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PROCEEDINGS
THE HEARING EXAMINER: At least one more witness. Let's see.

MR. ZIMSKY: Madame Examiner, I'm calling Eddie Behm, who has just appeared on video.

THE HEARING EXAMINER: Okay. Having just a little trouble hearing you, Mr. Zimsky.

MR. ZIMSKY: Is that any better?
THE HEARING EXAMINER: Yeah. When you keep your voice up, that's better. All right.

Mr. Behm, if you would please raise your right hand. I can't hear you. Maybe decided to get off and come back on. We'll see.

MR. BEHM: Can you hear me now?
THE HEARING EXAMINER: Yes.
MR. ZIMSKY: We can't see you.
THE HEARING EXAMINER: We can't see you, though. Oh. There you are.

MR. BEHM: All right. Thank you. I'm so sorry. And my answer was yes, ma'am, to the --

THE HEARING EXAMINER: Wow. Okay.
Everyone but me disappeared from the screen.
MR. ZIMSKY: I can see Adam, Madame Examiner, and Mr. Behm.

THE HEARING EXAMINER: Okay. So all I
see are gray boxes for all of you, who I had been seeing, which doesn't trouble me that much, except insofar as it indicates there's still some potential connectivity issues.

But, Mr. Behm if I could just hear you say for the transcript that you will swear or affirm to tell the truth.

WHEREUPON,
EDDIE BEHM,
called as a witness and having been first duly sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. ZIMSKY:
Q And, Mr. Behm, could you spell your name for the court reporter.

A $\quad E-D-D-I-E, B-E-H-M$.
Q Thank you. And you have your self-affirmed statement of Eddie Behm in front of you?

A Yes.
Q And are the statements in -- is the contents of your statement correct and accurate?

A Yes.
Q And the exhibits attached to your statement, Exhibit D1 through D24. Were those prepared by you or
under your supervision or from corporate records that you supervised the compilation of this data?

A Yes.
Q And are they correct and accurate, to the best of your knowledge?

A Yes.
Q And, Mr. Behm, have you ever testified before the division?

A Yes.
Q Have you been admitted as an expert in reservoir engineering?

A Yes, sir.
Q And petroleum engineering. Is that correct?
A Yes, sir.
MR. ZIMSKY: Ms. Examiner, can you hear us?

MS. SALVIDREZ: I can hear you all. I think she's having internet issues.

MR. ZIMSKY: Okay. Yeah. She sort of popped -- I can see her gray box. I'm not going to continue with this until -- that's why, you know, I didn't see her video. So $I$ thought she might still have the audio. Let's hold off and probably ask all those questions again, because I didn't notice when she left.

MS. SALVIDREZ: Yeah. Let's hold off. And she said that she turned off her camera. Let me call her. Hold on. She is calling in.
(Off the record.)
THE HEARING EXAMINER: I am now on the phone. This is Felicia Orth. Mr. Zimsky had just introduced Mr. Behm. Mr. Behm was sworn. I did hear the part where Mr. Zimsky asked Mr. Behm if he had his affidavit statement in front of him and was adopting that. But shortly after that, I could not hear anything at all.

Can you pick up from there, Mr. Zimsky?
MR. ZIMSKY: Yes, I can.
BY MR. ZIMSKY:
Q Mr. Behm, your statement. Was that prepared under your direction and your input?

A Yes.
Q Are the statements set forth -- is the text and the narrative set forth in your statement correct and accurate to the best of your knowledge?

A Yes.
Q And the exhibits that were attached to your statement, Exhibit D -- as in delta -- D1 through D24. Did you prepare those or were they prepared under your supervision and approval?

A Yes.
Q And are they correct and accurate to the best of your knowledge and belief?

A Yes.
MR. ZIMSKY: Your Honor, I would move to introduce the self-affirmed statement of Eddie Behm, Exhibit D, and his exhibits attached to Exhibit D1 through D24 -- I'd like to move that into evidence in cases 23448 through 23451 and cases 23594 through 23597 and cases 23452 through 23455 and cases 23591 through case 23601.

THE HEARING EXAMINER: All right. I'm going to pause for a moment. In the event Mr. Rankin or any other party has an objection, please just speak up. All right. The exhibits are admitted. Thank you, Mr. Zimsky.
(Exhibit D was marked for identification and received into evidence.)

BY MR. ZIMSKY:
Q Mr. Behm, have you ever testified before the Oil Conservation Division of New Mexico?

A Yes.
Q And have you been recognized as an expert in petroleum engineering and petroleum reservoir

Page 11
engineering?
A Yes.
MR. ZIMSKY: Madame Examiner, I would proffer Mr. Behm as an expert in petroleum engineering and reservoir engineering.

THE HEARING EXAMINER: All right. I'm going to pause for a moment in the event any other party has an objection. Please speak up if you do. He is recognized, Mr. Zimsky. Thank you. BY MR. ZIMSKY:

Q Okay, Mr. Behm. We're going to go -- as we've agreed to do the procedure, I'm going to go into your direct testimony, your statement, and exhibits. But we will go back to them in response to -- we're going to look at -- is it Fechtel? Is that his name?

THE WITNESS: Adam, can you help me out with that pronunciation.

MR. RANKIN: Sorry. It's Fechtel.
MR. ZIMSKY: Fechtel?
MR. RANKIN: Fechtel.
MR. ZIMSKY: Fechtel. Okay.
BY MR. ZIMSKY:
Q Mr. Behm, have you looked at the engineering exhibits F2 through F8 that Permian Resources has submitted in this case?

A Yes. I -- I have.
Q Okay. I'm going to go through some of those exhibits and ask you some questions about that. I'm going to first share --

MR. ZIMSKY: Madame Examiner, will you
be able to see the shared --
THE HEARING EXAMINER: I will not.
Until I get full internet access back -- and I will keep trying -- $I$ won't be able to see it. But $I$ can see exhibits which I have downloaded onto my computer. If you just make sure to reference the exhibit number in the page.

MR. ZIMSKY: I will do that.
BY MR. ZIMSKY:
Q And right now I'm sharing -- or I think I'm sharing the Exhibit F2, Mr. Behm. Do you use that?

A Yes, sir.
Q Okay. And I wanted to direct your attention to, on the right-hand side, number one. It talks about -- I guess it's area number one. Now, were you here when Ms. Mueller testified about the little bear wells that are referred to here at the bottom?

A Yes.
Q Do you recall what she testified to as far as what formation they were completed in and producing
from?
A Yes.
Q And you recall what she said?
A Yes. This -- this looks more like a Wolfcamp plastic and then a Wolfcamp A landing when we look at this. One of the challenges is we're all using public data. So this is an area we have good control, and we're confident in where those wells are. But everybody's doing the best they can with public data.

Q And when you say control, what do you mean by control?

A Different companies will have access to different density of logs in different locations. So where you have lots of logs, it's very easy to tell where wells are landed. Where you don't have good log control, it can be more difficult to correctly place a landing zone.

Q And you have good control in the area where little bear is being developed?

A Yes.
Q And little bear covers the south half of section 28 , west half of section 34 , and all of section 33 in the same township and range as the subject lands; correct?

A Yes.
Q Okay. And now, I want to ask you a question about conchos moss federals. In here, it says it's a third Bone Spring co-developed with Wolfcamp in two well pairs, which development delayed by more than a year in the case of moss federals.

Do you have any comment about that statement?

A Not particularly. Staci could speak to landings better than me for the moss federal. What we have here was the little bear.

Q And the moss federal. You would agree that the proration unit for each of them, each of those wells, is -- they're not stacked. In other words, there's not a third Bone Spring -- Wolfcamp below a third Bone Spring in the same proration unit.

A Well, yes.
Q So it's what you would call a flat development?

A The -- the risk of vertical interference would -- would not be as high as being directly -directly stacked.

Q Okay. And I'm going to go to F3. Now, on the right-hand corner, there's a chart that shows -it has four different colors with third Bone Spring in
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area of high quality. Wolfcamp. Wolfcamp in area of high quality. Wolfcamp. Third Bone Spring in the red. Area of low quality, Wolfcamp. And the darker blue is the Wolfcamp in area of low quality Wolfcamp. Do you have any comments about this slide?

A One of the challenges here is the -- the plots are -- are broken out by landing zone. So the -- the COG development in area one we show as Wolfcamp without -- without third sand landings. So that's -- that suggest pull the averages down on the red and blue lines.

The -- the other thing, as far as quality goes -- while there is improved PH, the Mighty Pheasant in both the third and the Wolfcamp -- PH is porosity times height. So what we're talking about here is how to best access what we view as a single reservoir. And the height difference between these areas is 300 feet versus 345 .

And this might be better covered by Staci, but her exhibits B6 and B20 show those thicknesses. So for us, comparing these areas and how to best access them with -- with a fracture and -- and landing pattern, we would view them as very similar for -- for the target reservoir.

Q Now, I'm going to share Exhibit F4. And on
the left-hand side, it's matador Verna Rae. Do you see that?

A Yes, sir.
Q And the commentary at the bottom is immediately offset of Joker Bane -- are examples of successful co-development on third bum spring at Wolfcamp at the exact same spacing and targeting that Permian Resources has proposed in Joker Bane.

Now, do you have any comments regarding -in paragraph 9 of his statement, he states of both the Verna Rae 134 H and the Verna Rae 204 H are extremely strong. The Verna Rae 133 H , however, does not directly wine rack with the wolf camp A well. Is a poor performer.

The Verna Rae results suggest that co-developing the Bone spring and Wolfcamp A wells together results in better long-term performance and higher cumulative oil production than producing third Bone springs well alone. Now, do you have any opinion regarding Mr. Fechtel's characterization of production from the Rae wells and the conclusion he draws from that production?

A The -- the characterization of production is fine. Those are good wells. The -- the concern I have is they're edge wells and not in a full
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development.
And additionally, they're -- they're a frac test, so there is significant fluid and sand put into those two edge wells, which lease line the joker.

Would it be better if I shared the exhibit? Can you see Exhibit D13 -- my testimony. It would be -- on PDF, it would be page 248.

Q Okay. I will pop that up.
A Or $I$ can share too. Are you able to see my screen?

Q Yes.
A Okay. So what I've called out here is the purple and green wells -- are the wells referred to. A lease line, the Mighty Pheasant, sections 5 and 8, the acreage we're talking about today. And what stands out to me is this is a frac test.

What I mean by that is, this is a significant amount of energy to put into the ground in this area. That's important on edge wells, because you can go grab reservoir beyond what you would be able to access in a bounded environment, in my opinion. I think that could have a significant overprint on -- on how two wells might perform versus a full development.

Q Now, can you explain what you mean by a
bounded well or bounded development?
A I've got a map up here. It's probably really hard to see. But if you look at where the wells are located, there are no competing well bores in the acreage we're talking about today.

Neither of us have drilled a third sand or a Wolfcamp. So that means these wells are able to access whatever this frac is able to touch. So to me, some of this overperformance is coming from within our section. This is lease line depletion as well.

Q And on Exhibit 4, there's also some discussion -- let me share F4 again. And do you see F4?

A Yes.
Q On the right-hand side. It talks about Batman well. And you have any opinion regarding his -- line 15 of paragraph 9 of his statement. He states, early time production from Permian Resources Batman development corroborates this observation. The production profile and cumulative production were co-developed third Bone Spring and Wolfcamp A wells in the Batman unit. Show these wells are outperforming third Bone Spring wells and they're developed alone.

Now, do you have any -- and then in Exhibit

F8, he also talks about the Batman well in the lower left-hand corner in the left-hand side. And I guess the whole exhibit is Batman. Do you have any opinion regarding his characterizations of production from the Batman wells and unit and then the conclusion he draws from that production?

A The performance from the wells early time and rates is -- is very good. But early time rate does not equal reserves.

Q Do you have Exhibit D17? Can you share that?

A Oh, yes.
Q And continue with your description of your opinion about the Batman production.

A This -- this is one thing -- is not -- I'm not the operator of this. But one thing I would be curious to check -- and it could not mean anything. It's just there's a significant shift in water cut and GOR right around when it looks like maybe an upset occurs.

And that -- that would be something I would check on my wells, just because both of these water cut and GOR oil productions and input into that. Just to make sure the allocation is -- is correct.

The other thing that I'm looking at here
is -- in terms of acceleration, the west half should be cleaning up maybe a little bit faster than the east half. I'd be curious how these wells perform with more data. Maybe once ESPs are installed and we're able to see some decline to verify reserves.

Q And ESP is the --
A Electric submersible pump. And the reason that's important is to get good drawdown on the wells. Early time when -- when wells are drilled, if I've got more wells in an area, I could accelerate production, 'cause I'm able to drawn down the reservoir a little quicker, 'cause the wells are closer together. My concern is late time, does that -- does that early time performance correlate to additional reserves?

Q Based on this data, is it 50 days of production?

A It's -- yeah. It's a little past 50. They'll have more. This is what we got last week. But you need to see more of the well before reserves would be a confident number in -- in my opinion.

Q In your opinion, how long would that take to be able to make a calculation that you would deem to be reliable as far as estimated ultimate recovery?

A I would get more comfortable throughout time that I -- I would want to see the -- the wells on
decline post-ESP install. So that might be six months, seven months of data to start having an opinion and then maybe out to a year or more to -- to start gaining some more confidence in that opinion.

And -- and what I'm showing here is Exhibit D15. And -- and again, they'll have some more data. I'm just showing these versus some of the other developments in the area. And -- and what I'm looking for here is, does this trend continue long-term, or do these wind up being more similar later out in time? If that makes sense.

Q No. That does make sense. Now, in the rebuttal exhibits -- if $I$ can find my cursor. I'm going to share Exhibit -- believe it is A15. Apologize for the delay here. Let's go back to D15 that you were just showing.

And so the purpose of D 15 is to show production from the Batman compared to these other wells?

A Yes. And -- and this is the average well oil per foot per day versus on the $X$ axis. And what you're looking for here is -- this is like a -- a capital efficiency plot. If you're doing well and capital efficiency space, you'll be at the top.

And what $I$ mean by that is, you're "cumeing"
lots of oil out of your wells. If you can "cume" as much oil as somebody else who's drilled additional wells with less well count, then your project is more profitable than somebody -- than a different development that was executed.

So I've called out some different
developments on here. The Reed and Stevens North Lea. This is adjacent to the Loosey Goosey Acreage at four wells per section or four wells in the section. And -- and we model that as an excellent third sand development that is -- is one -- one of the better developments in the area.

Q Okay. Now, going back to Exhibit F4, in paragraph -- statement in Exhibit F4. And Exhibits F2 and F3. He asserts that co-development of the third Bone Springs and Wolfcamp A is the optimum development tactic with respect to the subject lands.

Do you have an opinion regarding this claim about co-development of the third spring in Wolfcamp $A$ as being the optimal tactic for developing the subject lands?

A The black and tan to me is a very important development, because $I$ don't have to rely on edge wells, and $I$ can see significant density drilled in -in one location. And that's important to a reservoir
engineer to understand if the entire tank has been accessed or not. But that's part of why that features so heavily in -- in my slides -- is to me, it's the best example there is.

Q And in the rebuttal exhibits, they claim that the black and tan is not analogous. Let me get that --

MR. RANKIN: Objection to the question, Madame Examiner. Mr. Zimsky is listing testimony on your rebuttal exhibits to which we have not yet offered any testimony. This is surrebuttal, and I don't think it's appropriate, number one, for Cimarex to offer surrebuttal without leads. Number two, we haven't even testified on that yet.

THE HEARING EXAMINER: Right.
Mr. Zimsky, I think we had an earlier agreement about the fact that this would be divided kind of into two parts.

MR. ZIMSKY: Okay. And I think I
emailed Mr. Rankin last night about Mr. Behm going through the Exhibit $K$. But if he wants us to call Mr. Behm back, we can just do that.

THE HEARING EXAMINER: All right.
Thank you.
/ /

BY MR. ZIMSKY:
Q And, Mr. Behm, can you explain a little bit more detail why you believe the black and tan is analogous to the subject lands?

A When I'm talking about analogous, some of the things I'm looking at are -- if I were to look at Staci's exhibit, B6, B20, I've got a similar thickness of target. What appears to be predominantly driven by the -- the sands, which would have better flow properties.

We believe they contribute significantly more than -- than the A shell down below, which -which neither company is proposing the land in. What I'm looking at there is it's an interesting test, because six wells were drilled targeting just the third sand.

So you're able to see -- what does a single landing look like versus additional well bores? And then after that, it is underfilled with significant Wolfcamp development. And when -- when I look at that project, it's tough to see a benefit in reserves for the additional five wells targeting the Wolfcamp.

And -- and that's important, because if reserves were missed by not landing in the Wolfcamp, I would expect to see incremental barrels show up on the
wells landed in the -- on the new wells landed in the Wolfcamp.

Q So now, you were here when Mr. Rankin was asking Ms. Mueller about the difference is the PH between the subject lands being about an average of ten, $I$ recall, and the black and tan being average of seven.

Do you have any comment about that difference? Does that make it less analogous or more or -- what's your opinion about -- does that affect the comparison between black and tan and the subject lands?

A Black and -- the -- the subject lands might outperform black and tan due to having some more PH. But for me, when it comes to landings and targeting the reservoir, I have a -- a 300 foot of pay example that appears to have been entirely accessed with the flat landing versus a 345 foot pay interval, but without any barriers in either location. My assumption is that the additional 45 feet will not require a double well count.

Q The additional 40 feet in the subject lands is not enough to justify a Wolfcamp --

A Another landing zone. Yes, sir. I think -I think we'll -- we'll get the existing barrels
with -- with the landings for both.
Q And now, the black and tan has 11 wells per section. And the Permian Resources proposal has 8 per section. Is the density a factor in -- does that make it affect the analogous -- the use of the black and tan as an analogous development?

A Density on projects that've been drilled denser than what has been -- what has been proposed -that's very useful for setting some upper bounds on what you think you're going to be able to access at your analog target.

So if 11 wells -- and one of the wells never recovers after the frac underneath, so it's 10 wells later in time and 11 to start. But if 11 wells don't access additional barrels in a stagger, I would not expect 8 or some lower well count to -- to add additional barrels.

Does that make sense? 'Cause there's more frac energy placed at a higher well count throughout the section, which appeared to offer a negligible return. So doing less frac energy with less wells should probably achieve a similar result.

Q And how about the sequencing? Did they drill the third sand wells first, and then they drilled the Wolfcamp wells? Does that have an effect
on whether this is a -- black and tan is a good analogous situation?

