot. But they could change some, depending on timing.

MR. ZIMSKY: And can you explain why these current costs are less than the average that was presented in the investor relation presentation that Coterra made in the last several days?

MR. BOYLE: Yes, sir. So it is an average which directly means there is costs above and below that number. And currently, in our inventory, we have -- or we're drilling a significant one-mile development.

And with a one-mile development, those costs are higher so you're going to see a higher average cost which is dragging that up to 1400 .

Not only that, but a lot of those wells are in southern Lea County. And we have a more
expensive well bore design in the Wolfcamp down there, as well as a larger frac. And with that, the costs are higher compared to what we would see with these wells.

MR. ZIMSKY: So the June current cost
listed on $D 18$ is an accurate estimation of the cost that it would -- that Cimarex would incur in drilling the wells as shown on Exhibit D18?

MR. BOYLE: Yes, sir.
MR. ZIMSKY: That's all the questions
that I have. I tender the witness.

MS. ORTH: Thank you, Mr. Zimsky.
Mr. Rankin, do you have questions of
Mr. Boyle?
MR. RANKIN: Good afternoon, Mr. Boyle.
How are you?
MR. BOYLE: Great.
MR. RANKIN: Just a couple questions.
I understand that Cimarex here is proposing to use a single battery for all of its wells in this development project, the Loosey Goosey and the Mighty

Pheasant; correct?
MR. BOYLE: Yes, sir.
MR. RANKIN: And in your testimony, you say that there's going to be -- and I'm looking at Paragraph 11.

You say there's going to be -- oops. One second. I've got the wrong -- sorry. Thought I had the right one.

MS. ORTH: It's only two sentences. I can read it to you.

MR. RANKIN: I know. I'm getting slow. Sorry. All right. Paragraph 11.

At the start there, it says that
"Cimarex will use a single battery" -- okay -- which you discussed with Mr. Zimsky.

And then it goes on to say for all the 27 to 34 wells that Cimarex intends to drill as part of the MPLG Development Plan -- I understand that to be -- MP being Mighty Pheasant; LG being Loosey Goosey.

Now I'm trying to get a figure on this,
because I think I asked Ms. Mueller and I got an answer that we were up now from 24 wells to 30.

And now, $I$ read in your testimony it's potentially up to 34. And I'm wondering; is that your understanding as well?

MR. BOYLE: I believe that's a typo. That should be 30 .

MR. RANKIN: Okay. That answered my question there.

Now has Cimarex ever used a single battery for 30 wells before in New Mexico?

MR. BOYLE: In New Mexico, we are very close to that. I'm trying to remember the exact number.

We're above 20 on one of our
facilities. I can't remember exactly how many are in it. It's close, though.

MR. RANKIN: But so far, not yet?
MR. BOYLE: Yes, sir.
MR. RANKIN: Has Cimarex done an onsite with the BLM to confirm approval for its locations?

| 1 | MR. BOYLE: Yes, sir. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MR. RANKIN: Are you guys a member |
| 3 | of -- and I'm going to mangle it, but you can correct |
| 4 | me -- the CCA or CCAA or whatever it is? The |
| 5 | conservation agreement dealing with native species? |
| 6 | Are you guys -- |
| 7 | MR. BOYLE: Yes, sir. We are. |
| 8 | MR. RANKIN: -- a member? |
| 9 | MR. BOYLE: Yes, sir. We are enrolled |
| 10 | in the Candidate Conservation Agreements. Yes, sir. |
| 11 | MR. RANKIN: No matter how many times |
| 12 | I've heard that, I can never get it into my head. |
| 13 | Now did you also then do a meeting with |
| 14 | the representatives that help manage that program? |
| 15 | MR. BOYLE: We are currently working |
| 16 | with them. Yes, sir. |
| 17 | MR. RANKIN: Have you met with them yet |
| 18 | on those locations? |
| 19 | MR. BOYLE: I'm not sure. |
| 20 | MR. RANKIN: Okay. |
| 21 | MR. BOYLE: That would be with the |
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regulatory department.
MR. RANKIN: I'm sorry. Say that again?

MR. BOYLE: It would be with the regulatory department.

MR. RANKIN: So to your knowledge, you don't whether you've had that meeting? Or whether --

MR. BOYLE: Right.
MR. RANKIN: -- those locations have been approved for any the dunes lizard issues or other potential issues in the area?

MR. BOYLE: Yes, sir.
MR. RANKIN: Okay. So based on that, it's possible -- I suppose -- that they may recommend that you move some of your facilities or locations; is that fair to say?

MR. BOYLE: I mean, we've had our onsite. Yeah. I'm not sure.

MR. RANKIN: Okay. Now you mentioned in your testimony that Cimarex is going to spend an additional sum for tankless surge vessels, an
additional sum for line containment.
Are those additional costs that you call out included in the AFEs that were initially proposed with the well proposals?

MR. BOYLE: The original? The very original ones, they would not be. That would be with the new updated cost that we were just talking about.

MR. RANKIN: Okay.
MR. BOYLE: And those costs are -they're not necessarily just for surge vessels and containment.

That's a plethora of things that we're doing to go above and beyond to make sure that we don't have spills or emissions, et cetera.

MR. RANKIN: You just called out a couple of them in your testimony, but there may be other costs that are going to up the AFE to --

MR. BOYLE: Oh, no, sir. That -- that covers it. I didn't list out every single thing that was inside that cost.

MR. RANKIN: Okay. All right.

No further questions.
MS. ORTH: All right. Thank you, Mr. Rankin.

Now let me pause for a moment to see if there are questions by any other party entering an appearance. No.

Mr. Zimsky, do you have a follow-up before I turn to Mr. Garcia?

MR. ZIMSKY: Yes.
I'm going to share that Exhibit D18 one more time. And this is going to the question Mr . Rankin asked about Paragraph 11. Cimarex will use a single battery for all 27 -- now, you've corrected it to 30 .

Should it be 24 to 30? These upper Second wells, are they -- the note says, you know, you're not sure going to drill those depending on the data you get from the other wells.

So should this read: "Cimarex will use a single battery for all of 24 to 30 wells" instead of 27 to 33, I think it was?

MR. BOYLE: Yes, sir. I believe that's correct.

MR. ZIMSKY: Okay. And that's the only -- I just wanted to get that clarified. Thank you.

And that's all the questions I have.
MS. ORTH: All right. Thank you, Mr.
Zimsky.
Mr. Garcia?
MR. GARCIA: I just have a few.
Looking at your Exhibit C2. I guess out of curiosity, is this facility in New Mexico?

MR. BOYLE: The one specifically isn't, but we do have other tankless facilities in New Mexico.

MR. GARCIA: Okay. Mr. Rankin talked about the CCA. If they have issues with the site, is the goal to find another location that would still suit a one essential tank battery? Or would you --

MR. BOYLE: Yes. Yeah. I would expect us to continue to keep one tank battery. And if we
needed to move it for the lizards, we would.
MR. GARCIA: What's the safety factor and design for this tank battery?

Or basically, I guess my question is:
The initial design of this tank battery, is it going to have capacity if future Wolfcamp wells are drilled? Or will it need to be upgraded?

MR. BOYLE: No, sir. I would expect the first time to be able to cover all of the -- the future. If it needed to be upgraded, it would be minimal.

MR. GARCIA: And then, you guys have takeaway for all of the emulsion, oil, gas, water?

MR. BOYLE: We are -- we have proposals back right now that we're looking through.

MR. GARCIA: And those proposals would be 100 percent takeaway for gas and water?

MR. BOYLE: What do you mean, 100 percent?

MR. GARCIA: So basically, the waste rule went out which I'm sure you probably heard a few
times.
One of the big things OCD is on is reducing venting and flaring, which I'm assuming this exhibit's discussing?

So when you submit APDs, there's a natural gas management plan. And on there, you certify that you have 100 percent takeaway.

Or you submit an additional plan of what you're going to do with the gas that you don't have takeaway for, such as powering generators, heater treaters, et cetera.

MR. BOYLE: Yes, sir. We would have 100 percent takeaway. We permit zero flaring, zero routine flaring so we would not -- we would have 100 percent takeaway.

MR. GARCIA: And then you said you're working on water takeaway, too? Reduced water?

MR. BOYLE: Yes, sir. We're working on all of it. There will be no trekking from this facility.

MR. GARCIA: Your Exhibit C2 also says
shale bows in during highline pressure. How are you guys doing that? Is that just setting your back pressure valves?

MR. BOYLE: No. We're actually shutting the wells in. We have automated valves on the well head that would be shutting the wells in if we have highline pressure.

MR. GARCIA: Yeah. I guess that's what I meant, is your back pressure sees highline pressure and your SCADA systems are shutting it in?

MR. BOYLE: Correct.
MR. GARCIA: And also hitting on the waste rule since that's one of our big topics in recent years, how often do you guys do AVO inspections on these at the facilities?

MR. BOYLE: We're doing them pretty often. I'm not exactly sure what the exact cadence is.

MR. GARCIA: And is it always AVOs? Or do you guys use any other systems, like fenceline monitoring?

MR. BOYLE: We do more than that. We do AVOs. We also do a Bridger flyover. We have a plane that flies over that checks our facilities.

We also have the OGI cameras that we go out and check them on a certain cadence. We have an entire maintenance program that's based around checking these facilities to make sure there's no leaking.

Which is really the benefit of our tankless facility, because we have no high-risk emission devices on this facility.

So as far as like our OGI findings, we would expect it to be zero off of the closed vent system where you'd typically see the majority of your emissions.

MR. GARCIA: And if a vent or spill is detected, you guys have a pretty solid plan for submitting 129s, preventing flaring, or 141 for spills?

MR. BOYLE: Yes, sir.
MR. GARCIA: Okay. I believe that's

| 1 | all my questions. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MS. ORTH: Thank you, Mr. Garcia. |
| 3 | Ms. Thompson? |
| 4 | MS. THOMPSON: I have no questions. |
| 5 | MS. ORTH: All right. Thank you. |
| 6 | Anything further for this witness on |
| 7 | this day? |
| 8 | MR. ZIMSKY: Madam Hearing Examiner, I |
| 9 | have one question. |
| 10 | MS. ORTH: Go ahead. |
| 11 | MR. ZIMSKY: Mr. Garcia asked you |
| 12 | about, you know, leak detection. And one of the |
| 13 | things you said is that you have a plane that flies |
| 14 | overhead. I assume that can detect -- has |
| 15 | instrumentation to detect leaking? |
| 16 | MR. BOYLE: Yes, sir. |
| 17 | MR. ZIMSKY: That's the only question I |
| 18 | had. |
| 19 | MS. ORTH: All right. Thank you for |
| 20 | that, Mr. Zimsky. |
| 21 | If there's nothing else, Mr. Boyle, I |
|  | Page 237 |

thank you for your testimony.
Ewe have just about six minutes before we need to adjourn for the day. We'll start again tomorrow morning at 8:30. Is there anything we should talk about?

Any question that we'll be able to finish tomorrow with the other five witnesses?

MR. GARCIA: I have a simple question. Do we use the same link to join tomorrow? Or is it a different link?

MS. ORTH: Marlene?
MS. SALVIDREZ: It is a different link and it is on the docket.

MR. GARCIA: Okay. I am bad at looking. I am sorry, Marlene.

MS. SALVIDREZ: That's okay.
MS. ORTH: Thank you, Marlene.
Anyone have any question about whether we'll be able to finish tomorrow? We have five other witnesses.

MR. RANKIN: I think with our

| 1 | streamlined approach, Madam Hearing Officer, where |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | we're just going right to rebuttal and into |
| 3 | examination; I think I have every expectation that |
| 4 | we'll finish tomorrow. |
| 5 | MS. ORTH: All right. Well -- |
| 6 | MR. ZIMSKY: I concur. I think we |
| 7 | will. |
| 8 | MS. ORTH: Okay. Well, thank you, Mr. |
| 9 | Rankin and Mr. Zimsky. |
| 10 | Let's adjourn for the evening, then. |
| 11 | And we'll see you on the platform by 8:30. Thank you |
| 12 | all. |
| 13 | (Whereupon, the meeting concluded at |
| 14 | 4:30 p.m.) |
| 15 |  |
| 16 |  |
| 17 |  |
| 18 |  |
| 19 |  |
| 20 |  |
| 21 |  |
| 22 |  |
| 23 |  |
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| 241:6 | blake 2:7,11 | 105:1,2,3,11 | 182:19 183:12 |
| better 6:14 | 4:12 120:6 | 106:15,18,20 | 183:17 187:20 |
| 20:15 172:11 | blast 16:9 | 107:9,10,11 | 188:9 189:13 |
| 184:4 185:5 | blend 142:10 | 108:6 109:4 | 190:6,12 |
| beyond 230:13 | blm 77:8 | 110:1,18 111:3 | 191:21 192:1 |
| big 19:24 | 227:21 | 111:19 112:7 | 192:13,20 |
| 186:20,20 | blow 202:20 | 112:11,13,17 | 194:5 195:1,1 |
| 234:2 235:13 | blue 35:25 | 113:2,3,5,8,11 | 195:5,7,11,15 |
| bigger 177:5 | bone 15:15 | 114:3,8 115:12 | 196:16 197:10 |
| biggest 156:1 | 16:2,6 18:18 | 116:8,13 | 197:18 199:10 |
| bill 214:11 | 18:22 19:7,10 | 124:16,21 | 199:15,19 |
| billion 15:20 | 20:6,9,10,15,22 | 127:7 128:1,5 | 201:3 204:20 |
| 223:2 | 20:24 21:1,16 | 128:16,21 | 207:9 208:18 |
| binding 121:20 | 21:18 22:16 | 129:14 130:2 | 211:9,16,21 |
| bit 13:20 28:23 | 24:13,19 27:20 | 130:13,15 | 212:3,6,20 |
| 32:14 38:1,3 | 34:2,4,10 35:1 | 131:7 132:7,13 | bones 143:20 |
| 67:15 72:7 | 38:7,17,25 | 132:16 133:1 | bore 109:2 |
| 75:19 83:22 | 39:3 43:4 53:9 | 134:14,20 | 166:21 212:16 |
| 89:19 91:19 | 57:11 61:24 | 135:3 136:20 | 225:1 |
| 93:17 94:8 | 62:6,10,25 | 141:17,21 | bores 68:11 |
| 99:14 106:4 | 63:6,14 64:1 | 142:10 143:19 | 165:6 |
| 114:1 123:9 | 64:10,12,25 | 144:2,8 145:10 | bottom 57:9 |
| 125:17 126:15 | 65:20 66:18,23 | 153:14 154:19 | 77:22 157:3 |
| 135:20 148:8 | 67:6 70:2,12 | 155:6,17 157:1 | 179:15,16,18 |
| 157:8 172:11 | 82:1,20,23 | 158:1,11 | 180:9 183:17 |
| 175:21 177:11 | 84:12,15 87:8 | 162:10 164:13 | 183:18 184:4 |
| 177:13 179:16 | 87:12 90:21 | 166:8 168:21 | boundary 20:5 |
| 184:10 186:2 | 92:18,19 93:4 | 168:21 169:5 | 22:3 |
| 208:2 | 93:7,13,21 | 172:6,8 173:2 | bows 235:1 |
| black 115:18 | 94:2,4,5 97:3 | 174:6,9 176:9 | boyle 2:14 3:7 |
| 157:18 158:3 | 97:16 98:10 | 176:9,10 177:2 | 214:17,19 |
| 158:12 165:10 | 99:2,3,8,10 | 177:8,19 178:1 | 215:1,4,4,8,10 |
| 184:17 185:1 | 100:14,17,18 | 178:9,11,13,16 | 215:15,18 |
| 187:12 193:2 | 103:7,9,16,18 | 178:16 180:15 | 216:3,14,19 |

[boyle - case]

| 217:1,6,9,11 $218: 3,9,12$ $219: 3,7,15,21$ $220: 6,10,21$ $222: 1,14,21$ $223: 3,8,12,16$ $224: 4,12225: 9$ $225: 14,15,17$ $226: 2$ 227:6,12 $227: 19228: 1,7$ $228: 9,15,19,21$ $229: 4,8,12,17$ $230: 5,9,18$ $232: 1,13,20$ $233: 8,14,18$ $234: 12,18$ $235: 4,11,16$ $236: 1,20$ $237: 16,21$ bradford $158: 8$ $159: 3 \quad 179: 10$ bradford's $153: 19155: 20$ $156: 11 \quad 161: 5$ $162: 13163: 2$ $179: 13$ break $20: 5$ $62: 18$ $88: 6,9,10,6,19$ $167: 11,14,16$ $167: 18$ breakdown $49: 1456: 8,18$ $57: 558: 22$ $61: 3$ | breakdowns <br> $47: 25$ 59:9 <br> 61:19 <br> breakout $64: 15$ <br> breaks $19: 19$ <br> bridger $236: 2$ <br> brief $97: 1$ <br> $190: 21 \quad 191: 11$ <br> $191: 15,18$ <br> $216: 1$ <br> briefing $102: 20$ <br> $103: 14 \quad 138: 19$ <br> $190: 16$ <br> briefly $215: 16$ <br> $216: 11$ <br> bring $40: 10$ <br> $213: 11$ <br> broad $115: 9$ <br> brought $120: 21$ <br> $140: 11 \quad 201: 16$ <br> bruce $2: 94: 10$ <br> $119: 15$ <br> budget $216: 21$ <br> $217: 2$ <br> budgeting <br> $216: 21 \quad 217: 14$ <br> buffer $20: 18$ <br> $108: 7,13,20$ <br> $114: 12$ <br> bunch $75: 15$ <br> burden $75: 5$ <br> $127: 10,16$ <br> $128: 9,11$ <br> burdened <br> $126: 20 \quad 127: 16$ | burned $74: 23$ <br> business <br> 109:11 <br> butcher 205:8 <br> c <br> c $2: 113: 14: 1$ <br> $23: 16150: 21$ <br> $215: 5$ <br> c1 $218: 13$ <br> c14 $84: 2587: 3$ <br> c2 $218: 13$ <br> $232: 11 \quad 234: 21$ <br> c5 $33: 13,17$ <br> cadence $235: 17$ <br> $236: 5$ <br> caged $214: 1$ <br> calculated <br> $223: 10$ <br> calculation <br> $175: 1$ <br> call $6: 2423: 3,5$ <br> $45: 1787: 12$ <br> $98: 12 ~ 150: 12$ <br> $230: 3$ <br> called $230: 15$ <br> calls $205: 8$ <br> calvin $2: 143: 7$ <br> $69: 6,20214: 17$ <br> $215: 4218: 12$ <br> cameras $236: 4$ <br> camp $103: 17$ <br> candidate <br> $228: 10$ <br> capacity <br> $132: 18$ <br> $233: 6$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

[cases - cimarex's]