A I -- I would expect sequencing to -- to make degradation a little bit worse, but I would not expect it to -- to look like negligible barrels. And I guess what I'm trying to say there is -- is it's odd to me to go add another landing and not see a material improvement in recovery. That -- that tells me that that was one tank that was largely accessed initially in time.

Q And what happened to the production from the third sand wells when the Wolfcamp wells were completed? I think that's your Exhibit D6 maybe.

A Yeah. Exhibit D7 is my post. I can share that.

Q Yeah. Please.
A Everyone knows which -- this is page 242 as well.

Q Okay. Can you explain this? This is part of your black and tan analogous situation in response to, you know, my question about whether the optimal tactic for developing the subject lands is claimed by the engineer for Permian Resources as the optimum tactic. And so with black and tan, you're using it as an analogous situation.

So can you, you know, further explain what happened here and --

A Yes. On Exhibit D6, what I'm doing is I've got stable production I'm forecasting a decline through. There is some offset frac impact here. And then additional, on the OCD records, these wells were all drilled in a row.

So what that means is when I come back to drill within the same row, what operators will do sometimes is they will cut their casing and lower it below grade so it's out of the way of the drilling rig for, like, safety.

There -- there are operational issues in here impacting production, but this is my best estimate for what this project would've done had no additional wells been added. D7 --

Q I have a question. Now, in 2019, there seems to be like, a dip in the production vis-a-vis your prediction, I guess. Your forecast. Can you explain what that difference is, what generated that difference?

A There -- there is an offset frac nearby. One of the things we do is if we have ESPs down a hole, we might go change lift if we're worried about getting hit.

Additionally, you might be expanding your battery, doing some additional work to be able to bring those wells on. So you can have some -- some runtime and operations over print. And then, what I was talking about earlier was before these wells are drilled, based off the filings on the OCD, going off public data, it looks like a request is made to drop the well heads below grades so you can have your tree and all your pressurized equipment below ground.

So that means you'd have to shut in your wells and -- and go work on them as well. So there is an operational overprint, in my opinion, on this -- on this data here. But prior to that, I feel fairly good about this forecast being an accurate assessment of the barrels touched by these wells prior to the Wolfcamp wells.

Q Now, the black and tan P 02 H last produced in May of 2020 -- it was permanently abandoned in August of 2022. Does that have any effect upon using the black and tan as an analogous development?

A I -- I don't believe so. To me, it would highlight the risks that you would have if you came in and landed -- the 402 has landed very close to the 302. If you come in and underfill that close together, you would have more well bore risk at that
density.
So that -- so that would be an operational risk if somebody did third and then came right back in underneath and did the very top of the Wolfcamp. But -- but as far as analog goes, it's -- it's 11 wells. At the end, it's 10. That's still a very good end point for what may be maximum recovery target or a -- a total reservoir should be able to produce.

Q Now, Exhibit D12, I think, is your parry results. If you can share D12 with us. And could you explain how this supports your contention that the -rebutting Mr. Fechtel's claim regarding the co-development of third spring in Wolfcamp?

A In our position, it's not that there's no oil in the Wolfcamp. It's that the majority of the oil appears to be best accessed by the third sand. So for me, fracs had improved over time as operators have learned by executing.

And the -- the blue well, which is the third sand landing -- this is very old, vintage frac. This is 478 pounds per foot. That's very small. 2,000 pounds per foot. 2500 pounds per foot. Those are more normal fracs with a modern slick water completion.
And -- and this is an important edge well
comparison for us, because this Wolfcamp A landing down in the top of the $A 1$, despite having significantly better frac applied to it, more energy, more clusters, which you would expect to outperform a legacy frac, appears to not be any better. So if -if the choice is which landing zone do you target with a flat development, to us, this strongly supports third sand as the optimum landing.

Q Now, the paloma 214 H well was drilled maybe 5,000 feet or 5100 feet west of the parry 221A12?

A It's -- it's a lease line well offsetting the parry 4 H at about 760 feet. So a little looser than a permeance proposed spacing.

Q And did the production from the paloma have any effect on the parry wells, to your knowledge?

A I -- I don't believe so. FDIs will happen, and that's a fracture-driven interaction. When we put a lot of energy into the ground and we're producing on primary, you can get some short-term rate benefits on your wells. And then what's important to look at is -- is the decline afterwards.

When I look at these two wells, I could pretend the -- the lease line was not there, and I was choosing between drilling either the paloma or the parry 4H. I -- I would choose one of those wells.
'Cause to me, this -- that'd be another example where you see some significant interference once there's two wells there that are able to interact and fight for the barrels that they're both accessing.

Q And so the parry wells are -- are they an example of -- you talked about no edge?

A Yes. I would not apply this prediction to a -- a significantly denser development. As you add boundaries to the wells, the performance will change if -- if -- as you over space, it will change more, which will show up as steeper and steeper decline after the initial acceleration benefit of having more wells.

Q Now, if you could share Exhibit D14. And does this support your contention that third Bone Spring development in the subject lands is the optimal method to produce hydrocarbons of the subject lands?

A In my opinion, it does. The way I look at these plots, is I'm looking at the project oil normalized for length that's been "cumed" versus time. And if I drill additional wells, you can accelerate barrels, because you're spreading pressure drop out in the reservoir faster. I'm looking further out in time.

> Am I seeing a long-term reserves benefit
where new barrels touch, or is it primarily acceleration? And -- and so I look at for wells per section developments -- like the -- the purple, which is adjacent to the loosey-goosy with four wells per section -- as very competitive versus some of these denser developments.

It's six or eight wells per section. And so instead of drilling additional wells in something that looks like it's already been contacted, we would go drill additional wells to add new reserves in a different bench that doesn't look like it's been accessed.

Q And the black and tan Wolfcamp are graphed separately than the Wolfcamp. Does that have any effect on the purpose of this block?

A Not in my opinion. This was an incremental decision made that the value of that incremental decision -- to me, I would not have drilled those wells, which -- which is -- isn't really fair, 'cause I'm looking at the results after they already happen.

So the -- the point here is this addition of barrels with the shift that you get in black and tan -- to me, I -- I would not have done a stagger there. I -- I don't think it's supported. I would rather have a -- a project like the Enverus or Reed
and Stevens, the north Lea 3 wells. That is a much more efficient use of capital in this area.

Q And Exhibit D15. Can you explain how this supports your opinion that a third Bone Spring development is the superior tactic with the subject lands?

A What I'm looking at here is I can see -- and again, what we consider the Wolfcamp landings, like the little bear. So if -- if I shift lower in the potential tank and move all my landings down in the section, is that accessing more barrels or less barrels?

That's an important test to me that says most of the oil should be located further up -- up in the column where most of these other wells are landed. And I can see the -- the four wells per section perform very well early time. Again, there's some acceleration benefit from drilling additional wells. But I -- I don't see that maintaining over the life of -- of the well.

Q And at D16.
A What I'm looking at here is I've got wells that have been on for a long time. And -- and the way this works is, when we drill wells, you -- you don't make any money off of IP. And you have to recover
your initial investment.
So we can see some of these denser projects do have higher IPs. What I'm looking at is the long-term slope of this line. And what we're doing here is if a project came on in two steps, we -- we are normalizing that, and it's just producing days times well count.

So what I'm looking at here is, if I have a nice, flat profile, that well further out will access more EUR. It should "cume" more at project level. If I get a high IP and I've got a steeper decline, to me, that's -- I've got some rate benefit, and my production guys did a good job accelerating some production.

But in aggregate, the EUR of the project did not increase with the wells. So -- so I'm looking at wells like the Reed and Stevens, again, which is adjacent to the subject lands at four wells per section. And I see a nice, flat profile on that. The initial IP is not as high, but the reserves access by that project are -- are comparable to the denser developments, in my opinion.

Q In this Exhibit D16, did you merge the daily and monthly production?

A Well, I have the daily production that was
provided for the Batman. This is rate per foot versus "cume" for the project.

Q And could that be misleading, you using the daily and the monthly, mixing them in this chart?

A I don't -- I don't believe so. This -- this
is a standard way we look at a lot of our developments when we're assessing spacing and whether something's acceleration or additional reserves.

Q Now, I'm going to direct your attention to paragraph 10 of his statement. And talking about the results. Strongly supports the conclusion that co-developing the third Bone Spring in Wolfcamp A in this acreage with thicker, higher quality Wolfcamp A rod is necessary to recover incremental reserves that would otherwise risk being left unproduced if this acreage -- I think there's a missing line, at least on the PDF I had.

Do you have an opinion as to whether the incremental reserves that your Cimarex proposal would -- is at risk of not producing by just using a third Bone Spring well?

A I believe it's minimal, based off the whole development result that we looked at with black and tan and the third sand. I expect to capture the majority of economic barrels. So I -- I would
disagree with that.
Q And if we could go to your Exhibit D9. If you could share that.

A Are you able to see my screen, Bill?
Q Yes. I want to look at the table 1.0. And the bottom line. Estimated ultimate recovery and then BO. Third sand. And then you have the column under Wolfcamp plus 089. Can you explain what that -- does that mean you're going to recover -- what does that mean as far as your Wolfcamp recovery?

A What I'm doing here is I'm trying to summarize the prior three exhibits of forecasts into hopefully a more digestible table. So initially, the third Bone Springs had a high IP. It wasn't competing with other wells landed in the Wolfcamp. Then Wolfcamp wells were added.

Competition begins, and I see a decrease in -- in the third sand. If I look at the EUR on the Wolfcamps, to me, the -- the barrels that are coming out of the Wolfcamp wells look roughly equivalent to the barrels that are coming out of the third sand.

So for me, that says this is likely a single tank, as Staci Mueller testified to yesterday. And so the question is: Where do you best put your wells in that single reservoir to most efficiently access all
the barrels?
Q And in Exhibit D11, you indicate that in the bullet point to the right of table 1.3, in order create equivalent PV10, Wolfcamp landings must add approximately 40 percent more reserves versus the reserve estimate in table 1.3 and 31 percent more reserves versus P50 expectation in table 1.4.

Now, what's your opinion, whether you could get those extra 40 percent more reserves if you drilled -- you co-developed this with the Wolfcamp wells?

A The intent of this is a sensitivity around that, so $I$ have black and tan with a full development that in my opinion, added negligible uplift. Different reservoir engineers will forecast things differently. This is a sensitivity showing exactly how much do I need to produce in full development mode to -- to just break even on that extra capital I've put in the ground?

So -- so for me, given I've got 0 percent, in my opinion, at black and tan, getting 30 to -- to 40 percent just to break even seems low probability and high risk in -- in my opinion.

Q Now, going back to Exhibit D9 where you have that in the bottom and the table 1.0 estimated
ultimate recovery under the Wolfcamp, the bottom 0.89 . Could you use that to justify drilling the Wolfcamp? Would that mean the Wolfcamp recovery would be an extra, you know, 40 barrels a foot?

A That would say across all the wells drilled, those barrels that $I$ believe were already contacted by third sand would now be redistributed to the Wolfcamp. So -- so for paying out wells and supporting development, it's important to touch new barrels and additional reserves. So I -- I would say this example says absolutely do not stagger in the Wolfcamp and expect to pay out those wells.

Q Okay. And you remember testimony yesterday with -- or I guess Mr. Coffman. And I'm going to share from hearing packet 4, Exhibit A3. Let me share that. There was some questioning about that. And can you see the letter that's dated June 15, 2023?

A Yes.
Q Okay. And I want to go into the second paragraph. Is that highlighted?

A Yes, sir.
Q That sentence there.
A Yeah.
Q Okay. And the fourth line of the highlight says the wells -- which as proposed, the Bone Spring
wells -- and quote, will produce the primary concentrations of hydrocarbons in the Wolfcamp, those being in the upper Wolfcamp. And Cimarex believes that they will do so more optimally, given their current location within the third Bone Spring, than if additional unnecessary wells were drilled in the Wolfcamp itself.

How do you interpret that language? Does that mean that the Bone Spring -- let me rephrase that. The Bone Spring wells that you're proposing. What's the breakdown between production between what you have estimated production between Bone Spring and Wolfcamp?

A We would expect close to three quarters of the production to be coming from the third sand. So the majority of the barrels captured by the well are from the third sand.

Q And would those Bone Spring wells capture most of the Wolfcamp hydrocarbons in the sand?

A Within the sands, based off the -- the full analog development that we have -- so that'd be the XY and then the aggregate third sand -- I would expect the -- the Wolfcamp XY to have been captured largely by that third sand landing.

Q And so how do you read this sentence? Do
you interpret this to mean that these Bone Spring wells will be -- most of the production will be coming from the Wolfcamp or that they will get most of the hydrocarbons in the Wolfcamp?

A They will get most of the hydrocarbons in the Wolfcamp. I do think this could've been worded a little bit better to make that more clear.

Q Thank you. And going back to the paragraph 10 of this statement. He states that Cimarex's plan will particularly impair the correlative rights of owners, including Reed and Stevens, who own a greater share of interest in the Wolfcamp. Will only own in the Wolfcamp.

Do you have an opinion as to whether that statement about protecting relative rights is correct?

A From a -- a sensitivity standpoint, the purposes of some additional exhibits we made were to try to quantify that risk and where that would be true. So that is Exhibit B20. And in our opinion, we wanted to solve for all the possible land combinations you can have to make sure this was a win for everybody. And I don't know if I should share that.

Q Yeah. Why don't you share it.
A Let's find it. So again, we see it as a single batch target or single landing target. And
what we're doing here is we're trying to quantify -well, how bad of an imbalance do you have to do before -- you would lose out on the competing proposed plan.

And I've got the two worst acreage imbalances highlighted in this table just to show that -- and to be fair, this is our model. This is what we expect to happen. It shows that as long as my acreage imbalance isn't close to six where it would be very similar proposals, in terms of money and -- and PV10 made, the Cimarex plan would outperform despite the imbalance.

Q And so you have specific examples, I think, in Exhibit D21?

A Yes. Yes. So we're -- we're solving for the -- the worst imbalance in each acreage block just to show that in order to money PV10 made, there's -we see a significant benefit in not drilling two wells within the proration unit. And -- and that shows up as additional PV10 under our plan.

Q And when you were calculating the PV10, can you go to Exhibit D18?

A Yes.
Q And you were using what's June current costs for those figures?

A Yes.
Q And what was the reason you used those instead of the older costs from --

A Our June costs were higher. The AFEs that companies create through time are a function of the contracts that they have at that time. This reflects our current update for AFEs specifically in this area.

So we -- we would propose this at these costs today. And -- and the reason for that is there's a significant delta between the two capitals proposed, and I wanted to make sure we had our most accurate updated cost available to compare the differences in those two numbers.

Q And when you were making those PV10 calculations, you explained that in your testimony, I think, at paragraphs 55 and 56 -- just refer to that in case there's questioning on that. Now, can we go down to maybe -- and can you define the significant delta cost between the delta cost -- the cost between what Cimarex is proposing and Permian Resources?

A So our most current cost estimates put full development cost at $148,000,000$ per 1280 at $148,000,000$ per 1280 developed. The equivalent 1280 would be 269,000,000. I do not have permeance current June cost, so I've got a question mark there. This is
their February and March AFE cost that -- that were provided.

Q Yeah. But if we were just comparing the third Bone Spring under Permian under your plan, that would be $37,000,000$, $I$ believe, and third Bone Spring and Wolfcamp, which is in red -- that's 92,000,000; correct?

A Yes. And -- and the red are the landing zones. We don't -- we would not drill. We don't recommend those at this time, if that helps.

Q Yes. Okay. Can we go to -- I believe it's D22? Okay. And D21 was a comparison between Might Pheasant and Joker. Now, can you explain what this comparison is?

A Yeah. This is in our -- the Loosey Goosey bane lease. We have a -- a single imbalance that -that does not favor our proposed plan. But that imbalance is -- is very close together. It's a 1.37 ratio of Wolfcamp interest to Bone Spring interest. So -- so for this one owner, we would model significantly more $P V$ by not overdrilling the section.

Q And so looking at the PV10, can you explain, you know, in layman's terms? PV10. Is that something that you use in decision making at the company to decide whether to develop certain lands or formations?

A ATAX PV10 or after tax present value discounted at 10 percent would be a common metric that -- that most companies would look at.

Q And so in determining that, Cotera, like any other company, has a finite amount of resources to spend on development; correct?

A Correct.
Q And do you allocate that when somebody wants to develop an area subject lands to get approval from whoever's in charge of handing out the capital? Do you make a presentation on PV10 estimates for the development?

A Yes. That is one of the numbers provided.
Q And now, let's go to paragraph number 11 of this statement. While Reed and Stevens in Permian have undertaken a thoughtful, analytical approach to testing and planning its development in this acreage with flexibility built into its proposal to quickly respond to updated data and analysis, Cimarex has not demonstrated a similar level of planning or analysis in its development in this area to date or in the competing proposal.

Do you have any evidence that Cimarex has demonstrated a thoughtful analytical approach to testing and planning?

A Our approach would be to see if there's offset tests. If somebody else has deployed capital to re-risk something, looking at those results rather than risking your own capital to see if that can get you to maybe the same conclusions would be our first step there. The other piece of this, the flexibility built into its proposal. Let me find the reference.

The APD extensions of the process for that is kind of changed where you're no longer -- the two-year extension you used to be able to get is no longer kind of a given. So instead of permitting everything, what we do is we look really hard at the next two years for what we're sure we're going to execute, and we will permit that development. And then, the plan is to turn in additional permits every year.

Q And are you referring to BLM -- instruction memorandum IM --

A Yes. Thank you. I'm sorry. I couldn't remember the number.

Q We shouldn't talk over each other. But BLM IM 2023-011. Is that what you were referring to?

A Yes.
Q And so explain. So the BLM is no longer granting these extensions as they used to as a matter
of routine?
A Yes.
Q Now, with respect to his statement that you haven't demonstrated similar level of planning and analysis in this area, could you bring up Exhibit D1? Okay. And can you explain what this is?

A This is the top 15 operators in Lea County. This is your average per well, a 12-month queue. And BOE for 1,000 foot. So -- so there are differences in -- in where you own acreage that can be an overprint on this data. But our activity over the last five years is -- is very good compared to the top operators in the county.

Q And so this is the -- Enverus. That's a company that they track production data in New Mexico and Texas?

A Public data. Yes. You'll commonly see them referenced in investor presentations where people are comparing large sets of public data.

Q And can you go to Exhibit D2.
A This is the same plot in average. But this is oil instead of BOE for 1,000 foot. But again, we -- we compare favorably with -- with all our peers.

Q And now, the $X$ axis is on the left; right?
A The $X$ axis is on the bottom, and that would
be your lateral length. So this is showing, what length wells do you normally drill on average? So this can be a blend of 1 miles and 2 miles. Or like, occidental out here would be primarily 2 -mile wells, 'cause they're close to 9500 feet. The Y axis is your "cume" per well.

Q So the higher you are on the $Y$ axis, the better?

A Yes. In -- in first-year "cume."
Q Okay. And the same goes with Exhibit D1?
A Yes, sir.
Q Now, do you believe this reflects a thoughtful and analytical approach to testing and planning development in Lea County by Cotera Cimarex?

A Yes, sir.
Q Now, I'm going to show Exhibit F5. Do you see that?

A Yes.
Q And it talks about the Lea 7 federal unit. And his commentary is about improper sequencing and destroyed value. And he points to the Lea 7. Can you explain the Lea 7 to the hearing examiner?

A Yes. That is a black swan event. And what I mean by that was that it is a bad event that happened where we lost the well. We -- we got frac
hit, so that would be the sequencing comment. And then, the sand wedged our ESP down, and we were unable to retrieve it.

After this happened, we changed our procedures throughout Permian for what to do when you're being offset frac with an ESP in the hole as well as some casing design changes. So we changed all our operations practices and some of our well bore design around this single event, and it has not happened since.

Q I'm going to show F6. Operator activity. Says drilled one well in five years. Can you discuss Cimarex's activities in the area of interest over the past five years?

A Over the past five years, we have not been as active up here. We were -- we were an early play delineator and drilled a lot of the -- the blocked up acreage that we were able to drill early between 2010 and -- and 2016.

But the -- the well drilled was the single 2-mile location we have that was not impacted by a hearing or the federal unit issue that we're working to resolve. So it -- we can drill acreage that's set up and ready to go, but we're still working to get that federal set up and obviously to resolve the
hearing.
Q And so could you explain a little bit about the federal unit that's causing the delay in some development?

A We're not the designated operator of it. So what we have to do is we have to dissolve that and then create a new one. Our goal there is to try to develop the half township to the north with a single facility under that federal unit. But -- but we're not allowed to drill through lands that are part of an existing unit that we're not the designated operator of, so that is delaying things.

Q And you obviously proposed this development, but we're in the hearing because there's a competing application; correct?

A Yes.
Q Okay. Is Cimarex in any other hearings that they're proposing to develop wells, but subject to the OCD's decision on competing development proposals?

A We have the show biz development and then some additional trades working in the area, just trying to resolve issues. So we have drillable well bores.

Q And in Exhibit $F 6$, on the third bullet point. Permanently abandon one horizontal producing
for just seven months. Can you respond to that?
A Yes. That is the -- the Lea well that we touched on earlier. That -- that was a bad well result for losing the well bore. But we have changed our operational practices off that single occurrence to ensure that that doesn't happen again.

Q And in 2020 and 2021, did economic conditions have any -- was there a general slowdown of capital expenditures in the basin during that time period?

A Yes. Everyone slowed down in 2020 and 2021.
Q And why was that?
A Price crash and pandemic.
Q Now, in the fourth bullet point. Not tested to co-development of the third Bone Spring in Wolfcamp A. Can you respond to that? Why haven't you done that?

A We believe we have enough to make our development decision without executing a test from the surrounding wells. 'Cause -- 'cause we have lots of production data.

Q And so you have production data that you haven't risked any capital to accumulate?

A Yes.
Q Is that a reasonable financial risk analysis
management?
A Yes.
Q Now, HF2S2. Now, that's a study that's 43, 44 miles to the south. You've used that, I believe, in some of your testimony. Is that some of the data that you're relying upon?

A For our assumptions about fracs, yes.
Q And the fact that it's 44 miles away. Does that have any -- make it less useful, or does it have an effect on the use?

A Not in my opinion. Things that apply in tighter -- may be more heterogeneous rock -- I would expect to apply in places where we don't have a -- a baffle and -- and maybe on higher perm sands, in my opinion.

Q So relying on that data is -- are you misplacing reliance by relying on that data?

A I don't believe so.
Q Does the fact that it's in Texas have any difference?

A No. No, sir.
Q And does it include third Bone Spring development?

A No. It -- it does not.
Q And does that have an effect on whether you
should use that data?
A The -- the -- I -- no. It does not. The -the depletion that you see in third sand without any wells landed into it gives us some ideas about height that can be successfully accessed. So the fact that there is third sand depletion with no wells landed in -- we feel supports a single landing for the subject land.

MR. ZIMSKY: Madame Examiner, can you give me a few minutes to look through my notes to see if I have any more questions?

THE HEARING EXAMINER: All right. BY MR. ZIMSKY:

Q Mr. Behm, there was some questioning of Ms. Mueller by Mr. Rankin about 5 H porosity times height and whether there's -- the pours that are present -- could be a lot of pours present, but you don't know if it's water or oil or a mix or hydrocarbons.

And you're relying upon the $P H$ for some of your projects here on reserves and EUR and other estimates for the development of the subject lands. Can you speak to that, whether using porosity times height is a valid metric or basis to predict reserves in production?

A I -- I believe it's valid. It represents your total storage, your pore space that you're accessing with your wells. And then uniquely in this area, as you head to the northeast, you can see your water cuts decreasing in wells like the third sand.

And while we don't have a side wall core maybe from within the subject lands, there's a wealth of production data that shows improving third sand water cuts as you move up the high porosity channel that Staci identified in her exhibits. And lower water cuts moving up structure. Water cuts indicative of oil saturation. So that -- that's an important aspect to the area as well.

Q You have high-level mapping of the basin that indicates areas that have good third sand and good Wolfcamp. This particular -- do you develop all the Wolfcamp and any high-level outline of -- which you chose a high level of good in Wolfcamp.

Does that mean you developed the Wolfcamp in every and all the lands you own within that -- where you think the Wolfcamp is good, or is it more on a case-by-case basis?

A It would be case-by-case basis. So picking the correct landing zone plus spacing plus well configuration for how you're completing your wells --
getting those three things right are very important for development throughout the county.

Q And when you frac in -- if you drill the Wolfcamp in the subject lands and you fracked it, do the fracs tend to emanate vertically towards the surface more so than downward?

A Frac would go up in my opinion.
Q So if you drilled the Wolfcamp in this area, specific to this geological characteristics, a Wolfcamp well drilled in the subject lands would -the frac would go up and capture a lot of bone -- or third sand reserves; is that correct?

A Yes.
Q Earlier in your testimony, you talked about -- sometimes it's hard if you didn't have all the data -- if you're only using public data, sometimes it's hard to determine whether a well is third sand or Wolfcamp; correct?

A Yes.
Q So there could be some differences of opinion between Permian Resources and Cimarex as to some of those wells that you identified in Exhibit D4, whether they're -- and I guess Exhibit D24, whether they're third Bone Spring or Wolfcamp?

A Yes.


Officer.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. RANKIN:
Q Good morning, Mr. Behm. How are you today? Don't think I heard you. Make sure that you're unmuted.

A Good, sir. Sorry about that.
Q No problem. Good morning. As I walk through my discussion with you, my conversation, just let me know if you can't hear me, if $I$ get cut off, or what have you, so I know I can -- I'm happy to restate a question if you don't understand, if $I$ mangle it, which is certainly a possibility.

Mr. Behm, I'm confused. And I'm going to do my best to untangle my confusion. But basically, you know, listening to your testimony today, reading your written testimony, Ms. Mueller's testimony, and her written testimony, and of course, Cimarex's position in its papers and its legal papers, I'm a little confused. I wish I had more time with you, and I would probably be able to untangle all my confusion if I had more time. But I'm going to do my best with the time I have.

So I guess the first place I'm going to start is -- $I$ want to kind of just start getting a
framework. And I'm going to ask you if you have your exhibit packet in front of you. I'm going to go ask you to look at D3 first. I just want to make sure we're on the same page in terms of language and reference points; okay?

A Okay.
Q Great. I'll go ahead and share my screen, for those of us who still have internet. D3. In this exhibit that you prepared, you reference this as your area of interest; correct?

A Correct.
Q And so I just want to make sure we're on the same page. This is sort of your study area where you've identified, as I understand, wells and production and data that would be relatively comparable in this area. Is that your premise?

A Yes. The development assumptions in this area would be similar.

Q Now, that's notwithstanding the fact, as I read your testimony -- and reviewing Ms. Mueller's exhibits, there's a fair bit of discussion or at least some, you know, acknowledgement that there's quite a bit of variation within the area of interest between the landing zones -- I mean, the geology between the different landing zones and the different development areas, even just within this area of interest. Agree?

A Could you restate the question?
Q Sure. Between Ms. Mueller's testimony and your own and her exhibits and your testimony, there's some discussion about how there's quite a bit of variation in the geology here as between the different landing zones within the area of interest; correct?

A Yeah. Geology will change over this many townships. Yes.

Q But it's even within miles; correct?
A This is common throughout Lea County, where formations will improve or you'll get lithology changes. It -- it's close to the source, so it's -it's kind of more variable throughout. And when I say more variable, $I$ mean versus maybe like an -- a deep basin, primarily shell target.

Q So referring to paragraph 15 in your statement, you say -- is complex across the entire area. The flowing in it's changing drastically over several miles. Is that still your testimony?

A Yes.
Q Okay. So within this area of interest where we're talking about several townships -- there's drastic changes potentially in flow units within this area itself; correct?

A For South Lea, there's -- there's more vertical targets that are being targeted. There's also more thin carbonates and alternations of shell and sand.

And trying to understand the vertical interaction as you stack more and more wells to target it in South Lea, in my opinion, is -- is a little bit more complex than up here, where we've got a -- like, the third sand and XY right next to each other. That's a pretty well-defined flow unit. Does that makes sense, sir?

Q No. I guess my question is: Do you still agree with your statement that within your area of review, flow units change drastically over several miles?

A In this area or throughout the county?
Q Well, I'm asking you if your statement is still correct in paragraph 15.

A Paragraph 15. Let me read that again, just to make sure I'm not missing something. I -- I still agree with my statement here as far as -- this -- this being almost more of a convenient setup for the third sand, which we see in the -- the oil cut improvements moving up off a structure. And it's -- it's kind of a better defined tank, in my opinion.

MR. RANKIN: Madame Hearing Officer, I'm getting some background noise. I'm not sure if there's some -- not on mute. But I would appreciate it if we could go on mute. And not Mr. Behm, of course.

THE HEARING EXAMINER: Right. It's not me either. I had myself on mute.

Marlene, if you can see who is the source of the noise, please. Mute them.

MR. ZIMSKY: I was the source, I believe, so I'm muting myself.

THE HEARING EXAMINER: Okay. Thank you.

BY MR. RANKIN:
Q Okay. So I just want to make sure I understood that. As within this area of interest, your statement on paragraph 15 still applies?

A Yes, sir.
Q Thank you. Now, you discussed to some extent your exhibits D1 and D2, and I just want to make sure I'm -- again, working within a framework and that we're on the same page.

These exhibits that I'm showing here on the screen that you discussed with Mr. Zimsky, they, as I understand, are not limited to the area of interest,
that nine township area that we just discussed. But are inclusive of all of the county; correct?

A Yes.
Q Okay. Now, is this all of Cimarex's wells in Lea County that you used to create this exhibit?

A These are Cimarex -- yeah. All of Cimarex wells in Lea County between 28 and 2022 --

Q Sorry. Go ahead.
A Oh. I'm sorry. Go ahead.
Q We spoke over each other. You were saying something.

A I lost what $I$ was going to say. Sorry.
Q It's okay. So as to each of the other operators as well, this shows all of their production in Lea County?

A It shows wells drilled within this period that have a year of production. 'Cause it's comparing a year.

Q So all wells for these operators in Cimarex between 2018 and 2022?

A Yes. And it's public data if the well has come on production. But it's not out there, and it hasn't been on for a year. Would not be included in this plot.

Q Okay. And then, how many of the wells
within the area of interest that we reviewed in D3 are included in this chart?

A Oh gosh. The Mescalero won't be in there yet. So almost none. Our activity has been focused throughout the county.

Q Okay. So essentially, this chart shows everything but the area of interest?

A Yes, sir.
Q Now, let's go over to paragraph 9 of your statement. Again, this is just kind of cleaning up, because $I$ want to just kind of focus on this a little bit. And I don't want to spend too much time on this, but $I$ do want to just kind of, you know, understand. In paragraph 9 and page 3 of your self-affirmed statement, so towards the bottom where you have laid out your opinions from those bullet points -- the bullet point states that the spacing proposed by Permian Resources is eight laterals per section in the third sand. And I presume you mean the third Bone Spring sand; correct?

A The -- the third in the Wolfcamp flow unit. So we've proposed four wells. The -- the proposal from Permian would be eight wells with four in the Wolfcamp.

Q Okay. I just want to make sure I understand
your testimony here, because you limited it to the third Bone Spring sand. Ms. Mueller testified that while they're one tank, there are different formations, and that -- in her testimony, she specifies that it's four and four.

And you later discuss in the black and tan that the black and tan has actually landed -- I believe it's six wells in the third Bone Spring and then an aggregate of five wells in the lower Wolfcamp. So I just want to make sure that we're -- I appreciate your clarification there, that what you mean to say in this bullet is that it's four wells in the third Wellspring sand and four wells in the upper Wolfcamp that Permian is proposing; correct?

A Yes, sir.
Q Okay. Just want to make sure. Now, you said here as well -- as I read through and contemplated your testimony -- I'm going to refer you here to your testimony on pages 6 and 7 under your D3 Exhibit heading where we're talking about, again, that area of interest; okay? This area of interest here.

The thrust of your testimony -- and I understand Cimarex's position here -- is that the consensus of operators within this area is that the preferred landing zone is the third Bone Spring sand.

Is that a correct paraphrasing of your testimony?
A Yes.
Q And I guess we talked a little bit about how there may be some differences of opinion here about what is the third Bone Spring, what may be the Wolfcamp -- and as you explained, there may be some differences of opinion, given some of the complexities in the geology about what the actual landing is; agree?

A Yes.
Q Okay. But even assuming that, you know, there may be some, you know, differences here in opinion over what's the third Bone Spring and what's the Wolfcamp, isn't it the case that during the course of development in an area that often operators may focus on one or two targeted intervals or benches initially, and as they develop those benches and targets, start identifying new additional targets based on data that they collect, and over time, start drilling additional benches in that same area?

A Yes. That definitely happens.
Q And of course, you know, geology is complex. You know, there's going to be some pockets where some of those new additional benches may not be ideal; agree?

A Yes.
Q But nevertheless, your position here is that, you know, the consensus approach that the third Bone Spring is the best target -- you contend supports your position that it's the best and only target for developing this acreage; correct?

A Yes. I believe this is a single landing, and -- and the third sand would be the best way to access the reservoir.

Q Now, as you noted in your testimony, you do spend a fair bit of time and exhibits discussing and analyzing past use black and tan offsetting development. And you said today and in your written testimony that you believe that it's the only development plan in the entire area of interest that is similar to what Permian is proposing; agree?

A Yes. For -- for full development without edge wells where you can get a good idea of sectioned performance where there's history.

Q And you say in your testimony -- I'm going to point you to -- let's see. I believe it's paragraph 27. The last sentence of that paragraph. You say that the development of the black and tan wells was based on similar well drainage assumptions and utilized outdated completion height assumptions
that Permian Resources appears to be relying upon. Okay. First, what are those assumptions that you believe Permian is relying upon?

A This is my assumption here. It's -- it's based off of what's been proposed. So through -throughout the last four or five years, people have generally increased vertical separation. It's become that people work on more.

And I was -- I tried to outline some of that in my Section 14 , which refers to just Lea County in general, where those are some examples from our company where we've increased vertical separation based off the geology within an area to deliver better results. 95 feet of vertical separation, in my opinion, is very, very tight for -- for a staggered development.

Q Okay, Mr. Behm. My question, though, is: What assumptions specifically are you referring to? What are the drainage assumptions that you're talking about?

A It would be a height assumption that -- that the Wolfcamp XY either has a 100-foot crack and is not significantly or -- 100 foot height and is not significantly interacting with the third sand -- that the height of the third sand wells is not sufficient
to -- to access the reservoir. I guess simply, it would be underestimating the vertical height growth of -- of fractures.

Q All right. Last thing you said there was about the third -- tell me again now. Are you saying -- the assumption here is that -- I just want to make sure $I$ understand it. Okay. That it's about the frac height in the XY. Correct?

A Or the third.
Q Or the third.
A Yeah. It would be an under -- to me in my opinion, it's -- it's under -- underestimating the height growth you would expect to get in this bench. Because I would have to assume that I've got barrels that I'm not accessing in order to add a second bench.

Q What's the assumption about the wells in the third Bone Spring and their frac height?

A Well, the assumption is that fracs must be significantly less than 300 feet in height in order to add a second bench for -- for reserves, in my opinion.

Q 300 feet in height from the third Bone Spring going up?

A Around the well bore. Yeah. There's 300 to 340 feet of sand, whether you're looking at black and tan or Mighty Pheasant, Loosey Goosey. In my opinion,
based off of well performance throughout the county and studies like HFTS2, I would assume that that height would be sufficiently drained. And -- and to me, projects like the black and tan confirm that.

Q Okay. Now, I'm going to come back to that; okay? I appreciate your testimony there, and it's always a risk to come back to something. But I think I understand what you're saying, and I want to come back to it. Because what you just said, I think, frankly, added to my confusion. But I'm going to save that for another unit of our discussion. Because I have another series of questions to address that. But you have set out some of the framework there.

Now, on the black and tan. Okay. What I understand you to say is that it's the best analog and that's it's predictive of what you believe will result from Permian's development plan that goes forward. Agree?

A Yes.
Q Okay. Now, that's approximately 2 miles away from the subject development area that would be the Joker Bane; agree?

A Yes.
Q And as I pointed out in your testimony in paragraph 19, or rather paragraph 15, you testified
that the flow units will change drastically over several miles -- and then you go on to say -- with much more variation in rock quality within individual landing zones. Agree?

A In -- in the beginning of Section 15 is South Lea County is complex. So I'm -- we've been active largely not in -- in this area for the last four or five years. And that doesn't mean that we don't learn things when we go drill throughout the county.

I'm just trying to point out that this area is -- is -- to me at least, simpler on the vertical interaction. That -- that's a risk in all of the developments where operators come in and target multiple benches.

Q Okay. Now, when I look at the geology, I believe referred to Ms. Mueller's Exhibit B6 and B10. We talked about this. And you talked about it with Mr. Zimsky. That there's a difference here between the two benches, the third Bone Spring, and the Wolfcamp XY. Agree?

A Yes.
Q And as to the black and tan, which is in Section 27, which I believe I'm pointing to here. Do you agree with my cursor? Can you see that?