| cases 4:23 5:3,7 | certificate | charge 142:13 | 87:22 90:14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5:10,12 15:3,7 | 240:1 241:1 | chase 52:23 | 93:11 94:3 |
| 17:5,20 18:3 | certified | 53:6,17,22 | 96:13,14 97:16 |
| 18:10 19:6 | 144:16 | chauvez 134:7 | 97:20 103:6,13 |
| 24:3,12,13,18 | certify 234:7 | check 160:1 | 104:16 105:5 |
| 24:19,24,25 | 240:3 241:2 | 204:8 236:5 | 106:5 107:20 |
| 25:8,21 36:8 | cetera 144:17 | checking 160:9 | 114:13,16 |
| 43:5 44:19 | 230:14 234:11 | 236:7 | 117:2,6,19 |
| 45:2,19 46:1,5 | chair 2:3 | checks 236:3 | 118:4,5 124:12 |
| 49:15 58:12 | challenge 20:8 | child 207:2,4 | 124:15,21 |
| 63:20 80:13 | challenger 51:5 | choose 39:20 | 125:2 130:17 |
| 84:2 85:4 86:9 | 51:8,11,15 | 139:20 | 131:11 136:19 |
| 90:12,16 | 52:8 | cimarex 5:1,5 | 138:4 140:2 |
| 129:18 131:11 | challenger's | 5:16,22,24 6:2 | 150:13 152:3 |
| 131:15 134:6 | 34:24 | 6:7,23 7:16 9:9 | 159:19 162:15 |
| 145:21 152:4 | challenges | 11:7,14 14:25 | 162:17 163:8 |
| 187:13 190:17 | 15:11 17:14 | 15:22 16:9,14 | 166:6 168:13 |
| 202:21 204:2 | challenging | 17:7,16,18,21 | 171:4 172:4 |
| 213:10,11 | 15:10 | 18:2,9 20:4,8 | 178:15,19 |
| 218:16,17 | chance 6:10 | 20:17,23 21:7 | 182:21 191:14 |
| casing 31:24 | 9:16 100:13 | 21:16 22:15 | 191:19 192:18 |
| catch 19:2 | 219:4 | 23:6 27:10,19 | 196:4,9,12 |
| cca 228:4 | change 37:6 | 28:1 31:6 | 216:6,8,13,16 |
| 232:17 | 38:21 53:15 | 33:24 37:8,19 | 222:18 225:7 |
| ccaa 228:4 | 54:19 58:11 | 38:3 40:23 | 225:19 226:14 |
| cement 216:4 | 75:3 115:8 | 41:8 43:13 | 226:17 227:10 |
| central 26:17 | 124:19 224:2,5 | 44:10 45:22 | 227:20 229:20 |
| 220:4 | 224:6,6 | 52:16 55:23 | 231:12,19 |
| certain 54:1,14 | changed 10:22 | 59:1 68:5,10 | cimarex's 8:8 |
| 121:9 136:21 | 52:8 120:18 | 68:23 70:8 | 10:13 15:21 |
| 171:11 192:4 | changes 75:4 | 76:15 79:8,12 | 18:14 22:6,9 |
| 236:5 | 124:14,18 | 79:16,22,24 | 22:20,25 24:3 |
| certainly 14:14 | changing 51:9 | 80:4,16 81:9 | 24:7 25:1,9 |
| 102:15 | channelized | 81:15,21 82:2 | 26:22 37:23 |
|  | 163:10 | 82:19 85:12 | 39:4,13 40:14 |
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| 48:20 50:1 | 108:12 147:20 | 36:10,16,19,25 | 71:2,7,10,15,22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 57:1 58:7 | 168:10 172:13 | 37:20 38:5 | 72:6,12,16,18 |
| 84:11 87:4 | 202:17 211:4 | 39:7,14,24 | 72:23 73:7,12 |
| 96:19 97:1 | clay 173:6 | 40:1,4,7,12 | 73:17,21 74:1 |
| 98:10 103:18 | clear 13:11 | 41:7,13 42:13 | 74:2,14,20 |
| 107:8,9 128:20 | 46:10 56:9 | 42:14,22 43:6 | 75:2,6,10,12,24 |
| 142:1 151:12 | 58:18 59:5 | 43:10,25 44:7 | 76:2,7,11,14,18 |
| 166:1 169:18 | 73:9 141:11 | 44:14,20,23 | 76:24 77:3,12 |
| 190:16 191:11 | clearly 38:10 | 45:4,14,21,24 | 77:15 78:2,4 |
| 194:20 197:5 | 133:9 209:14 | 46:2,9,18,24 | 78:13,20 79:1 |
| 199:15 220:4 | clemens 219:4 | 47:3,9,14,18 | 79:10,15,19 |
| circle 186:17 | clicked 191:9 | 48:3,7,13,16 | 80:1,6,14,20 |
| circling 186:5 | clm 38:12 64:4 | 49:1,6,11,12,23 | 81:4,14,18 |
| circulated 8:6,8 | 112:8 141:15 | 50:2,6,15 | 82:4,10,13,18 |
| 8:18 | 144:3 149:8 | 51:13,24 52:3 | 82:22 83:5,9 |
| circumstance | close 167:18 | 52:10,18,25 | 84:3,17,20,23 |
| 12:20 110:18 | 227:13,17 | 53:14,19 54:4 | 85:5,19 86:25 |
| 114:18,19 | closed 236:13 | 54:9,17 55:3,7 | 88:17,22 89:1 |
| 181:3 | closely 13:4 | 55:9 56:1,6,11 | 89:4,21 90:8 |
| circumstances | 124:1 | 56:15 57:8,14 | 90:17 91:2,10 |
| 19:15,22 | closer 68:24 | 58:9,13,16,20 | 91:17 92:2,4,8 |
| claim 27:9,9 | closing 17:19 | 59:4,10 60:3 | 92:16,21 93:18 |
| 33:13 36:22 | coded 204:16 | 60:11,20,24 | 94:9,14 95:1,3 |
| 156:14 | coffman 2:17 | 61:4,9,15,21 | 95:14,19 96:1 |
| claiming | 3:5 23:5,8,9,13 | 62:2,8,12,22 | 96:4,10,17,20 |
| 129:16 | 23:16,20,22,22 | 63:1,3,10,21 | 97:6,18 98:2 |
| claims 11:13 | 24:1,5,10,16,22 | 64:2,6,12,18,23 | 98:15,18 |
| 28:12 33:23 | 25:4,13,14,17 | 65:7,11,14,18 | 100:11,21 |
| 37:22 | 26:9,13,14,19 | 65:23 66:1,8 | 102:1,2 103:3 |
| clarification | 27:7,11,22,24 | 66:12,16,20,25 | 103:11 104:2 |
| 41:2 42:8 | 28:4,13,25 | 67:10,14,17,21 | 104:15,21 |
| clarified 95:3,5 | 29:17 30:7 | 67:25 68:2,4,7 | 105:7,14,19 |
| 232:4 | 31:8 32:12,15 | 68:12,17,20 | 106:17 107:1,6 |
| clarify 51:7 | 33:17,25 34:17 | 69:4,12,21,25 | 107:13 108:11 |
| 92:12 100:3 | 34:22 35:11,16 | 70:4,10,16 | 108:20 109:9 |
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| $109: 17110: 3,8$ | $142: 5,8,17,20$ | $38: 1247: 20$ | committed |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $110: 11,13,16$ | $143: 4,8144: 1$ | $80: 10115: 13$ | $48: 1949: 25$ |
| $111: 1,4,10,15$ | $144: 6,12$ | $121: 11128: 7$ | $50: 4,6,14$ |
| $111: 21112: 5$ | $145: 20146: 10$ | $155: 3167: 17$ | $51: 1952: 9,15$ |
| $112: 15,20$ | $146: 18147: 3,7$ | $169: 8192: 18$ | $52: 2453: 4,12$ |
| $113: 6,19114: 5$ | $147: 11,21$ | $192: 20197: 2$ | $54: 3,13,15,25$ |
| $114: 10,15,19$ | $148: 1,3,6,7,17$ | $206: 6,14,21$ | $55: 2,656: 9$ |
| $114: 21115: 3$ | $149: 1,6,10,12$ | $207: 14221: 8$ | $123: 19146: 7$ |
| $115: 15,19$ | $149: 16,19,21$ | $221: 14,16$ | common $19: 1$ |
| $116: 3,9,14,17$ | $150: 7,8190: 1$ | comes $37: 5$ | $19: 13153: 16$ |
| $117: 4,9,15,20$ | coffman's | $81: 1108: 14$ | $173: 1,19$ |
| $118: 7,13,19$ | $40: 15139: 18$ | $162: 4$ | communicate |
| $119: 3,9,17$ | $168: 15$ | coming $35: 17$ | $43: 21$ |
| $120: 12,15$ | colleague $4: 19$ | $86: 19188: 9$ | communication |
| $121: 2,7,12,21$ | $75: 21$ | commence | $50: 893: 7$ |
| $122: 13,16$ | collect $163: 13$ | $16: 24167: 11$ | $100: 16104: 4$ |
| $123: 1,5,8,13,16$ | $200: 21$ | commenced | $132: 3,11133: 3$ |
| $123: 18124: 3,7$ | collected $164: 8$ | $164: 3$ | $133: 16145: 12$ |
| $124: 13125: 4,7$ | collection | commencem... | $176: 8177: 1$ |
| $125: 15,18,21$ | $16: 14$ | $73: 2374: 7$ | $192: 5$ |
| $126: 3,7,12$ | color $49: 17$ | comment $99: 18$ | communicati... |
| $127: 2,6,12,20$ | column $49: 25$ | $101: 5179: 9$ | $29: 144: 4$ |
| $128: 13,18,21$ | com 67:7 | $208: 6,7209: 10$ | $132: 7$ |
| $129: 3,13,19,21$ | combination | $209: 11$ | companies $30: 9$ |
| $130: 6,10131: 4$ | $176: 11181: 16$ | commentary | $30: 937: 10$ |
| $131: 9,13,19$ | $193: 4,20$ | $100: 5$ | company $23: 6$ |
| $132: 5,10,19$ | combine $8: 2$ | comments | $121: 3,4131: 2$ |
| $133: 4,8,11$ | $46: 2147: 12$ | $210: 11211: 2$ | $150: 13$ |
| $134: 5,17135: 1$ | combined | commission | comparable |
| $135: 4,7,10$ | $164: 18$ | $137: 13,14$ | $66: 6$ |
| $136: 18137: 2,6$ | combo $204: 10$ | $138: 6139: 19$ | compared |
| $137: 12,16,19$ | combos $203: 19$ | $140: 7$ | $35: 21166: 1$ |
| $139: 16140: 2,5$ | $204: 1$ | commitment | $188: 18221: 5$ |
| $140: 10,14,17$ | come $30: 19$ | $123: 10$ | $221: 13225: 3$ |
| $141: 3,18142: 2$ | $33: 937: 15,19$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
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| comparing | 100:18 103:19 | conflicts | constantly |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 184:1,5 189:2 | 105:9 | 155:20 | 115:6 |
| comparison | concern 14:8 | confuse 14:10 | contain 165:18 |
| 36:25 57:18 | 208:16 | confused 41:6 | contained |
| 58:1 64:20 | concerns 10:13 | 50:18 53:2 | 106:10 |
| 130:17 167:3 | 53:8 55:20 | 143:15 | containment |
| 177:21 199:10 | 208:18 | confuses | 230:1,11 |
| 202:16 223:11 | concise 8:17 | 126:14 | contended |
| competing | 10:3 | connected | 45:22 |
| 18:11 32:8 | concluded | 191:5 | contentious |
| 80:25 | 239:13 | connectivity | 31:9 33:8 |
| competitor | conclusion | 33:10 | contest 18:10 |
| 83:23 | 102:6 136:6 | connects | contested 19:5 |
| competitors | conclusions | 220:15 | 45:19 46:1 |
| 79:23 80:4,16 | 138:21 | consensus | 51:23 81:2 |
| 80:18 86:1,14 | concrete | 84:12 | 118:5 121:1 |
| complete 48:1 | 201:12 | consequence | 145:21 |
| 74:12 | concur 239:6 | 46:3 | context 27:6 |
| completed 66:7 | cone 174:5 | consequences | continuance |
| completely | conferred | 166:15 | 5:13 7:4 |
| 20:13 207:9 | 198:5 | conservation | continue |
| complicated | confident 170:3 | 1:1 228:5,10 | 232:21 |
| 19:19 99:18,19 | 189:16 194:1,3 | consider 79:16 | continuing |
| 122:5 135:14 | 194:9 | 126:17 136:7,9 | 52:22 |
| 138:3,7 175:16 | confirm 60:14 | 136:15 158:7 | continuous |
| comply 140:6 | 95:17 146:2 | 158:18 159:1 | 154:21 |
| compulsory 5:2 | 152:15 160:11 | 164:16 166:21 | continuously |
| 5:6,9 144:8,8 | 227:21 | 169:17 173:7 | 16:15 |
| 144:11 145:21 | confirmation | 176:19 | contract 46:14 |
| 207:19 213:9,9 | 50:13 | consideration | 77:12 118:4 |
| computer 82:8 | confirmed | 160:21 | contractua |
| concentration | 55:1 | considering | 59:3,6,7,9,13 |
| 99:7 | conflict 21:12 | 184:12 | 59:16,18 60:1 |
| concentrations | 156:2 | considers 32:7 | 60:17 61:2,7 |
| 93:9 94:20 |  |  | 61:12,20 62:10 |
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| 63:9,18 122:2 | 25:3,4,12,16 | 92:3,4,7,8,15 | 175:2,3 178:3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 122:17 123:2 | 28:3,4 34:22 | 92:16,20,21 | 178:4,13,14,17 |
| contrasts 28:8 | 35:11 36:9,10 | 94:21 95:1,18 | 178:18 179:1,2 |
| contribute | 36:15,16 42:9 | 95:19 97:17,18 | 179:6,7,10,11 |
| 122:16 190:10 | 42:21 43:5,6 | 98:1,2 103:11 | 179:18 180:5,6 |
| 195:21 | 44:13,14,19 | 104:1,19 105:6 | 182:11,16,17 |
| contributed | 45:13,14,20,21 | 105:7,13,14,19 | 183:3,18 |
| 62:14 97:4 | 46:2,8,9,17,18 | 107:5 110:2,3 | 185:11,12 |
| contributes | 46:23 47:8,9 | 110:7,16 111:1 | 187:8,9 193:20 |
| 182:14 | 47:13,14,18 | 111:3,4,9,10,14 | 194:6,7,10 |
| contributing | 48:6,7,12,13,16 | 112:4,15 113:6 | 195:15,16,18 |
| 189:17 | 49:22,23 50:15 | 113:18 114:9 | 196:2,3,6,7 |
| control 203:2 | 51:24 52:2,3 | 114:10,14,15 | 199:12 200:8 |
| 204:1 209:15 | 52:10 55:3,6,7 | 115:19 118:13 | 208:13 213:4 |
| controlling | 57:16 58:9,12 | 121:1,2,6,7 | 217:8 218:7 |
| 114:13 | 58:13,16 59:3 | 122:13 124:2,3 | 220:5,6 222:14 |
| conversation | 59:4 60:20 | 124:6,7 125:7 | 224:3 226:1 |
| 139:3,5 | 63:9,20 64:2,6 | 125:14,21 | 228:3 232:2 |
| conversations | 64:11 65:6,7 | 126:6 127:1,2 | 235:11 |
| 29:6 | 65:20 66:7,20 | 127:5,11,12,19 | corrected |
| cookie 22:11 | 66:24,25 67:13 | 127:20 128:12 | 231:13 |
| 115:7 | 67:14,20,21 | 128:13,17 | correctly 93:17 |
| cooling 5:2 | 69:24,25 70:9 | 129:12 131:12 | 155:12 |
| copies 203:17 | 70:10,16 72:6 | 131:19 134:17 | correlation |
| 204:4 | 72:12 73:11,12 | 135:1,3,4 | 188:3,20 189:7 |
| copy 46:4 | 73:16,17 75:2 | 141:17,18 | correlative |
| 48:23 82:7 | 75:5,25 76:10 | 142:1,2,21 | 17:6,8 20:21 |
| 87:2 | 76:11,14,23,24 | 144:6 148:21 | 21:8 22:2 |
| cordial 44:3 | 77:3 78:12,25 | 149:1,5,6,9,12 | 37:23 38:2,4,8 |
| core 171:21 | 79:9,15 80:1 | 151:17,18,20 | 160:14 |
| 172:1 | 80:14 81:14,18 | 152:21 155:8 | cost 16:20 37:1 |
| corner 65:16 | 82:21 83:4,5 | 155:13,18 | 37:2,3,3,25 |
| correct 22:18 | 84:17,19,20 | 161:2 165:3,4 | 39:21 57:2,18 |
| 23:25 24:4,9 | 90:16,17 91:1 | 169:9 172:21 | 58:4 64:19 |
| 24:15,16,21,22 | 91:2,16,17 | 174:6,7,11 | 66:4,10,19 |
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| 67:8,12 68:21 | 241:7,10 | create 108:6 | 159:6 217:2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 68:24 69:12,16 | counsel's | creating 139:8 | 224:14 228:15 |
| 69:17 71:12,24 | 144:15 207:17 | credited 36:4 | cursor 106:5 |
| 125:12 222:17 | count 9:23 | criteria 145:20 | 186:6 222:11 |
| 223:9,14 | 166:11 170:12 | cross 6:5,23 | curtis 2:18 |
| 224:19 225:5,6 | counter 22:9 | 7:22 8:3,20 | cutoff 173:19 |
| 230:7,20 | 142:6,14 | 9:12 13:12,13 | cutter 22:11 |
| costing 15:19 | county 5:3,6,9 | 87:18 88:17 | 115:7 |
| costs 17:24 | 15:23 68:11,24 | 100:13 154:2 | d |
| 56:25 66:5,6 | 85:25 117:10 | 167:4 168:2,11 | d 4:1 219:5 |
| 67:23 68:10 | 173:6 217:2 | 173:8 203:10 | d10 71:6 |
| 69:2,8 70:8,11 | 222:18 224:21 | 203:13 222:5,9 | d18 66:10,16 |
| 70:21 71:6,10 | couple 31:21 | crosses 205:12 | 67:11 71:8,9 |
| 71:13,16,19 | 50:17 55:19 | crossing 40:25 | 71:12 223:7 |
| 72:15 73:15 | 84:6 161:11 | 221:15 | 225:6,8 231:10 |
| 74:6,10,11,12 | 168:10 225:18 | crude 51:6,8 | d3 221:2 |
| 74:13 126:20 | 230:16 | 52:8 | d9 219:19 |
| 217:14 223:17 | course 4:7 16:2 | crude's 51:11 | dana 1:19 |
| 224:2,9,13,18 | 56:17 140:21 | ctb 221:18,19 | 240:2,20 |
| 225:2 230:2,9 | 197:15 | 222:3,6,8 | darin 2:15 |
| 230:17 | courses 129:20 | culminate | 26:25 95:4 |
| coterra 36:3,3 | court 31:13,14 | 16:17 | 134:8,10 |
| 124:15 142:12 | cover 46:7,12 | curiosity | 205:16 |
| 216:13,16 | 47:7 156:9,15 | 213:15 232:12 | dashed 154:3,4 |
| 222:18 224:11 | 233:9 | curious 203:15 | data 16:14 |
| coterra's 38:16 | covered 31:10 | 203:20 205:13 | 163:13 164:8 |
| 58:2 112:10 | 121:19 123:9 | 213:14,17 | 171:5,13 172:1 |
| counsel 15:7 | covers 24:12,18 | current 66:19 | 181:14 182:4,5 |
| 27:15 87:4 | 24:24 25:8 | 71:16 93:12 | 182:9 183:1 |
| 96:7 97:1 | 28:16 45:11 | 96:19 223:9,14 | 189:1,7 193:19 |
| 102:12 119:14 | 47:2,5,16 | 223:17 224:9 | 193:21 201:1,5 |
| 139:4 141:9,12 | 58:11 59:14 | 225:5 | 204:9 208:8 |
| 145:19 190:16 | 62:13 121:16 | currently 16:10 | 231:18 |
| 191:19 213:11 | 123:3 156:20 | 46:19 47:11 | databases |
| 240:10,13 | 230:19 | 108:16 146:3 | 131:18 |
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[date - develop]

| $\text { date } 57: 21,23$ | dedicates 195:1 | depend 61:9 | designation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64:24 65:8 | dedicating | 77:15 | 77:1 |
| dated 83:2 | 114:7 | depending 53:2 | designations |
| davro 219:4 | deem 175:6 | 146:5 224:6 | 123:10 155:7 |
| day 19:21 | deemed 111:8 | 231:17 | designing |
| 146:19 237:7 | deep 204:1 | depends 220:21 | 216:15 |
| 238:3 | deeper 170:1 | depiction | desire 10:23 |
| days 7:5 11:10 | defer 117:12 | 179:13 | detail 35:7 |
| 11:17 68:23 | define 159:12 | deposition | 218:5 |
| 73:22,22,22 | 159:20 | 240:1 | details 12:17 |
| 74:6,9 126:17 | defined 159:18 | depth 213:8,10 | detect 237:14 |
| 224:11 | defining 160:3 | 213:12 | 237:15 |
| deal 19:21 32:2 | 161:11,13 | depths 92:14 | detected |
| 33:10 | definitely 102:3 | 160:10 162:5 | 236:17 |
| dealing 228:5 | 160:4 197:2 | derived 182:1 | detection |
| deals 81:24 | 209:19 | describe 29:15 | 237:12 |
| dealt 131:21 | definition | 33:23 35:13 | determination |
| debate 161:7 | 205:8 | 156:19 165:21 | 171:7 172:5 |
| decide 128:5,8 | degree 24:9 | 166:4,15 | 183:9 |
| 137:13 | 215:19 | 216:12 | determine |
| decided 127:19 | delaware | described | 175:17 176:4 |
| decides 74:17 | 153:17 | 34:21 35:5 | 182:4 192:18 |
| 140:7 | demonstrate | 92:14 | determined |
| deciding | 105:16 | describing 25:1 | 93:6 100:15 |
| 213:16 | demonstrates | 25:9 36:24 | 106:6 |
| decisions 217:5 | 21:20 34:21 | description | determines |
| declined | 163:4 | 35:14 | 160:14 |
| 142:11 | demonstrating | design 209:1,14 | determining |
| decreases | 10:25 | 209:18 211:14 | 176:1 |
| 173:17 | density 173:17 | 216:18 217:13 | detriment |
| dedicate 90:21 | 173:18 174:15 | 219:13,16,17 | 38:15,16 |
| 114:9 | 181:9 204:14 | 220:21 221:2,5 | develop 22:18 |
| dedicated | department | 225:1 233:3,5 | 32:2,3 78:9 |
| 145:11 | 229:1,5 | designated | 80:19 94:5 |
|  |  | 18:21 19:16 | 98:11 109:14 |
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[develop - disregarding]

| $117: 3127: 19$ | $164: 17165: 2$ | different $9: 22$ | directly $14: 24$ |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| $172: 7206: 7,15$ | $165: 10166: 17$ | $15: 818: 21$ | $21: 1229: 20$ |
| $223: 18$ | $168: 13169: 3$ | $22: 1335: 21$ | $160: 20165: 16$ |
| developed | $169: 18,20$ | $36: 849: 17$ | $191: 6224: 13$ |
| $17: 2320: 19$ | $170: 6,9171: 18$ | $68: 2072: 7$ | disagree $98: 15$ |
| $21: 2433: 1$ | $197: 16206: 6,9$ | $81: 685: 2,3,10$ | $187: 17$ |
| $116: 2134: 20$ | $206: 9207: 12$ | $86: 987: 6,7,23$ | discovery $8: 13$ |
| $164: 10166: 19$ | $224: 16,17$ | $112: 18157: 20$ | discrepancies |
| $212: 4$ | $225: 21226: 18$ | $160: 11176: 13$ | $125: 11$ |
| developer 79:9 | developments | $182: 6202: 1$ | discrepancy |
| developing | $34: 2,10,11$ | $209: 1211: 20$ | $64: 19160: 2$ |
| $15: 916: 522: 3$ | $37: 569: 13,14$ | $238: 10,12$ | discuss $89: 8$ |
| $84: 1285: 14$ | $72: 885: 11$ | differentiating | $140: 11222: 16$ |
| $106: 9128: 16$ | $117: 5169: 17$ | $113: 8$ | discussed $5: 23$ |
| $129: 17163: 19$ | develops | difficult $30: 17$ | $13: 2043: 13$ |
| development | $132: 15133: 1$ | $30: 2537: 17$ | $109: 21116: 6$ |
| $16: 15,1721: 22$ | deviation $162: 2$ | $43: 24100: 2$ | $146: 1177: 11$ |
| $29: 1930: 12$ | $162: 4$ | $159: 17170: 14$ | $204: 19211: 16$ |
| $33: 1536: 22$ | devices $236: 11$ | $175: 9,12,14,17$ | $226: 15$ |
| $37: 1,3,1738: 7$ | diagonal | $188: 7189: 5$ | discusses $73: 4$ |
| $38: 2346: 14$ | $222: 12$ | difficulties | $97: 1$ |
| $50: 153: 8$ | dialogue $43: 14$ | $120: 4$ | discussing |
| $56: 2558: 2,2$ | dictates $110: 14$ | digestible $24: 3$ | $109: 21234: 4$ |
| $70: 1777: 1,6,8$ | difference $19: 3$ | digital $240: 8$ | discussion |
| $77: 1778: 4,12$ | $19: 1137: 4$ | $241: 3$ | $32: 2543: 12$ |
| $78: 14,2179: 2$ | 66:22 $70: 24$ | direct $7: 19,22$ | $89: 4133: 13$ |
| $79: 283: 2$ | $114: 6157: 21$ | $8: 3,39: 310: 19$ | $153: 19190: 4,9$ |
| $86: 1591: 13$ | $158: 1,6,19$ | $11: 1413: 18$ | discussions |
| $107: 3115: 7$ | $169: 4176: 12$ | $40: 2541: 9,10$ | $32: 1633: 5$ |
| $126: 21127: 7$ | $186: 20,21$ | $41: 2042: 7$ | $47: 21205: 14$ |
| $128: 19143: 2,5$ | $187: 10,15$ | $43: 881: 22$ | $213: 17$ |
| $156: 18158: 3$ | differences | $154: 10$ | dispute $71: 5$ |
| $159: 6,9,11$ | $19: 1758: 4$ | directed $10: 9$ | disregarding |
| $161: 7,8163: 5$ | $143: 21161: 11$ | $11: 5,1240: 12$ | $21: 7$ |
| $163: 7,13$ | $189: 4$ | $45: 7141: 12$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
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[distance - east]

| distance 156:7 | 168:6 178:19 | draw 102:15 | 164:3 166:16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 209:16 | 180:8,21 181:2 | drill 16:20 | 170:3,11 |
| distinct 192:11 | 212:10 214:11 | 20:10,11,14,24 | 196:20 222:18 |
| distinction | 230:13 235:2 | 21:16,17 74:12 | 224:15 225:7 |
| 102:13,16 | 235:16 | 74:18 77:18 | drills 132:21 |
| 188:13 | dollar 72:2 | 78:25 79:13 | drop 207:15 |
| distinctions | dollars 15:20 | 83:12,16 90:4 | dual 203:19 |
| 183:14,16 | 37:11 | 98:13 108:5 | due 12:12 34:7 |
| distinguish | door 70:23 | 114:17 115:4,9 | 69:13 93:6 |
| 43:17 101:13 | 86:2 | 115:12,14 | 100:15 |
| district 205:3 | double 160:1 | 128:4,5,8 | duly 240:5 |
| disturbance | doubling | 148:14 149:14 | dunes 229:10 |
| 221:10,12 | 166:11 | 163:8,14 | dylan 2:12 |
| division 1:1 | doubtful | 165:15,16 | e |
| 17:19 18:3,8 | 194:15 195:14 | 166:7 169:20 | e $2: 1,13: 14: 1,1$ |
| 18:21 19:16 | doubtfully | 197:2,6,8 | 151:1,1 215:5 |
| 20:18 22:20 | 195:21 | 200:20 201:3 | e15 159:5 |
| 23:25 27:13 | drag 87:25 | 222:5 223:19 | e3 158:9 |
| 28:3 32:7 96:8 | dragging 88:3 | 226:17 231:17 | e4 156:12 |
| 138:8 140:16 | 224:19 | drilled 15:14 | 179:10 |
| 151:9 190:17 | drain 20:15 | 15:17 16:1 | e5 154:1 155:20 |
| 191:19 194:20 | 98:12 107:10 | 29:3 31:1 | e7 162:13,13 |
| 203:17 205:14 | 133:2 136:20 | 75:10 93:14 | e7 163.3 |
| dizzy 66:3 | 192:4 195:8,11 | 114:3 117:6,19 | e8 159:5 |
| docket 1:1,3 | drainage 96:8 | 118:3,18 119:2 | eagle 161:21 |
| 238:13 | 98:1,7 101:13 | 130:2,17 | earlier 4:10 |
| document | 101:15 109:7 | 162:11 164:20 | 22:10 85:20 |
| 191:14 | 111:9 132:17 | 171:17 184:18 | 202:18 204:19 |
| documents | 133:11 134:15 | 195:3 196:9 | 207:6 222:16 |
| 12:22 | 192:11 195:10 | 224:1 233:6 | early $8: 18$ |
| doing 47:11 | 199:20 200:2 | drilling 16:13 | ease 64:20 |
| 79:24 80:5,24 | drained 195:5 | 16:25 17:25 | easiest 202:15 |
| 85:10 86:14 | draining 96:16 | 70:8,14 73:23 | east 28:17,17 |
| 109:13 115:6 | 132:17 157:11 | 74:7 106:6 | 49:15,15 57:10 |
| 135:21 136:3 | 208:18 | 108:7 130:13 | 86:8 130:18 |
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[east - especially]

| 159:8 162:1 | 107:10 195:7 | employee | enjoy 146:19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 196:14 221:16 | effects 207:2 | 240:13 241:10 | enrolled 228:9 |
| easy 50:22 | efficiencies | employment | ensure 13:7 |
| 65:21 | 70:19 | 216:2 | 145:6 |
| echo 215:11 | efficient 22:22 | emulsion | ensuring |
| economic 16:4 | efficiently 22:4 | 233:13 | 109:12 |
| 197:10 | 195:8 | encompass | entered 26: |
| economically | effort 17:18 | 62:14 211:21 | 119:14 198:15 |
| 163:18 | 24:3 | encompasses | entering 231:5 |
| economics | efforts 44:18 | 28:15 | entertain |
| 197:5 | 149:4 | encroach 103: | 142:19 |
| economies | eight 130:15 | ended 27:2 | entire 47:7,13 |
| 70:25 | 164:18 166:18 | endorse 22:20 | 157:7 178:6,11 |
| eddie 2:16 | either 10:22 | energy 5:1,6 | 179:3,5,14 |
| 39:15,23,24 | 14:9 27:14 | 23:6 132:15 | 180:9 196:5 |
| 69:6,20 96:3 | 50:7,8,12 52:5 | 150:13 211:10 | 199:7 213:12 |
| 97:7 98:19 | 53:3 54:25 | energy's | 236:6 |
| 104:3 116:18 | 56:22,23 78:10 | 191:15 | entirely 46:8 |
| 117:5,16 126:8 | 142:19 143:16 | engineer 39:25 | entirety 83:11 |
| 132:11 156:9 | 149:18 | 66:9 67:11 | 85:24 |
| 208:6,11,11 | elaborate 32:13 | 71:13 109:7 | entities 34:8 |
| 209:11 | elect 74:10,16 | 133:20 134:4 | entries 4:9,16 |
| eddie's 165:9 | elections 31:15 | 208:12,15 | entry 4:11 |
| 193:2 | element 148:10 | 216:6,7,9,12 | environmental |
| eddy 173:6 | email 29:6 | engineer's 71:5 | 221:10 |
| edited 126:15 | 50:12 54:17,20 | engineering | equate 187:7 |
| educated 171:7 | 54:25 55:10 | 6:25 10:1, 1,4,4 | equip 74:12 |
| educational | emails 80:8 | 10:10,18 15:11 | equipment |
| 215:17 | emission | 18:12 134:3 | 221:9 |
| effect 46:25 | 236:11 | 193:5 209:12 | error 33:10 |
| 59:12 157:13 | emissions | 215:19 217:12 | es 240:4 |
| effective 22:22 | 230:14 236:15 | 217:12 | especially |
| 175:6 199:16 | employed | engineers 93:3 | 29:10,22 30:2 |
| effectively $22: 5$ | 240:11,14 | 95:17 96:3 | 50:25 85:13 |
| 94:5 98:11 | 241:8,11 | 103:16 | 163:18 173:5 |
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[especially - exhibits]