A Yes, sir. Yeah. That's correct.
Q That's the black and tan. There's a difference here between the porosity height mapped where the black and tan is located and where the Joker Bane units are located; correct?

A Yes.
Q And as you point out in your testimony, it's a difference between 7 phi height and 10 phi height between where the Joker and Bane are located; agree?

A Yes.
Q And I think Ms. Mueller testified that that's a small -- she said 30 percent, but $I$ think actually the increase difference is more like 43, 42 percent between the phi height between those two areas; agree?

A Yes.
Q I mean, I'd say it's approaching a 50 percent difference. And now, as I understood your testimony and Ms. Mueller's testimony, that that difference is insignificant relative to the porosity height in the third Bone Spring sand; agree?

A Both of these -- both of these areas, if you compare the subject land versus the black and tan -there is more PH. Part of the reason $I$ was bringing up height earlier is $P H$ is porosity times height.

Right.
So when you move between these two developments, there's only about a 45 foot change in the pay height being targeted. And so when we talk about frac height and being able to access it, half of the improvement moving from the black and tan to the end of the third sand kind of porosity channel Staci's highlighting here is -- is improved porosity within the -- within the sands themselves.

So I would tell, like, better perm. Maybe better connected rock. If anything, it might be easier to drain that than -- than tighter rock further out. Does that help?

Q A little bit, but I think I also heard you say previously when we were talking about frac heights that it's going to go around the well; correct? I mean, up and down. Yeah?

A The sands themselves, the XY in the third sand -- I would expect the sands to -- to frac similarly.

Q Well, I'll get back to this a little bit later, I think. But I mean, I guess my biggest point here I want to make sure is clear is that in your testimony, you said the black and tan is the best analog between what Permian is proposing in the Joker
and Bane unit and the situation at the black and tan. But I see a 43 percent difference in phi height between those two areas. Agree?

A The phi H Wolfcamp that you're talking about. Yes. The third sand improves by kind of a similar PH number.

Q So then I also I want to talk about the well spacing. Okay. And I'm going to skip back down to your D5. What $I$ see here is your depiction of your understanding of the black and tan well patterns. Vertical spacing and horizontal spacing. Correct?

A Yes. Yes.
Q And what I see here is one, two, three, four, five, six wells and the third basil Bone Spring sand.

A Yes.
Q Whereas as I understood we previously discussed, Permian is only proposing four wells; correct?

A Correct.
Q The difference -- that's a totally different spacing; agree?

A The -- the relevance of having a denser space pilot like -- or development like this is if -if 11 wells, 10 wells -- once the issues show up on --
believe it was the 302 .
If they're unsuccessful in accessing
additional barrels with increased stagger -- because you know, three of the Wolfcamp wells are actually landed lower. A larger tank was targeted there with more wells. And -- and yet, I don't see -- I don't see uplift to -- to justify the additional well count.

So -- so the fact that it's denser is actually really important, because if additional wells are drilled and they don't add barrels, drilling -drilling less wells than that, I -- I would -- I would expect them to not outperform the denser well count.

Q Okay. Here's my question. As to density, you're comparing a development with six wells in the third Bone Spring basil sand versus four wells in the Bone Spring basil sands; correct?

A Yes.
Q And unlike in Permian's proposal, we're looking at five wells in the upper Wolfcamp; agree?

A Yes.
Q Now, Ms. Mueller distinguished in her testimony between the Wolfacmp A, which is where you've also distinguished that there's -- three of these wells proposed a little lower. Staggered within the upper Wolfcamp. Agree?

| 1 | A Yes. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q And in Ms. Mueller's testimony, she stated |
| 3 | that where there are no frac baffles or frac barriers, |
| 4 | she considers those geologic units to be single flow |
| 5 | units. Agree? |
| 6 | A Yes. |
| 7 | Q And do you recall her testimony that there |
| 8 | are no frac baffles or barriers between the third Bone |
| 9 | Spring basil sand or the upper Wolfcamp XY? |
| 10 | A Yes. |
| 11 | Q Nor are there barriers between the upper XY |
| 12 | and the top of the Wolfcamp A, the lower Wolfcamp that |
| 13 | we were just discussing? |
| 14 | A Yes. |
| 15 | Q Okay. So in this situation here, just so |
| 16 | I'm clear, we're talking about a well density that's |
| 17 | eleven wells versus eight wells. Eleven wells in the |
| 18 | black and tan versus eight wells in the Permian |
| 19 | proposal; correct? |
| 20 | $A \quad Y e s$. |
| 21 | Q Okay. And that's roughly what -- I think |
| 22 | it's nearly a 40 percent increase in well density? |
| 23 | A Yes. |
| 24 | Q Okay. Now, on the sequencing, you did |
| 25 | address this to some extent in your testimony. And |
|  | Page 76 |

when $I$ look at this next Exhibit $D--$ is it D6 or D7? Now that I'm looking at it, I'm not sure. D6, I guess.

A Yes, sir.
Q Okay. So under D6 again, you have a representation here of the well spacing design. And I guess not totally clear. But if you would just explain what the X axis is again.

A $\quad \mathrm{X}$ axis is time.
Q And that means that year -- is that 2018 then, or what is that?

A Yes.
Q Okay. And it's a log scale of course; correct?

A Yes.
Q Okay. This just shows the Bone Spring wells in this development in the black and tan; correct?

A Yes. This shows the 301 through the 308 H . And the forecast is prior to any of the Wolfcamp wells being drilled or fracked.

Q How much time elapsed between when the 301 through the 308 H wells were drilled and producing to when the Wolfcamp wells were drilled and fracked?

A The -- the frac date -- I -- I've tried to call out there. I had it at the end of '19.

Q So how much time elapsed between when the initial -- when the Bone Spring wells are drilled in and commenced production until the Wolfcamp wells were fracked and started producing?

A Could be -- looks like 21 months. Each -each of those flat lines is a month. So I'm sorry. I -- I don't have that number handy. I can count real quick. So I've got 12 months prior to the -- the offset frac. Then I've got -- I've got another 7 months after that, so -- so 19 months.

Q All right. In this situation, the Apache drills produced their Bone Spring wells first. And then 19 months later, came back in and drilled and started commencing their Wolfcamp production. Agree?

A Yes.
Q Do you understand that that delay or lag is something that Permian is proposing here?

A No. No. They -- they are not. It would be co-development all at once, I believe.

Q Let's go with that, Mr. Behm. Yes. I believe the intent here is to co-develop. And what's your understanding of what their intent would be there, that being the case?

A I believe it would be eight third sand and eight Wolfcamp across the aggregate drilling unit
at -- at one time. I'm assuming they're going to have to split the benches up, just 'cause infrastructure and being able to move the volumes in this area will be a bit of a challenge.

Q The question then would be -- I mean, essentially as you understand it, they would intend to drill each of those wells and then to complete them at one time; agree?

A Yes.
Q Okay. Now, that's not at all what Apache did here; is it?

A No. No. This is not co-developed.
Q Okay. So I just went through three elements of your analog here. We talked about the phi height and the difference between the Joker Bane and black and tan. We were talking about 43 percent increase in phi height at the Joker Bane location, which Ms. Mueller testified is a proxy for production. Productivity.

We talked about the well spacing, where we're looking at a 38 percent increase in well spacing between what black and tan proposed and executed versus what Permian is proposing. Now we're talking about well sequencing here, where the black and tan completed their Wolfcamp wells 19 months after their

Bone Spring.
So I ask you. In your opinion then, based on that, you still contend that this black and tan unit is nevertheless the best analog to what Permian is proposing?

A Yes. In terms of $E U R$, because the reason you would go drill the Wolfcamp drills below would be the assumption that you had not accessed all the barrels. So -- so while it's not identical to what will be drilled, the fact that it's so many wells targeting such a -- with larger stagger targeting the same flow unit. And -- and I don't see much uplift. Makes me confident that -- that a second landing is -is not necessary.

Q Okay. Now, I think we addressed my next set of questions well enough, so I don't necessarily think we need to go into it here. Just want to touch on it. But I understand you heard my cross-examination of your colleague, Ms. Mueller?

A Yes.
Q And we discussed whether or not phi height would give you any indication of oil saturation or water saturation?

A Yes.
Q Okay. And you would agree that phi height
does not give any information on oil saturation; agree?

A Correct. There is a wealth of offset production in the third sands. So another way to get an idea about saturation is the water cuts that you observe in the producing wells targeting the third sand. It's one of the things I referenced earlier.

Q Now, let me ask you something. I mean, do you have an understanding -- I mean, you talked about the geology. Do you have an understanding of what the source rock is here for the oil that's located in the third Bone Spring sand?

A My -- well, I'm an engineer. But my understanding would be the Wolfcamp as well as migration from -- from down dip.

Q As you sit here today, you can't discern between what is the larger contributor of oil in the third Bone Spring, whether it's the Wolfcamp or any other migration within that zone?

A No. And I'm sorry. When I said migration, I meant like, this could be, you know, townships and townships away over time. This is a third point in the third sand, so you get some really high oil cuts as you move up Staci's third sand channel. I can't remember what exhibit that was. That might be B6.

Q But nevertheless, the Wolfcamp is, as you understand, source rock that contributes to the single tank in this area?

A Yes.
Q Now may be the time $I$ want to talk a little bit about your frac model. This testimony and your exhibits and the position you've taken on drainage in the Wolfcamp is where I am confused. Okay. So paragraph 36 of your testimony is where you introduce Exhibit D10.

A Yes.
Q D10, as I'm sharing on my screen, is as I understand, a cartoon of your frac model for this area; agree?

A Yes.
Q As I understood your written testimony and your statements today, your frac modeling is based on your understanding of the data derived at least in part from the HFTS2 project; agree?

A Yes. And -- and the picture here is we've got $a \operatorname{black}$ and tan example at full development with production before and post. Or before and -- and post. So the -- the stimulated rock volume that's accessed by the fracks before any Wolfcamp wells are completed and after must look very similar. That's --
that's what I'm trying to show here.
Q All right. I'm getting confused. Because here, I thought you were showing Permian Resources proposed development. Explain to me what you mean when you refer to black and tan.

A Black and tan, whether it was third sand or Wolfcamp -- the stimulated rock volume, the reserves accessed, appear to be the same. Went versus flat prior to any Wolfcamp wells to when they came back in and underfill. So my assumption here is I'm just trying to draw a cartoon to explain what -- what that might look like in both our proposed developments.

Q I guess what I'm confused about, Mr. Behm, is you testified that you're going to be draining with your third Bone Spring wells the hydrocarbons available from the XY sands; correct?

A I guess yeah. Yeah. No. I -- I would not expect to add additional reserves by landing in the Wolfcamp.

Q Okay. And that's not what you said. You said you're going to effectively drain the reserves existing in the Wolfcamp; agree?

A Yes. In the XY. Sorry. I'm -- I'm just trying to be specific.

Q That's fine. I totally appreciate that.

What I understood you to say -- and I agree with you. That you testified that your third Bone Spring wells are going to effectively produce the hydrocarbons existing in the $X Y$ sands. Agree?

A Yes.
Q Okay. My question is: Based on this cartoon, how are you doing that for Cimarex's development plan? Is this an accurate depiction of Cimarex's fracture model?

A This -- this a cartoon. I'm -- I'm just trying to show that we're -- both plans are going to grow up to the carbonate frac baffle, and then the -the expectation I would have would be that the stimulated rock volume of the Permian Resources plan or black and tan, which was executed, must look very similar to a four well flat or third sand only landing.

Q As to Cimarex's plan and the fact that you're going to develop the Wolfcamp, are your fracks actually going to go down into the Wolfcamp XY?

A Well, I -- oh. Okay. I'm sorry. I should probably have drawn this cartoon with the bottom of the frac drawn into the Wolfcamp. I -- I see your question now.

Q So how would you change your cartoon to make
it a more accurate representation of what you expect the fracks are going to do?

A I -- I would drag the bottom of my frac down maybe a little bit further in the Wolfcamp. And -and just to be clear, this is a cartoon. This is not a -- not a -- the intent was to try to help explain that the barrier at the top of the third was very important -- growing up until it hit that.

Q I'm sorry. I did not mean to speak over you. I'm sorry. The reason I'm especially confused -- because in your dialogue with Mr. Zimsky, I understood you to say that this geology is more unique here in that the fractures would tend to go up. And I want to be clear that they're also going to go down.

A If -- if $I$ were to land in the $Y$ sand, $I$-I would expect the majority of my drainage to be contributing from the third and the $X$. I -- I expect the sands to frack better than the shales below. And then, I would expect the shale in the A to contribute way less flow than the clastics or the sands. The third sand and the $X$ and the $Y$.

Q Okay. Now, just so I'm clear, because I think I want to make sure that I'm getting my question answered. When you discussed with Mr. Zimsky about
the direction of the fracks, where Cimarex's fracks are going to go, it's accurate to say that in fact, Cimarex's fracks are going to go up, but also down, but will be limited in their downward growth to some extent by the Wolfcamp shale; agree?

A I would expect that the -- the big barrier here is a carbonate frac baffle that kind of go labeled at the top. So I would expect whether you landed in third or Wolfcamp to grow up until you -you hit a barrier.

Q I'm talking about down. Okay. I understood you just to say that the fracks will extend down, but will be inhibited in their downward growth by the Wolfcamp A shales; agree?

A That -- that would be my -- yes. I think that'd be most likely. And then again, upward bias is -- is the strongest bias I think there is.

Q Okay. Did you also hear Ms. Mueller testify that Cimarex is potentially evaluating coming back to drill the Wolfcamp A shales at some point in the future?

A Yes.
Q Is that something that is viable that Cimarex would actually consider doing given your assessment of the black and tan development in the

Wolfcamp A?
A The -- the target has to be significantly lower than where they landed. And what $I$ mean by that is, potentially, you could increase the stagger between the wells vertically in that development and -- and potentially access maybe lower Wolfcamp A or the Cisco. Something much lower than -- than what has been drilled today.

Q Okay. So to the extent Ms. Mueller was talking about coming back to Wolfcamp A, you would agree, but only to the extent that it's whatever the landing zone would be, would have to be sufficiently lower to avoid any interference with the sands and the third basil sands or the $X Y$ sands?

A I -- I would -- yes. To minimize interference and add additional barrels for the well, I would land -- I would have a much wider stagger.

Q All right. Now, I kind of need to walk through your testimony that you had with Mr. Zimsky. And I'll do my best to do that. I haven't had a lot of time to organize my thoughts, but I want to do my best to walk through it. And I apologize if I end up jumping around a little bit.

Okay. Edge effects Verna Rae. You were referring to Permian Exhibit F4. Couple things I want
to ask you about. I don't have it in front of me.
I'll discuss with you as $I$ try to pull it up. But in that exhibit, you pointed out -- let me see if $I$ can actually show it on your D13. You point out the Verna Rae -- if I'm correct, it's this 1-mile lateral here that you're referring to, the Verna Rae well that you had concerns about contributing to an edge effect?

A Yes.
Q It's the 204H?
A Yes.
Q Okay. So that well is drilled at a legal location off the lease line; agree?

A Yes.
Q And it's only a 1-mile well; agree?
A Correct.
Q And what Permian is proposing is a 2 -mile well; agree?

A Correct.
Q Okay. On your Exhibit D15, I understood the point of this as you discussed your testimony was to show project-based cumulative oil; agree?

A Yes.
Q And you understand that from Permian's perspective, when they talk about -- you know, when they, you know, hear project-based, they're thinking
because this is -- they're proposing a co-development -- okay -- between the third Bone Spring sands and the upper Wolfcamp. That it be appropriate to look at third Bone Spring production and the Wolfcamp production together. You understand?

A Yes.
Q In this chart, you don't show that; do you?
You break out the Wolfcamp production from the Bone Spring production; agree?

A For the -- for the black and tan, yes.
Q But not for the others?
A Correct.
Q Why did you do it only for the black and tan and not the others?

A The -- the black and tan -- we lose a well. Or not we. But the third sand has a well lost kind of further out in time. And $I$ just wanted to highlight the differences there in -- in that incremental decision.
'Cause you can look at -- what would that be? It would be -- right where the black and the yellow line kind of separate. You can see a change in performance. And it -- it's interesting to me that that wedge is very close to that -- that change in performance versus the EOG Delo wells, which -- which
are good wells.
Q Are you saying that the change in performance is when the black and tan Wolfcamp wells came on?

A Yes. That's when competition -- competition for barrels in the same flow unit kind of starts.

Q Wasn't there also something else that occurred with the Bone Spring wells at that time?

A There's the operational overprint ahead of time. Yeah.

Q Okay. But in your view, that divergence there is due solely to the introduction of competition from the Wolfcamp wells below?

A That would be the -- the dominant view in my point. And then just while we're here, the intent of this plot is there's some great four wells per section development holdout on here.

And just to make sure we're all reading it the same way, I've got project oil per foot on the $Y$ axis and then time on -- on the $X$ axis. And -- and so what I'm looking at when $I$ look at this plot is, like, the blue development at four, the Reed and Stevens, the North Lea three wells at four wells per section. You can see long term very similar "cumes."

Q Mr. Behm, not to be rude. I appreciate it.

But this will go a lot faster -- and just in order to make time, I would like you just to answer my questions; okay? Not to be rude. I appreciate your additional input. But I'm going to try to just keep it to my questions. It's okay. Not to be rude. On this "cume" plot as well -- I mean, we saw some significant difference in the phi height between even just the black and tan and the Joker Bane project area. This "cume" plot does not take into account any of the rock quality issues that we were discussing previously. Agree?

A Correct. This is just production.
Q I was a little confused on D16 for why you believe it's not confusing or misrepresentative to mix daily with monthly in this chart on D 16.

A For the Batman wells, we had a daily data that we were able to -- to use. So I -- I just plotted that on there.

Q You don't think there's a better way to achieve the same assessment or analysis of EUR?

A This seems okay to me.
Q Okay. I don't have the luxury of time, and I don't have the luxury of getting details from you and understanding fully your economic analysis. Okay. So I'm not going to really dive into it here. Okay.

But I want to understand. In your economic analysis, are the presumption and economic assumptions made -are they based on the black and tan development?

A This is my -- my base case. My reserves case. So I'm running -- this would be table 1.3 on Exhibit D11.

Q So here, this analysis, your base case economic analysis, is based on the black and tan development; agree?

A Yeah. It would -- it would -- yeah -assume similar performance.

Q And that's the same as with your Exhibit D9; right? Your D9. You addressed the EUR from the black and tan. That serves as the basis for your economic analysis going forward in your testimony and exhibits; agree?