| 209:16 | 208:21 | 26:24 55:8 | 25:2,3,11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| essential 220:3 | evaluations | 86:20 99:12,15 | 33:13 34:19,20 |
| 232:19 | 125:6 | 100:7 101:4 | 35:12,13 36:5 |
| essentially 8:12 | evening 8:7 | 120:1,14 | 36:7,21,23 |
| 8:25 14:3 21:7 | 239:10 | 135:14 137:21 | 39:11 42:17,20 |
| 43:16 45:18 | event 12:3 | 152:2 167:2 | 46:4 48:22 |
| 59:20,22 | 119:14 152:11 | 198:19 202:8 | 49:4 53:3 57:8 |
| 115:17 164:17 | 198:14 | 210:10 215:17 | 57:15,22 61:16 |
| 166:11,18 | everybody 30:1 | 218:10 237:8 | 65:2 66:10 |
| 167:1 183:10 | 73:2 | examiners 4:3 | 71:6,9,12 |
| 185:14 189:14 | everyone's | 11:24 14:5 | 72:19 81:20,23 |
| 204:21 | 51:16 | 15:3,7 24:4 | 84:25 86:10,21 |
| establish | evidence 21:20 | 34:16 36:18 | 86:25 87:3 |
| 135:15 | 154:5,11 | 51:8,10 58:21 | 89:7 91:11 |
| established | 218:15 | 140:19 152:18 | 95:8 129:11 |
| 15:25 163:19 | evidentiary | 198:12 | 130:11 146:7 |
| 166:8 | 139:4 | example 34:20 | 151:13,15 |
| estimate 74:11 | ewe 238:2 | 102:14 119:16 | 152:3 154:1 |
| 87:18 97:2 | exact 98:1 | 128:5 129:18 | 155:20 156:12 |
| estimated 69:2 | 192:7 193:9 | 131:17 206:18 | 158:9 162:13 |
| 74:6,10 | 222:9 227:13 | examples | 162:19 163:3 |
| estimation | 235:17 | 131:11 159:5 | 166:6 174:1,4 |
| 125:13 201:10 | exactly 36:23 | exceed 195:14 | 176:7 177:7,19 |
| 225:6 | 227:16 235:17 | except 34:5 | 178:1 179:10 |
| et 144:16 | exam 167:4 | 35:2 45:19 | 180:14 202:14 |
| 230:14 234:11 | examination | 124:21 144:3 | 202:15 203:2 |
| evaluate | 6:23 8:20 | 180:3 | 204:5 205:20 |
| 163:16 182:13 | 13:13 87:18 | exceptions | 218:13 219:5 |
| 206:3 | 88:17 168:2 | 144:5 | 219:19 221:2 |
| evaluated 93:4 | 190:1 239:3 | excessive 17:11 | 221:18 225:8 |
| 100:14 103:16 | examined 13:4 | excludes 46:16 | 231:10 232:11 |
| evaluating | examiner 2:4,5 | excuse 99:18 | 234:21 |
| 128:3 191:15 | 5:22 9:20 11:4 | exhibit 8:8,11 | exhibit's 234:4 |
| evaluation 32:8 | 15:1,6 18:2 | 9:21,22 13:8,9 | exhibits 5:14 |
| 32:11 169:1 | 23:5 25:18 | 13:11 24:14 | 5:14,15 6:2,8 |
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[exhibits - faith]

| $6: 13,18,227: 1$ | expand $212: 9$ | explore $138: 11$ | $217: 12220: 10$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $7: 8,208: 6,12$ | expect $81: 6$ | express $21: 12$ | $220: 15232: 12$ |
| $8: 15,189: 4,14$ | $155: 2199: 20$ | expressly $83: 24$ | $234: 20236: 10$ |
| $10: 7,9,12$ | $209: 7,13224: 5$ | extended | $236: 11$ |
| $12: 12,13,22,25$ | $232: 20233: 8$ | $220: 13$ | fact $7: 218: 24$ |
| $13: 6,2314: 6$ | $236: 13$ | extension | $29: 444: 15$ |
| $24: 15,20,21$ | expectation | $220: 15$ | $53: 1299: 20$ |
| $25: 11,15,19,19$ | $239: 3$ | extensive $28: 9$ | $102: 5133: 17$ |
| $25: 2026: 10,11$ | expense $142: 1$ | $93: 7104: 4$ | $138: 20159: 7$ |
| $31: 333: 20$ | expensive $22: 7$ | extensively | factor $233: 2$ |
| $34: 1535: 5$ | $225: 1$ | $184: 19$ | factors $32: 7$ |
| $36: 739: 15$ | experience | extent $29: 15$ | $70: 22$ |
| $41: 20,2242: 3$ | $132: 16$ | $43: 1460: 18$ | facts $86: 7$ |
| $47: 2248: 9,15$ | expert $18: 11$ | $92: 12102: 9$ | $134: 9$ |
| $48: 1951: 14$ | $23: 23135: 15$ | $156: 20$ | factual $22: 19$ |
| $53: 654: 14$ | $151: 7215: 14$ | extra $126: 17$ | $101: 1$ |
| $56: 1859: 1$ | $217: 11$ | $169: 7$ | fair $43: 2444: 5$ |
| $71: 2173: 10$ | experts $6: 25$ | extrapolate | $47: 1766: 6$ |
| $84: 22,2585: 13$ | $14: 3$ | $69: 15$ | $70: 1394: 7$ |
| $140: 11148: 13$ | expire $31: 22$ | extrapolation | $102: 3104: 14$ |
| $151: 16,20$ | explain $10: 17$ | $126: 19$ | $106: 21107: 11$ |
| $152: 4,13153: 2$ | $38: 151: 10$ | extremely | $108: 9118: 12$ |
| $153: 5,9155: 21$ | $59: 798: 9,21$ | $30: 16$ | $131: 6132: 3$ |
| $156: 4159: 4$ | $122: 14224: 8$ | f |  |
| $161: 5172: 15$ | explained | f $23: 16,16$ | $180: 8,14$ |
| $203: 13204: 10$ | $133: 8172: 18$ | facilitate $13: 1$ | $198: 2200: 21$ |
| $204: 16206: 19$ | explaining | facilities $69: 7$ | $229: 16$ |
| $218: 6,12219: 2$ | $90: 1995: 12$ | $70: 19215: 14$ | fairly $8: 13$ |
| $223: 6$ | explains $91: 19$ | $216: 16,18$ | $10: 1911: 4$ |
| exist $159: 6$ | explanation | $217: 2,14$ | $184: 19$ |
| existing $77: 17$ | $126: 9$ | $227: 16229: 15$ | fairway $158: 5$ |
| $122: 1$ | explanatory | $232: 14235: 15$ | $158: 20$ |
| exists $62: 19$ | $13: 6$ | faith $32: 8$ |  |
| $202: 19203: 5$ | explicitly | facility $167: 11$ | $44: 11,17$ |
|  | $153: 21$ | $216: 9,12$ | $118: 12149: 4$ |
|  |  |  |  |
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[familiar - foot]

| familiar $66: 11$ | field $14: 329: 19$ | fine $82: 10$ | flexibility $22: 9$ |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $68: 4,872: 10$ | $216: 6217: 11$ | $104: 7107: 15$ | flies $236: 3$ |
| $72: 13,1776: 5$ | fifty $29: 2530: 1$ | $116: 19119: 6$ | $237: 13$ |
| $90: 796: 5,10$ | $158: 6$ | $126: 8205: 17$ | flow $18: 17$ |
| $189: 20190: 15$ | figure $42: 25$ | $210: 19$ | $172: 19189: 14$ |
| $190: 18$ | $226: 21$ | finish $11: 20,22$ | $220: 11,16,17$ |
| far $13: 1820: 17$ | figures $131: 15$ | $238: 7,19239: 4$ | $220: 20221: 3,7$ |
| $39: 440: 13$ | file $42: 376: 16$ | finished $202: 7$ | $221: 14,20$ |
| $49: 2461: 6$ | $89: 18$ | firm $201: 12,18$ | fluctuates |
| $109: 3217: 4$ | filed $6: 89: 17$ | first $4: 245: 24$ | $125: 16$ |
| $227: 18236: 12$ | $10: 913: 22,23$ | $7: 1623: 343: 3$ | fluctuations |
| farther $183: 2$ | $14: 1340: 20$ | $43: 848: 23$ | $126: 5$ |
| fast $210: 2$ | $41: 2247: 22$ | $49: 1465: 19$ | flyover $236: 2$ |
| february $76: 9$ | $76: 22,2578: 22$ | $70: 4,678: 7,22$ | focus $42: 17$ |
| $83: 2,785: 17$ | $80: 1081: 9,15$ | $78: 2281: 10$ | focused $9: 10$ |
| fed $67: 7$ | $82: 16,2084: 14$ | $91: 19,2192: 10$ | $10: 1085: 4$ |
| federal $29: 5,9$ | $84: 2285: 14$ | $104: 19,20$ | $86: 3,13$ |
| $29: 10,18,22$ | $87: 3191: 19$ | $162: 21163: 14$ | focusing $131: 7$ |
| feed $10: 17$ | files $13: 9$ | $176: 9,16$ | folks $4: 737: 9$ |
| feedback $213: 5$ | filing $29: 977: 4$ | $206: 12219: 9$ | $95: 12$ |
| feeding $208: 17$ | $78: 782: 1$ | $221: 11223: 12$ | follow $59: 21$ |
| feel $11: 1588: 3$ | filings $80: 12$ | $233: 9$ | $139: 2210: 20$ |
| $164: 4170: 3$ | filled $193: 19$ | firstly $89: 9$ | $231: 7$ |
| feet $62: 13$ | finally $25: 5,23$ | fishing $143: 9$ | followed $24: 15$ |
| $156: 7164: 15$ | $218: 17$ | five $33: 4$ | $24: 2025: 2,11$ |
| $174: 19175: 12$ | financial $17: 23$ | $174: 19238: 7$ | $151: 15215: 20$ |
| $175: 12176: 20$ | $37: 14106: 8$ | $238: 19$ | following $84: 10$ |
| $206: 1,16$ | financially | fixated $167: 13$ | $191: 20$ |
| $209: 17$ | $240: 15241: 11$ | flaring $234: 3$ | follows $64: 15$ |
| felicia $1: 102: 3$ | find $37: 14$ | $234: 13,14$ | $108: 5$ |
| $4: 5$ | $61: 1182: 11$ | $236: 18$ | foot $68: 11$ |
| fenceline | $184: 14232: 18$ | flat $164: 17$ | $69: 13,16,18$ |
| $235: 20$ | findings $138: 20$ | $165: 1$ | $157: 21158: 1,6$ |
| fiber $208: 8$ | $236: 12$ | flex $146: 15$ | $165: 7185: 15$ |
|  |  | $223: 4$ |  |
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[footages - garcia]