A Yes. My -- my -- yes.
Q All right. Now, in your discussion with Mr. Zimsky, when he referenced the June 15 th letter that Mr. Coffman sent --

A Yes.
Q Your testimony was that based on -- I just want to make sure $I$ understand that. Okay. You testified that approximately three-quarters of the oil that would be produced from the Bone Spring wells
would be produced from the third Bone Spring. The basil sand and the third bone spring.

A The third Bone Spring sand in -- in aggregate.

Q In aggregate. And then approximately a quarter percent would be produced as some the Wolfcamp XY sands; agree?

A Yes. That would be my -- my estimate.
Q And that's just based on the assessment of the phi height; yeah? Bore height.

A Paired with the production results from all the developments up in that area.

Q When you say paired with the production results, is that an analytical pairing, or is it simply that the production results bolster that determination in your view?

A The production results bolster that determination in my view.

Q I mean, I guess what I'm getting at is, you're not making some sort of calculation incorporating production from the area of interest to come up with a three-quarter, one-quarter allocation; are you?

A No. That's -- that's primarily the PH.
Q Okay. But you don't know what the oil --
you haven't done an oil and place calculation determination for the acreage at issue in these cases; have you?

A We have SO phi H. I can't remember what it -- I don't know if it's an exhibit, but it's very similar to PH with our model.

Q Okay. But I think Ms. Mueller testified that's based on the model; correct?

A Yes.
Q Okay. So other than the model, you don't have any data indicating what the oil in place as between the Bone Spring or Wolfcamp here; do you?

A We have the producing water cuts of wells landed in the third sand for -- for the surrounding area. And so water cut's kind of a proxy for oil saturation. Water cut goes down, and the third sand gets oily. You would assume saturations would go up.

Q And are those water cuts partly the basis for, you know -- do the water cuts help Cimarex target then the basil third sand? In other words, you're not targeting the upper portion of the third sand; you're targeting the bottom of the third sand. Is that based in large part on the data you recovered on water cuts?

A Could you ask the question again?
Q My question is: Why is Cimarex targeting
the very bottom of the third sand? What's the data basis for that target?

A That would be the -- the best quality landing zone. And then again, we're more confident in growing up to touch that -- that frac barrier up above us. So you would -- you would tend to land lower in your target reservoir.

Q What's the data that supports that best quality landing zone?

A That would be your porosity within that zone. That's -- that's good, high-quality sand.

Q When you say porosity, you're talking the phi height within that zone; yeah?

A I'm talking -- the -- the porosity is not uniform throughout. That -- or we call it the $C$ sand. Lots of people might name it differently at a different company. But landing in that sand would be our recommendation from the production results.

Q Okay. So that sand, that landing zone, has better porosity than other portions of the third Bone Spring basil sand; correct?

A Yes. We -- we would target the best rock for the landing zone.

Q Just wanted to make sure I understood. Thank you. One thing I also thought I heard you -- I
just want to make sure $I$ get the timeline straight here. I thought I understood Mr. Zimsky ask you about -- that you guys proposed your applications in response to Permian's proposals. Did I understand you to say that?

A Oh. I'm -- I'm not sure.
Q Okay. But just to be clear, I mean, you understand that Cimarex was first to issue its well proposals and to propose development in this acreage before Permian -- is that your understanding?

A Yes.
Q Permian made its well proposals in response to Cimarex's plan development; agree?

A Yes.
Q And I thought I heard you say that you are comfortable with the production data or the data that Cimarex has and that you wouldn't need additional data in order to proceed to develop the Mighty Pheasant and Loosey Goosey acreage. Is that my understanding?

A The third sand specifically is development ready. We plan to gather some data. As you drill wells in an area, you can gather data on those wells to re-risk some of the other benches and landings.

Q All right. Is Cimarex planning to drill a pilot hole or do any additional science-based testing
within the Mighty Pheasant or Loosey Goosey?
A We would grab some additional log data right now.

Q So in other words, there are plans to take log data across the different potential target zones in the development area?

A We would -- yes. We -- we would go -- yeah.
Q So I just want to make sure, because you sound a little ambivalent. But are there concrete plans for Cimarex to go in and take test data within potential target zones in this development area?

A We plan to do some logging on the first well to maybe better understand some of the barriers for -for stuff like upper second sand and get confirmation on some of the less proven targets like the -- like the lower second. That wouldn't matter. But that upper second, which Staci spoke to prior -- gathering some more data on that to optimize spacing and expectations for that zone. We -- we would do that.

Q Just going through. Make sure and see if I have everything $I$ want to cover, Mr. Behm. I apologize for my delay. Mr. Behm, one of the comments I think you made -- you know, as we discussed, there may be some differences of opinion over whether certain wells in the area of interest are landed in
the third Bone Spring sand or the upper Wolfcamp. Remember that discussion?

A Yes.
Q And Mr. Zimsky asked you whether it would have any impact or change your opinion about anything whether those landing zones were accurate or not that you depicted. Remember that?

A Yes.
Q And you said that in your view, it wouldn't change your opinion. It would have no effect on your analysis. Agree?

A The -- the wells close to the subject lands where we have lots of log control -- I'm confident in where our geologists have placed them. So I would not expect it to change my opinion here.

Q So even if some of those wells were actually Wolfcamp -- I guess my question is, the whole point of this dispute here, to some extent, is whether the Wolfcamp is a viable target, either by itself or in conjunction as co-development with the third Bone Spring.

And you're saying that whether a high-performing a good-performing well is actually landing in the Bone Spring or Wolfcamp would have no impact on your assessment or your opinion -- is just confusing to me.

A Well, if for some reason the wells that are labeled as third sand, like the -- the Lea 3 is adjacent to Mighty Pheasant, Loosey Goosey. That's a four well development that we have in the third sand. If -- if the well count's really what's most important there, if one of those wells is like an $X$ sand and all the other wells are a third sand C, it's still a single flat target. The -- the big risk here is actually well count, if that makes sense.

Q Okay. I'm just going through to make sure $I$ covered everything, Mr. Behm. On your Exhibit 23 -I'm going to pull it up here. Let me know when you can see my screen.

A Oh. I can see it.
Q Great. Now, I think that a lot of the issues that are raised by what Cimarex is proposing, as we discussed with Mr. Savage yesterday and -- are implicating, you know, ultimately legal issues. I think there's some factual issues that need to be addressed.

But one of the things $I$ just wanted to make sure I understood here -- 'cause I think in your testimony you make the point that all -- and you use the word "all." All the Wolfcamp owners will benefit
more from Cimarex's proposal than from Permian's proposal. Do you agree with my paraphrasing of your position?

A Yes.
Q I mean, I'm not going to get into the differences here between each of the Wolfcamp owners and your analysis about the economics. I just don't have the time to do that. But as I understand, just to be clear, the economic argument that you're making here for each of these Wolfcamp owners is based on your economic analysis of the black and tan; agree?

A It -- it's based off my expectations for the -- the subject lands --

Q Permian stopped the black and tan performance; agree?

A And it would also be similar to the adjacent Reed and Stevens development. It's -- it's that sort of EUR -- would be my expectation.

Q Did you use the Reed and Stevens offsetting development in your economic analysis in these exhibit?

A The -- the 10,000,000 barrel expectation versus the 12 as the high range where all the PH translates into an -- into an uplift. I was trying to bracket the range of outcomes as a sensitivity to see
if $I$ could get to a Wolfcamp proposal.
Q Okay. Just so I'm clear, is that which is up -- what exhibit is that?

A I'm sorry. I showed two tables. And I've showed table 1.3 and 1.4 in D11.

Q I just want to make sure I'm on the same page. Okay.

A Yes.
Q Okay. So on this example, this table, you're showing a bracket of EURs between 10 and 12 based on black and tan and then the Lea 7 production; is that right?

A The -- the $10,000,000$ would be very similar to black and tan. You could get some overperformance on the PH. We tend to predict ranges. I don't think I'm helping any, but the --

Q This is helping. So the top table is based on the black and tan; agree?

A It would be a similar -- yeah. It would be similar in EUR space for black and tan.

Q And the $12,000,000$ EUR is based on what?
A That would be significant uplift. Minimal degradation from the offset wells that exist like the Verna Rae. I'm just trying to bracket how many additional reserves $I$ would need to add with a

Wolfcamp landing to justify drilling it.
Q All right. So when you do your assessment down here and you're comparing the economics, picking your ratios, this is just the creation of your ratios that you then apply to the economics to determine that to each of these owners?

A Yes.
Q Okay. The slide that you compare the economics for these owners is this slide, D20; correct?

A Yes.
Q And you're just using -- when you say the Permian plan here, PV10, that refers back to the D11?

A I mean, it would be my -- my 10,000,000 -yeah. Table 1.3 kind of base case. And instead of doing a sensitivity, it's just one number.

Q Okay. I'm just catching up a little bit. Now, on this ratio exhibit where you explain or show how you come up with your ratios between the Bone Spring Wolfcamp, obviously -- you know, there's two owners for whom that ratio doesn't apply; agree?

A Yes.
Q And that's because they don't own the Bone Spring at all; agree?

A And our intent is to get them into the
wells.
Q But if you pool them, if they don't agree to an agreement of any kind with Cimarex about how to do that, they don't get any benefit from your Bone Spring wells; do they?

A They -- they would not, unless we assign them interest like John talked about earlier.

MR. RANKIN: Madame Hearing Officer, I don't have any further questions of Mr. Behm at this time.

THE HEARING EXAMINER: All right.
Thank you, Mr. Rankin. And Mr. Behm.
I'm going to pause for a moment in the event any of the other parties has a question of Mr. Behm. No. All right.

Mr. Zimsky, do you have redirects?
MR. ZIMSKY: Yes, Your Honor. I just have a few minutes.

THE HEARING EXAMINER: All right. REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. ZIMSKY:
Q Mr. Behm, the EUR that you were just discussing with Mr. Rankin between 10 and 12. That's based upon black and tan, but with those estimates that you tried to bracket what this was going to
produce. What other information did you use besides black and tan productions?

A I looked at recovery factors in the area. The -- the way some of the different projects have performed. The surrounding production. Incorporated Staci's geology delta in the third there. Again, I'm just trying to provide a range of expectations to see if $I$ can get to enough reserves to see if $I$ can justify drilling four more wells for de-issue.

Q And I want to go back to this PH difference. And I think you mentioned density might have a role in this. So the difference between the ten average subject lands and the seven average at the black and tan might be somewhat muted by density considerations. Maybe I'm misunderstanding, but --

A PH is porosity times height. And so the height of these two developments is -- it doesn't change by as much as the porosity. Is also a component. So this is in a higher porosity. So I would expect better -- better flow properties.

Q Better flow properties which location?
A At the Mighty Pheasant Loosey Goosey, there's some upside of being able to drain it more efficiently maybe.

Q Okay. And the fact that the black and tan
is a denser development versus the Permian proposal. You would expect the denser development -- it might not be an economic way to produce the hydrocarbons, but you would expect to get more from a denser development; correct?

A The absence of uplift at denser spacing makes me very confident in my recommendation.

Q As four Bone Spring wells in the subject lands?

A Yes, sir.
Q Okay. And would you say that's the increase in production?

A Increase in reserves.
Q Reserves.
A Yes.
Q And Mr. Rankin talked about -- first sentence in paragraph 15. South Lea County's complex across the entire area with flow units changing drastically over several miles. But when you analyze the black and tank, which is 2 miles away from the subject lands, did you find any changes in the flow units?

A No. To me, it was -- it's a -- it's a very similar analog.

Q But it could be possible you could go 2
miles the other way, and it might not be a good analog?

A Or as I head further south -- yeah. Eventually, things will change.

Q And you testified that water cut is a good proxy for oil saturations?

A Yes. The lower the water cut, the -- the better the oil saturation should be in -- in equivalent rock.

Q And you have water cut information from nearby lands near to the subject lands?

A All the -- all the producing wells water cut is public data like the oil production that's -that's reported.

Q And so you're getting at from development similar to the geology of the subject lands?

A Yes.
Q And I think Mr. Rankin -- he was talking about Exhibit D1. I think he might have said that you created this Exhibit D1, D2. Is this something that Enverus put out that you just used?

A Yes.
Q And the difference in the sequencing between Permian Resources development plan to co-development completing all of the wells, the four Wolfcamp, and
the four Bone Spring, and the subject lands for each section, so eight and eight -- versus the black and tan, which they waited nineteen months to drill the Wolfcamps. Does that have any impact on why you decided that black and tan is analogous?

A The black and tan value is -- is the density at an increased stagger, not adding reserves. That's important to me, because it shows that it kind of reinforces that the majority of reserves are accessed by the third sand landing. Otherwise, you would expect to see some barrels added when you add additional wells lower.

Q Even if they're developed 19 months later?
A Yes. I would expect to see some incremental if significant barrels had been missed.

Q And you did not?
A Correct.
MR. ZIMSKY: That is all the questions that I have. Thank you, Mr. Behm.

THE HEARING EXAMINER: Mr. Zimsky, did you say you were done?

MR. ZIMSKY: Yes.
THE HEARING EXAMINER: Okay. Thank you.

> Mr. Garcia, do you have any questions
of Mr. Behm?
MR. GARCIA: I have a few. I'll be
quick.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. GARCIA:
Q All right. Mr. Behm. Is that correct?
A Yes, sir.
Q Quick question. I believe you heard me ask the geologist yesterday. Just curious. Do you think Reed and Steven's plans or Permians' plan -- no matter what practice I may have, you'll have that upward growth into the Bone Spring, whether it's a gel drops like water, crosslink, et cetera?

A That would be my expectation. Landed as proposed. If it's landed further down in the shale. The more height difference there is, the -- the more unknown that would become.

Q Sorry. My questions are just clarification stuff for when $I$ try to order. How high off the bottom are your guys' Bone Springs wells off the bottom of the Bone Springs?

A I've got 50 feet in my head. The 40 feet off the bottom of the third sand.

Q Did you run a fracks simulation at all on these wells?

A No. No, I did not.
Q Okay. Based on your prior experience in this area or other areas in New Mexico, what do you think an estimated downward growth of your fracks would be on these Bone Spring wells length wise?

A I -- I don't think we would grow into the A. I -- I think we would grow into the Y. But again, I'm -- I'm really confident in the upward growth. It's just that absence of a barrier makes it more likely to add the $Y$ and the $X$.

Q Yeah. I'm just curious about the drainage of the Wolfcamp. And I guess just to clarify, when you talk about Permian's frack length growth, you're talking about effective drainage growth, not just overall frac length?

A Yes. What -- what effective drainage is.
Q Just want to make sure. Some people talk about frac length and not drainage length. So I have a question on one of your exhibits that's actually not your exhibit. Your counsel submitted an amended motion back in July 28, I believe. Basically, I talks about why you guys would prefer option one as the Bone Springs as XY reservoirs.

But then it further says poor quality reservoir of the upper Wolfcamp. I guess I was
curious on the reason of the poor quality, since geology yesterday testified that this is basically one reservoir one why the Bone Springs is excellent and the Wolfcamp is poor. And I can probably screenshare this if you haven't seen it.

A That would -- that would be helpful. Thank you.

Q It should have paragraph 5 right here. Does that look about right?

A Yes, sir.
Q Okay. And so mainly right here is the -and this was filed again on behalf of your counsel.

A Yeah. I'm -- I'm not sure. Might be saying that the third sand is predominantly sand, and then the upper Wolfcamp -- you've got the two XY sand packages. And kind of the rest of it is shale.

So the -- the majority of the reserve stuffs would be located within the -- the storage of the third sand. And we would expect that to contribute the -- the most to flow. But the -- the $X$ and $Y$ to me would -- would contribute as well.

Q Let me see if $I$ can stop sharing without breaking it. Last questions. Or a few more questions, I guess. On your Exhibit D16. You can screenshare that if you want. I have it open on my
side. So I guess so you're counsel is aware of what I'm referencing. So right there, the impact of the Wolfcamp underfill begins?

A Yes.
Q I guess, how do you know that's the impact? Is that just based off timing?

A Yeah. No. That's fair. That is based off of time. But the -- the production response that you see in the wells where you have to clean up all the -the water cuts high. Your GOR is suppressed. Those are all common things that you would see with an FDI where large amounts of water had gone into the zone you were draining. I think I called that out on one of my black and tan exhibits. Yeah.

Q Okay. And then one slide up from this page. So this slide confused me. So is this actual production data? Is that what this is?

A Yes.
Q Okay. That's what I thought. And basically, $I$ think you're trying to call out, highlight here, these are when the wells were fracked. And we saw decreased production or decreased EURs after this. Is that correct?

A Yes. I'm trying to put a pre-impact to the wells, what -- what sort of reserves were -- were
accessed with third sand only landing.
Q Okay. And I think you said each line is a month earlier. So out of curiosity, these wells look like they were shut in for roughly two months after the frac. Do you think any damage was caused by that shut-in that's contributing to the lack of production, or do you think it's mostly the Wolfcamp effect?

A And this is an amalgamation of all six well, so there -- there's things outside of reservoir engineering like takeaway constraint. They have a hard time getting these wells back on. So this -this first month isn't all six wells. It takes a long time to get all the wells back producing where they are.

Q Okay. And that was probably my misunderstanding. I thought this was the one well.

A This is all six.
Q Okay. Do you think shut-in did cause any damage to these production, though, or do you still think it would still be mostly Wolfcamp if there was no takeaway issue coming back online?

A To me, it would be predominantly Wolfcamp.
Q Okay. Do you know the overall Wolfcamp thickness in this area?

A For the XY, I would defer to Staci for the
thickness of the A. I know it's significantly thinner than where we target it down south.

Q Okay. Yeah. I know our Wolfcamp can be like, up to 3,000 feet in some places. And so I guess my question is, your guys' option one is compulsion pulling the Bone Spring only. And essentially, banning drilling in the Wolfcamp is -- pardon my poor summary. Do you think there's going to be resources left in the lower Wolfcamp from not drilling that that won't be drained by these Bone Spring wells?

A I -- I think the $X$ and $Y$ will be captured further down in the A1. Again, the further away you go, the more chance you would have of accessing barrels that hadn't been touched. It would just be a less economic well compared to the third, the second, the first sand. Those stuffs would be the -- the tier one targets in the area.

Q Okay. One of our goals is to try to get all resources out obviously most effectively, but also try and prevent from stranding resources. And so that's one of the things I'm curious about. Is there going to be stranded lower Wolfcamp resources?

A It would be developed -- if -- if it's viable, it would get drilled. It would just -there's finite infrastructure, so $I$ would assume we
would both drill third sand first.
And -- and you tend to go best to worst economics and production without overfilling your infrastructure. And then, we tend to not work in landing zones. That's one of our approval requirements to go drill wells at -- at Cotera Cimarex. An orphan landing zone would be intentionally stranding a bunch of economic barrels.