| footages 109:18 | former 121:19 | 175:18 176:12 | function |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| foran 4:10 | formula 27:19 | 176:13 177:6 | 189:14 |
| 34:24 56:6,17 | 27:21 | 177:11 202:20 | further 8:25 |
| 56:21 57:1,12 | fort 32:21,22 | 208:2,3,4,19 | 102:16 119:8 |
| 57:13 58:7 | forth 7:15 42:6 | 209:1,3,6,8,9 | 139:12 189:12 |
| 123:21 124:1,1 | forward 10:23 | 209:14,15,17 | 197:12 198:10 |
| 124:5 | 12:23 30:11 | 209:18 225:2 | 221:9 231:1 |
| forced 19:18 | 33:6 43:1 | fracs 209:2,5,6 | 237:6 240:12 |
| foregoing | 72:18,19 74:18 | 211:14 | 241:9 |
| 240:3,4 241:4 | 104:12 146:15 | fracture 174:19 | future 81:7 |
| foresee 207:1 | 214:2 | 175:14 | 117:5 170:4,21 |
| forgot 196:11 | found 91:7 | fractures | 206:5,9 207:1 |
| form 26:25 | 188:3 | 132:12 175:9 | 207:12 233:6 |
| 160:7 161:2 | foundation | 175:13,19 | 233:10 |
| 213:12 | 135:16 136:4 | framework | fyi 203:17 |
| formation | four 5:16,16 | 47:21 | 207:21 |
| 24:13,19 90:15 | 9:22 13:24 | frankly 10:20 | g |
| 92:20 93:4,5 | 24:8 30:22 | free 142:13 | g 4:1 |
| 100:14 103:7,9 | 33:4 44:18,20 | freeze 82:9 | $\text { gain } 80: 17$ |
| 133:1 148:20 | 45:2 62:1 | front $32: 18$ | game 102:3 |
| 154:8,20,20 | 115:11 130:2 | 46:6 72:22 | gamma 204:12 |
| 158:11 172:19 | 130:13 152:16 | 218:2 | 204:14 |
| 192:13 196:5 | 166:7,12 | fruition 121:11 | garbled 168:8 |
| 204:12 212:4 | 168:20 182:10 | full 17:17 23:20 | garcia 2:5 4:4 |
| 213:7 | 219:10 221:11 | 29:19 56:25 | 12:8,10,11,14 |
| formations | fourth 57:9 | 69:7,20 83:1 | 12:24 13:7 |
| 19:15 38:9,19 | fourths 63:3 | 138:6 144:20 | 141:1,2,4,19 |
| 106:10,14 | frac 153:13,19 | 151:5 169:3,18 | 142:3,6,15,18 |
| 130:15 132:3 | 154:5,7,9,11,12 | fully $86: 15$ | 143:1,7,11 |
| 154:19 156:20 | 154:14,17 | 100:3 109:14 | 144:4,7,14,18 |
| 173:12,21 | 156:5 170:20 | 121:20 146:16 | 145:2,5,8,13 |
| 192:6 195:2 | 172:12,14,15 | 200:6 | 146:11,15,17 |
| 202:1 203:7,9 | 172:20 173:2,7 | fulton 1:19 | 147:1,13 |
| 205:12 206:11 | $173: 9,14,19$ $174 \cdot 4$ 175.8, | 240:2,20 | 202:10,12 |
|  | 174:4 175:8,8 |  | 203:8,15 204:7 |
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| 204:11,15,19 | gentleman | 194:2 216:1 | going 10:23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 205:7,17 206:2 | 214:6 | given 51:23 | 11:21 12:2 |
| 206:8,20 207:6 | geologic 159:2 | 92:13 93:12 | 18:12,14 21:15 |
| 207:17 208:10 | 160:11 209:11 | 124:9 | 25:6 38:22 |
| 208:16 209:21 | geological | gives 71:12,13 | 41:8 42:15,16 |
| 210:3,12 211:7 | 102:14 | go 5:24 7:16,19 | 43:2,7,8 45:15 |
| 213:3 214:4 | geologically | 9:13 14:24 | 45:16 47:7,19 |
| 231:8 232:9,10 | 156:17 157:17 | 15:4 23:18 | 47:23 48:2,21 |
| 232:16 233:2 | 158:7 162:21 | 32:18,22 43:1 | 50:13,16 51:5 |
| 233:12,16,20 | geologist 75:23 | 47:23 49:9 | 52:1,5 55:1 |
| 234:16,21 | 150:13 | 50:19 55:12,19 | 57:24 63:13,18 |
| 235:8,12,19 | geologist's | 55:24 66:21 | 65:3,3 67:8,12 |
| 236:16,21 | 153:2 | 74:17 84:9 | 68:21 69:17 |
| 237:2,11 238:8 | geologists 93:3 | 87:10 93:2 | 70:14 73:15,19 |
| 238:14 | 95:16,21 | 102:17 104:12 | 74:23 75:14 |
| garcia's 147:17 | 100:12 103:16 | 128:5 145:16 | 77:19 80:8,17 |
| 148:9 211:2 | 132:2 133:13 | 148:5 149:21 | 80:18,22 81:2 |
| garnered 33:24 | 133:16 | 151:3 167:16 | 81:22 83:12,15 |
| gas 4:13 17:4 | geology 6:25 | 167:19 168:3 | 84:6 88:4 |
| 21:13 55:5 | 9:25 10:15,17 | 183:1 201:3 | 89:13 91:5,7 |
| 120:7 136:16 | 15:10 18:11 | 203:1 208:19 | 94:16 95:13 |
| 137:4,5 138:2 | 22:13 151:8,16 | 209:14,18 | 97:11,15 98:5 |
| 187:8 233:13 | 153:6,9 160:7 | 211:5,15 | 98:6,11 101:19 |
| 233:17 234:6,9 | 160:13,20 | 215:16 218:4 | 103:6 104:18 |
| general 35:14 | 193:5 198:6 | 230:13 236:4 | 105:17,17 |
| 116:15 166:1 | geomechanical | 237:10 | 106:4,11 107:9 |
| 190:10 203:13 | 18:16 | goal 232:18 | 110:15 114:8 |
| generally 19:24 | getting 29:9 | goes 13:19 | 114:17 115:9 |
| 20:9 42:18 | 33:1 81:20 | 20:17 28:5 | 115:13 116:2,7 |
| 154:8 216:14 | 110:8 226:11 | 29:9 43:11 | 116:12 117:12 |
| generated | gist 185:17 | 64:19 92:18 | 119:13 123:19 |
| 160:8 | give 8:19 31:3 | 93:20 94:2 | 126:20 129:6 |
| generators | 49:1 77:9 | 107:2 164:14 | 138:10,13 |
| 234:10 | 109:17 143:1 | 203:16 226:16 | 139:10 141:7 |
|  | 159:4 161:14 |  | 156:8 157:11 |
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| 161:1 165:9,17 | 188:2,3 196:19 | group 37:12 | 228:2,6 233:12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 168:16 171:11 | 202:13 213:5 | growing 132:12 | 235:2,14,20 |
| 174:19 175:10 | 214:16 215:6 | 208:9 | 236:17 |
| 176:17 177:14 | 225:15 | growth 154:9 | guys's 203:10 |
| 182:8 183:11 | goosey 16:11 | 208:2 209:15 | 208:12 |
| 184:9 185:4,5 | 24:18 34:1 | guess 9:2 13:16 | h |
| 190:21 191:7 | 36:12 46:6,22 | 27:1 33:18 | h 23:16 157:1,2 |
| 191:13,16 | 56:22 65:9 | 40:10 41:6 | h 158:16 181:18 |
| 195:21 200:15 | 81:17 90:5 | 42:2,25 48:21 | 181:19 187:19 |
| 205:7 208:7 | 91:13 186:16 | 48:24 49:5 | 187:21 188:1,4 |
| 209:19 218:4 | 223:11 225:21 | 53:5,10 60:13 | 188:19,21 |
| 219:18 220:2,3 | 226:20 | 63:11 65:21 | 189:4,8 193:3 |
| 220:4,11 | gotten 197:14 | 68:19 77:15 | 193:14 194:2,4 |
| 221:14 222:1,3 | gradations | 78:1,6,18,20 | hailee $2: 44: 4$ |
| 222:6,12,15 | 183:14 | 85:8,15 86:3,6 | hairy 30:3 |
| 223:19,19 | graduated | 86:12 87:1,20 | half 16:19 |
| 224:18 226:4,6 | 215:18 | 107:7,19 117:1 | 31:11 34:5,5,9 |
| 228:3 229:20 | grand 67:1 | 117:11 139:20 | 34:9 35:2,2 |
| 230:17 231:10 | grasp 6:14 | 142:16 168:12 | 36:1,2 37:20 |
| 231:11,17 | gratuitous | 177:5 181:1 | 37:20,25 38:13 |
| 233:5 234:9 | 17:25 | 183:6 185:15 | 38:14,19 45:12 |
| 239:2 | great 49:6,13 | 186:14 203:15 | 45:20 46:15,16 |
| good 6:10 | 89:1 91:7 | 203:19 206:4,8 | 46:25 47:5 |
| 14:17 23:7,8,9 | 136:8 146:14 | 206:10,20 | 49:15,15 57:10 |
| 32:8 39:15 | 214:14 225:17 | 207:10 208:10 | 57:10 59:14,16 |
| 42:13,14 44:4 | greater 19:7,8 | 208:11 213:16 | 60:25 62:17,17 |
| 44:11,17 61:15 | 20:9 113:17 | 232:11 233:4 | 64:3,3 123:6 |
| 75:18 88:9,23 | green 144:16 | 235:8 | 125:1,1 166:20 |
| 107:16 118:11 | grids 159:20 | guidelines 77:8 | 209:9 |
| 119:21 120:12 | 160:5,11 | gun 166:4 | halliburton |
| 121:5 126:10 | gritty 39:16 | 168:12,17 | 216:3 |
| 136:14,14 | 69:9 | 169:4 | hammer 69:9 |
| 148:3 149:4 | gross 179:13 | guys 12:11 | hand 21:17 |
| 168:4 176:13 | 184:2,6 | 203:18 204:6 | 23:11 150:16 |
| 184:15 187:2,4 |  | 206:2 208:20 | 214:20 |
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| handful 15:14 | heard 22:6 56:2 | 198:19 214:10 | hfts2 208:6,8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| handle 11:19 | 62:21 103:3 | 215:17 218:10 | hiccup 19:18 |
| 12:4 101:20 | 129:10 132:2 | 219:6 237:8 | high 69:5,13 |
| handled 144:19 | 133:16 179:9 | 239:1 | 158:5,20 173:6 |
| hands 29:12,13 | 184:11 190:8 | hearings 1:1 | 209:3,3 236:10 |
| hang 17:10 | 228:12 233:21 | 14:15 19:21 | higher 69:17 |
| hanging 73:22 | hearing 4:20 | hearsay 133:21 | 188:1 203:5 |
| happen 29:1 | 5:1,21 6:16 7:5 | 134:2 | 224:18,18 |
| 85:25 99:9 | 7:9,11 9:7 | heater 234:10 | 225:3 |
| happened 68:7 | 11:16,18 13:15 | height 176:12 | highlight 93:2 |
| 115:17 | 13:16 15:1,6 | 177:14,14,18 | 106:5 174:17 |
| happening | 18:2,7 24:4,7 | 177:18 179:4 | highlighted |
| 86:16 98:5 | 24:11,17,23 | 179:14 181:3,3 | 186:16 187:13 |
| happens 165:5 | 25:8,18,21 | 181:8 184:9,21 | 191:12 |
| happy 14:5 | 34:18 36:8,11 | 184:21 185:10 | highlighting |
| hard 37:15 | 36:13 40:8 | 185:10,14,18 | 173:20 |
| 82:7 87:1 | 42:12,23,24 | 186:9 187:7,14 | highline 235:1 |
| 170:7 185:20 | 43:3,3 47:23 | 187:15 191:3 | 235:7,9 |
| 185:21 186:4 | 48:22 51:17 | 208:4 209:15 | highly 31:9 |
| 199:18 204:16 | 52:1 55:8,18 | heights 208:19 | 163:10 166:18 |
| hardest 30:14 | 66:13,14,15 | held 134:7 | 193:15 194:15 |
| harkey 163:16 | 81:23 82:5 | heller 241:2,18 | 205:6 |
| 164:9 172:6,7 | 86:20 88:12,19 | hello 214:15 | highway |
| harm 21:3 | 89:12,16,17 | help 10:17 | 221:15 222:13 |
| hate 29:12 | 90:11,12 99:12 | 14:17 147:20 | hired 78:15 |
| head 89:13 | 99:15 100:6 | 228:14 | historical 83:10 |
| 228:12 235:6 | 101:4 108:2 | helpful 12:16 | 107:3 |
| hear 18:12,25 | 119:7 120:1,13 | 210:12 | history 31:3,6 |
| 20:8 21:19,23 | 121:1 123:20 | hereto 240:14 | 120:16,19 |
| 21:23 41:12 | 129:1,2 135:13 | 241:11 | 216:2 |
| 119:18 129:3 | 137:21 139:1 | hesitant 189:11 | hitting 235:12 |
| 133:21 136:13 | 139:14 140:15 | hesitate 189:15 | hold 119:12 |
| 136:13 152:12 | 146:5 147:15 | hesitation | hole 77:21,22 |
| 168:7 190:3 | 151:12 152:2 | 89:6 | 171:17 172:1 |
| 215:8 | 152:15 167:2,9 |  |  |
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| information | 148:15 | 112:10 113:8 | interject 99:17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9:25 25:7 | intends 108:13 | 113:11,17 | internal 68:4 |
| 124:5 126:11 | 163:7 226:17 | 117:7,9,13 | interpretation |
| 170:8 171:1,5 | intent 17:2 | 122:17 124:11 | 145:17 |
| 171:13 211:3 | 56:4,10 91:20 | 124:11,15 | interpretations |
| inhibit 154:9 | 92:10 98:18 | 125:3 126:17 | 212:13 |
| initial 16:23 | 99:6 103:4 | 127:15 132:8 | interrupt 120:5 |
| 22:10 59:1 | 148:13 | 133:2 134:21 | interval 154:21 |
| 61:16 74:7 | interaction | 141:16,17,21 | 164:18 166:12 |
| 92:11 164:2 | 206:17 | 142:10,11 | 178:7,11,17 |
| 206:8 233:5 | interactions | 146:8 148:20 | 179:4,5,14 |
| initially 62:5 | 32:10 120:20 | 148:21 153:10 | 180:9 181:10 |
| 78:21 230:3 | interest 10:21 | 185:2 | 184:21 |
| initiate 101:10 | 11:1 17:9 19:9 | interested | intervals 20:1 |
| inside 230:20 | 20:9 28:23 | 143:10 196:20 | 184:2 |
| insight 80:17 | 29:23 33:22,24 | 240:15 241:12 | intervening |
| insignificant | 34:12,25 37:2 | interesting | 173:12 |
| 187:6 | 37:4 38:17,20 | 145:13 211:8 | intractable |
| inspections | 46:20 47:25 | interests 22:23 | 20:7 |
| 235:14 | 49:14 52:14,16 | 43:20,23 46:21 | introduce 4:14 |
| instance 52:7 | 52:17,19,24 | 47:12 48:5 | 4:19 218:11,15 |
| 53:16 54:7 | 53:17,22 54:15 | 49:21 53:9 | introduction |
| 55:4 56:13 | 56:14,18 57:6 | 56:7 57:5,17 | 5:20 90:2 |
| instances 12:15 | 57:19 59:3,6,7 | 58:3,22 59:16 | inventory |
| 54:1 | 59:9,13,24 | 59:23 60:7,17 | 197:12 224:14 |
| institute 114:12 | 60:10,16 62:15 | 61:2,7,20 | investigating |
| instruct 102:4 | 62:16,19 63:9 | 63:18,18 79:25 | 163:9 |
| instrumentati... | 71:18 73:16 | 111:16 113:4 | investor 11:7,9 |
| 237:15 | 74:9,16,22 | 122:21 123:3 | 68:5 222:19 |
| insurmounta... | 75:5 76:17 | 128:10,12 | 224:10 |
| 17:15 | 77:10,24 83:12 | 143:10,18,19 | invite 138:20 |
| intend 12:17,19 | 85:6 90:20 | interfere 156:8 | invited 102:15 |
| 12:22 90:20 | 92:6 98:10 | interference | involved 31:5 |
| intended 22:8 | 103:5 110:20 | 165:9 | 44:18 45:1 |
| 48:10 108:21 | 111:19 112:10 |  | 131:2 143:13 |
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| 216:17 | j | 84:22 87:4 | knew 38:22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| involving 45:3 | 3:16 | 96:8 | 83:6 |
| 211:10 | javelina 37:13 | jump 67:16 | know 7:15 8:5 |
| irreparably | jenny 2:11 | 72:4,5,8 | 8:9,12,16,23,25 |
| 21:3 | jim 2:9 77:16 | 174:15 | 9:4 10:1,14,25 |
| ish 206:16 | joa 46:12 47:16 | june 35:18 | 11:6,12 12:21 |
| island 77:18 | - 47:20 50:11,14 | 57:21 58:15 | 13:20,23,25 |
| issuant 136:16 | 51:23 60:1 | 64:24 66:18 | 14:9,10 19:23 |
| issue 8:14 | 22:11,12 | 71:15 90:2 | 19:24 20:1 |
| 19:25,25 27:13 | joas 60:21 | 91:21 148:13 | 26:14 28:15,18 |
| 44:8,19 45:2 | 144:16 | 190:4 223:9,14 | 29:2,4,8,11,21 |
| 45:19 46:1 | job 1:20 | 225:5 | 29:23,25 30:8 |
| 101:1 124:9 | john 2:5,17 3:5 | justification | 30:14,20,23 |
| 164:6 211:12 | $4: 4 \text { 23:5,22 }$ | 107:4 | 32:18,20,22,25 |
| 212:18 | johnson 120:6 | justify 21:21 | 33:1,3,5,5,9 |
| issued 11:7 | join 50:13 | k | 35:14,20 37:10 |
| 68:5 81:12 | 51:17 238:9 | keaton 2:18 | 37:12,15,16 |
| 164:3 | joint 46:6 | keep 20:19 | 38:8,12,13,18 |
| issues 9:11 | J4:21 | 42:16 50:22,23 | 38:24 39:6,18 |
| 10:14,15 11:8 | joker 83:3 | 80:4 83:15 | 42:2,17 44:9 |
| 21:14 44:16 | Joker 156:15,17 | 232:21 | 44:17 49:10 |
| 81:10 99:20 | 157:14,16,19 | keeping 79:22 | 50:20,21,22 |
| 102:19 103:2 | 158:4 186:16 | 210:1 | 53:21,24 55:12 |
| 146:2 190:17 | 187:13 199:2,7 | kind 17:9 33:21 | 55:20 57:5,20 |
| 209:7 211:16 | 221:19 222:3,6 | 33:23 48:17 | 57:21 58:19,20 |
| 229:10,11 | 222:10 | 64:18 69:1 | 59:17 64:19 |
| 232:17 | jones 2:7 4:12 | 75:16,1 | 65:22 67:3 |
| it'd 57:17 85:23 | Jones $4: 14119: 16,20$ | $85: 1112: 9$ | 68:7 69:2,8,9 |
| 170:14 222:8,8 | 119:21 120:6 | 114:13 136 | 69:22 70:20,21 |
| it'll 14:17 38:12 | josephine | 139:8 161:15 | 78:17,23 79:7 |
| 116:3,3,5 | 124:14 | 172:3 177:10 | 79:8,13 80:7,9 |
| 208:11 | judicial 17:19 | 83:8 184:1 | 80:10,16 81:2 |
| item 13:5 | july 9:6,6,7 | 206:21 208:7 | 81:25 83:7 |
| items 35:4 | $41: 2147: 24$ | kinds $162: 8$ | 84:9 85:12 |
| 146:5 | 69:23 73:10 | kinds 162.8 | 86:1,2,10,18 |
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| 87:24,24 89:9 | 1 | landman's | lead 41:13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 91:9 95:11 | 1 151:1,1 $215: 5$ | 131:6 | 163:16 |
| 100:4 105:20 | 1 215:5 | lands 15:9,17 | leader 15:23 |
| 107:18 109:7 | labeled 35:15 | 15:24 16:18 | leading 26:25 |
| 117:12,13 | lack 31:14 | 17:23,25 93:6 | 129:2 135:12 |
| 118:11 119:5 | 153:19 154:12 | 106:11 122:9 | leads 206:21 |
| 124:1 125:11 | 154:14,17 | 132:9 153:10 | leak 237:12 |
| 127:14 131:11 | 202:18 209: | 153:12 | leaking 236:8 |
| 134:3 135:18 | $\text { aid } 124: 5$ | language 73:6 | 237:15 |
| 135:20 138:10 | 18 | 73:25 74:5,19 | leasehold 28:15 |
| 139:19 140:16 | land 6:24 9:25 | 97:11 103:15 | 59:15,23,24 |
| 140:20 144:15 | land 10:12 16:9 | 103:21 104:2,6 | 60:8,16 61:13 |
| 146:4 150:1 | 23:24 25:19 | 105:12 110:6 | 62:2,6,15 63:8 |
| 162:7 167:15 | $26: 10.1249: 16$ | 126:16 192:15 | 63:16,17 79:25 |
| 168:8 170:5 | $121: 16 \quad 176: 21$ | large 12:12 | leases 49:18 |
| 171:11 177:4 | 206:15 207:3 | 72:2 89:18 | leave 208:5 |
| 181:13 184:1,3 | landed 108:16 | 189:3,4 | left 178:2 |
| 185:15 193:17 | 159:12,17,20 | larger 30:9 | legal 21:14 |
| 194:13,17,18 | 160:12 161:12 | 33:19 225:2 | 22:19 26:16 |
| 209:3 210:2 | 161:13 176:8 | late 6:87:3 | 96:6,7 97:1,20 |
| 211:7,20 | 198:7 | 11:16 83:7,7 | 99:20 100:5 |
| 212:15,17 | landing 154:3,4 | lately 51:9 | 101:1,11,18 |
| 213:1 $214: 3$ | 155:2 156:6 | lateral 68:15 | 102:6,14,19 |
| 223:10,15 | $7: 4159: 21$ | 203:19 | 103:2 138:1,18 |
| 226:11 231:16 | 164:6 178:15 | law 57:7 65:1,5 | 138:21 141:12 |
| 237:12 | 179:5,15,18,19 | 99:20 138:21 | 143:13 145:17 |
| knowledge | 180:9 206:16 | lawyer 102:8 | 190:17,19 |
| 25:16 79:12,21 | 211:13 | 102:11 | 213:20 |
| 151:21 217:12 | landings 154:6 | laying 138:17 | length 209:4 |
| 218:8 229:6 | $176: 13$ | layman 39:17 | lengths 209:6,8 |
| 240:9 241:6 | landman 23: | lea 5:2,6,9 | lengthy 14:1 |
| known 157:6 | 17 23.6 | 15:23 68:11,24 | lenses 173:12 |
|  | 102 | 85:24 117:10 | leonard 2:13 |
|  |  | 217:2 222:18 | lessee 78:17 |
|  |  | 224:21 |  |
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| lessened 127:17 | 222:12 230:1 | lizards 233:1 | 206:6 214:2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| letter 31:19 | lines 220:12,16 | llc 219:5 | looked 135:18 |
| 34:24 50:7,12 | 220:18,20 | load 89:20 90:1 | 156:12 |
| 51:15,22 53:7 | 221:3,7,14,20 | located 16:6 | looking 13:8 |
| 55:11 90:3 | link 238:9,10 | 157:4 158:4 | 18:9 27:7 |
| 91:12 92:11 | 238:12 | 185:1 | 34:19 36:20 |
| 94:12 95:15 | list 2:2 48:1,5 | location 13:2 | 38:21 39:1,11 |
| 98:4,9,17 | 48:10 50:11 | 93:12 187:12 | 51:3 58:22 |
| 100:10,21 | 230:19 | 193:18 199:6 | 60:6 62:22 |
| 101:2,8,9,17,21 | listed 33:16 | 232:18 | 63:8,17 85:24 |
| 103:14,15 | 54:13,15,24 | locations 77:17 | 92:9 159:4,7 |
| 104:9 105:6,8 | 57:1 225:6 | 92:14 227:21 | 160:7,10,20 |
| 105:12 106:2 | little 13:20 | 228:18 229:9 | 161:4 162:12 |
| 106:14 108:1 | 32:14 38:1,3 | 229:15 | 164:11 174:3 |
| 137:18 143:14 | 41:5 50:18 | $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { l o g }}$ 175:2 176:7 | 175:5 181:13 |
| 143:16,18 | 53:2 67:15 | 178:2,2,7 | 202:13 203:20 |
| 144:21 148:14 | 68:15 69:5 | 204:9,17 | 221:2 226:4 |
| 148:19 189:21 | 72:775:19 | $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { l o g s }} 160: 1$ | 232:11 233:15 |
| 190:4,9 | 83:22 85:1 | 173:16 176:17 | 238:15 |
| letters 55:14 | 89:8,19 91:6 | 203:8,11,18,18 | looks 4:7 15:13 |
| 90:3,7,10,19 | 91:19 99:14 | 203:19,20 | 26:20 28:6,7 |
| 92:1 144:12,16 | 114:1 125:17 | 204:4,5 | 31:2 37:24 |
| level 173:21 | 126:14 131:8 | long 13:10 | 39:2 49:7 |
| $\boldsymbol{l g}$ 226:19 | 135:20 148:8 | 76:19 83:16 | 66:17 126:16 |
| lie 158:19 | 157:8 159:11 | 131:2 | 162:14 174:12 |
| 162:18 | 161:6,15,19 | longer 21:4 | 174:14 |
| likely 197:17 | 172:10,11 | 52:4 136:1 | loosey 16:11 |
| 207:19 | 175:21 177:11 | look 9:16 34:16 | 24:18 34:1 |
| limit 7:14 | 177:13 179:16 | 35:6,12 53:3 | 36:12 46:5,22 |
| 133:18 | 184:10 186:2 | 56:17,18 58:4 | 56:22 65:9 |
| limited 7:4 8:14 | 188:7 189:5 | 64:14 65:16 | 81:16 90:5 |
| 10:16 165:19 | 191:6 208:2 | 72:25 84:25 | 91:13 186:15 |
| 176:8 188:6 | 216:9 | 86:1 87:10 | 223:11 225:21 |
| line 4:6 100:1 154:3,4 222:2 | lizard 229:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 146:14 150:1 } \\ & \text { 181:17 188:17 } \end{aligned}$ | 226:19 |
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| lost 123:20 | m | main 161:20 | 206:17 211:1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 141:1 | m 23:16 151:1 | 164:5 202:14 | 217:5 230:13 |
| lot 12:1 25:6 | macha 26:11 | 211:16 | 236:7 |
| 29:1,11,11,12 | 26:21 28:5 | maintains 17:7 | makes 28:12 |
| 30:8 37:9 | 34:15 37:21 | maintenance | 37:22 48:24 |
| 42:23,24 50:20 | 73:4,18 74:4 | 62:18 236:6 | 126:19 175:18 |
| 50:21 67:1 | 74:15 84:25 | major 15:25 | making 96:14 |
| 70:22 73:20 | macha's 27:7 | 30:5 38:2 | 183:16 |
| 81:5 83:10 | 28:7 33:12,22 | majority 31:10 | manage 228:14 |
| 123:18 129:2 | 36:21 41:14 | 31:18 34:3,12 | management |
| 138:1,10 | 72:10 | 34:16,25 35:10 | 234:6 |
| 141:14 162:14 | madam 5:21 | 35:23,23 85:20 | managing |
| 170:18,19 | 7:11 9:20 11:3 | 103:8 113:7,10 | 216:15 |
| 188:8 204:1 | 13:15 15:1,6 | 124:20 125:3 | mancha's |
| 212:5 224:6,20 | 18:2,7 23:4 | 158:20 164:20 | 26:18 |
| lots 145:14 | 25:18 39:6 | 236:14 | mandate 27:10 |
| 146:12 208:16 | 40:8 42:11 | make 15:2 | 27:15 |
| 213:8 | 55:8,18 86:20 | 16:16 18:10 | mangle 228:3 |
| loud 74:4 | 88:11,19 99:12 | 38:24 39:18 | mangling 93:16 |
| love 201:9 | 99:15 100:7 | 40:22,23 42:5 | manifestation |
| low 172:19 | 101:4 119:7 | 51:2 52:12,21 | 122:21 |
| 173:21 207:4 | 120:1,13 129:1 | 53:10 54:6 | manner 8:2 |
| lowe 2:13 | 135:13 137:21 | 55:22 58:20 | 106:9 118:12 |
| lower 39:21 | 139:14 140:15 | 59:17 65:21 | 135:20 |
| 117:3,7,18,20 | 147:10 152:2 | 66:2 68:14 | map 157:2,3 |
| 162:18 163:20 | 167:2,9 198:18 | 86:18 88:1 | 162:4 178:6,10 |
| 170:15 172:8 | 202.7 210.10 | 95:7,10 101:5 | 178:12 180:18 |
| 187:21 196:10 | $214: 10218: 10$ | 104:10 105:21 | 180:19 184:13 |
| 197:1,11,18 | 237:8 239: | 108:13,17 | 185:10 188:3 |
| 200:7 209:6 | made 8:13 24:2 | 115:8 137:10 | 188:19,21 |
| lowered 109:2 | 48:14 96:7 | 138:1 139:1,9 | 189:2 194:2 |
| lowering | 112:14 124:18 | 146:18 171:6 | mapped 179:3 |
| 211:12 | 142:16 172:5 | 177:15,21 | 180:8 |
| lunch 88:9,20 | 224:11 | 183:7,13 184:8 | mapping |
| 88:23 |  | 189:7,11,18 | 156:21 157:7 |
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| 178:3 182:18 | maximum | means 154:18 | mesaverde |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 188:8 | 163:4 169:20 | 203:5,6 224:13 | 205:11 |
| maps 188:15 | 170:5 | meant 85:16 | met 228:17 |
| 193:14 | mba 215:20 | 209:3 235:9 | methodical |
| march 76:10 | mccoy $2: 8$ | measure | 16:13 |
| 81:17 83:3,7 | mean 10:8 | 175:13 182:15 | mexico 5:3,7,9 |
| 85:17 | 32:17 34:10 | measurement | 32:19 227:11 |
| marie 241:2,18 | 42:2 48:20 | 181:9 194:1 | 227:12 232:12 |
| mark 2:8 52:15 | 50:4,5 57:23 | mechanism | 232:15 |
| mark's 53:22 | 59:7 60:3,4,5 | 112:2 | microseismic |
| 54:7,11 | 61:25 71:3,23 | medium 30:9 | 208:8 |
| marked 50:14 | 73:9 75:6 76:9 | meet 27:10 | middle 19:16 |
| 54:3 82:7 | 77:13 80:21 | 32:19 | 19:20,23 32:5 |
| market 125:17 | 83:22,24 85:9 | meeting 228:13 | 83:7 200:7 |
| marlene 2:6 | 85:20 86:5,6 | 229:7 239:13 | mighty 16:11 |
| 238:11,15,17 | 86:12 87:25 | meetings 30:20 | 24:12 34:1 |
| massive 17:23 | 95:7,10 97:10 | 33:4 | 43:4 46:5,22 |
| 126:20 | 97:10 101:2 | member 228:2 | 49:15 56:22 |
| matador 34:24 | 104:8,16 | 228:8 | 57:11 65:9 |
| 37:8 56:3,6 | 107:17 110:10 | members 122:4 | 67:6 81:16 |
| matched 32:23 | 111:11 113:14 | 122:6 | 90:5 91:14 |
| math 68:17 | 114:21 115:5 | memo 97:12 | 186:15 223:11 |
| matter 13:16 | 122:5 123:1 | memorandum | 225:21 226:19 |
| 40:11 101:12 | 126:7 135:18 | 97:20 | mile 32:4 68:15 |
| 101:18 119:15 | 142:9 154:7 | mention 56:2 | 69:13,14,16,17 |
| 138:7 165:14 | 160:17 162:13 | 153:8 | 69:18 77:23 |
| 209:13,18 | 183:13,20,21 | mentioned | 78:18 130:18 |
| 228:11 | 187:3,3 194:13 | 56:17 64:5 | 130:19 162:10 |
| matters 17:22 | 199:2 206:5 | 71:25 96:6 | 224:15,17 |
| 23:24 26:12,16 | 209:8 210:14 | 120:15 124:10 | miles 163:11 |
| maturity | 213:3 229:17 | 158:16 161:18 | 186:1 |
| 163:17 | 233:18 | 229:19 | million 37:5,16 |
| maximize | meaning 17:4 | mentions 57:22 | 39:19,20 57:2 |
| 219:11 | 162:20 | mesa 213:7 | $\begin{aligned} & 67: 8,9,13,16 \\ & 68: 15,22,22,25 \end{aligned}$ |
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| 69:5 70:15 | 119:13 152:10 | 150:12,15,18 | 188:14 189:10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| millions 37:11 | 190:21 198:14 | 150:21,21 | 189:15,20 |
| mindset 141:5 | 210:7 217:19 | 151:4,6,6,10,14 | 190:2,7,13,18 |
| mine 147:19 | 219:1 231:4 | 151:18 152:1 | 191:4 192:16 |
| mineral 60:7,9 | money 39:18 | 152:14,17,21 | 193:1,7,11,14 |
| minerals 21:5 | monitoring | 153:3,7,13,21 | 193:21 194:7 |
| 22:17 109:14 | 235:21 | 154:12,18 | 194:11,15,18 |
| minimal 124:13 | month 9:5 | 155:9,13,16 | 195:9,16,19 |
| 126:8 170:20 | 82:15 | 156:1,13,16,21 | 196:3,7,11 |
| 203:1,6 206:17 | months 76:12 | 157:16 158:15 | 197:1,7,11 |
| 233:11 | 78:7 130:2,12 | 159:10 160:9 | 198:1,4,8,10,16 |
| minute 35:5 | 130:21 224:2 | 160:16 161:1 | 198:20 199:2,4 |
| 119:12 167:18 | morning 4:17 | 161:10,19 | 199:8,13,18 |
| minutes 26:15 | 6:15 7:8 11:19 | 162:9,17 164:5 | 200:4,8,12,18 |
| 238:2 | 23:7,8,9 42:13 | 164:14 165:4,7 | 201:2,9,14 |
| miscommuni... | 42:14 120:4 | 165:13,20 | 202:11,13,21 |
| 180:4 | 238:4 | 166:3,17 167:3 | 203:12,21 |
| misrepresent... | motion 95:4 | 167:8 168:2,5 | 204:8,13,18 |
| 179:16 180:12 | 97:11 100:6 | 168:6 169:6,12 | 205:5,15,21 |
| misrepresent... | motions 5:13 | 169:19 170:7 | 206:5,10 207:3 |
| 157:8 | move 7:24 33:5 | 171:9,15,19 | 207:13 208:5 |
| missed 205:20 | 75:17 147:8 | 172:2,9 173:1 | 208:14 209:10 |
| missouri | 218:11 222:15 | 173:10,15 | 210:5,9,20 |
| 240:22 | 229:15 233:1 | 174:7,12 175:3 | 214:7 227:1 |
| mixed 99:20 | moved 210:2 | 175:7 176:6,18 | multi 13:9 |
| 213:4 | moving 30:11 | 177:9 178:4,8 | multiple 78:14 |
| model 182:2 | 79:4 115:6 | 178:14,18 | 144:15 |
| modeler 182:8 | 208:1 | 179:2,7,11,19 | mute 133:7 |
| moderated | mp 226:19 | 180:2,6,14 | n |
| 1:10 | mplg 226:18 | 181:7,12,17 | n $2: 13: 1,14: 1$ |
| modification | mrc 4:11 57:11 | 182:1,5,11,17 | $23: 16,16215: 5$ |
| 73:5 | 124:2 | 183:4,19 184:7 | name $4: 4$ 23:15 |
| moment 65:4 | mueller 2:20 | 185:8,12,19 | 23:21 75:22 |
| 66:2 72:10 | 3:675:22 | 186:7,11,13,18 | 150:20 151:5 |
| 89:15,18 91:6 | 95:21 100:12 | 187:1,9,17 | 215:3 |
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| narrowly $9: 10$ | $222: 5233: 7$ | $121: 17122: 8$ | notes $145: 16$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| native $207: 1$ | $238: 3$ | $122: 11,12,18$ | notice $17: 19$ |
| $228: 5$ | needed $28: 2$ | $223: 20227: 11$ | $77: 9,16,21$ |
| natural 234:6 | $89: 2149: 1$ | $227: 12230: 7$ | $78: 2479: 3$ |
| naturally $192: 4$ | $169: 1233: 1,10$ | $232: 12,14$ | $124: 5,5145: 3$ |
| nature $40: 12$ | needs $9: 1213: 3$ | nice $85: 1146: 6$ | $149: 2,4$ |
| $51: 23134: 19$ | $13: 427: 13$ | night $6: 87: 3$ | noticed $78: 11$ |
| $135: 17$ | $164: 8171: 4$ | $9: 1711: 16,16$ | $161: 20$ |
| near $83: 16$ | negatively | $41: 2354: 18$ | notices $144: 15$ |
| $85: 2588: 16$ | $44: 17$ | nitty $39: 16$ | $144: 21$ |
| $170: 4$ | neglected $4: 19$ | $69: 9$ | notification |
| nearby $80: 20$ | negotiate $149: 4$ | non $212: 8$ | $78: 10$ |
| $80: 2186: 5$ | negotiations | normal $76: 15$ | notified $145: 6$ |
| $203: 10$ | $30: 1132: 9$ | north $28: 16,20$ | notify $67: 23$ |
| nearly $33: 8$ | $44: 11120: 20$ | $29: 2045: 20$ | $78: 14144: 10$ |
| $88: 4$ | $121: 10$ | $46: 16,2547: 5$ | notwithstandi... |
| necessarily | neither $240: 10$ | $59: 1660: 25$ | $103: 12,13$ |
| $28: 2529: 7$ | $241: 7$ | $62: 2385: 21$ | nowadays |
| $69: 1472: 1$ | net $37: 2,3$ | $86: 4123: 5$ | $209: 2$ |
| $77: 2082: 23$ | $49: 2157: 18$ | $130: 19163: 12$ | nuance $136: 14$ |
| $83: 16,1885: 23$ | neutral $10: 23$ | $205: 11$ | nullify $122: 2$ |
| $142: 9230: 10$ | $34: 2536: 4$ | northern $4: 12$ | number $5: 3,7$ |
| necessary | $52: 1,556: 4,10$ | $37: 853: 8$ | $15: 1717: 1,11$ |
| $16: 1679: 21$ | $124: 19$ | $120: 7$ | $41: 1343: 3$ |
| necks $17: 11$ | neutron $173: 17$ | northwest | $48: 2249: 2$ |
| need $9: 9,13$ | $203: 18204: 14$ | $78: 18$ | $81: 2487: 15$ |
| $11: 2212: 6$ | never $32: 23$ | nos $1: 4$ | $108: 5121: 14$ |
| $21: 2425: 7$ | $115: 4,9119: 4$ | notary $240: 21$ | $123: 11156: 2$ |
| $75: 1787: 21$ | $228: 12$ | note $9: 2138: 11$ | $159: 4161: 2,8$ |
| $88: 691: 594: 3$ | nevertheless | $52: 2353: 21$ | $186: 20187: 4$ |
| $105: 16114: 12$ | $63: 574: 21$ | $102: 7231: 16$ | $188: 6196: 12$ |
| $133: 13144: 14$ | $109: 13196: 4$ | noted $11: 18$ | $203: 4,6211: 11$ |
| $146: 5163: 16$ | new $5: 3,6,98: 8$ | $16: 2251: 4$ | $218: 15224: 14$ |
| $167: 13,15$ | $8: 11,1232: 18$ | $54: 8130: 10$ | $227: 14$ |
|  | $47: 16106: 6$ |  |  |
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| numbers 10:2 | occur 19:19 | offsets 182:10 | 69:11,21 70:24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13:1 35:19,20 | 132:7 | offsetting 22:14 | 72:9 73:25 |
| 35:22 39:2,16 | occurred 44:12 | 171:6,17 183:1 | 74:3 76:3 81:9 |
| 191:1 192:18 | 51:10 | ogi $236: 4,12$ | 81:21,21 82:13 |
| 201:12,18 | occurrence | oh 32:20 89:9 | 82:14 84:4 |
| 223:21 | 19:2,13 | 119:12,18 | 87:17 89:13 |
| 0 | ocd 1:3 131:14 | 140:18 169:11 | 91:7,11 92:5,9 |
| ( 3:14:1 $23: 16$ | 131:17 205:2,8 | 191:9 230:18 | 93:19 94:15 |
| $23: 16215: 5$ | 215:13 234:2 | oil 1:14:11,13 | 95:2,6,15 |
| o'clock 6:9 9:17 | offer 74:15 | 17:4 21:13 | 96:12,18,21 |
| oa 45:17,23 | 112:14 142:7,9 | 53:22 54:11,13 | 97:9,19 98:6 |
| 46:25 59:11,13 | 217:11 | 54:22 55:5 | 98:16 100:20 |
| $62: 13122: 17$ | offered $32: 18$ | 120:7 136:16 | 103:12 104:8 |
| 122:18 123:3 | 32:21 38:15 | 137:4,5 138:2 | 105:1,3,20 |
| object $26: 24$ | 112:6,9 141:20 | 181:15 187:8 | 106:2,3,19,19 |
| $39: 7$ | 142:12 | 193:20 194:1 | 107:2,7,20 |
| objection 25:25 | offers 142:15 | 201:10 205:9 | 108:3 109:20 |
| 26:1,4 152:8,9 | 144:16 | 233:13 | 110:17 112:1 |
| 152:11 201:21 | office 89:20 | okay 14:22,22 | 112:14,17 |
| 217:16,17,19 | 160:8 | 21:10 23:19 | 114:20 115:21 |
| 218:19,20 | officer 4:18 | 26:2 28:1 32:6 | 116:5,9,11,19 |
| objections 5:15 | 7:12 13:15 | 32:13 33:12,18 | 116:20 117:17 |
| $59: 1$ | 18:8 39:6 40:9 | 34:14 35:4 | 119:5,6 121:13 |
| obligations | 42:12 55:18 | 36:6,17,20 | 122:4,14 123:4 |
| $122: 2$ | 88:12,20 119:8 | 37:21 42:25 | 123:7,17 126:4 |
| obliquely 148:8 | 129:1 139:14 | 43:7,10 45:6 | 129:7 131:5 |
| obstacle 32:1 | 140:15 167:9 | 45:17 48:14,17 | 135:5 136:19 |
| obstacles 31:7 | 214:10 239:1 | 49:9,13 52:6 | 137:3,8,20 |
| obtain 171:4 | 240:1,2 | 52:11 53:20,21 | 141:4 142:18 |
| obtained 87:7 | offices 205:3 | 53:23 56:12,16 | 143:7 144:4 |
| obviously 5:13 | offs 87:12 | 57:14 58:10,24 | 145:2 147:21 |
| $57: 2469: 17$ | offset 160:1 | 60:11,13 61:14 | 149:3 150:4 |
| $114: 16$ | 162:20 163:11 | 61:14 64:14,21 | 152:18 153:1,4 |
| occasionally | 170:8 171:13 | 65:12 66:1 | 153:8,18 |
| 102:20 | 194:4 | 67:5,9 68:3 | 154:15 155:5 |
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| 155:19 156:11 | one's 18:21 | 80:2 86:13 | 90:16 108:5,9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 156:19 157:13 | ones 145:17 | 118:5 130:12 | 109:5,20,20 |
| 158:8 159:3 | 146:12,18 | 132:14,21 | 110:19 111:9 |
| 161:14 162:6 | 161:15,17 | 171:10 191:20 | 112:2,2 113:2 |
| 162:12 164:11 | 170:3 230:6 | 192:1 | 113:21 114:1,2 |
| 165:1,11 174:3 | onsite 227:20 | operators | 114:12 115:15 |
| 176:1 177:16 | 229:18 | 15:11 47:11 | 116:1 117:2 |
| 177:20 180:21 | oops 226:6 | 70:14 83:10 | 134:13 135:5,6 |
| 182:3,7 184:14 | open 14:23 | 85:10 158:21 | 135:9 136:7,9 |
| 184:15,16,17 | 27:2 30:10 | 164:20 209:2 | 136:15 137:4,5 |
| 186:8 191:3,4 | 82:8 | operatorship | 137:7,9,11,11 |
| 191:7,12,16,18 | opening 3:3,4 | 31:9,15,16 | 137:15 139:20 |
| 192:14 193:5 | 5:19 14:24 | 81:3 | 140:3,4,5 |
| 193:16 194:16 | 15:2 | opinion 27:9,12 | 141:13,13,14 |
| 195:4,5 200:9 | operate 30:23 | 28:11 35:18 | 144:7 194:21 |
| 203:8 204:7 | 118:11 | 58:11 64:10,22 | 196:6 207:7,7 |
| 206:2,20 | operated | 79:7 129:16 | 207:8,10,11,14 |
| 207:17 209:21 | 216:16 | 159:8 160:12 | 207:20 211:8 |
| 210:18 211:6 | operating | 195:6 | 212:19 |
| 220:1 222:11 | 31:12,16,24 | opinions 18:11 | options 21:10 |
| 222:15 223:7 | 37:11 45:9,11 | 134:1,3 | 21:11 87:22,23 |
| 226:14 227:8 | 46:7,13 47:1,4 | opportunity | 101:12 107:20 |
| 228:20 229:13 | 47:6 50:9 | 8:19 11:18 | 107:21 108:2,4 |
| 229:19 230:8 | 51:19 54:22 | 14:9 17:16 | 131:21 132:1 |
| 230:21 232:3 | 60:18 62:15,19 | 18:3 21:4 | 140:3 |
| 232:16 236:21 | 80:3 121:14,15 | 38:18 74:16 | order 5:25 7:14 |
| 238:14,16 | 121:17,19 | 169:21 | 7:21 8:10,19 |
| 239:8 | 122:1,3,6,7,9 | opposed 161:1 | 8:24 9:23 10:5 |
| oklahoma | 122:12 219:5 | opposite 222:7 | 13:21,24 16:25 |
| 215:20,20 | operations | 222:9 | 56:1 67:25 |
| old 122:6,9 | 114:14 | optimally | 72:15 75:11 |
| 209:5 | operator 16:1 | 93:12 | 104:10 107:11 |
| once 101:14 | 30:24,24 32:3 | option 25:1,10 | 110:12,12,21 |
| 123:15 162:4 | 45:23 74:5 | 26:22,23 27:25 | 126:2,16 164:3 |
| 200:20 221:10 | 79:8,17,21 | 81:24 90:13,14 | 167:12 171:6 |
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| 174:18 | 140:18,21 | overlapping | 74:16,22 76:17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| orders 87:7,9 | 145:15 146:21 | 79:25 | 77:10,24,24 |
| 87:11 129:14 | 147:6,15,21 | overlaps 60:2 | 78:8 83:13 |
| ordinary 17:4 | 148:3 150:6,9 | overview | 90:20 92:6 |
| organized | 150:14,19 | 161:15,15 | 94:16 95:8 |
| 42:16 | 151:2 152:7,10 | own 19:7,8,9 | 98:10 103:5 |
| orient 14:5 | 167:5,15 168:1 | 19:10 20:9 | 109:13 110:1 |
| 15:3 | 198:13 202:4,6 | 22:17 34:4,4 | 110:20 111:3 |
| oriented 62:23 | 202:9 210:3,8 | 38:13 63:25 | 111:12 112:2,6 |
| original 32:16 | 210:14,17,19 | 64:2,22 78:19 | 112:13,16 |
| 47:22 92:15 | 211:5 214:5,14 | 102:12 112:6,7 | 113:2,7,11,16 |
| 123:3 230:5,6 | 214:18 215:2,7 | 112:13,17 | 121:18 125:20 |
| originally | 217:16,18 | 113:8,11,16 | 126:17 127:10 |
| 47:23 92:19 | 218:18,21 | 125:6 141:16 | 141:16 146:8 |
| 142:9 | 225:12 226:9 | 150:2 187:14 | 190:5 |
| orth 1:10 2:3 | 231:2 232:7 | 204:4 | ownership |
| 4:2,5,22 7:10 | 237:2,5,10,19 | owned 35:25 | 10:14 19:2,4 |
| 9:15 11:15 | 238:11,17 | 36:3 | 19:11,14,17,19 |
| 12:10 14:14,19 | 239:5,8 | owner 37:2,4 | 20:5 35:17 |
| 15:4 18:5 23:1 | outcome 39:21 | 57:19 59:24 | 49:14,16,20 |
| 23:7,10,14,17 | 124:20 197:17 | 60:6,8,9 74:8 | 51:1 56:8 57:6 |
| 25:25 26:2 | 207:8 240:15 | 74:25 75:5 | 58:22 59:2,8 |
| 27:3 40:5,16 | 241:12 | 78:17 85:7 | 59:15 60:16 |
| 40:19 41:1,12 | outline 85:1 | 127:15 148:20 | 61:3,3,7,10,13 |
| 41:24 42:10 | 186:17 | owners 10:21 | 61:19,24 62:5 |
| 55:24 86:22 | outset 117:21 | 11:2 17:9 19:4 | 63:1,6,19 |
| 87:17 88:2,6,8 | outside 44:18 | 19:7,9 20:22 | 64:16 111:14 |
| 88:13,16 100:9 | 44:20 45:1 | 20:25 21:1,3,8 | 111:16,19 |
| 101:6,19 | overall 122:20 | 22:2,16,23 | 112:4,18 125:7 |
| 119:10 120:9 | 124:10 125:2 | 29:24 30:8 | 212:11 |
| 129:4,8 133:12 | 126:20 128:14 | 34:3,12 38:6 | owning 34:8 |
| 133:14 135:11 | overhead | 39:2,12 46:20 | 57:10 58:7 |
| 136:5,11 | 237:14 | 49:22 50:21 | owns 125:3 |
| 138:15 139:12 | overlap 60:23 | 63:25 67:23 |  |
| 139:16 140:8 |  | 71:18 73:16 |  |
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| p | 34:19 41:25 | $231: 12$ | particularly |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| p 2:1,1 4:1 | 48:23 49:2,5,8 | paragraphs | 11:17 |
| p.m. 239:14 | 51:3 55:23 | 10:6,6 | parties 12:9 |
| package 33:19 | 65:3 66:3 | paramount | 20:2 31:16 |
| 41:20 127:4 | 72:24 73:3 | 17:5 | 48:1,11 55:21 |
| packet 9:15 | 82:4,5,7 91:4,8 | paraphrase | 124:19 198:15 |
| 10:4 13:1,11 | 91:9 97:13 | 51:25 94:7 | 203:17 240:11 |
| 24:11,17,23 | 106:1 113:2 | paraphrasing | 40:14 241:8 |
| 25:8,21 34:18 | 191:11 202:14 | 134:11 | 41:11 |
| 36:11,13 43:3 | 219:9 | pardon 119 | partners 37:13 |
| 43:3 46:4 | pages 6:9 9:23 | 190:20 | 37:13 76:13 |
| 48:22 61:16 | 10:20,20,24 | parent 207:2,4 | 95:9 |
| 66:13,14,15 | 33:19,19 46:6 | park 2:12 | parts 121:16,18 |
| 81:20,23 82:5 | 49:19 65:13 | part 17:18 | 122:9 205:10 |
| 84:8 86:10 | 73:20 | 33:18 35:5 | party 14:9 52:5 |
| 89:7,12,16,17 | paginated 49:4 | 55:16 77:9 | 54:10 57:7 |
| 90:11,12 91:12 | paid 39:3 75:6 | 79:20 101:8 | 85:7 152:11 |
| 95:8 101:10 | panel 2:7,8,9 | 105:15 106:3 | 231:5 |
| 108:2 152:15 | 2:10,11,12,13 | 119:15 122:11 | past 15:13 16:3 |
| 219:6 | 2:14,15,16,17 | 131:20 144:19 | 53:22 81:7,8 |
| packets 8:8,11 | 2:18,19,20,21 | 144:20 157:5 | 120:21 121:10 |
| 9:21,22 13:8,9 | 141:5 | 159:16 174:13 | 121:10 |
| 24:4,7 36:8 | paragraph | 174:21 180:4 | patience 26:8 |
| 42:17,20,23,25 | 26:22 27:8 | 182:6,18 | patterns 206:3 |
| 49:4 123:20 | 28:7 37:22 | 209:11,12 | 206:4 |
| 151:12 | 43:9 45:7,8 | 216:20 222:18 | paula 4:19 |
| packs 98:20 | 72:25 79:6 | 223:13 226:17 | pause 34:7 |
| pad 220:2,3,5,8 | 81:23 82:15 | partially 60:1 | 119:13,17 |
| 220:11,12,14 | 84:8,9 91:19 | 60:22 | 152:10 198:14 |
| 220:16,17,18 | 92:10,17 93:2 | participate | 217:18 218:21 |
| 221:7,9 | 93:20 94:8 | 122:8 126:18 | 231:4 |
| pads 220:16 | 104:19,20 | particular | pay 39:19 |
| 221:11,16 | 130:6,9 162:13 | 41:15 54:2 | 74:10,25 75:7 |
| page 3:2 9:23 | 177:16,17 | 79:9 | pdf 49:5,8 82:5 |
| 10:2 13:1 | 219:9 226:5,12 |  | 82:8 202:14 |
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[people - place]