Q Okay. And then I think last question. When you guys are perfing and fracking these wells -assuming you're perfing, you're fracking -- are perfs being rotated all 180 degrees or all 360 degrees?

A No.
Q What direction would they be mostly aimed in?

A Mostly up.
Q Mostly up.
A Zero degree.
MR. GARCIA: I think that's all my
questions. Thank you for all your exhibits.
THE HEARING EXAMINER: All right.
Thank you, Mr. Garcia.
Ms. Thompson, do you have questions of
Mr. Behm?
MS. THOMPSON: I have no questions at
this moment.
THE HEARING EXAMINER: All right.
Thank you. Is there any reason not to excuse Mr. Behm, for the time being, anyway?

MR. ZIMSKY: Madame Hearing Examiner, I have a point of clarification on Mr. Garcia's question about the buffer.

THE HEARING EXAMINER: Yes. Go ahead.
MR. ZIMSKY: I don't know if it's
something to necessarily list it from the witness. But we're just proposing, I think, the bumper in the sand in the upper Wolfcamp and not, you know, in the shale. So the lower Wolfcamp -- we're not saying that can't be developed under the proposal. The one option.

So I just wanted to clarify. It's in the papers. It's a proposal, so I don't think this witness necessarily has to testify to that. I just want to make sure that that was clear. And Mr. Garcia may have said that, but $I$ might have misheard.

MR. GARCIA: No. Thank you for the clarification. I figured I butchered what the motions and exhibits had. Trying to process them. I think it's like 1500 pages, and this case file is rough. MR. ZIMSKY: It's in there, so just
want to make sure you were aware. Thank you.
MR. GARCIA: Thank you.
THE HEARING EXAMINER: All right.
Well, thank you Mr. Zimsky. And thank you Mr. Garcia. And thank you, Mr. Behm. It seems like it's probably time to take a lunch. It's 12:20. Does 1:30 work for folks?

MR. SAVAGE: Madame Examiner, I was wondering if $I$ could quickly get in the notice, Exhibit E, right before lunch. It's a one paragraph statement to accept the exhibits. And I think that we would be done submitting all of our exhibits. Do you want to wait until --

THE HEARING EXAMINER: Oh. Terrific. That sounds like Mr. Savage. Go ahead.

MR. SAVAGE: I'm sorry. Did you mind? We can get this out of the way, and then we can go to lunch and --

THE HEARING EXAMINER: Sure. Go ahead.
MR. SAVAGE: My name is Darin Savage, representative and attorney for Cimarex Energy Company. I testified today based on the Exhibits E and Subexhibits E1 through E3 and hearing packets 1, 2, and 4, in cases 23448 through 23451,23452 through 23455, and 23494 through 23601.

That all working interest owners were sent notice letters or waived notice in a timely matter. And publication notice was timely published in the Hobbs News-Sun, a newspaper of general circulation in Lea County, New Mexico, as shown in Subexhibit E3. There are a handful of letters still in transit -- just a handful -- and designated as mailed in the mailing report.

And there is one returned letter from Diamond Star Production Company, LLC, which appears to be at this time unlocatable. The mailing report and reports of receipts returned are provided in Exhibit E2. And sample notice letters are provided as Exhibits E1. At this time, I ask that Exhibits E and all Subexhibits E1 through E3 and hearing packets 1, 2, and 4, and the above said cases be admitted into the record. And I am available for any questions.

THE HEARING EXAMINER: All right.
Thank you, Mr. Savage. Let me pause for a moment in the event any party has an objection. I don't hear any. So Exhibit E and all the subexhibits are admitted. And thank you very much.

```
                                    (Exhibit E was marked for
                                    identification and received into
                                    evidence.)
```

MR. SAVAGE: Thank you.
THE HEARING EXAMINER: So let's break for lunch until 1:30.
(Off the record.)
THE HEARING EXAMINER: Does Counsel
have an impression yet as to whether we'll actually be able to finish today? Ms. Salvidrez has to make certain arrangements if we're not going to do that.

MR. RANKIN: I remain hopeful that we will finish today. We're going to switch our order or sequence of witnesses so that we'll do Mr. Fechtel as the engineering witness. And he probably will take the most time.

I think probably only do two witnesses -- I mean, our facilities engineer will just be mostly addressing his direct exhibits to get him accepted to the record. And then, we'll just touch on some rebuttal for land and geology. So I believe that we should be able to finish today depending on how extensive the cross-examination is.

THE HEARING EXAMINER: All right. And keep in mind we will have to stop around 4:30. So all right. Well, let's give it a shot, then. And if you would please just give me and Ms. Salvidrez a heads-up if you come to the reasonable conclusion that it's not
going to finish today.
MR. RANKIN: Okay. Will do.
THE HEARING EXAMINER: All right.
Thank you very much. Please go ahead and call your first witness.

MR. RANKIN: Madame Hearing Officer, the Division would like to call our first witness in this case. In this case, it's going to be Mr. John Fechtel.

THE HEARING EXAMINER: All right.
Thank you.
Mr. Fechtel, would you please raise your right hand. WHEREUPON,

## JOHN FECHTEL,

called as a witness and having been first duly sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

THE HEARING EXAMINER: All right.
Thank you. I'm having a little trouble hearing you. If you would speak up and spell your name for the transcript, please.

THE WITNESS: John Fechtel. It's
$\mathrm{J}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{N}, \quad \mathrm{F}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{T}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{L}$.
THE HEARING EXAMINER: Thank you.

Go ahead, Mr. Rankin.
MR. RANKIN: Thank you.
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. RANKIN:
Q Mr. Fechtel, if you would maybe just check the input on your audio, and then there may be a way you can increase sensitivity of your microphone. That may help with the sound quality.

A Is it hard for you as well?
Q Just a little bit. Yeah. It's a little soft.

A Yeah. It's -- it's -- the settings are locked, it looks like.

Q Yeah. You sound better now.
THE HEARING EXAMINER: Yeah. I think he sounds great.

THE WITNESS: If it becomes an issue, I have another one here. We can switch. BY MR. RANKIN:

Q You sound a lot better. Mr. Fechtel, will you please state your full name for the benefit of the court reporter.

A John Fechtel.
Q And will you spell your last name?
A $\quad \mathrm{F}$ as in Frank, $\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{T}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{L}$.

Q By whom are you employed and in what capacity?

A The reservoir manager for Permian Resources.
Q Have you previously testified before the Oil Conservation Division?

A $\quad$ No.
Q Will you please review for the examiners -let me just ask. Is your resume attached to your exhibit packet as Exhibit 1?

A Yes.
Q Will you briefly review for the examiners your education and work experience as a reservoir engineer.

A I graduated from the University of South Carolina in December of 2012. I've been a reservoir engineer since 2015 for Pioneer Natural Resources as an asset development engineer, an asset development lead, and as a senior reservoir engineer on a regional team.

Joined Colgate in 2019 as the development plan manager -- pardon me -- where $I$ oversaw kind of all aspects of field development. And 2022 with the merger with Centennial, $I$ became the reservoir manager, you know, when Permian Resources was created. That's my current role, and I continue to oversee

| 1 | asset development and oversight of kind of asset |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | development engineers. |
| 3 | Q Are you familiar with the applications that |
| 4 | were filed in these competing cases between Cimarex |
| 5 | and Permian? |
| 6 | A I am. |
| 7 | Q Have you conducted a study of the reservoir |
| 8 | in the subject lands? |
| 9 | A Yes, I have. |
| 10 | MR. RANKIN: At this time, Madame |
| 11 | Hearing Officer, I would tender Mr. Fechtel as an |
| 12 | expert in reservoir engineering. |
| 13 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Let me pause for |
| 14 | a moment in the event any other party has an |
| 15 | objection. |
| 16 | MR. ZIMSKY: Madame Hearing Officer, I |
| 17 | have just a voir dire question. |
| 18 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: All right. |
| 19 | Please go ahead. |
| 20 | CROSS-EXAMINATION |
| 21 | BY MR. ZIMSKY: |
| 22 | Q Mr. Fechtel, your degree is in mechanical |
| 23 | engineering; is that correct? |
| 24 | A It is correct. |
| 25 | Q And did you take any petroleum engineering |
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classes at the University of South Carolina?
A Sure did not.
MR. ZIMSKY: That's all the questions I
have. And I don't have an objection.
THE HEARING EXAMINER: All right.
Thank you, Mr. Zimsky.
He is so recognized. And, Mr. Rankin, go ahead.

MR. RANKIN: Thank you.
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. RANKIN:
Q Mr. Fechtel, would you please -- do you have your exhibit handy in front of you or the exhibit packet?

A Yes, sir.
Q And did you prepare a self-affirmed statement that's been marked as Exhibit $F$ in that packet?

A Yes.
Q Did you also prepare exhibits that were attached to your self-affirmed statement, Exhibits F1 through F8?

A Yes.
Q Do you have any additions or corrections or updates to those exhibits that were made to your
statement?
A We did add one slide or replace on slide. Is that included in this?

Q No. Which slide is that, Mr. Fechtel?
A Let me get to the exhibit number. This would've be Exhibit F3.

Q Okay. And what was the change made to Exhibit F3?

A Just one well being reclassified. Originally, the one -- the Verna Rae 133 was included and co-developed with the Wolfcamp A when it is not --

Q Okay. So that would be a replacement exhibit. And that exhibit was filed with the Division and circulated to all parties; correct?

A Yes, sir.
Q Right. I think I'm hearing some background noise, and I don't know if it's from you, John, or from somebody else.

MR. RANKIN: But just want to make sure. If we can, everyone can mute so we aren't hearing distractions in the background. BY MR. RANKIN:

Q Except for you, John. Don't mute. Now, other than that, did you have any other changes or updates to your testimony or exhibits on direct?

A Yes, sir.
MR. RANKIN: Okay. At this time,
Madame Hearing Officer, I would move the admission of Exhibits $F$ and the attachments into the record. MR. ZIMSKY: No objection. THE HEARING EXAMINER: Let me pause for -- okay. Well, thank you for that. And let me pause just momentarily in the event any other party has an objection. All right. Exhibit $F$ and its attachments are admitted.
(Exhibit F was marked for
identification and received into
evidence.)
MR. RANKIN: Thank you.
BY MR. RANKIN:
Q Now, Mr. Fechtel, have you reviewed the testimony and exhibits that were prepared by Cimarex and their reservoir engineer? John, I'm sorry. I don't know what it is. But now, all of a sudden, sometimes I'm not catching your yeses. Will you make sure that -- maybe try again so I make sure $I$ hear you.

A I have -- I have reviewed the exhibits.
Q Okay. And did you prepare rebuttal exhibits in response to Mr. Behm's testimony and exhibits?

A I did.
Q Are those marked as Exhibit K?
A Yes, sir. They are.
Q Okay. I'm going to go ahead and full these up. And then we can walk through them. And I'll share my screen in just a moment once $I$ get them on. If you let me know once you see my screen. Can you see my screen, Mr. Fechtel?

A I can.
Q All right. You prepared some testimony in response. What does this first slide show? And explain to us what we're looking at here.

A Right. And just given that we've had microphone, if you raise your hand at all, I'm try to kind of stop or get louder.

But yeah. So this first exhibit -- kind of to step back. Obviously, we just went through Mr. Behm's and Cimarex's direct and cross here. And a lot of the argument around the property development of this area is based on offset wells and based on kind of what other operators have been doing.

Exhibit D3 on the left and D4 on the left were both provided by Cimarex. D3 in the top-left is the kind of map overview in the AOI. They reference often as part of a study they did of these lands and
their recommendation that Bone Spring should be drilled by itself.

And then $D 4$ is a kind of histogram of activity in the area broken out kind of between the third Bone Spring, the Wolfcamp, and by operator. They also attached a well list that we referenced. Believe it's D24.

And there are a few differences in the way that -- those were highlighted already by Cimarex in their testimony. What we did is take all the wealth in the offset area and pull the OCD pooling code and then walk through kind of that development. I do think it paints a little bit of a different story than the one Cimarex put forward regarding the Wolfcamp as a primary target in the area.

Decidedly, the Wolfcamp has been targeted far more than Cimarex asserts with -- since 2018,40 percent of the wells targeting the Wolfcamp. I do think there are a number of reasons this is happening. Differences in landing and incorrectly identified wells. But the main takeaway is that the Wolfcamp is a real target, and it is decidedly appraised and included with development.

Again, there are differences in landings, but $I$ do think that it's important when you don't have
your own direct development, and you're relying on offset development, that it is crucially important that we understand what is going on on the offset wells.

Q Mr. Fechtel, if you would explain how it was that you identified whether the wells were in the Wolfcamp or not in the portion of this exhibit on the right.

A This is by OCD producing pool.
Q What does this next exhibit show?
A These are the wells in the Wolfcamp by OCD producing pool in the same kind of AOI presented by Cimarex. We don't need to spend a ton of time on this. There are two columns to focus on, though. We have the producing pool and then we have the Cimarex formation.

So again, that Cimarex formation came from Exhibit D24. And where you see an EA -- N/A. Pardon me. Means that it was not present in the exhibit.

Q Okay. So looks like maybe approximately 10 percent of the wells in the Wolfcamp in the AOI were not identified in Cimarex's analysis?

A It would probably be more than 10 percent, but I haven't counted.

Q Okay. Some number anyway of the wells were
not included, identified --
A Sorry.
Q Say that again.
A Sorry. Go ahead.
Q Okay. Just some number of wells were actually included in the Wolfcamp but were not included in Cimarex's assessment?

A Yes, sir.
Q Tell me. What does this next slide show?
A Right. So I think let's start in the middle right of the slide. This is just a locator map. So these wells are pretty far away from the area of interest here. But I have included them, because they were part of Exhibit D24 where Cimarex lists the wells that were used as part of their study.

The top left here. I've just pulled the directions in for these wells in this kind of subset and colored them by the identified producing zone provided by Cimarex. Again, you know, we're getting -- we're coming out of the basement right here. Landings are challenging. I fully expect that. But a few things do jump out, particularly when we're talking about third bone sand wells that are in the same unit and have greater than 450 feet of TBD separation. And they're also where we have

Wolfcamp wells that are, you know, shallower than the third Bone Spring wells. If anything, it just highlights that there are some peculiarities with how these wells have been landed and how they've been identified in these exhibits and as part of the study. On the bottom then, I've done the same well -- I've actually added one well that wasn't in the last. It's in pink. I probably should've chosen a little bit different color. But it's a well -we -- we landed in the Harkey. And then the -- the rest of the wells. You can see there's a large subset that $I$ believe are actually second Bone Spring wells. Again, they're pretty far away. I don't think they're a huge portion of this discussion other than to say that when we're doing kind of deep studies on the appropriate development of an area, it's important to understand what other people are doing, what they're targeting, and what wells are being drilled.

Q And tell me this next exhibit. What does it show?

A Yes, sir. This is just for a succinct picture, a full picture. These are the same wells, but they're actual well names and APIs. And again, same -- the identified formation and then the
formation -- so this is not the OCD pool. You know, this will all be Bone Spring, just as the third bones were. This will be what $I$ believe they are.

Q All right. Next slide. Tell me what this shows. And what is it responding to?

A So this is -- you know, we in our original exhibits did not include the Apache black and tan's beyond date cursory note on them, primarily because we -- we really didn't think they were analogs or going to be an important part of the discussion. Cimarex has spent quite a bit of time, I believe, in Mr. Behm's direct testimony and in the cross-examination just before lunch there -- this was well covered. But the black and tans have been identified as the only one development plan within the entire AOI, similar to the plan Permian Resources is proposing for its Joker and Bane wells.

And it's the Apache drill black and tans. We do not believe that these are an appropriate analog for what we are proposing for a number of reasons. Three key ones listed on the left. The geology. Not analogous, as Mr. Rankin touched on in cross-examination.

The Wolfcamp itself has a -- a phi height or a porosity height of 43 percent less than in the --
the units -- the Bane and Joker units that we're talking about today. The density is also extremely different. You know, approximately 37 percent different in the density. I think probably most important in all this -- and we'll touch on this as we go through the next handful of slides -- is the sequencing.

You know, before we flip to the next one, I believe core to Mr. Behm's assertion that the Wolfcamp does not add any reserves is the fact that when Apache came back in below the third Bone Spring wells, the overall reserves as he has them forecasted did not increase, as indication that whatever reserves actually existed there were already being drained by the third bone in the inclusion of Wolfcamp wells a year and a half later or 19 months later. Did nothing to -- to increase production, because that had already been captured. I do not think that is appropriate, but we will get that for the next few slides.

Q Great. Okay. Explain your analysis of Mr. Behm's discussions around the black and tan production in this slide.

A Awesome. So we're going to step back a little bit and talk about the fundamentals in empirical forecasting. So you know, the kind of bread
and butter forecasting reservoir engineering is decline group analysis. And implicit in decline group analysis, you are -- you are taking history or production that you already have, and you are forecasting a trend to that.

And exactly as you're highlighting there, we have the left. The top-left quadrant is -- this is just synthetic data. This isn't real or related to black and tan. But we have production data, and we fit a curve to it.

And then, we're assuming that that curve has diagnostic ability to forecast out to the future what that well -- those wells would've done. We can see then the bottom plot when we add that data. That's exactly what happened. And this is really core. Right. This is the idea that what see in the past can predict the future.

If we move over to the right side of the page, looking at the analysis of the black and tans. In, you know, bubble one then, we see the third Bone Spring only composite forecast or composite well production that's being forecasted.

And then, you know, moving to slide -- or to bullet two there on the right, we can see the -- you know, the -- the implication is that that forecast
with the third bones without the Wolfcamps would've done and the delta between that and the actual productions. The damage caused by the third bones. I'd like to highlight that this is not a bad approach. Right. This is -- this is pretty core. You -- you forecast out what something would've done, and then when a change happens, you -- you can attribute, you know, the cause to -- then that's a reasonable understanding of value creation, value destruction. I do have issue with the way that this is being used. And some violations of core assumptions of this.

If we move to slide seven. So you know, on the left side of that -- that black line, as Mr. Behm highlighted in the cross-examination, that is the kind of -- where the Wolfcamps were developed beforehand. And in his direct testimony, you know, he's explicitly saying that the forecast is fit through May of 2019 . And so that's right before that red forecast missed that I've added in starts. But this is well before the Wolfcamps were -- were fracked.

And so somehow, our third Bone Springs were changed. And -- and the forecast we've created -Mr. Behm's created has lost the ability to predict. And this is well before the Wolfcamps were fracked.

I -- you know, I don't think it was direct, but some of the -- some of the redirect earlier -- some of the examination of Mr. Behm did highlight -- you know, there was a frac offset.

And then, you know, there's something else that could've been going on. Perhaps the well heads had to be replaced so that a walking rig could drill the Wolfcamps and the same pads. And it -- it doesn't matter, actually. The whole concept with empirical forecasting is that you have a trend that you can fit, and you can forecast that out.

And once you lose that trend, you need to have another trend to fit before you know that it's valid. And this is actually something that -- I'm going to refer to some literature real quick. So this is from site petroleum engineering. This is the golden rule of decline group analysis. I'll read just -- it's a quick little paragraph.

But the basic assumption in this procedure is that whatever causes controlled the trend of a curve in the past will continue to govern its trend in the future in a uniformed manner. Fitting a line for the performance history and assuming the same trend will continue in the future forms the basis of DCA. It is important to note here that in the absence of
stabilized production trends, technique cannot be expected to give reliable results.

So this is -- this is a very, very
fundamental piece of this. It's actually one of the core constraints proposed by ARPs in the $40 s$. But this means that even if it wasn't the frac, even if it was just change in operational conditions, it is completely technically invalid to use a trend that was before operational conditions or constraints were create or happened and forecast out in time.

Now, in reality, what $I$ believe is
happening -- I'll step back briefly. I can't say that it wasn't operational changes. It wasn't change in well heads. This is public data. But again, it doesn't matter. It violates a core tenant and core assumption of this analysis. But coincidental to -to the miss on the forecast was a -- frac. The little bear 2 H .

And so you know, this has come up earlier in cross that -- that Cimarex believes this is actually a Wolfcamp well. You know, this is producing into the Bone Spring pool. Either way, at Bone Spring, in my opinion, well offset was completed. It did impact the other wells.

> We have not seen a stabilized trend to
forecast. And we have no technical ability to deconvolute the impact of the offset well, the impact of changing operational conditions, and the impact of the Wolfcamp wells being completed.

Now, one thing that isn't called out here that we hadn't originally intended to fully dive into -- but upon cross, one thing that would be helpful for everyone -- what $I$ think Mr. Behm is talking about when he says that, you know, the Wolfcamp wells came in under the third Bone Springs.

The third Bone Springs got a lot worse, and whatever wells -- whatever performance increase the third Bones saw -- I'm sorry. The Wolfcamps saw was just robbing from the third Bones. And the idea being that we didn't create any -- you know, Apache didn't create any SRV by adding -- you know, SRV being stimulated rock volume.

So this is the -- the rock that you break down and then drain where they -- you know, unconventional hydraulic fracturing. So the idea being here that no SRV -- additional SRV was created by the addition of these -- these wells. And then, that is a sign that the third Bone Springs were already adequately draining it, and so the Wolfcamps came in, and they're just touching the same rock.

I think there's a little nuance here, and it's actually -- I don't think that wrong, but $I$ think it's pretty wrong in a way that isn't fully appreciated here. And so we'll be getting on that a little bit as we go through. I think the next slide highlights some of that as well, and I think Mr. Behm also highlighted that.

While it isn't called out in any of the original testimony, it looked like it's the same third Bone Spring wells that are producing -- it actually is one fewer wells. One well was lost during this and has since been abandoned. And of the Apache third Bone Spring wells. So I -- I hit that kind of quickly. But if -- if we go to the next slide, I'll try to slow down a bit.

Q Mr. Fechtel, just real quick. You guys assigned little bear to the Bone Spring pool. How do you have confidence that that's in the Bone Spring and not the Wolfcamp, just so I understand?

A Correct. Yeah. And we'll start with -- it is in the Bone Spring pool. We'll start with where it's landed. But more than anything -- we'll hear from Ira here in a bit. But Ira was the geology manager that managed the team that drilled this well and actually many of the wells in the area here.

And -- and has -- he can speak a lot better to the -the landings there. So it'll take a bit of the nuance out of whose grid is correct. But this was started in the third Bone Spring.

Q Next slide. What does this show? And explain how this fits into your analysis.

A Yeah. So we'll start at the top left here. And what we're seeing in the top left -- this is actually from the HF2S2. You know, that does get a lot of screen time in Cimarex's testimony, so we are reaching out to it a few times as well. And you know, that is 43.7 miles away, $I$ believe $I$ recalled it. But -- but there are -- it's a fascinating study. And you know, a lot was done. A lot of really awesome learnings.

And there's certainly pieces that we can take away from this by it being very far away and -and very different play. And so this particular screenshot. This is kind of micro-seismic colored by the density of micro-seismic events. So this is where kind of rock is being broken down. We're looking down the well bores. So -- so it's a little hard to make out, especially with Mr. Rankin changing everything.

So we're looking down the well bores.
And -- and you're seeing kind of on the left side
then -- these are the same well bores on the left and the same well bores on the right. But we're looking at it at a different portion of the lateral. On the left side, there's no parent well next to it. And then on -- on the right side, there is a parent well that has caused parent depletion. But we see that -we see several things.

First off, you know, we see kind of broad coverage up and down. But we also see that on the left side, we're -- we're kind of well-contained. And then on the right side, we see that the -- there's kind of strong bias. We actually see fractures growing towards the depletion. And this is a -- a pretty fundamental piece of unconventional development.

This is why co-development is so absolutely important. It's because when you create depletion, your fracture's biased towards that. And what can happen -- you have the first -- you know, fractures start growing preferentially towards depletion. And the first fracture that interacts with a depleted zone starts taking all the fluid. And from that point forward, you're breaking down no new rock, so no new SRV is created.

Not because that SRV had already been broken
down by something else necessarily. Because you created no net pressure by tying it to a depleted zone with your first fracture. And this -- this we can see in the black and tans; right? Black and tans were -were developed below existing wells, below dense third bone development that had already depleted the third bone largely. And as soon as you put wells --

Q But you move on, I just want to make sure. Because I want to make sure we understand exactly what this inset shows and how it relates to the two sides of this depiction. So I want to make sure it's clear. Will you just make sure --

A If you zoom in, it might help.
Q Yeah. I'll do that. I want to make sure it's clear what the inset shows in relation to where it says north and south and how -- how these -- I think you said these were existing offsetting laws. How that informs this -- this other depiction here in the south. I want to make sure that's captured.

A Right. So you see in the middle there, there's a there well pad that is -- they're -- you know, they're longer laterals. And so we're actually looking down those well bores. And then on the north side, if you look to the right of them, to the east, there would be no parent well.

On the south side of it, if you look to the side, there would've been existing parent wells. And so we're seeing the micro-seismic as they exist when there's not a parent well on the side called north, and then on the other side, the south side, where there was a parent well. And we see very different fracture growth.

And then, we see -- you know, you see white space in between too. Right. While there may be larger coverage, there's lots of stuff left behind. That's because these fractures were influenced to grow elsewhere. They reached out elsewhere very quickly. And then, as soon as they encountered kind of low pressure zones, they started taking all the fluid in that direction. They stopped breaking down any new rock.

Q Okay. So just explain again. You were talking about SRV and the difference -- and just explain so $I$ understand. Where you don't have existing wells and when you do have existing wells, the difference in SRV volume.

A And there are times that it's much more -much more dramatic than this. Right. But -- but SRV is -- can be correlate with micro-seismic. There's some complexities. But what we're seeing here is an
example of where $S R V$ is -- is not being created and not being created with the same magnitude, the same complexity, where there is depletion.

Because the depletion itself is biasing the fractures towards it. And as that's happening, you're not breaking down new rock elsewhere. Some rocks being broken down as the fractures grow out. But as soon as they start interacting with -- with the low-pressure -- you lose your net pressure. You lose your ability to break down new rock.

Q Explain how that plays into your analysis in this slide with the black and tan.

A Yeah. So black and tans -- Apache came in under existing well bores, and then they -- they fracked the Wolfcamp there. As -- as Cimarex asserts, you know, fracks grow up. They grow up into the depleted zone, and they -- those well bores took all the fluid and to the point where you can see lost well bores.

We have an abandoned 302 H on the right there. And we see lots of issues produced in these wells thereafter. Now, this could've been takeaway. It could've been operational issues. But the assertion that the black and tans -- the Wolfcamp development didn't create any new SRV may well be
correct, but that's because they all went into the third bound because there was depletion there, not because the Wolfcamp and third bone are incompatible together.

Q On the operational side, explain more about the 302 and what happened here. I mean, explain -looks like something happened to this red well. I want to understand more about --

A Yes, sir. So the red well then is the 302 H . It's the well that is ultimately abandoned. And when it's first -- you know, we see it -- we see it drop the first time. And this is -- this is, you know, coincidental in time with the black and tan 2 H completion.

We do see kind of typical frac response that Mr. Behm identifies. You know, elevated water ratios being depressed or raised being chief among them. And then we all -- you know, we see it struggle to recover. And then ultimately, it stops producing altogether. And -- and that is when, you know, the black and tan completion -- the Wolfcamp completion happens.

From that point forward, you know, I think around the next year, around -- the only -- the months that could've been produced by each well, less than
half of those months do any of the wells produce hydrocarbon.

So there's more nuance to saying that -- oh. The third bone's completely stopped producing, and then the Wolfcamps took all the oil. The third bone stopped producing, but it may've been 'cause you pumped a bunch of sand and water into them or you -something was going on. Again, public data. We don't know.

What we do know is that Apache had abandoned the well. That's in the ODC filing. But I -- I think that they're -- it's -- it's a little cavalier to say that it's just because it was the same reservoir that's now being drained by the Wolfcamps. The Wolfcamps themselves are terrible, but they're terrible because they didn't break down any rock.

Q Just so I don't forget. I want to make sure you cover this. But explain how the sequencing that you propose will avoid some of those problems. I just want to make sure that's clear.

A Yeah. It's -- it's pretty uncommon to co-develop wells together and then immediately have to abandon one of those wells because you fracked into it. Co-developing reduces the risk to the well bores. You're not going to frack it yourself with your next
set of wells if you did them all together.
So that's -- that is, you know, one key reason that you wouldn't see this if you co-developed. But there are also a lot of advantages to co-development that -- beyond just the list of well bores. You can see them on that in the -- in the micro-seismic stuff from HFTS to the top there. You know, the -- if we just focus on -- you know, there's -- there's layers of kind of science they were doing in this.

Again, very -- very cool study. But this one in particular, they were -- they were testing sequencing of well bores to see if they could -- if they could, you know, change fracture growth. If you look at the -- you know, we'll focus on non-parent depletion piece and focus on the far left well bore that's -- that cloud is one. Right. That's a -- a much small -- that's a much smaller event cloud.

Right. The micro-seismic event right there were -- were far less than the other ones. And then with successive completions, we're creating more fractures. And -- and really, additional wells co-developed have the ability to increase that pressure, increase complexity, and to increase the amount of rock that you're breaking down.

That's one reason that, you know, throughout this, you'll see lots and lots of evidence that co-developed Wolfcamp and third bone -- even in the XY third bone up in -- in this area, are creating additional SRV. And -- and that leads to increased reserves. It leads to increased, cash flow, and -and mineral checks to -- to folks that own in both formations.

Q Anything more on this exhibit, Mr. Fechtel?
A I think I've beaten this one up pretty thoroughly.

Q Next one. What does this show? Explain how your SRV comments play into this.

A Well, I'd actually like to jump to 11 , if that's possible.

Q Oh. Sorry. Thank you. Yeah.
A Oh. You're good. That's my order that I gave you. So we're going to -- we're going to step into -- you know, I believe Mr. Behm walked through this with everyone here a little bit ago. But I'm just going to highlight a few different pieces from a few different exhibits. And -- and so I've tried to kind of identify where these are coming from. The top left is Exhibit D9.
And in this, Mr. Behm is -- is kind of
highlighting the EUR that, you know, these Wolfcamp wells had by his own forecasts. And so he's saying that that -- you know, these Wolfcamp wells -- five were drilled. And they have a total EUR of 890 NVO. So you know, between the five wells then at 890 NVO, that's 178 NVO per well.

And each of these wells -- I mean, the average well length is about 4600 feet. And so we can, you know, surmise from this that the average EUR as forecasted by Cimarex is 38.5 barrels per foot. And you know, that's -- that's an interesting benchmark, especially as we move to Exhibit D11.

In D11, Mr. Behm provided a sensitivity, which is great engineering practice. But a sensitivity around what will we have to see for this to have been a good decision. And -- and he comes to -- we would've needed to see -- you know, he has sensitivities. There are a couple different, you know, benchmarks. But in -- in kind of the worst case for the argument we're making -- you see a 40 percent performance increase in these -- in these Wolfcamps for this to have been a -- a good decision. Kind of -- I -- I think related.

But up top, we see also the -- the phi height calculations between the black and tans and
also the -- you know, the Joker and Bane units or the Loosey Goosey, Mighty Pheasant units. There's lots of discussion to be had around if phi height actually correlates with -- with production.

But if we follow the -- the kind of logic train as set out by Cimarex, then this is a 43 percent increase in phi height in the Wolfcamp again against the 40 percent needed -- performance increase needed for the Wolfcamps to have been accrued for at least neutral on PV10 bases.

You know, but Cimarex isn't fully relying on the black and tan development to -- for their assessment in the third bone and -- and Wolfcamp in favor of the third bone, at least. And so Exhibit D12 -- you know, we'll spend more time on this exhibit here in a little bit. But in Exhibit D12, Cimarex has provided the EUR of their lone Wolfcamp test in the area.

And so that EUR there is listed at 837 MBO at -- at 9500 feet. So you know, that comes to 85 barrels per foot, which -- which is well above the -the 54 barrels per foot that has been laid out as what has been necessary for the Wolfcamp to have been a viable project. So I -- I do believe by this logic, the -- the Wolfcamp would be highly economic.

But again, that's not entirety of Cimarex's argument. They have argued very clearly that the Wolfcamp is -- is a poor reservoir. Its economic -- I think at one point, financial -- financially ruinous was used. But they're also saying that the Wolfcamp has the ability to damage the third bone.

And third bone being a better -- a better well or a better target by Exhibit D12 is what you want to protect. So if you're going to damage the better target in favor of a -- you know, slightly inferior, although highly economic target, that -that could be a problem if you were to be forbidden from drilling other minerals there.

So we move up back to slide nine. Sorry for the out of order. We'll see -- okay. Fortunately, the parry test did have some other nuance to it. There was existing third bone offset. It's fast and operated well. It's not Cimarex's well. It had been on for a few years prior to the parry 224 H being drilled, so I -- I would argue that the parry itself wasn't even a standalone test.

There was still a -- you know, a partial child test there. But you know, if -- if the parry 224 H is going to be absolutely destructive to the paloma 214 H , which was the existing third bone, this
should be somewhere we can see that. And -- and you know, far from destroying the existing third bone, we do see material performance improvement from that third bone.

Third bone rises from -- you know, prior to the offset, 180 barrels a day. It looks like it's probably shut in for a while there. And then, you know, it comes to 245 barrels a day. And -- and you know, the scale on the $X$ axis can be a little misleading. This is sustained uplift for, you know, by my eye, nearly a year. So this is -- this is real uplift.

Q Anything further on this slide, Mr. Fechtel?
A No, sir. I don't think so.
Q Explain to us -- we touched on this a little bit in cross with Mr. Behm. But is there anything further to comment on on this slide regarding fracture modeling?

A I -- I don't believe there's a ton to go into here. I -- I -- you know, you covered it thoroughly. But $I$ will just highlight what's going on for the broader audience. On the left are -- are Mr. Behm's assertions of -- of what the -- you know, fractures must look like.

```
    I -- I do think he's -- he's kind of
```

modified that in cross. They should look a little bit different. But there is the assertion that these -you know, this learning and this understanding should be derived from the HFTS2. And as -- again -- Ira will be up next.

But it's -- lines were 43.7 miles away. And in -- you know, it's different geology, but it is -there are, you know, really great pieces to take out of this. So we have the same micro-seismic piece there kind of showing upward and downward growth that -- don't really -- don't -- you know, it's -it's still a different area, but it just -- I don't see how it translates to Exhibit D1.

And then we have, you know, from the same DOE project -- we have another kind of example there where they show upward and downward growth in the -you know, stage by stage. So again, different area. But again, don't see the translation to Exhibit D10, which I think is admittedly a cartoon.

Q So are we skipping up to slide 12? Is that correct?

A Yes, sir. And so these are -- yeah. These are just in response to some of the -- the slides that -- that Cimarex put out there. I -- I did want to highlight that $I$ think this approach is a little
bit misleading. And so this slide is one amongst many. And this is Exhibit D14 on the -- I'm looking at the top left there. Thank you for highlighting that.

This slide is -- is one of -- of several that is attempting to kind of demonstrate project recoveries, and project being the development of the third bone in the Wolfcamp. And -- and you know, what's being implied here is that, you know, there are developments that -- with the Wolfcamp in the third bone that -- that don't -- you know, they look bad. But they can split apart.

It's -- if the development is done together, why -- why are we splitting them apart? Even if they are done at different times, it is the total project. It is kind of core to the argument being made here. So you know, there's a couple things to highlight.

First is, you have the Delos on top that are in yellow. They have not broken out. The -- it doesn't appear that the Wolfcamp is broken out here that has a single Wolfcamp and then five third bones. And it is, you know, at least through 1500 days the -the strongest pad. And then, we have the -- the Wolfcamp developments for black and tan. The black and tan development broken out.

Little barriers being identified as -- as all third bone, all Wolfcamp. You know, believe they're third bone, but $I$ believe they're a deeper Wolfcamp target. And then, so on the right then, we -- I've attempted to reproduce this. And unfortunately for everyone viewing this, I did not use the same colors. It's a little bit -- little bit confusing.

But -- but you know, the big takeaway here -- the marine wells, the black and tans, they are -- you know, now that the Wolfcamp has been added to -- you know, and the Wolfcamp and the third bone black and tans are the same curve. We do see that this is a kind of higher performing or higher producing project.

That doesn't necessarily mean economics are higher or anything else, but it does pretty damningly push back on the assertion that -- that adding wells does not add any barrels. And even with the four sequencing here. It's -- it's a very different plot when -- when viewed as a combination.

Q What's your next slideshow? What are you talking about here?

A Yes, sir. So this is in the same thread. Again, Exhibit D16 on the left. I -- I do think this
is a pretty cool way of viewing things, just to be clear. This is not in the overall approach that I have a problem with. It's just in the way it's being used and -- and the way it can potentially be misleading.