| people $32: 4$ | permian $4: 11$ | $171: 17198: 20$ | $73: 4,1874: 4$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $39: 2069: 7$ | $5: 176: 3,7,21$ | $199: 11200: 5$ | $74: 1585: 1$ |
| $72: 178: 13,14$ | $15: 1216: 7,19$ | $219: 5,6,10$ | $134: 7$ |
| $78: 1581: 5$ | $16: 2217: 10$ | $220: 2,8221: 1$ | pheasant $16: 11$ |
| $87: 25$ | $20: 321: 17$ | permian's $19: 1$ | $24: 1334: 2$ |
| percent $30: 1$ | $26: 928: 8,22$ | $21: 2222: 7,8$ | $43: 446: 5,23$ |
| $34: 838: 19$ | $30: 1831: 3,4$ | $22: 2128: 14$ | $49: 1556: 22$ |
| $67: 1971: 24$ | $33: 2,7,14$ | $35: 2241: 10$ | $57: 1165: 9$ |
| $72: 4,897: 3,14$ | $35: 2036: 1$ | $64: 16,2072: 21$ | $67: 781: 16$ |
| $97: 1599: 2,4$ | $37: 1,9,16$ | $82: 1,2584: 21$ | $90: 591: 14$ |
| $111: 6,7116: 7$ | $38: 2339: 5,13$ | $105: 5118: 9$ | $186: 15223: 11$ |
| $173: 18,18$ | $41: 2143: 19,22$ | $143: 5197: 16$ | $226: 1,19$ |
| $174: 16180: 15$ | $44: 2,1248: 20$ | $197: 17221: 13$ | phi $157: 1,2$ |
| $180: 16187: 1$ | $56: 2557: 12$ | permit $212: 13$ | $158: 16177: 14$ |
| $187: 11189: 17$ | $58: 1,361: 6,17$ | $234: 13$ | $177: 18179: 4$ |
| $190: 11192: 9$ | $62: 372: 14$ | permits $76: 19$ | $179: 13181: 3,8$ |
| $192: 10,19,19$ | $73: 9,1474: 17$ | $76: 20159: 18$ | $181: 18,19$ |
| $193: 13196: 1$ | $74: 2379: 23$ | permitted | $184: 21185: 10$ |
| $233: 17,19$ | $81: 1382: 20$ | $160: 10161: 2$ | $185: 18186: 9$ |
| $234: 7,13,15$ | $83: 8,2384: 1$ | perry $196: 11$ | $187: 7,14,15,19$ |
| percentage | $84: 10,13,25$ | $196: 13,18$ | $187: 21188: 1,4$ |
| $97: 7134: 15$ | $85: 2,1687: 6$ | $197: 5$ | $188: 19,21$ |
| $136: 21186: 21$ | $118: 15,21$ | personal | $189: 4,8191: 2$ |
| $192: 4195: 14$ | $120: 18121: 4$ | $204: 11$ | $193: 3,14194: 2$ |
| percentages | $124: 11125: 6$ | perspective | $194: 4$ |
| $19: 533: 16$ | $126: 21127: 4$ | $12: 21$ | philosophies |
| $111: 14112: 4$ | $127: 18128: 1$ | petroleum | $15: 8$ |
| $193: 3201: 12$ | $129: 16130: 11$ | $215: 19$ | phrase $29: 12$ |
| $201: 19$ | $131: 2,4,7,14$ | petrophysics | pick $6: 18$ |
| performance | $132: 14135: 3$ | $182: 2$ | pilot $171: 17$ |
| $81: 7,8,8$ | $149: 16153: 2$ | ph $26: 11,18,21$ | $172: 1$ |
| permeability | $156: 2160: 3$ | $27: 828: 5,7$ | pioneer $15: 22$ |
| $172: 19$ | $161: 12163: 7$ | $33: 13,2334: 15$ | pivot $107: 20$ |
| permeable | $164: 1166: 1,10$ | $36: 2137: 21$ | place $20: 18$ |
| $166: 19$ | $166: 15170: 16$ | $41: 1472: 11$ | $27: 1947: 12$ |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
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| 77:6 81:22 | platform 4:25 | 177:5 180:14 | 129:14 144:8,9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 121:16,20 | 239:11 | 183:7 197:3 | 145:1,6,21 |
| 162:16 212:8 | play 70:22 | 201:11 217:10 | 147:18 148:10 |
| 213:17 | 207:18 | pointed 120:17 | 148:16 191:21 |
| places 125:12 | players 15:25 | 125:10 126:15 | 202:2 207:9,20 |
| 153:16 | 30:5 | 126:15 145:10 | 211:9 213:9,10 |
| plain 103:15 | plays 32:9,10 | 223:5 | pools 18:21 |
| plan 12:11,15 | pleadings 5:11 | points 98:9 | 19:3,7,15 87:8 |
| 14:6 15:21 | 27:14 | 189:2 203:3 | 191:20 194:21 |
| 16:19 22:8,21 | please 15:4 | pool 18:22,23 | 205:8,11 |
| 26:22 28:8 | 18:8 23:10 | 19:16,20,23 | pore 157:21 |
| 30:11 33:15 | 27:3 86:22 | 20:5 22:3 | 158:1 177:14 |
| 36:22 39:5,13 | 87:19 88:18 | 48:11 90:15 | 179:4 181:3,9 |
| 39:13 50:1 | 150:15,20 | 107:11 108:5 | 182:16 184:9 |
| 55:2 57:3 | 168:3,8 214:20 | 110:18 137:15 | 184:20 185:10 |
| 126:21 127:4 | plethora | 137:20 155:7 | 185:14,15 |
| 127:10 163:3,7 | 230:12 | 195:4 196:5 | pores 181:11 |
| 168:13 169:18 | plot 49:16 | 205:4 211:20 | porosity 158:5 |
| 169:20 170:6 | 166:4 | 212:10 | 158:20 173:17 |
| 171:18 197:16 | plots 204:12 | pooled 48:2 | 173:18,21 |
| 201:2 206:6 | plugged 118:17 | 54:10 73:15 | 174:15 177:18 |
| 208:17 221:18 | 119:1 | 74:8,15 110:20 | 184:2 193:17 |
| 223:11 226:18 | plus 33:19 | 116:4,6 144:11 | 193:19 |
| 234:6,8 236:17 | point 12:17 | 200:1 | porous 166:19 |
| plane 236:3 | 21:22 37:7 | pooling 5:6,9 | portion 98:19 |
| 237:13 | 40:3 51:12 | 16:10 19:18 | 116:11 179:18 |
| planning | 54:23 56:10 | 36:14 72:15 | 181:14 182:13 |
| 216:15 217:13 | 58:6 61:15 | 73:575:11 | portions |
| plans 16:16 | 63:11 78:6,19 | 80:13 83:19 | 183:14 |
| 31:10 32:22 | 84:13 86:7,21 | 84:2 85:4,25 | position 11:1 |
| 37:24 57:1 | 98:17 102:21 | 86:9 87:7,15 | 20:12 28:9 |
| 78:9 80:25 | 120:21 136:14 | 101:9,10,11,15 | 51:9,11 84:11 |
| 117:3 130:14 | 137:9,21 138:5 | 101:15 104:12 | 96:19 107:5,8 |
| 156:3 166:6 | 138:14 145:9 | 105:3 110:6,11 | 113:15,18 |
| 206:9,9 219:10 | 157:18 169:17 | 110:12,21 | 189:12 |

[positioning - produce]

| positioning | pre $13: 22,23$ | presents $15: 10$ | printed $14: 20$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 198:21 | $14: 13$ | pressure $209: 3$ | prior $31: 4$ |
| positions $10: 22$ | precise $16: 12$ | $235: 1,3,7,9,9$ | $43: 2244: 12$ |
| $103: 1,13$ | precludes $77: 4$ | presumably | $118: 9240: 5$ |
| possibility | predictive | $5: 20178: 20$ | probably $37: 15$ |
| $205: 3$ | $197: 16$ | pretend $182: 8$ | $53: 569: 9$ |
| possible $76: 20$ | prefaced | pretty $13: 6$ | $87: 24135: 20$ |
| $133: 19166: 15$ | $133: 15,15$ | $30: 3,3,10$ | $141: 8174: 18$ |
| $207: 4210: 11$ | prefer $129: 2$ | $38: 1072: 4$ | $176: 11,14$ |
| $229: 14$ | $207: 11$ | $133: 9141: 8$ | $206: 16208: 5$ |
| possibly $6: 6$ | preference | $143: 12153: 16$ | $213: 8233: 21$ |
| post $139: 1$ | $20: 10140: 3,6$ | $176: 18187: 2,4$ | problem $20: 23$ |
| posting $144: 17$ | preferred | $187: 14188: 2,3$ | $21: 10$ |
| potash $76: 23$ | $207: 8$ | $204: 9208: 1$ | procedural |
| $77: 1,10,20$ | prehearing | $219: 15235: 16$ | $13: 16$ |
| $78: 11,21$ | $5: 138: 9$ | $236: 17$ | procedure $5: 24$ |
| potential $145: 6$ | prep $208: 11$ | prevails $51: 17$ | $101: 9,11$ |
| $169: 8174: 14$ | prepare $8: 20$ | prevent $17: 8$ | proceed $41: 8$ |
| $178: 21180: 11$ | $8: 24$ | $22: 16108: 7,21$ | $139: 10171: 7$ |
| $181: 6187: 11$ | prepared $48: 1$ | preventing | $215: 12$ |
| $207: 12208: 18$ | $59: 2,865: 16$ | $236: 18$ | proceeding |
| $229: 11$ | $65: 1784: 18$ | previous $190: 6$ | $1: 158: 2241: 4$ |
| potentially | $241: 3$ | price $15: 19$ | proceedings |
| $78: 8116: 12$ | present $5: 25$ | $17: 10125: 11$ | $17: 15240: 3,4$ |
| $144: 11170: 1$ | $7: 1717: 918: 3$ | pride $69: 23$ | $240: 6,8241: 6$ |
| $170: 11187: 14$ | $24: 341: 8$ | $70: 25132: 15$ | process $77: 9$ |
| $200: 10227: 4$ | $121: 11129: 10$ | $211: 10$ | $101: 18219: 11$ |
| powering | $153: 14189: 21$ | primarily $16: 6$ | produce $20: 15$ |
| $234: 10$ | presentation | $103: 7199: 19$ | $20: 2421: 5,17$ |
| pr $35: 25,25$ | $41: 7222: 19$ | primary $93: 9$ | $22: 593: 894: 1$ |
| practicable | $224: 10$ | $94: 1,16,19$ | $94: 16,1998: 11$ |
| $22: 1$ | presented | $100: 17103: 19$ | $99: 2,10100: 17$ |
| practical $22: 22$ | $127: 4224: 10$ | $105: 9$ | $103: 19104: 11$ |
| practicality | presenting | prime $176: 17$ | $104: 18109: 2,4$ |
| $17: 1$ | $127: 1$ |  | $136: 20199: 7$ |
|  |  |  |  |
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[produce - proven]

| $200: 6,11,16$ | $215: 14216: 7$ | properly | $80: 1983: 8$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $211: 15212: 15$ | $216: 16217: 13$ | $189: 19$ | $87: 2292: 19$ |
| 212:19,20 | $219: 12$ | proportion | $93: 894: 19$ |
| produced | productivity | $112: 18$ | $100: 16105: 2$ |
| 105:10,17 | $178: 21182: 16$ | proposal $14: 17$ | $107: 21127: 21$ |
| $108: 15111: 7$ | $187: 7,11,15,16$ | $21: 222: 10,20$ | $128: 1,2138: 20$ |
| $116: 13193: 10$ | $188: 4,17,20$ | $48: 2057: 7$ | $162: 17170: 2,9$ |
| 201:7 | $189: 8194: 4$ | $78: 1081: 24$ | $197: 17206: 13$ |
| producers | professional | $90: 492: 11,15$ | $230: 4$ |
| $79: 18$ | $23: 24216: 4$ | $101: 8,9105: 6$ | proposes $15: 16$ |
| produces 192:1 | program | $137: 18147: 13$ | $74: 4$ |
| producing | $228: 14236: 6$ | $148: 14,15$ | proposing $16: 8$ |
| $22: 1696: 14$ | progress $16: 15$ | $149: 10,14$ | $20: 2421: 9,16$ |
| $103: 7192: 12$ | project $225: 21$ | $190: 6219: 14$ | $22: 1531: 23$ |
| $199: 14,16$ | projected | proposals $17: 2$ | $63: 472: 14$ |
| production | $92: 13141: 21$ | $65: 2,580: 9$ | $73: 1474: 25$ |
| $16: 1938: 12$ | projects $217: 3$ | $81: 10,1283: 1$ | $78: 2585: 16$ |
| $74: 1375: 7$ | prompted | $83: 18,2584: 5$ | $97: 17121: 17$ |
| $92: 13,1994: 1$ | $139: 20,21$ | $104: 17119: 4$ | $149: 5164: 1$ |
| $94: 10,13,17$ | $147: 14,19$ | $147: 13,18$ | $168: 13220: 9$ |
| $95: 1396: 9$ | $148: 10$ | $148: 9171: 14$ | $225: 19$ |
| $97: 398: 599: 8$ | prompting | $223: 6230: 4$ | proration $34: 1$ |
| $101: 13,16$ | $102: 13$ | $233: 14,16$ | $34: 9,1135: 2$ |
| $103: 8108: 14$ | promptly | propose $6: 19$ | $57: 1163: 4,13$ |
| $108: 15109: 21$ | $123: 15$ | $6: 2113: 21$ | $70: 17112: 11$ |
| $110: 19111: 13$ | pronounce | $47: 4,1676: 16$ | prospective |
| $112: 3,8113: 3$ | $75: 21$ | $78: 16,2183: 11$ | $163: 5$ |
| $116: 7133: 5$ | pronunciation | $171: 11$ | protect $17: 8$ |
| $134: 14162: 20$ | $76: 1$ | proposed $6: 20$ | $20: 2022: 2,23$ |
| $181: 6187: 18$ | propagate | $7: 1316: 10,23$ | $108: 21$ |
| $187: 21188: 7,9$ | $174: 20$ | $22: 946: 6,11$ | protecting |
| $189: 3190: 11$ | propagating | $47: 660: 2$ | $20: 2138: 8$ |
| $192: 3,7,12,19$ | $172: 20$ | $66: 2369: 2$ | protection $17: 5$ |
| $195: 14196: 1$ | propagation | $73: 574: 15,24$ | proven $16: 13$ |
| $200: 2208: 12$ | $173: 14$ | $76: 1378: 11,15$ | $30: 24,24$ |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
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| provide 8:24 | 190:21 | 101:1 103:4 | 147:2,4 150:5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10:18 13:5 | pulled 11:25 | 117:1,16 | 160:19 161:16 |
| 22:8 28:2,2 | 97:15 143:14 | 119:16 133:10 | 161:18 167:7 |
| 126:11 149:2,4 | pure 59:23 | 135:16,17,19 | 167:13 168:8 |
| 149:10,13 | purple 154:4 | 136:6,8 139:17 | 198:10,11 |
| 150:2 204:3,5 | purpose 101:3 | 139:21 141:3 | 202:10 208:3 |
| 210:11 | purposes 51:25 | 147:12,18,19 | 210:1,4,7,12 |
| provided 8:23 | 59:19 202:2 | 148:9 164:12 | 211:2,8 213:20 |
| 17:16 24:14,20 | pursuant | 164:13 198:16 | 219:8 225:10 |
| 25:2,10 46:4 | 191:21 | 201:15 202:5 | 225:13,18 |
| 57:7,18 58:3 | push 69:6 | 202:15 211:9 | 231:1,5 232:6 |
| 131:11 | 107:17 | 211:19 219:18 | 237:1,4 |
| provides 77:16 | put 6:12,14 7:7 | 223:13 227:9 | quick 58:4 |
| providing | 8:7,16 12:22 | 231:11 233:4 | 61:11 82:11 |
| 191:15 | 29:5 51:18 | 237:9,17 238:6 | 91:4,8 202:18 |
| provisions | 85:1 102:2 | 238:8,18 | 208:1 |
| 21:12 | 117:8 156:3 | questioning | quickly 76:20 |
| proximal | 165:5 | 6:13,18 7:7 | quite 52:13 |
| 159:16 | putting 40:24 | 100:1 102:16 | 76:19 |
| proxy 181:5 | 42:6 221:6 | 118:1 139:9 | r |
| 182:16 187:16 | q | 22:16 | r 2:1 4:1 151:1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 193:17 } \\ & \text { prudent } 32: 3\end{aligned}$ | qc 162:5 | questions 6:1 <br> 17:1 27:2 40:2 | rack 206:3 |
| 57:17 79:17 | qualified 240:7 | 40:6,12 50:18 | racks 208:8 |
| 106:9 | quality 179:17 | 58:19,23 84:6 | radius 77:23 |
| prudently 80:3 |  | 87:21 99:19 | 78:9 |
| public 29:7 |  | 102:1,6,10,14 | aise 23:10 |
| 80:11,12 |  | 102:15 119:8 | 150:15 161:16 |
| 144:17 240:21 | quarter 15:20 | 120:7,16 | 161:18 214:19 |
| published | quarters 63:12 | 121:14 123:8 | raised 9:1 |
| 145:1 | question 12:8 <br> $17 \cdot 326 \cdot 25$ | 129:2 131:21 | 44:16 |
| pull 48:24 |  | 135:14 138:1,5 | raises 11: <br> $16 \cdot 25$ |
| 65:21 84:24 |  | 139:16 140:16 | raising 13:17 |
| 86:23 87:11 | $64: 8 \text { 68:19 }$ | 141:8 143:12 | 44:9 |
| 89:13 105:18 | 69:6 85:9 | 145:14 146:13 |  |

[range - rankin]

| range $68: 21$ | $65: 1,8,12,15,19$ | $99: 16100: 7,10$ | $168: 7169: 10$ |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 185:14,17 | $65: 2566: 2,9$ | $102: 17,18$ | $169: 14170: 5$ |
| 192:9 193:6 | $66: 15,17,21$ | $103: 12104: 7$ | $171: 2,10,16,20$ |
| rankin 2:10 3:4 | $67: 3,11,15,18$ | $104: 16105: 1,8$ | $172: 3,10173: 8$ |
| $4: 185: 236: 5$ | $67: 2268: 1,3,9$ | $105: 15,20$ | $173: 11174: 3,8$ |
| $6: 207: 10,11$ | $68: 14,1969: 11$ | $106: 19107: 2,7$ | $174: 21175: 4$ |
| $9: 18,2012: 14$ | $69: 2170: 1,6$ | $107: 15108: 18$ | $175: 20176: 15$ |
| $13: 1518: 6,7$ | $70: 11,2471: 3$ | $109: 6,10,19$ | $177: 4,10178: 5$ |
| $23: 125: 25$ | $71: 8,11,17,23$ | $110: 4,10,14,17$ | $178: 9,15,19$ |
| $26: 1,15,24$ | $72: 9,13,17,21$ | $111: 2,5,11,18$ | $179: 3,8,12,21$ |
| $39: 6,1040: 6,8$ | $72: 2473: 8,13$ | $112: 1,12,16,21$ | $180: 3,7,21$ |
| $40: 18,2141: 3$ | $73: 18,2474: 3$ | $113: 13,21$ | $181: 8,13,20$ |
| $41: 5,18,25$ | $74: 2175: 4,9$ | $114: 6,11,16,20$ | $182: 3,7,12,21$ |
| $42: 1,11,24$ | $75: 14,2576: 3$ | $115: 2,11,16,20$ | $183: 6,21184: 8$ |
| $43: 7,1144: 2,8$ | $76: 8,12,15,21$ | $116: 5,11,16,19$ | $185: 9,13,20$ |
| $44: 15,22,25$ | $76: 2577: 7,14$ | $117: 6,11,17,21$ | $186: 8,12,14,19$ |
| $45: 6,15,22,25$ | $78: 1,3,6,19$ | $118: 8,14,20$ | $187: 2,10$ |
| $46: 3,10,19$ | $79: 4,11,16,20$ | $119: 5,10$ | $188: 11189: 6$ |
| $47: 3,10,15,19$ | $80: 2,12,15,24$ | $120: 16121: 13$ | $189: 11,18$ |
| $48: 4,8,14,17$ | $81: 9,15,19$ | $123: 9124: 10$ | $190: 3,8,15,20$ |
| $49: 3,7,13,24$ | $82: 6,12,14,19$ | $125: 9126: 14$ | $191: 5192: 17$ |
| $50: 3,10,16$ | $82: 2583: 6,21$ | $127: 14129: 1$ | $193: 4,8,12,16$ |
| $51: 2152: 4,11$ | $84: 4,18,21,24$ | $129: 10133: 6$ | $194: 5,8,12,16$ |
| $52: 2053: 1,16$ | $85: 886: 6,21$ | $133: 20135: 8$ | $194: 19195: 13$ |
| $53: 2054: 5,12$ | $86: 2387: 17,20$ | $135: 19139: 13$ | $195: 17,20$ |
| $54: 21,2455: 4$ | $88: 5,7,11,16,18$ | $139: 14,17$ | $196: 4,8,17$ |
| $55: 17,2556: 7$ | $88: 1989: 3$ | $140: 15,20$ | $197: 4,8,13$ |
| $56: 12,1657: 13$ | $90: 9,1891: 3$ | $141: 9143: 14$ | $198: 2,5,9,13$ |
| $58: 5,10,14,17$ | $91: 11,1892: 3$ | $147: 10,12,16$ | $200: 5201: 17$ |
| $59: 5,1960: 5$ | $92: 5,9,1793: 1$ | $147: 17148: 1,5$ | $201: 21217: 16$ |
| $60: 13,2161: 1$ | $93: 1994: 12,15$ | $148: 7,18149: 3$ | $217: 17218: 19$ |
| $61: 5,14,23$ | $95: 2,6,15,20$ | $149: 7,11,13,18$ | $218: 20223: 5$ |
| $62: 4,9,2163: 2$ | $96: 2,5,12,18,21$ | $149: 20150: 4$ | $225: 13,15,18$ |
| $63: 5,11,24$ | $97: 9,1998: 3$ | $152: 8,9167: 7$ | $226: 3,11227: 8$ |
| $64: 4,7,14,21$ | $98: 1699: 11,13$ | $167: 9,20168: 4$ | $227: 18,20$ |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
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[rankin - reference]

| $228: 2,8,11,17$ | $150: 1162: 11$ | $8: 17,17,22,25$ | reconfiguration |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $228: 20229: 2,6$ | $168: 15185: 21$ | $9: 1,9,1010: 18$ | $8: 15$ |
| $229: 9,13,19$ | $185: 21191: 16$ | $11: 1912: 4$ | record $23: 21$ |
| $230: 8,15,21$ | $204: 16208: 17$ | $40: 13,14,24,25$ | $25: 7,2429: 7$ |
| $231: 3,12$ | $226: 10227: 3$ | $41: 9,2242: 4,6$ | $59: 2360: 3,4,9$ |
| $232: 16238: 21$ | $231: 19$ | $43: 1451: 4,14$ | $60: 1661: 19$ |
| $239: 9$ | readily $36: 18$ | $53: 655: 14,16$ | $63: 1777: 25$ |
| rankin's $102: 5$ | ready $89: 16$ | $56: 3140: 11$ | $78: 1788: 15$ |
| $131: 21$ | real $6: 1061: 11$ | $167: 3179: 9$ | $120: 3139: 5$ |
| rate $109: 7$ | $66: 382: 11$ | $239: 2$ | $147: 20151: 5$ |
| $209: 3$ | $91: 4,8202: 17$ | rebuttals $41: 14$ | $152: 6167: 21$ |
| rather $8: 3$ | realistically | rebutting $33: 22$ | $240: 9241: 5$ |
| $13: 2448: 20$ | $163: 8$ | $34: 14$ | recorded $240: 6$ |
| $57: 1568: 4$ | really $9: 810: 24$ | recall $48: 2$ | recording |
| $75: 2081: 10$ | $11: 1316: 4$ | $118: 6192: 14$ | $240: 8241: 4$ |
| $114: 7118: 15$ | $21: 2142: 19$ | $197: 20222: 19$ | recross $6: 6$ |
| $136: 8220: 16$ | $88: 1124: 8$ | $223: 2$ | red $154: 3$ |
| reach $44: 5$ | $126: 5127: 13$ | recapitulation | $186: 17,17$ |
| $173: 21$ | $131: 7159: 17$ | $54: 10171: 8$ | redirect $6: 5,24$ |
| reaching $29: 23$ | $168: 12172: 18$ | $198: 3$ | $7: 24119: 11$ |
| read $5: 8,17$ | $179: 17236: 9$ | receipt $74: 9$ | $120: 11138: 13$ |
| $28: 1030: 13,16$ | reapply $207: 19$ | receive $201: 19$ | $198: 11,17$ |
| $31: 4,13,19$ | reason $11: 25$ | received $31: 18$ | $202: 8$ |
| $32: 10,1634: 8$ | $46: 11,1147: 10$ | $78: 1082: 25$ | reduced $234: 17$ |
| $43: 12,18,19,21$ | $71: 580: 6$ | $119: 4124: 4$ | $240: 6$ |
| $43: 2344: 10,13$ | $90: 10,18$ | recent $85: 3$ | reducing $234: 3$ |
| $45: 161: 17$ | $105: 15143: 1$ | $107: 3235: 14$ | reevaluate |
| $72: 1074: 3,5$ | reasonable | recently $51: 9$ | $212: 9$ |
| $79: 23103: 15$ | $22: 2130: 11$ | reclassified | refer $39: 22$ |
| $118: 2,10,10,14$ | $66: 670: 13$ | $101: 16$ | $45: 1651: 8$ |
| $118: 15,16,17$ | reasons $187: 19$ | recognized | $95: 497: 698: 4$ |
| $118: 20119: 1$ | rebut $41: 20$ | $14: 2217: 20$ | $104: 3107: 3$ |
| $120: 17,20$ | rebuttal $6: 8,13$ | recommend | $177: 14205: 16$ |
| $121: 4130: 11$ | $6: 18,227: 1,7$ | $229: 14$ | reference |
| $149: 8,14,16$ | $7: 20,238: 4,6$ |  | $152: 19$ |
|  |  |  |  |
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[referenced - resistivity]

| referenced | 143:9 | rely 116:17 | representatives |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 59:11 93:6 | regards 36:21 | 117:4 133:21 | 228:14 |
| 99:5 | 200:10 | 134:2 | represented |
| references | regular 7:9 | remain 48:12 | 161:9 |
| 130:1 | regulations | 53:13 55:20 | request 7:6 |
| referencing | 212:14 | remainder | 41:6 |
| 27:16 28:14 | regulatory | 87:18 | requesting 7:3 |
| 45:9 57:12,13 | 15:11 17:13,22 | remaining | required 19:18 |
| 65:23 72:19 | 229:1,5 | 17:22 | requirement |
| 91:12 | relate 26:11 | remember | 101:8 137:18 |
| referred 119:1 | 153:5 | 102:13 190:13 | requirements |
| referring 39:23 | related 11:25 | 227:13,16 | 110:5 |
| 87:1 102:19 | 17:20 101:17 | remote 1:15 | requires |
| 106:14 159:11 | 146:8 191:2 | renaming | 170:21 |
| 177:19 191:14 | 240:11 241:7 | 205:3 | research 171:1 |
| refers 117:14 | relates 108:2 | rendered 35:18 | reserve 42:2 |
| reflect 51:1 | 160:15 | repeat 41:3 | reserves 165:14 |
| 60:17 | relation 24:25 | 44:23 60:11 | reservoir 16:5 |
| reflected 10:22 | 93:5 100:15 | 63:10 104:15 | 39:24 154:21 |
| 44:17 71:6 | 103:17 224:10 | 118:19 132:19 | 155:15 164:18 |
| reflecting | relations 11:7,9 | 223:12 | 164:21 165:3,6 |
| 71:20,20 | 68:5 | repeats 141:9 | 165:18 166:12 |
| reflection 48:9 | relationship | rephrase 39:8,9 | 166:19 173:3 |
| refrain 213:19 | 43:12,20,24 | report 11:7,10 | 180:15,16,18 |
| refused 38:20 | 44:3 194:3 | 35:17 68:5 | 182:14,19 |
| 142:3 | relationships | reported 1:19 | 183:10 188:12 |
| refuted 31:20 | 207:4 | reports 68:23 | 188:16 189:17 |
| regard 34:23 | relative 22:13 | represent 15:7 | 191:16 197:2 |
| 129:13 211:18 | 80:23 240:13 | 19:18 155:11 | 204:21 205:1,9 |
| regarding 6:2 | 241:10 | representation | 208:14 217:11 |
| 7:7 17:1 27:8 | relatively $8: 17$ | 61:2,10 64:16 | reservoirs |
| 125:11 211:2 | 10:3 14:1 19:1 | 71:5 108:9 | 155:11 |
| 217:13 | 19:13,13 | representations | resistivity |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { regardless } 29: 2 \\ 38: 2339: 19 \end{gathered}$ | 190:18 | $\begin{aligned} & 59: 261: 8 \\ & 68: 20 \end{aligned}$ | 204:14 |
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[resized - rights]

| resized 189:19 | respect 50:25 | revise 123:14 | 120:10 134:10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| resolved 17:14 | 136:2 | rich 18:20 | 136:9 138:15 |
| 31:1 99:21 | respective | riddler 162:8,9 | 140:9,14 |
| resolving 100:5 | 92:14 | right 7:19 | 146:21 147:6 |
| resort 107:14 | respond 12:14 | 11:15 12:1 | 150:14,16 |
| resource | 22:12 | 13:8 14:19 | 152:7 160:7,9 |
| 165:19 170:19 | response 8:7 | 15:4 19:20,23 | 164:1 165:2 |
| resource's | 42:2 92:2 | 20:4 23:11 | 167:5 173:9,10 |
| 26:10 28:8 | 103:4 | 26:5 40:16 | 174:21 177:8,9 |
| resources 6:3,7 | responsibilities | 41:24 45:23 | 177:15 178:3,7 |
| 6:22 15:12 | 216:12 | 49:24 50:1 | 178:8 180:2 |
| 16:7,19,23 | responsibility | 51:21 52:9 | 181:12,17 |
| 17:10 28:22 | 216:21 | 53:18 55:2,24 | 184:7,8,9,13,14 |
| 30:18 31:3,4 | responsive | 56:5 58:5,8 | 184:15,21 |
| 33:14 36:1 | 30:19 33:3 | 59:20 64:4,5 | 185:6,17 |
| 37:1,9,16 39:5 | restate 13:25 | 64:17,22 65:4 | 186:10 189:10 |
| 39:13 43:19,23 | 168:9 | 65:10,13 66:5 | 191:7,10 |
| 44:3,12 58:2 | result 106:7 | 66:19 67:7,16 | 192:17 194:14 |
| 79:24 106:7 | 128:14 134:13 | 67:19 70:3,23 | 195:19 200:7 |
| 118:15 120:18 | 209:6 | 76:5,13 79:4 | 202:4,9,20 |
| 121:4 124:12 | resume 217:7 | 79:14 80:13,19 | 204:13 210:8 |
| 125:6 126:21 | resuming 4:2 | 80:22 81:1,11 | 210:14,15 |
| 127:4,18 128:1 | retention | 81:17 82:3,17 | 214:18,19 |
| 129:16 131:2,4 | 219:11 | 84:2,16,22 | 217:18 218:21 |
| 131:7,14 | review 6:10 | 85:8,9 86:2 | 226:8,12 229:8 |
| 132:15 135:3 | 8:19,22 11:3 | 88:13 92:1 | 230:21 231:2 |
| 149:17 153:2 | 28:3 73:14 | 94:17 95:17 | 232:7 233:15 |
| 156:2 160:3 | 91:18 196:10 | 101:19 104:7 | 237:5,19 239:2 |
| 161:12 163:7 | 219:4 | 107:19 108:6 | 239:5 |
| 164:1 166:2,10 | reviewed 26:9 | 109:6,9,14 | righthand |
| 166:16 170:16 | 84:21 148:12 | 110:15,21 | 185:9 |
| 198:20 199:11 | 153:1,5 197:21 | 111:20,21 | rights 17:6,8 |
| 200:5 219:5,6 | reviewing 48:9 | 112:14,20 | 20:21 21:8 |
| 220:8 221:2 | 145:20 152:19 | 113:13 114:4 | 22:2 37:23 |
|  |  | 115:16,18 | 38:2,4,9 60:1 |
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[rights - save]

| 108:21 109:1 | 108:16,21 | 15:1,5,6 18:5 | 135:8,12,13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 160:14 | 132:13 154:2 | 23:2,4,18,19,23 | 136:10,13,19 |
| righty 211:5 | 154:20 155:3 | 24:2,6,11,17,23 | 137:3,8,14,17 |
| risk 162:18 | 155:17 156:3,8 | 25:5,14,18 | 137:20 138:16 |
| 236:10 | 157:1 158:1,5 | 26:6,7,14,20 | 139:7 144:18 |
| road 30:25 | 158:20,21 | 27:3,4,17,23 | 145:3,8 146:8 |
| robert's 54:19 | 162:10 163:1,1 | 28:1,5,21 | 146:13,14 |
| robust 22:8 | 163:1,9,11,14 | 29:14 30:4 | 150:9,11 151:3 |
| role 32:10 | 163:20 164:7 | 31:2 32:6,13 | 151:4,7,11,15 |
| roswell 32:19 | 164:10 165:15 | 33:12,18 34:14 | 151:19 152:2 |
| rough 193:20 | 166:8 169:8,13 | 34:18 35:4,12 | 152:14,18 |
| round 9:13 | 170:12,16,19 | 36:6,11,17,20 | 153:1,4,8,18 |
| 70:15 | 177:2 178:10 | 37:18,21 39:1 | 154:10,14 |
| routine 234:14 | 180:19 181:15 | 39:8,11,22 | 155:5,10,14,19 |
| rule 145:17 | 187:20 188:10 | 40:1,5 41:1,3 | 156:11,14,19 |
| 233:21 235:13 | 188:18,19 | 41:11,13 42:15 | 157:13 158:8 |
| run 134:5 | 189:16 196:16 | 43:15 55:8 | 159:3 160:6,13 |
| 220:11,16,17 | 199:5,19 | 86:20 99:12,15 | 160:18 161:4 |
| 221:14 222:1,3 | 200:13,13 | 99:17 101:4,7 | 161:14 162:6 |
| running 221:3 | 201:3 206:11 | 118:2 119:11 | 162:12 163:21 |
| 221:7 | 206:12,12,16 | 120:11,13 | 164:11 165:1,5 |
| rushed 164:4 | 207:5 209:20 | 121:3,8,13 | 165:11,18,21 |
| rushing 163:12 | sands 155:17 | 122:4,14,19 | 166:14 167:2 |
| rutley 77:16 | 157:6 158:2 | 123:4,7,14,17 | 198:17,18 |
| s | 159:14,15 | 123:21 124:4,8 | 199:3,6,9,14 |
| ( 2:1 3:14:1 | 185:11 | 125:2,5,9,16,19 | 200:1,9,15,20 |
| s $150: 21$ | satellite 221:6 | 126:1,4,10,13 | 201:5,11,15 |
| saty 233.2 | satisfied 124:6 | 127:3,9,13,21 | 202:3,5,7 |
| salvidrez 2:6 | satisfy 27:18,20 | 128:14,20 | 210:10,15,18 |
| $238: 12,16$ | saturated | 129:5,7,9,15,20 | 211:1,6 214:2 |
| sample 131:17 | 181:15,15 | 130:4,8,21 | 214:9,11 |
| samples 172:1 | saturation | 131:5,10,16,20 | savage's 58:25 |
| sand 16:2,3,6 | 194:1 201:10 | 132:6,14,21 | save 7:21 13:21 |
| $18: 18 \text { 65:20,24 }$ | savage 2:15 3:3 | 133:14 134:12 | 56:2 145:15 |
| 66:18 67:6 | 12:24 13:14,19 | 134:18 135:2,5 |  |

Page 49
[saw - seems]

| saw 4:8,11 | 49:11 66:22 | 159:7 164:19 | 89:11 91:9,10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 56:23 91:12,13 | 73:1,25 82:8 | 166:7,18 | 91:12 111:12 |
| saying 35:8 | 86:24 89:14 | 168:12,14,17 | 119:19 143:11 |
| 59:22 63:15 | 90:1 98:4 | 169:7,11,14 | 145:17 146:12 |
| 73:19 97:20 | 185:5,6 186:3 | 182:10 185:2 | 153:17,18 |
| 105:16 111:17 | 189:19 190:20 | 185:21 186:5,9 | 154:5,9 155:1 |
| 115:3,17 | 191:8 219:18 | 187:12 191:12 | 155:19 161:5 |
| 155:10 156:16 | scroll 50:16 | 196:13,13,14 | 168:17 170:11 |
| 159:13 163:3 | 52:22 53:21 | 196:16 203:10 | 173:2,6,15,20 |
| 171:4 175:16 | 54:1 89:6 91:5 | 222:4 | 174:4,15 176:6 |
| 184:3 187:5 | 191:13 | sections 28:9 | 176:7 177:1,15 |
| 188:14 200:12 | scrolled 51:4 | 28:16 29:19,19 | 184:13 185:5,7 |
| 221:19 | 52:12 | 30:23 31:11,11 | 186:3,4 191:13 |
| says 51:16 | se 142:16 | 34:5 36:2 | 202:16 205:21 |
| 104:1,3,6,19,20 | search 131:17 | 38:14 44:19,21 | 211:13 214:8 |
| 105:13 106:14 | searched | 45:2,12,13,20 | 217:19 219:1 |
| 115:9 130:10 | 131:13 | 46:15,15,16,21 | 219:19 223:7 |
| 168:16 191:20 | second 65:20 | 46:22 58:11 | 224:18 225:3 |
| 203:4 219:10 | 65:24 66:18,23 | 59:14 62:1 | 231:4 236:14 |
| 226:13 231:16 | 70:4,6 92:17 | 63:22 64:3 | 239:11 |
| 234:21 | 93:2,20 104:20 | 115:12 125:1 | seeing 73:25 |
| scada 235:10 | 163:1,9,11,20 | 161:21 173:8 | 85:10 192:14 |
| scale 71:1 | 164:7 168:21 | 187:13 203:13 | seeking 48:11 |
| 184:2 | 168:21 169:5,8 | see $4: 3,9,15$ | 77:1 90:15 |
| scarring 17:24 | 169:12 170:12 | 11:4,11 16:7 | 148:21 196:5 |
| scenes 29:2 | 170:15 172:6,8 | 23:2 33:15 | seem 186:19 |
| scheme 67:1 | 176:9,14 | 48:23,25 49:10 | seemed 146:1 |
| 126:5 | 184:13 206:12 | 49:12 52:7 | seems 9:19 |
| school 209:5 | 219:18 226:7 | 53:22 54:2,7 | 26:17,21,25 |
| science 171:21 | 231:16 | 54:12,13 55:5 | 27:17 28:6,21 |
| 175:21 | section 30:2 | 56:19,20,21 | 33:13 38:2 |
| scope 11:12 | $31: 2532: 5$ | 57:1,1,4 65:20 | 102:12 158:9 |
| 69:20 92:12 | 57:10 86:7 | 73:4 80:9,11 | 159:4 180:7,11 |
| screen 4:4 | 87:21 89:4 | 86:4 87:5,11 | 212:3,7 215:11 |
| 12:12,16 49:10 | 118:3 154:2 | 88:13 89:8,9 |  |
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[seen - single]

| seen 51:16 53:6 | separators | 20:9 38:18 | sides 22:3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| sees 235:9 | 221:6 | 49:10 74:10,11 | 86:16 |
| selective 12:21 | sequentially | 91:8 99:6 | sign 52:16 |
| self 5:15 13:6 | 74:16 75:1 | 112:3 113:3,17 | 122:11 |
| 14:20 40:20 | series 123:8 | 185:5 191:7 | signature 102:2 |
| 41:14 72:25 | serve 148:15 | 219:18 231:10 | 240:19 241:17 |
| 76:4 84:19 | served 87:4 | shared 170:19 | signed 50:7,9 |
| 218:1,11 | 144:15 | 223:7 | 51:19,22 54:22 |
| send 91:15 | server 191:6 | sharing 12:12 | 100:21 |
| 95:11 126:1 | serving 181:5 | 65:3 66:22 | significance |
| sense 48:24 | set 7:58:17 | shelf 85:25 | 154:17 |
| 108:17 176:3 | 10:7 11:17 | shoot 33:4 | significant 8:14 |
| sent 31:15,19 | 29:9,18 31:24 | short 167:11,14 | 72:5 106:8 |
| 51:15 65:5,9 | 90:12 135:19 | shortly 100:13 | 126:6 158:19 |
| 67:22 90:3 | 221:7,10 | shotgun 16:8 | 165:8 224:15 |
| 91:21 95:8,14 | sets 5:12 46:5 | show 17:22 | significantly |
| 104:10 105:6 | setting 221:9 | 34:16 35:22 | 156:8 |
| 143:16,16,18 | 235:2 | 39:16 58:7 | sikes 2:19 |
| 143:19 144:1,2 | seven 32:7 | 129:12,17 | similar 67:8 |
| 144:21 148:19 | seventeen | 154:2 165:9 | 70:13 181:18 |
| 190:4 | 87:16 | 180:15 203:2 | 209:7 223:20 |
| sentence 93:17 | several 4:7 | showing 31:20 | similarly 53:20 |
| 104:20 219:10 | 224:11 | 162:18 208:8 | simple 238:8 |
| sentences 226:9 | severance | 219:20 | simply 54:11 |
| separate 21:21 | 212:11,14,16 | shown 51:14 | 86:7 102:20 |
| 98:13 100:4 | 213:8,11,13 | 54:9 57:9 | 182:15 |
| 155:11 205:12 | severely 21:2 | 181:19 225:8 | single 16:5 |
| 212:16 | shale 157:2,8 | shows 35:13 | 55:13 70:17 |
| separating | 157:12 163:17 | 36:1,25 38:7,9 | 74:23 130:18 |
| 18:17 170:20 | 169:21 170:10 | 53:17 | 155:14 165:3,6 |
| 203:6 | 195:12 196:13 | shutting 235:5 | 189:14 191:16 |
| separation | 206:15 207:5 | 235:6,10 | 205:1,4 221:7 |
| 155:1 165:8 | 207:16 235:1 | sic 100:12 | 225:20 226:14 |
| 219:11 | share 12:15,19 | side 10:11 33:7 | 227:10 230:19 |
|  | 13:5 19:7,8 | 33:11 185:9 | 231:13,20 |

[sir - spread]

| sir 32:12 36:19 | slightly 157:20 | sort 10:25 | 63:16,19 71:19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 65:11,14,18 | 203:5 | 12:21 32:25 | 82:21 90:15,21 |
| 74:2 126:3 | slow 226:11 | 50:19 80:13 | 91:16 92:7,12 |
| 215:10,15,18 | slowed 175:13 | 99:13 175:4 | 104:13 110:2 |
| 216:19 217:1,6 | small 37:9,10 | 183:8 184:5 | 114:8,9 163:4 |
| 217:9 218:3,9 | smaller 30:8 | 207:15 | 164:15 209:17 |
| 219:7,15 220:6 | smooth 31:7 | sorted 57:25 | span 189:4 |
| 222:14,21 | solely 45:4 | sounded 136:5 | speak 6:22 |
| 223:3,8,16,17 | solid 176:20 | 142:4 196:19 | speaking 37:14 |
| 224:12 225:9 | 236:17 | sounds 122:5 | 222:13 |
| 226:2 227:19 | somebody | 133:12 143:20 | special 1:1 |
| 228:1,7,9,10,16 | 119:19 | 145:14 163:6 | specialty 204:9 |
| 229:12 230:18 | somewhat | 175:20 | species 228:5 |
| 232:1 233:8 | 134:9 224:5 | source 205:9,9 | specific $22: 12$ |
| 234:12,18 | sonics 204:2 | south 28:14,17 | 44:15 79:14 |
| 236:20 237:16 | sooner 74:6 | 28:17,20 31:10 | 106:21 110:17 |
| sit 117:17 | sophisticated | 45:12 46:14 | specifically |
| site 232:17 | 135:21 | 59:14 62:17,17 | 11:13 22:11 |
| sitting 71:4 | sorry 43:18 | 62:23 85:22 | 57:12 70:21 |
| situation 30:21 | 60:12 71:8 | 130:18 159:8 | 232:13 |
| 81:1 134:6 | 73:20 82:9,13 | 161:21 163:16 | speed 14:17 |
| 169:2 185:4 | 85:18 89:5,15 | 173:5 185:2 | 41:18 |
| situations | 89:15 104:19 | 186:1 196:13 | spell $23: 15$ |
| 209:9 | 108:19 118:21 | southern | 150:20 215:3 |
| six 163:11 | 119:9,9 132:20 | 224:21 | spend 229:20 |
| 224:2 238:2 | 133:6 134:11 | southwest 86:8 | spending 14:6 |
| sized 30:9 | 140:18 141:2 | space 59:24 | 72:2 |
| skills 136:2 | 146:11 147:10 | 182:16 | spill 236:16 |
| 240:10 241:6 | 147:17 169:11 | spaced 156:6 | spills 230:14 |
| skip 75:15 | 169:15 179:21 | spaces 191:20 | 236:19 |
| slick 209:2,9 | 179:21 180:1 | spacing 5:2 | splits 61:12 |
| slides 10:16 | 199:13 208:1 | 19:5 47:24 | spoke 148:8 |
| 11:9 39:15 | 213:19 226:7 | 48:6 54:5 60:2 | 207:6 |
| slight 146:2 | 226:12 229:2 | 60:6,7,9,17 | spread 188:2 |
| 158:16 | 238:15 | 62:23,24 63:7 |  |
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[spring - states]

| spring $15: 15$ | $116: 8,13$ | $199: 16,19$ | staring $13: 11$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $16: 218: 18,22$ | $124: 16,21$ | $201: 3211: 9,16$ | start $7: 643: 2$ |
| $19: 8,1020: 6$ | $127: 7128: 1,6$ | $212: 1,3,6,20$ | $45: 948: 21$ |
| 20:10,10,15,22 | $128: 16,21$ | springs $53: 9$ | $89: 3226: 13$ |
| $20: 2521: 1,16$ | $129: 14130: 2$ | $64: 1141: 17,21$ | $238: 3$ |
| $21: 1822: 16$ | $130: 13,15$ | $143: 19,20$ | started $120: 4$ |
| $24: 13,1927: 20$ | $131: 8132: 7,13$ | $144: 8178: 1$ | $216: 3$ |
| $34: 2,4,1135: 1$ | $132: 16133: 1$ | $204: 20207: 9$ | state $23: 20$ |
| $38: 7,1739: 4$ | $134: 14,20$ | $208: 19$ | $79: 1887: 12$ |
| $43: 557: 11$ | $135: 3136: 20$ | spud $31: 24$ | $93: 17105: 9$ |
| $61: 2462: 6,11$ | $142: 11144: 2$ | $130: 14$ | $120: 2143: 3$ |
| $62: 2563: 6,14$ | $145: 10153: 14$ | spudding $32: 4$ | $151: 5205: 10$ |
| $64: 10,13,25$ | $154: 20155: 6$ | staci $2: 203: 6$ | $215: 21240: 22$ |
| $65: 2066: 18,23$ | $155: 17157: 1$ | $95: 2197: 7$ | stated $7: 18$ |
| $67: 670: 2,12$ | $158: 1,11$ | $104: 3116: 18$ | statement $3: 3,4$ |
| $82: 1,20,24$ | $162: 10164: 13$ | $117: 4150: 12$ | $5: 1614: 21$ |
| $84: 12,1587: 8$ | $166: 8168: 21$ | $150: 21151: 6$ | $15: 217: 20$ |
| $87: 1390: 21$ | $168: 21169: 5$ | stacked $206: 4$ | $40: 2041: 14$ |
| $92: 18,2093: 4$ | $172: 7,8173: 2$ | stacking $29: 12$ | $43: 945: 866: 5$ |
| $93: 7,13,21$ | $174: 5,6,9$ | $29: 13$ | $72: 2576: 4$ |
| $94: 2,5,697: 3$ | $176: 9,10,10$ | staff $4: 6$ | $79: 684: 7,19$ |
| $97: 1698: 10$ | $177: 2,8,19$ | stage $219: 10$ | $104: 14115: 9$ |
| $99: 2,3,8,10$ | $178: 10,11,13$ | stagger $164: 16$ | $131: 6139: 18$ |
| $100: 14,17,18$ | $178: 16,17$ | $169: 8170: 15$ | $145: 19152: 15$ |
| $103: 7,9,17,18$ | $180: 16181: 14$ | staggered | $154: 1163: 2$ |
| $104: 17,18$ | $182: 14,19$ | $159: 13$ | $177: 17180: 5$ |
| $105: 2,2,3,11$ | $183: 12,17$ | stand $39: 18$ | $180: 13217: 8$ |
| $106: 15,18,20$ | $187: 20188: 9$ | standard $73: 5$ | $218: 2,6,7,11$ |
| $107: 9,11,11$ | $189: 13190: 6$ | $110: 6213: 9$ | $219: 4$ |
| $108: 6109: 4$ | $190: 12191: 21$ | $219: 16$ | statements $4: 8$ |
| $110: 1,18111: 3$ | $192: 2,13,20$ | standing | $5: 14,1910: 13$ |
| $111: 19112: 7$ | $194: 5195: 1,2$ | $194: 13$ | $14: 2495: 17$ |
| $112: 11,14,17$ | $195: 5,7,11,15$ | standpoint | $102: 1$ |
| $113: 2,4,5,8,12$ | $196: 16197: 10$ | $29: 2279: 2,3$ | states $97: 14$ |
| $114: 3,8115: 12$ | $197: 18199: 10$ |  | $100: 11103: 15$ |
|  |  |  |  |
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[states - support]

| 186:1 | stipulate 55:9 | 234:5,8 | suggesting |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| status 43:20 | 55:10,15 | submittal | 171:12 |
| 52:13,17 | stone 173:6 | 139:1 | suit 232:19 |
| statute 27:18 | stood 104:17 | submitted 9:22 | sum 22:15 |
| 27:23 101:15 | stop 51:5 65:3 | 41:21 53:7 | 229:21 230:1 |
| 212:14 | 106:11 | 54:18 61:17,17 | summarize |
| statutes 191:21 | stopped 175:10 | 73:9 76:5,9 | 13:25 |
| statutory 27:10 | 175:15 | 96:7 190:16 | summarizing |
| 27:15 110:5 | straight 51:2 | submitting | 14:7 |
| stay 52:1 184:9 | 112:9 142:13 | 236:18 | summary 48:10 |
| steal 165:17 | 167:19 | subsequent | 53:24 216:2 |
| steer 141:11 | strategies 15:8 | 49:19 65:13 | superior 36:22 |
| step 189:12 | 80:18 | 103:14 118:14 | supersede 47:7 |
| stepped 4:15 | streamline 7:14 | subsequently | 59:12 121:21 |
| steptoe 120:6 | streamlined 8:2 | 78:11 | superseding |
| steven's 34:8 | 239:1 | substantial | 122:18 |
| stevens 5:8,17 | strike 202:5 | 9:19,24 145:12 | supplement |
| 28:10 30:14,16 | structure 158:6 | 187:15 | 90:4 91:15 |
| 31:4,14,19 | struggle 204:12 | substitute | 95:12 148:14 |
| 32:10,16 43:13 | study 117:14 | 181:5 | 150:3 190:5 |
| 43:18,21 44:13 | stuff $75: 15,17$ | subtle 143:21 | supplemental |
| 45:1 61:17 | 121:5,6 202:17 | successful | 5:14 98:3 |
| 79:23 118:2,10 | sub 24:15,21 | 79:13 207:20 | 105:6 149:14 |
| 118:11,16,16 | 25:3,11,20 | sudden 16:8 | supplements |
| 118:17,21 | 152:3 | suddenly 15:16 | 10:25 95:5 |
| 119:2 120:17 | subject 15:9,17 | sued 187:19 | support 10:14 |
| 120:20 121:5 | 15:24 16:9,18 | sufficiently | 31:19 33:22,24 |
| 130:11 149:8 | 17:22 106:11 | 107:9 | 34:3,12 35:1 |
| 149:15,16 | 121:16 127:10 | suffocating | 35:10,23,25 |
| 150:2 162:11 | 132:8 153:10 | 17:24 | 36:3 38:6,22 |
| 208:17 | 153:11 | suggest 6:12 | 38:22 50:7 |
| stevens's 43:19 | submission | 28:21 77:8 | 51:1 113:7 |
| 43:23 44:10 | 139:2 | 118:9 | 124:16,20,20 |
| stick 14:13 | submit 22:4 | suggested | 125:8 143:4,5 |
|  | 74:5 137:17 | 44:16 | 143:9 194:1 |
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[support - technical]

| 205:6 <br> supporters | surprise $82: 2$ surprised | $\begin{aligned} & \text { takeaway } \\ & 233: 13,17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 158: 12 \text { 165:10 } \\ & \text { 184:17 185:1 } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20:8 | 81:21 82:19,22 | 234:7,10,13,15 | 187:12 193:2 |
| supporting | 83:20 105:5 | 234:17 | 197:13 198:6 |
| 52:5 113:18 | surprising | taken 103:14 | tangent 183:8 |
| supports 33:14 | 83:19 | 145:4 182:5,9 | tank 188:11 |
| suppose 194:20 | surrebuttal | 213:17 240:3 | 220:3 232:19 |
| 229:14 | 8:24 | 240:12 241:9 | 232:21 233:3,5 |
| sure 11:21 | surrounding | takes 29:11 | tankless 229:21 |
| 18:12 40:22,23 | 15:23 107:4 | 76:19 79:13 | 232:14 236:10 |
| 42:5 48:24 | 132:8 153:10 | 89:19 191:6 | targe 196:10 |
| 51:2 52:12,13 | survey 162:3,4 | talk 5:18 12:6 | target 16:4,4 |
| 52:21 53:10 | swear 23:11 | 33:21 38:1,3 | 20:1 22:12 |
| 54:6 55:17,22 | 150:16 214:20 | 65:1 69:20 | 153:14,15 |
| 58:20 76:18 | switched 55:6 | 79:7 109:16 | 163:18 166:8 |
| 80:12 84:3 | switching 7:15 | 114:1 132:2 | 172:6 180:12 |
| 86:18 88:1 | sworn 14:2 | 172:10 177:13 | 192:12 196:12 |
| 95:7,10 101:6 | 240:5 | 177:18 184:11 | 197:9 |
| 104:16 105:21 | system 236:14 | 213:2 238:5 | targeted 9:18 |
| 108:13 133:10 | systems 235:10 | talked 33:3 | 196:15 |
| 138:8 139:9,12 | 235:20 | 81:11 83:21 | targeting 70:2 |
| 146:10,18 | t | 97:10 118:2 | 85:15 157:9 |
| 160:2,16 177:1 | 3:1,1 150:2 | 125:10 126:14 | 158:21 163:15 |
| 177:15 183:19 |  | 141:14 158:13 | 199:19 |
| 184:9 189:18 | 36:12,14 171:4 | 205:2 213:15 | targets 18:20 |
| 206:17 212:17 | tables 34 | 232:16 | 20:4 21:21,24 |
| 228:19 229:18 |  | talking 90:2 | 22:4 |
| 230:13 231:17 | take 13:24 | 112:16 113:1 | teams 80:9 |
| 233:21 235:17 | 17:19 29:21 | 116:21 172:4 | technical 4:3 |
| 236:7 | $\begin{aligned} & 17: 1929: 2 \\ & 42: 2248: 8 \end{aligned}$ | 176:15 195:17 | 11:24 15:7 |
| surface 31:24 | $59: 10,13,15$ | 202:19 203:12 | 18:10 104:5 |
| 77:20,21,25 | 59.10,13,15 | 230:7 | 107:14,18 |
| 78:17 |  | talks 28:9 | 120:3 133:9,18 |
| surge 229:21 | 107:7 115:5 | $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { t a n }} 115: 18$ | 140:19 143:15 |
| 230:10 | 167:10,13,16 | 157:19 158:3 | 216:4 |
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[technically - things]

| technically | 41:19 129:3 | 230:16 238:1 | 237:5,19 238:1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16:24 | 135:10 151:19 | tests 188:6 | 238:17 239:8 |
| tell 18:15 23:11 | testifying 118:1 | thank 4:2,22 | 239:11 |
| 61:6 66:13 | 240:5 | 7:11 13:14 | thanks 18:2 |
| 71:11 97:20 | testimony 6:2 | 18:5,7 22:25 | that'd 37:17 |
| 98:16 150:17 | 7:19,20,22 | 23:1,4,14,17,19 | 49:6 77:24 |
| 154:16 159:17 | 8:15 9:3,14 | 26:6,7,8 27:4 | 130:6 |
| 170:15 175:9 | 10:4,5 11:14 | 39:10 40:1,4,5 | theirs 57:22 |
| 175:14 181:10 | 13:5,12,12,19 | 40:8 42:10,11 | thereto 218:13 |
| 186:4 188:7 | 14:1,4,7,11 | 47:19 52:20 | therewith |
| 189:5 214:20 | 18:11 21:19 | 55:25 61:15 | 217:15 |
| 221:1 | 24:7,14,20 | 63:24 65:25 | thick 205:19 |
| telling 74:22 | 25:2,10 26:10 | 88:5,19,20 | 209:5 |
| ten 28:8 84:14 | 26:18 27:8 | 101:7 102:18 | thicker 158:11 |
| tend 12:21 | 28:7 33:13 | 119:10 120:8,9 | thickness 175:2 |
| tender 225:11 | 37:22 40:7,15 | 120:13 123:7 | 175:5,17,18 |
| term 52:16,19 | 41:9,10,20 | 129:9 136:14 | 176:2,5 213:12 |
| 83:16,16 | 42:4,7,18,20 | 138:15 139:7 | thin 159:16 |
| terms 12:22 | 51:5 56:3 | 139:11 140:10 | 174:14,18 |
| 35:13 57:6 | 72:11,14,20,22 | 140:12,14 | 176:18 202:20 |
| 71:25 72:15 | 73:8 76:6 | 146:21 147:5,6 | thing 38:11 |
| 73:15 138:12 | 118:6 130:1,4 | 147:7,9,11 | 40:10 80:13 |
| 138:17 161:5 | 133:21 134:3 | 150:6,7,8,11,19 | 172:4 178:10 |
| 176:2 199:14 | 140:13 151:12 | 151:2,4 152:13 | 180:8 184:15 |
| 201:19 | 153:2,9,19 | 154:15 167:5 | 191:10,17 |
| testified 23:24 | 154:11 155:21 | 167:20 168:9 | 206:21 213:5,6 |
| 66:4 69:22 | 156:10 158:9 | 183:6 194:12 | 230:19 |
| 70:7,12 75:20 | 168:15 171:3 | 198:13,18 | things 14:17 |
| 76:3 141:19 | 172:17 179:12 | 202:6,9 210:1 | 29:21 41:18 |
| 151:8 198:3 | 180:5 181:5 | 210:3,8 214:5 | 67:2 80:8 81:6 |
| 208:20 215:13 | 184:19 186:9 | 214:5,7,14,18 | 83:15 89:20 |
| testifies 26:21 | 187:7 196:18 | 215:2,7 217:21 | 115:8 120:17 |
| 197:14,15 | 197:20,21 | 218:18 219:2 | 126:5 138:10 |
| testify 6:25 | 222:20 226:3 | 225:12 231:2 | 168:11 178:5 |
| 25:15 27:2 | 227:3 229:20 | 232:4,7 237:2 | 230:12 234:2 |

[things - time]

| $237: 13$ | 98:18 99:16 | third $16: 2,3,6$ | $204: 20206: 11$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| think 6:9,20 | $100: 1102: 1$ | $18: 1827: 20$ | $206: 16207: 5$ |
| $9: 5,1210: 19$ | $103: 3106: 1$ | $38: 17,2567: 6$ | $209: 19211: 15$ |
| $11: 3,4,1112: 2$ | $108: 1,11,13,20$ | $70: 2,5,6,12$ | $211: 21212: 20$ |
| $12: 15,1613: 5$ | $109: 4112: 21$ | $93: 1394: 4$ | $219: 9$ |
| $14: 12,15,17$ | $113: 1,14118: 4$ | $97: 398: 10$ | thompson $2: 4$ |
| $15: 1821: 23$ | $119: 7124: 13$ | $99: 2,3,8,10$ | $4: 4141: 2$ |
| $22: 1726: 21$ | $129: 19,21$ | $106: 17,20$ | $147: 2,4210: 4$ |
| $27: 1228: 6,13$ | $132: 10133: 8$ | $108: 15,21$ | $210: 6237: 3,4$ |
| $28: 1329: 1,17$ | $133: 20134: 8$ | $109: 4112: 7,11$ | thoroughly |
| $30: 7,13,25$ | $137: 4,6,7,12$ | $115: 12127: 7$ | $93: 4100: 14$ |
| $31: 2132: 9,15$ | $138: 11,13,17$ | $132: 13145: 10$ | thought $8: 1$ |
| $32: 1633: 4,7$ | $140: 5143: 12$ | $153: 14154: 2$ | $57: 1785: 12$ |
| $34: 738: 5,9$ | $144: 1,2145: 18$ | $154: 19155: 3,6$ | $89: 12,16141: 5$ |
| $39: 12,14,20$ | $146: 11147: 19$ | $155: 17156: 3,8$ | $141: 7226: 7$ |
| $40: 1641: 16,21$ | $148: 7,9,10$ | $157: 1,21158: 5$ | thousand's |
| $42: 1,1,19$ | $156: 1157: 7,18$ | $158: 20,21$ | $67: 1$ |
| $51: 1653: 2$ | $158: 13159: 10$ | $159: 14162: 10$ | thread $141: 1$ |
| $56: 1,2,19,21,23$ | $161: 19164: 5,8$ | $163: 1,14$ | three $9: 615: 13$ |
| $57: 20,2258: 18$ | $165: 2,13166: 3$ | $164: 10165: 15$ | $31: 2559: 17$ |
| $58: 2159: 19,20$ | $170: 21172: 13$ | $166: 7170: 16$ | $63: 3,12169: 12$ |
| $59: 2160: 24$ | $172: 15,17$ | $170: 19174: 1,5$ | $169: 14205: 12$ |
| $61: 9,10,12$ | $175: 11177: 4,5$ | $174: 5,9176: 10$ | thrown $162: 8$ |
| $62: 2165: 2$ | $178: 6179: 8$ | $176: 21177: 2,2$ | thrust $180: 5$ |
| $69: 4,12,16,19$ | $195: 9,11198: 9$ | $177: 8,18178: 9$ | tier $79: 880: 2$ |
| $69: 2271: 15,24$ | $202: 16204: 3$ | $178: 11,13,16$ | $197: 1,12$ |
| $72: 775: 15$ | $205: 11,12,15$ | $178: 16180: 19$ | $206: 11$ |
| $78: 1680: 7,22$ | $207: 3,13209: 1$ | $181: 14182: 14$ | tight $154: 8$ |
| $81: 4,5,11$ | $209: 18,21$ | $183: 12,17$ | $156: 6164: 15$ |
| $82: 2283: 9,11$ | $211: 2,17213: 1$ | $184: 4,4187: 20$ | $172: 18173: 12$ |
| $83: 14,14,17,20$ | $222: 2227: 1$ | $188: 9,18,19$ | time $7: 21,23$ |
| $83: 2185: 23$ | $231: 21238: 21$ | $189: 13,16$ | $8: 3,4,2212: 1$ |
| $88: 689: 9$ | $239: 3,6$ | $196: 15197: 18$ | $13: 21,2514: 7$ |
| $91: 13,1995: 3$ | thinks $125: 10$ | $199: 10,15,19$ | $15: 1419: 25$ |
| $95: 5,1296: 7$ | $135: 9138: 9$ | $200: 13201: 3$ | $21: 15,2529: 21$ |
|  |  |  |  |
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[time - true]

| 40:2 43:17,17 | 41:10 42:7 | total 9:22 15:18 | 150:20 215:3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 43:18 44:24 | 71:4 88:22 | 16:17 37:1 | 241:3,5 |
| 51:18 56:2 | 117:18 141:15 | 71:12 86:9 | transcriptionist |
| 58:6 65:10 | 194:13 208:20 | 157:2 169:7,16 | 240:7 |
| 68:173:13 | 210:9 214:1 | 180:18 | transition |
| 74:17 76:19 | 222:17 | totally 188:15 | 137:10 138:2 |
| 85:24 88:9 | today's 4:20 | touch 47:20 | travel 98:20 |
| 89:19 118:4,9 | toe 77:19 | 75:17 97:8 | traverse 221:21 |
| 119:7 120:12 | together 8:7,16 | touched 75:16 | travis 28:14 |
| 123:9 126:2 | 21:24 29:5 | 208:2 213:21 | 33:3 |
| 130:14 136:1 | 85:1 117:8 | touches 11:8 | travis's 57:22 |
| 152:3 167:16 | told 94:15 | tough 32:24 | 130:1 |
| 191:7 198:9 | 194:9 195:13 | towards 15:3 | treaters 234:11 |
| 213:2,10 | tomorrow 6:15 | 28:19 36:5 | trekking |
| 221:14,16 | 6:15,17 7:8,9 | 42:7 44:10 | 234:19 |
| 231:11 233:9 | 11:19 12:3,5 | 179:15 | trend 188:8 |
| timed 88:20 | 18:13 35:6 | township | trends 86:15 |
| timeframe | 51:14 139:6 | 130:19 | trespass 99:1 |
| 130:20 | 140:12 145:15 | track 50:22,23 | 99:10 |
| timelines 146:4 | 146:13 223:19 | 79:22 80:4 | tried 30:23 |
| timely 145:1 | 238:4,7,9,19 | tracking 80:16 | 32:17 133:18 |
| times 85:3 | 239:4 | 83:25 | triple 203:19 |
| 228:11 234:1 | took 129:21 | tract 49:20 | 204:1,10 |
| timing 224:7 | 171:2,21 172:1 | 52:8 53:3,21 | trouble 147:15 |
| title 10:14 | top 65:16 79:8 | 54:2 86:8 | trucking 70:21 |
| 35:18 55:20 | 79:17,21 80:2 | tracts 22:14 | true 29:14 |
| 57:15,20 58:6 | 157:1,11 | 47:5 49:17 | 44:22 67:4 |
| 58:11,24 59:23 | 159:21 178:11 | 86:8 87:6 | 75:9 79:1 |
| 60:4,4,9,16 | 179:20,21 | trade 30:20 | 118:16,20 |
| 61:19 63:17 | 180:1,19,20 | 33:9 | 119:3 121:19 |
| 64:10,22,23 | 183:16,17 | trading 212:3,5 | 123:11,13 |
| 77:25 125:6 | 204:20 | transcriber | 127:3 158:14 |
| today 6:17 | topic 79:5 | 241:1 | 164:16 240:9 |
| 11:20,22 12:2 | topics 235:13 | transcript | 241:5 |
| 18:4,13 40:24 |  | 23:15 139:2 |  |
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[truly - understand]

| truly 9:18 | 15:8 18:19 | type 160:1 | 45:23 51:19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 161:6 | 19:6,9,12 | 173:2 176:6 | 56:25 57:3,8 |
| trust 52:14 | 21:10,11,20 | 178:2 203:10 | 60:1,18 67:25 |
| 124:15 | 25:10 26:22 | typewriting | 68:15 75:10 |
| trustee 52:13 | 27:25 62:4 | 240:7 | 81:24 90:12,16 |
| truth 23:12 | 63:25 66:25 | typically | 101:15 109:19 |
| 150:17 214:21 | 68:15,23 69:14 | 138:20 236:14 | 109:20 110:18 |
| try 12:25 42:16 | 69:16,18 72:8 | typo 54:11 | 111:8 112:1,3 |
| 76:20 83:15 | 86:7 87:22 | 55:10 227:6 | 113:2 115:15 |
| 86:3 99:13 | 88:4 90:13,14 | typos 55:13 | 116:1 117:2 |
| 141:11 176:2 | 100:4,16 | 123:12,20 | 118:1,3,11 |
| 204:14 209:14 | 101:12 108:2,4 | u | 122:2,8,17 |
| 219:18 | 112:13,19 | u 151:1 | 136:16 137:4,5 |
| trying 27:5 | 114:1,2 115:15 | ultimate | 138:2 147:13 |
| 29:5,18 30:13 | 116:1 117:2 | 127:10 136:6 | 194:21 196:5 |
| 30:25 32:2 | 130:18,19 | ultimately | 197:5 212:13 |
| 39:7 50:19,23 | 132:1 137:7,9 | 127:9 | underlying |
| 98:21 134:8 | 137:11,15 | unable 183:13 | 106:11 |
| 145:16 146:12 | 140:3,4 141:8 | 209:14 | undermined |
| 146:17 157:18 | 141:13 142:15 | uncertain 98:1 | 37:23 |
| 173:16 211:13 | 144:5,7 154:5 | 192:8 193:10 | understand |
| 212:6 213:19 | 154:19 155:2,7 | uncommitment | 8:21 9:2,8 35:9 |
| 213:21 226:21 | 155:11 156:5 | $123: 10$ | 40:13 41:7 |
| 227:13 | 158:17 159:19 | uncommitted | 42:19 43:4 |
| tune 69:7 126:8 | 165:6 169:10 | 48:12 50:4 | 45:12 51:11 |
| turbulence | 170:20 175:12 | 52:9 53:4,13 | 53:11 54:6 |
| 139:8 | 176:16 178:5 | 53:15,17,25 | 56:9 58:6,21 |
| turn 7:18 72:24 | 181:16 184:2 |  | 58:25 60:15 |
| 129:8 136:11 | 186:1 188:13 | $56: 14123: 19$ | 73:14 74:14 |
| 198:10 231:8 | 194:21 196:6 | $146: 8$ | 76:8 84:10 |
| twenties 59:17 | 203:7 207:7,11 | uncommon | 86:15 88:2 |
| twice 100:19 | 212:19 213:11 | 19:22 | 90:9,11 96:13 |
| 164:19 | 216:4,9 218:6 | under 9:23 | 97:21 98:8,17 |
| two 4:37:5 | 218:12 221:16 | $16: 2531: 12,16$ | 98:20 104:9 |
| 10:16 11:10,17 | 226:9 | 31:23 39:4,12 | 105:4 107:16 |
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[understand - upper]

| 107:16 108:4 | 95:7 103:9 | 112:11 122:8 | 230:7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 110:10 113:14 | 106:4 168:11 | 132:15 134:20 | upgraded |
| 113:15 114:2 | 172:13 | 161:7 162:9 | 233:7,10 |
| 116:6,20 | undertaken | 189:14 | uphold 38:4 |
| 125:20 132:6 | 85:3 | units 15:15 | upper 18:18 |
| 133:3 134:19 | undertaking | 19:5 29:10 | 20:19 21:18 |
| 135:16 136:16 | 84:1 | 58:7 62:23 | 83:2 93:10 |
| 139:10 155:6 | uneconomic | 63:7,13 71:19 | 94:4,6,10,13,17 |
| 155:15 158:10 | 20:13 | 82:21 90:16 | 94:21 98:12,14 |
| 160:6 163:21 | unexpected | 91:1 92:7,12 | 99:1,9 100:20 |
| 165:2 168:19 | 82:3 83:18 | 104:13 110:2 | 103:20 105:10 |
| 171:16,20 | unfortunately | 114:8,9 132:7 | 106:20 108:7 |
| 181:4 191:1,3 | 49:3 | 132:8 135:3 | 108:14 109:1,3 |
| 199:9 212:2 | uniform 62:1,6 | 156:15 159:6,9 | 114:17 115:4 |
| 225:19 226:18 | 62:10,16,19 | 161:8 162:7 | 115:10,14 |
| understanding | 212:8 | university | 116:1,14,16 |
| 54:16 55:1 | uniformity | 215:19,21 | 117:1,1 127:8 |
| 74:19 80:17 | 62:24 63:13 | unknown 18:16 | 132:12,17 |
| 86:14 96:19 | 183:10 | unnecessary | 133:2,5 134:15 |
| 97:5,8 102:21 | union 54:13,22 | 16:20 17:12,25 | 136:21 153:15 |
| 106:13,16 | 55:5 | 93:14 | 154:3 155:4,6 |
| 131:1 134:13 | unique 18:15 | unresolved | 157:5 163:9,11 |
| 135:6 138:6 | 18:25 19:12 | 99:20 | 164:7,9,12 |
| 141:10 148:12 | 21:622:13 | unusual 15:10 | 166:13 168:21 |
| 148:16 155:12 | 153:9,11 205:9 | 219:13 | 169:5,8,12 |
| 172:12 196:17 | 205:9 | update 92:11 | 170:12 172:6 |
| 196:21 197:4 | unit 5:2 29:5,9 | 149:14 | 174:13 180:17 |
| 227:5 | 29:18,22 34:1 | updated 48:9 | 182:19 184:4 |
| understands | 34:9,11 35:2 | 48:15,18 58:14 | 192:4,8 195:4 |
| 101:2 | 47:25 48:6 | 58:24 66:10,18 | 195:10,18,20 |
| understood | 57:11 59:25 | 67:22,24 71:6 | 196:1 197:18 |
| 17:3 40:11,21 | 60:6,7,9,17 | 71:13,17,19 | 199:17,20 |
| 40:23 42:6 | 62:24 63:4,16 | 72:5 83:15 | 200:6 211:15 |
| 43:16 52:12,21 | 63:19 70:17 | 126:2 146:3,6 | 211:21 212:20 |
| 56:3 86:18 | 90:5,5 91:16 | 146:7 168:16 | 231:15 |
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[upward - we've]

| $\begin{gathered} \text { upward } 98: 20 \\ 132: 12 \end{gathered}$ | vance $4: 19$ variation 19:14 | $\begin{array}{lc} \hline \text { visual } & 91: 9 \\ \text { volume } & 12: 12 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline 183: 7 \\ \text { wants } \\ \text { wa } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| upwards | 42:19 55:10 | vote 31:15 | 21:17 |
| 208:19 | 158:16 | w | war 161:21 |
| use 29:12 35:21 | varies 24:8 | wait 89:21 | warren 38:12 |
| 57:17 85:24 | various 123:10 | 119:12 191:9 | 64:5 112:8 |
| 106:7 159:19 | 125:12 | walk 12:18 | 141:15 144:3 |
| 159:20 175:8 | vary 68:21 | 48:18 | 149:8 |
| 176:2 204:14 | vent 236:13,16 | walked 5:11 | waste 17:3,8,24 |
| 209:2 221:18 | venting 234:3 | wall 20:25 | 20:14 106:8 |
| 221:19 223:18 | verbal $50: 8$ | want 13:7 | 160:14,19 |
| 225:19 226:14 | 54:25 | $20: 20 \text { 40:10 }$ | 166:21 233:20 |
| 231:12,19 | verbally 50:12 | 48:18 51:1 | 235:13 |
| 235:20 238:9 | verified 16:3 | $52: 1153: 10$ | wasteful 98:13 |
| used 36:18 | versus 96:9 | 54:6 55:22 | water 70:21 |
| 37:10 58:3 | 159:18 160:4 | 58:20 75:16,19 | 181:15 193:20 |
| 64:20 118:8 | 161:12 175:8 | 76:8 81:19 | 209:2,5,9 |
| 173:19 209:1 | 176:9,10 177:2 | 88:1 95:6,10 | 233:13,17 |
| 227:10 | 180:16 182:15 | 98:12 105:21 | 234:17,17 |
| useful 55:12 | 182:19 200:13 | 107:19 11 | way 6:4 8:1 |
| 211:3,17 | vertical 156:7 | 115:8 120:5 | 22:2,4,18 |
| uses 66:10,18 | 164:15 165:7 | $122: 7142: 19$ | 47:15 90:1 |
| using 35:17,19 | 204:1 209:17 | 146:15 171:13 | 101:20 109:12 |
| 160:1,4 222:8 | vessels 229:21 | $\begin{aligned} & 140: 131 / 1 \\ & 172: 10,11 \end{aligned}$ | 127:14,15 |
| 223:17 | 230:10 | $\begin{aligned} & 172: 10,11 \\ & 177: 10,13 \end{aligned}$ | 143:16 166:3 |
| usually 139:3 | viable 135:6 | $191: 1,3210: 20$ | 182:18 203:16 |
| utilize 219:10 | 136:7,9,15 | 212:15 | 207:18 222:3 |
| v | 163:18 | wanted 40:22 | ways $62: 4$ |
| v 215:5 | view 18:9 20:14 | 40:23 42:5 | we've 12:1 20:2 |
| value 182:4 | $1: 22$ 22:10 | $47: 20 \text { 52:20 }$ | 29:22 30:10,20 |
| 186:15 | 79:7 168:12,18 | 86:17 104:8 | 30:23 32:1,17 |
| values 175:2 | 195:21 | 120:2 129:12 | 33:4 68:20 |
| 181:18,21 | views 15:8 | 139:7,9 142:10 | 88:4 109:21 |
| valves 235:3,5 | virtual 33:10 | 143:2 145:5 | 116:21 141:14 |
|  |  | 168:10,18 | 170:2 221:10 |
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| 229:17 | 127:5,18 128:1 | 231:18,20 | wolfbone |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| weakness | 128:2 129:11 | 233:6 235:5,6 | 212:10 213:4,4 |
| 204:12 | 129:11,17 | went $10: 1,3$ | wolfcamp |
| week 8:9 11:7 | 130:3,13,15,19 | 31:9,13 78:22 | 15:16 18:18,22 |
| 19:21 32:21 | 156:2,6,8 | 118:16,21 | 19:8,10 20:6 |
| 68:6 211:11 | 157:15 158:10 | 216:5 233:21 | 20:11,12,16,19 |
| weekend 32:21 | 158:12 159:17 | west 34:5,5,9,9 | 20:25 21:3,8 |
| weeks 9:6 | 159:20 160:4 | 35:2,2 36:1,2 | 21:18 22:16,17 |
| 13:24 | 160:12 161:12 | 38:13,14 57:10 | 25:9 34:3,4,6,9 |
| wells 15:15,17 | 161:13 162:8 | 64:3,3 125:1,1 | 34:10 35:1,3 |
| 16:1,9,10,12,18 | 162:10,10,14 | white 36:3 | 36:14,15 38:6 |
| 16:21,23,23,25 | 162:15,17 | wide 63:16 | 38:14,25 53:9 |
| 17:12 18:1 | 163:11,14,14 | wider 77:21 | 56:23 61:24 |
| 29:2 31:23,25 | 164:2,3,18,19 | 209:6 | 62:7,11,14,25 |
| 32:4 66:7 69:3 | 166:7,13,16,18 | william 2:21 | 63:7,14,25 |
| 70:1,8,12 | 166:20,21 | 5:22 | 64:11,15,16,24 |
| 76:13 77:19 | 168:13,17,20 | wine 206:3 | 82:2,20,23 |
| 78:15,16,25 | 169:3,6,10 | winner 213:16 | 83:1,2,8,17,20 |
| 79:13 83:1,3,4 | 170:2,10 171:6 | winning 124:20 | 84:5,16 85:4 |
| 83:8 85:17 | 176:8 183:1 | witness 4:8 | 85:15,17 86:9 |
| 90:5,6,21 | 187:21 188:18 | 7:25 14:21 | 86:11 87:8,13 |
| 92:13,18 93:8 | 190:6,12 | 23:3,23 27:1,2 | 87:15 89:11 |
| 93:13,14,21,21 | 192:20 195:2,5 | 66:10 102:4 | 90:15,21 93:5 |
| 94:4,5 95:9 | 195:7,11,15 | 133:9 135:15 | 93:8,9,10,15 |
| 97:3,16 98:10 | 196:8 197:17 | 147:8 150:10 | 94:2,4,6,11,13 |
| 98:14 99:1 | 198:6,21 | 151:8 214:9,12 | 94:17,18,20,21 |
| 100:17 103:18 | 199:17 200:6 | 214:17 225:11 | 96:15,16 97:4 |
| 103:18 104:11 | 200:13,21 | 237:6 240:4 | 97:15 98:6,13 |
| 104:17 105:2 | 201:4 203:10 | witnesses 4:8 | 98:14 99:1,5,9 |
| 105:11 106:6 | 206:17 207:2,5 | 5:16,17,20,25 | 99:9 100:15,19 |
| 107:3,9 113:4 | 222:10 223:19 | 6:2,3,14,22 | 100:20,20 |
| 114:3,7,17 | 224:2,20 225:4 | 7:16,17 14:2 | 103:20,20 |
| 116:8,13 | 225:8,20 | 14:25 18:14 | 104:11,13 |
| 117:18 118:17 | 226:17 227:2 | 19:1 41:9,19 | 105:5,10,10,18 |
| 119:1 123:2 | 227:11 231:16 | 238:7,20 | 106:6,15,20 |

Page 62
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| 107:10 108:8 | 170:10,18 | word 42:23 | wrap 11:22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 108:14 109:1,3 | 173:4,5 174:9 | words 43:22 | written 24:6,14 |
| 109:14 111:7 | 174:10,13 | 181:9 183:21 | 24:20 25:1,10 |
| 111:12,14,16 | 177:7 178:1 | 195:3 | 50:8 90:10 |
| 112:3,7,17 | 180:17 182:15 | work 11:25 | 101:21 138:21 |
| 113:9,11,17 | 182:20 185:11 | 13:10 29:8,11 | 151:11 197:21 |
| 114:9,14,17 | 187:18 188:5,7 | 30:13,17 | wrong 51:24 |
| 115:4,10,13,14 | 188:8,18 189:1 | 103:17 216:6 | 71:9 191:10 |
| 116:2,7,12,14 | 189:2,8,9,13,16 | worked 95:16 | 226:7 |
| 116:15,16 | 190:10 192:5,8 | working 10:21 | wrote 100:11 |
| 117:1,3,7,18,20 | 192:21 193:9 | 11:1 15:24 | $\mathbf{x}$ |
| 124:17,21 | 194:10 195:1,4 | 17:9 29:4,23 | x 39:18 157:6 |
| 127:8 128:2,8 | 195:4,8,10,11 | 30:5,6,10,15 | x 174:9,10 177:8 |
| 128:9,16 | 195:15,18,20 | 33:22,23 34:12 | 178:6 179:14 |
| 129:14,17 | 196:2,5,10,12 | 37:2,3 38:20 | 180:4 183:11 |
| 130:3,13,15 | 197:9,18 199:1 | 46:20 47:25 | 183:18 185:11 |
| 131:8 132:12 | 199:5,7,11,15 | 48:5 49:14 | 188:19 189:1 |
| 132:17 133:2,5 | 199:17,17,21 | 56:18 57:5,6 | 189:13 197:19 |
| 134:15 136:21 | 200:6,7,11,13 | 57:19 71:18 | 205:19 |
| 137:15 141:16 | 200:17 201:7 | 73:16 74:8,15 | y |
| 143:2,20 144:9 | 204:21 205:19 | 74:22 75:5 | y $\frac{y}{\text { y }}$ |
| 144:10,20 | 206:3,7,15 | 76:17 77:24 | у 157:6 174:9 |
| 145:1,7,11 | 207:2,5,12,20 | 83:12 85:6 | 174:10 177:8 |
| 147:19 148:16 | 208:17 211:13 | 90:20 92:6 | 178:6 179:14 |
| 148:20 149:5 | 211:15,21 | 98:9 103:5 | 180:4 183:11 |
| 150:2 153:15 | 212:7,21 225:1 | 110:20 125:19 | 183:18 185:11 |
| 154:4,20 155:4 | 233:6 | 126:17 127:15 | 188:19 189:1 |
| 155:7,16 156:3 | wolfcamp's | 128:9,12 | 189:13 197:19 |
| 156:7 157:2,5 | 105:17 | 138:12 148:20 | 199:5 200:13 |
| 157:8,11,12 | wonder 140:1 | 228:15 234:17 | 205:19 215:5 |
| 158:2,11 | 167:10 | 234:18 | y'all 76:4 |
| 159:12,14,15 | wondering | works 143:11 | y'all's 57:17 |
| 162:3 164:10 | 69:1 88:8 | worth 6:9 | yeah 7:13 10:8 |
| 164:12 165:16 | 227:4 | 13:17 32:21,22 | 23:7,22 26:19 |
| 166:13 169:21 |  |  | 27:3,22,24 |
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## [yeah - zoro]

| $28: 1329: 17$ | $135: 11136: 5$ | $7: 1811: 18$ | $171: 8,12$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $30: 732: 15$ | $142: 20,20$ | $12: 413: 19$ | zoro $37: 13$ |
| $33: 2535: 16$ | $145: 13146: 17$ | $14: 14,1641: 11$ |  |
| $38: 540: 18,21$ | $148: 6149: 11$ | $41: 12,1642: 9$ |  |
| $42: 1144: 7,25$ | $149: 21150: 1$ | $214: 10,11,13$ |  |
| $49: 651: 13$ | $154: 14156: 21$ | $214: 15,16$ |  |
| $52: 3,2553: 14$ | $158: 15161: 3$ | $215: 6,8,11,16$ |  |
| $54: 956: 6,20$ | $161: 10164: 5$ | $216: 1,11,17,20$ |  |
| $57: 1458: 13$ | $174: 12186: 17$ | $217: 4,7,10,20$ |  |
| $60: 2061: 21$ | $187: 3194: 11$ | $217: 21218: 4$ |  |
| $64: 1867: 3,14$ | $194: 19204: 15$ | $218: 10219: 3,8$ |  |
| $68: 269: 4,25$ | $204: 15205: 7$ | $219: 17220: 1,7$ |  |
| $70: 4,1671: 2$ | $206: 10210: 17$ | $220: 19221: 17$ |  |
| $71: 1572: 12$ | $214: 4224: 4$ | $222: 11,15$ |  |
| $73: 1776: 14,18$ | $229: 18232: 20$ | $223: 1,5,9,14$ |  |
| $76: 2479: 3,11$ | $235: 8$ | $224: 1,8225: 5$ |  |
| $80: 6,14,20,22$ | year $16: 24$ | $225: 10,12$ |  |
| $82: 4,12,18$ | $164: 4216: 6,8$ | $226: 15231: 7,9$ |  |
| $83: 984: 3$ | years $15: 14$ | $232: 3,8237: 8$ |  |
| $85: 1987: 20$ | $16: 330: 15$ | $237: 11,17,20$ |  |
| $88: 5,789: 13$ | $31: 21131: 1$ | $239: 6,9$ |  |
| $94: 996: 12$ | $216: 5,9235: 14$ | zimsky's $8: 21$ |  |
| $97: 10,12100: 9$ | yellow $36: 2$ | $41: 6$ |  |
| $106: 17107: 1$ | $222: 2$ | zone $157: 4$ |  |
| $108: 11109: 17$ | yep $49: 12$ | $159: 21163: 19$ |  |
| $111: 18113: 6$ | $53: 1963: 2$ | $164: 9168: 21$ |  |
| $113: 13,19$ | $66: 167: 10$ | $169: 5178: 20$ |  |
| $115: 20117: 15$ | $75: 12172: 2$ | $179: 17197: 9$ |  |
| $119: 21121: 12$ | yeso $213: 12$ | $211: 13$ |  |
| $123: 16125: 15$ | z |  | zones $18: 19,20$ |
| $126: 7127: 2,6$ | zero $174: 16$ | $19: 1221: 20$ |  |
| $128: 18129: 4$ | $203: 4234: 13$ | $22: 562: 25$ |  |
| $129: 13131: 13$ | $234: 13236: 13$ | $66: 7155: 2$ |  |
| $132: 10,11$ | zimsky $2: 21$ | $156: 6162: 18$ |  |
| $133: 4,12$ | $5: 21,227: 14$ | $163: 5164: 6$ |  |
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New Mexico Rules of Civil Procedure for the District Courts Article 5, Rule 1-030
(e) Review by Witness; Changes; Signing.

If requested by the deponent or a party before completion of the deposition, the deponent shall have thirty (30) days after being notified by the officer that the transcript or recording is available in which to review the transcript or recording and, if there are changes in form or substance, to sign a statement reciting such changes and the reasons given by the deponent for making them. The officer shall indicate in the certificate prescribed by Subparagraph (1) of Paragraph $F$ of this rule whether any review was requested and, if so, shall append any changes made by the deponent during the period allowed.

DISCLAIMER: THE FOREGOING CIVIL PROCEDURE RULES ARE PROVIDED FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY.

THE ABOVE RULES ARE CURRENT AS OF APRIL 1, 2019. PLEASE REFER TO THE APPLICABLE STATE RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE FOR UP-TO-DATE INFORMATION.

COMPANY CERTIFICATE AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
Veritext Legal Solutions represents that the foregoing transcript is a true, correct and complete transcript of the colloquies, questions and answers as submitted by the court reporter. Veritext Legal Solutions further represents that the attached exhibits, if any, are true, correct and complete documents as submitted by the court reporter and/or attorneys in relation to this deposition and that the documents were processed in accordance with our litigation support and production standards.
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