So you know, there are a few things here. One. And unfortunately, $I$ just kind of did the same thing to try to replicate stuff, but you know, we're breaking out the Batman. We're breaking out, you know, both sides of them separately. But like, they're only half sections. We're looking at full section there. That -- that may not be -- that may not be, you know, correct. The culmination of daily and monthly.

Like, I -- you know, we provided daily data instead of rolling it to monthly to match all the other wells. You know, just the daily data was used. And if you had enough data, that wouldn't be an issue. But there's only a little bit of data, so you're getting a month and a half. And so you're -- you're not seeing the actual decline trends in the same manner that you're seeing the other ones.

You're seeing -- they look materially steeper, but that -- again, that's only because you're not seeing the data, you know, over the full month as
the months have been transferred into the days in the other -- the other one. And then, I think kind of most egregious is the separation of the Wolfcamps from the -- from the third bones.

Again, I have no doubt that coming and developing the Wolfcamp below the third bones is a horrible idea. It demonstrates it clearly the Wolfcamps did not do well. But this is in support of the assertion that that very clearly didn't add any barrels or anything else. If you actually look at it at project level with these all done together, that -that claim doesn't actually work.

And so we see on the right there then the black line now. So the tan lines disappeared, and it's being added to the black line. And -- and so we see, you know, that we were producing at a higher rate with higher "cume" for the black and tans. And again, like, we are not proposing the black and tans. Apache did a horrible job of those wells. But this assertion of black and tans say that four Bone Springs wells only is the only way to go is -- is -- just doesn't track.

And then on economics, Cimarex's arguments or -- or testimony feature heavy in economics. You know, this is the same plot in the left there that --
that we had in the original hearing statement. I believe that was brought up for under -- under Mr. Behm's, you know, testimony. And -- and so this is grouped by the total development then. So we have two third bones with the one Wolfcamp and the -- and the blue.

And so those are the co-development tests that we -- we executed in Batman. And then red would be the two standalone third bone wells. You know, this is updated to, you know, partially more recent data or -- but 125,000 barrels delta between the two projects after 67 days. These are early forecasts. But these strongly suggest increased SRV, increased EUR, increased economics at -- you know, along with massively increased early time performance to the tune of 125,000 barrels, 367 days.

Q Mr. Fechtel, at the start of your testimony, you talked about stimulated rock volume, SRV. And you explained to us a little bit about how the -- the importance of sequencing in order to maximize your SRV. And where sequencing is not done correctly, as I understood you to say -- in the black and tan, you're not maximizing your $S R V$ in new rock.

And then the fractures are preferentially growing into already degraded rock, so you're not
stimulating, you know, new undeveloped rock. Is that a fair recap of your testimony initially?

A Yes, sir. And -- and what we're looking at here then is $I$-- I think a -- a strong indication that we are accessing new rock. We are seeing increased performance. We are seeing more contribution for more rock with added targets. And -and I think this should make sense.

Q Now, you may have heard this too when Mr. Behm was testifying. He talked a little bit about acceleration. And you can tell me if I'm wrong. But my impression is he's saying that by landing more wells, more density, that while you may be increasing your IP, your initial production, and showing a faster, you know, accelerated production out of a unit, ultimately, you're not really touching any additional rock or getting incremental reserves out of it.

And I guess I just wanted to make sure I understand what your view is on whether, you know, you're proposing to simply accelerate production out of your proposed units or whether you're actually going to be developing and touching new rock.

A Yeah. I -- so this is another -- another moment that $I$ think it makes sense to step back a tiny
bit. So Mr. Behm did have a -- a few kind of back and forths with his counsel regarding in PV10, so -- and kind of the assertion -- you know, the question was, is that a good metric? Absolutely. Yeah.

You know, depends -- different counties use different metrics, but in PV, it's net present value. So it takes into account the time value of money. Right. In PV10, uses a 10 percent discount rate. And implicit in any sort of time value money analysis is that a dollar today is worth more than a dollar tomorrow. Is worth more than a dollar after that. And so to touch on acceleration first, acceleration on its own right can have value. Now, that doesn't mean it's -- it's always good at all. Right. You don't overcapitalize just to -- to get barrels. But acceleration can have value.

That being said, I do not think that's what's happening here. I think we are absolutely touching more rock, and -- and that is going to translate into increased financials, increased production, and -- and less waste. And -- and the waste I'm talking about here is not over cancellation, but it's leaving reserves behind.

Q On this point, Mr. Fechtel, were you present for Examiner Garcia's questions to Mr. Behm?

A I was.
Q Did you hear Mr. Garcia ask Mr. Behm about the Division's concerns about leaving reserves behind in the Wolfcamp?

A I did. Yes, sir.
Q Can you explain to us a little bit about how what you just said and about your assessment of sequencing here -- true co-development so that you're properly sequencing third Bone Spring drilling and stimulation with the Wolfcamp XY drilling and stimulation -- will, in your opinion, result in a greater recovery of reserves in the Wolfcamp and more effectively and efficiently drain Wolfcamp compared to what Cimarex is proposing.

A Yeah. So I -- I share some of your confusion around what -- what exactly Cimarex is proposing. But it -- it does -- it does seem like either the Wolfcamp will never be drilled, in which case by everything we are seeing, we will be leaving -- we will less SRV and less rock being drained than if the Wolfcamp had been developed with it.

Or they're planning on coming back later and developing the Wolfcamp, in which case they will have a very hard time in -- in breaking down new rock with
depletion above them when admittedly they don't see a frac baffle there. I think fair to say a pretty core part of their argument. And without -- without that frac baffle, they're going to have a -- a challenge, I believe, in -- in properly stimulating the Wolfcamp at a later date.

So both of those are -- are wasted, I believe, in -- in kind of in line of -- of Mr. Garcia's questions. But there's also -- there's also other forms of waste tied into this and the various options -- options and proposals that've been thrown around over the last four weeks, including a prohibitive drilling zone and -- and the like.

Q Now, I just want to kind of in summary get your kind of -- I want you to try to sort of encapsulate -- I think what a core issue here is in these competing cases is -- you know, obviously, Cimarex has got a proposal to drill into the Bone Springs.

And they're going to complete only in the Bone Springs. And Permian, on the other hand, has got a proposal to drill and develop in both pools and formations, including co-development between the basil third Bone Spring sands and the $X Y$ sands immediately underneath.

I would like -- you know, if you could, just explain to us and examiners how it's important in this context, this geology where we are, the quality of the Wolfcamp that we have and the quality of the third Bone Spring. Why is it critical for these to be co-developed and be coordinated through sequencing and completion? So I want to make sure that's understood. And I'd like for you just to touch on that in summary.

A I -- I will start with saying that we share Cimarex's enthusiasm for the third Bone Spring. Third Bone Spring is awesome. And we wholeheartedly disagree that the third Bone Spring is awesome at the exclusion of the Wolfcamp. Wolfcamp is a high-quality target with a lot of resource in place, a lot of thickness. And Ira will get into all of that. We are very excited about the Wolfcamp for all our -- our science to date.

But what we have seen -- and the entire reason that we've taken the approach that we've taken to date with a science-based thoughtful and methodical development in Batman offset -- which will continue through our other units and the next few months -- is that we do not think that the Wolfcamp in third Bone Spring has been adequately and properly tested in co-development in this area.

And we think that looking at all the offset wells through 2010 is -- is misleading and -- and misguided. And we do think that relying on that is an extremely risky approach to where you're left with -with just two options. Right. You make crate through Bone Spring wells and forever write off the Wolfcamp, the upper Wolfcamp in particular. Or you repeat the black and tans.

That -- that you come back in under existing depletion without a frac baffle, and you stimulate the Wolfcamp. But you don't break down the Wolfcamp. You fracture straight into the third Bone Spring existing well bores. You damage your existing well bores, and you break down no new rock in the Wolfcamp.

This is a Wolfcamp that is a tier 1 target. It's extremely productive. It's been targeted all over the place. But to adequately do it with a third Bone Spring, they have to be done together. In doing so, SRV and total source is actually touched -appears everything that we're seeing to increase.

Q And on that basis -- I just want to understand. You had urged the Division to approve your application because they're going to be done in a coordinated fashion?

A Absolutely. And obviously, a big portion of
this is the -- is the different ownership between them and the myriad of concerns that that creates. I -layman, not a lawyer. But $I$ see a pretty clean remedy for that. Let's develop them together and -- and all make a lot of money here.

Q Any other comments you want to make,
Mr. Fechtel, in response to any of Cimarex's engineering statements or testimony?

A No, sir. I think there was a couple more slides. We can go through if you'd like or -- no. I'll look at it. Yeah. This is -- this is just -this was just a few days ago. Came from Cotera's earnings presentation. And -- and you know, of note here, they do highlight a prolific Wolfcamp play in the earnings call -- and that does, you know, appear to align with the way we think about the world, which is -- which is awesome.

There is a disconnect between whoever's making these slides and whoever's planning development. And you know, so we -- looking at the next slide -- before we turn to it, though, I think it's got some air time already. Just the callout that Lea County includes. $\$ 1400$ per foot or -- or close to thirteen and a half million dollar per well cost.

I think the -- the voice over to that is
apart from Cimarex. That's because they have a 1-mile wells. You know, this is -- the slide does say that this is a 9700 foot average lateral length, but we'll -- we'll trust Cimarex that all those wells are not in Lea County.

Next slide, please. Yeah. And this is just to make sure we're not just taking my word at face value. This is the prolific Wolfcamp outline from Cimarex's earnings presentation and then the exhibit map from their testimony kind of merged together. And again, this is the same area that the Wolfcamp would be financially running it -- was to develop.

Q That was everything. Is that correct, Mr. Fechtel?

A I think so.
MR. RANKIN: At this time, Madame
Hearing Officer, I would move the admission of Exhibit $K$ to the record.

THE HEARING EXAMINER: All right. I'll pause for a moment to ask for objections to the admission of Exhibit K.

MR. ZIMSKY: Hearing Examiner, we don't have an objection to Exhibit K. But $I$ do have a point of order regarding whether our witnesses will be able to testify regarding these rebuttal exhibits.

THE HEARING EXAMINER: That was my understanding from our discussion yesterday or the day before. Yes.

Mr. Rankin, you remember that as well? MR. RANKIN: I remember that
discussion, and $I$, you know, maintain my objection to it. And I want to make sure that we complete our case before any sort of rebuttal is provided. I will say that -- we address this separately. But much of what was in Exhibit $K$ was covered by Mr. Zimsky's examination of Mr. Behm. So I guess, you know, I reserve the opportunity to continue to have a discussion about it at the end of our case.

THE HEARING EXAMINER: Right. All right.

So, Mr. Zimsky, as far as I'm
concerned, you will have a turn when Mr. Rankin is done with his case to raise what you'd like to raise. And if Mr. Rankin has an objection at that point, I'll address it. But I don't think any door is closed here. And $I$ know it was a little confusing to put out some of the rebuttal but not all of the rebuttal depending on what exhibit it related to. But let's keep going.

So Exhibit $K$ is admitted. Was that
all, Mr. Rankin?
(Exhibit $K$ was marked for
identification and received into evidence.)

MR. RANKIN: No further questions of
Mr. Fechtel. And I will tender the witness for examination by counsel and the division.

THE HEARING EXAMINER: Thank you very much, Mr. Rankin.

Mr. Zimsky, do you have questions of Mr. Fechtel based on his testimony?

MR. ZIMSKY: Yes. I have some questions.

THE HEARING EXAMINER: Please go ahead. CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. ZIMSKY:
Q Mr. Fechtell, good afternoon. William Zimsky. I'm the attorney for Cimarex. I have some questions for you. You agree that there is disagreement over whether some of the wells are Wolfcamp or third spring; correct?

A Yes, sir. It appears that way.
Q And you based yours on OCD records?
A Well, we did that in order to circumvent some disagreement in that these -- these are
hopefully -- these are the pooling codes. These are what the OCD is using. We do also -- go ahead.

Q No. Go ahead.
A No. That's -- OCD is -- especially in the original slide -- is the OCD pooling codes.

Q And relying on type logs and grids. Would that be a better way to actually determine the landing zone for particular wells as opposed to what is reported by the operator?

A They -- they both have their -- their place.
Q And so you agree that if Cimarex is looking at type logs and grids, that's a valid way to determine the landing zone?

A That's absolutely a valid way to determine what they believe landing zone is to be.

Q Thank you. Assuming that all the wells that you say are Wolfcamp that Cimarex said are third spring -- those are still flat developments for the most part, other than tan and black. In other words, they're not stacked with a Bone Spring and a Wolfcamp? Do you understand the question?

A I think so. You're saying that irregardless if the $O C D$ call them one thing, that Cimarex calls them the other. It's a moot point, because they're all wells that are close to each other.

Q Correct. And there's no stacking between -a co-development situation other than like in -- and a couple others?

A Yeah. I disagree with the kind of broad assertion. I think there are a number of wells that are -- that are -- you know, in units that have both. And I think there are a number of wells that are omitted altogether that are also with the -- but by and large, I -- I agree that a lot of development in the area has not included both the third bone and the Wolfcamp.

Q Okay. And going to slide K6.
A I've got to log back in real quick. Sorry.
Q K6.
A Slide 6, Exhibit K.
Q Yes. And let me get it up there. Okay. Do you see it?

A Yes, sir.
Q Okay. So on the left, you said something about synthetic -- I forget exactly how you termed it.

A Yes, sir. It's a synthesized right side. But that -- my -- my point -- like, this is actual well data, but it's -- it's not the black and tans. And this is -- this is a mixed audience. Wanted to step back a bit about forecasting.

Q And so it's synthetic. Does that have anything to do with the black and tan?

A Has to do with the -- the fundamentals of forecasting and how -- how we forecast.

Q Okay. And tying that back into the Batman where you only have 60 days now of data. I mean, if you rely on these fundamentals of empirical forecasting, wouldn't it be prudent to not make any types of conclusions on the long-term production from the Batman well unit until you got onto the decline curve?

A There are many forms of -- of analysis. And this is -- this is early time data, but it's extremely encouraging.

Q It's encouraging. But you would have a higher level of confidence with a longer interval production; correct?

A Of course. I'm sorry. It's maybe a mic issue. Yes, sir.

Q And the Batman well -- you heard Mr. Behm's testimony about the fact that this hasn't been fully developed. There's only, I guess, five wells in that section, so it might be producing more than what it might otherwise do in a fully development scenario? Do you agree with his testimony?

A I think the question was -- did $I$ hear it? I -- I did hear his testimony. And then, his -- his point was -- well -- but you didn't fully develop. And I agree. We did not. We -- we were taking a thoughtful and methodical approach. This was the first test in which we included one Wolfcamp well moving next door. And adding Wolfcamp wells because of this test. We are extremely excited.

Q Okay. So you're excited. Now, if the OCD grants your application, are you going to be drilling these -- you said you're going to co-develop. So let's just focus on the third sand and the Wolfcamp. Are you going to co-develop both the Joker and Bane at the same time?

A We -- we intend to co-develop the Wolfcamp and the third Bone Spring.

Q And both the Joker and Bane, so in other words --

A Go ahead.
Q Okay. I apologize. I don't mean to interrupt you. But are you going to drill the eight third sand wells and the eight Wolfcamp wells all at the same time?

A That will be dependent upon when we get our orders back and we get our permits back and if we have
the rig ability and are further enough along in the delineation test to go do both all at once. At minimum, one section will be co-developed between the third bone and Wolfcamp A.

Q But that's dependent upon the data you're getting from Batman?

A Batman and the continuation of that test through Robin.

Q So it's possible that you may decide, based upon that data, to change your plan and maybe just drill four Bone Springs or maybe just drill four Wolfcamp wells?

A I would -- I would find either of those two scenarios extremely unlikely. But absolutely. It's possible that we continue to learn and it's not four and four.

Q And if you try to do eight and eight, are you going to have any takeaway problems or infrastructure problems as far as completing sixteen wells at once?

A So sixteen wells at once is not new to Permian Resources, but $I$ have also not fully sat down with our -- our marketing team, partially because we don't have -- we don't have any orders or idea when our permits will be. It's -- it's hard to plan
details like that.
Q And so it's also hard to plan the details of just doing the Joker four and four without knowing the takeaway and the midstream; is that correct?

A No, sir. We've -- we've had new takeway midstream issues beyond the very early time flowback when our midstream partner did not get there in time. That's water only for a few days. I'm sorry. You said Joker. I thought you said Batman.

Q No. I was talking about Joker Bane. Thanks for that point. Maybe I misspoke. But based upon issues about takeaway infrastructure, other production issues, infrastructure issues, are you certain at this time that you can do the four and four in Joker?

A So I -- I am not the person that can have the certainty here as a -- as a reservoir engineer. We will not be -- we will not be drilling beyond our ability to take away production. We have a great team, and I have all the confidence in the world that we will have takeaway fully for any number of wells.

Q But sitting here today, you can't testify to that; correct?

A I can't testify as to when we will be able to go drill, owing to the contested hearing here.

Q Okay. We get a decision next week. Being a
little facetious. But you get a decision pretty soon, and Cimarex decides not to appeal. Would you be ready at that point to co-develop the eight wells in Joker?

A If this wasn't a hypothetical, then we would -- we would circle up with all the appropriate teams and -- and the machine would kick in, and we would make sure we had everything in place. But I can't speak to random hypotheticals.

Q And you said that Permian Resources has drilled, completed 16 wells at one time?

A Yes, sir. So we -- we bring them on with slight staggers in timing. But large developments like that are -- are not entirely unique.

Q Can you give us an example?
A That we are -- we are fracking a 15-well pad right now.

Q And where is that?
A That would be in -- in our Lockridge area. It's in Ward County.

Q In which county?
A Ward County.
Q And what's the project called?
A It's the Aberdeen and Waikiki.
Q Any other completions with that many -- any other development that you're completing that many
wells at the same time?
A We -- yes, sir. We've had -- we've had other developments. I can't give you the exact number, but between thirteen and eighteen.

Q Thirteen and eighteen wells at one time?
A Yes, sir.
Q Go ahead.
A Yeah. Again, these are hypotheticals around a cadence in -- in Batman Robin in the future, unknown date. How many wells ultimately come on at the same time is -- is again part of this hypothetical.

Q Look at K12. Can you see that on your screen?

A Yes, sir.
Q And do you see where my cursor is circling?
A Yeah.
Q Is that the Lea North wells?
A Yes, sir.
Q And you have three wells there; right?
A Yes, sir. We got the eastern most one, which we realized today.

Q And that would be the --
A I -- I couldn't tell you. Reproducing Mr. Behm's plot here. Attempting to.

Q That would be the Lea North 3 fed com 001H
well?
A I believe so. I -- it's one of the Lea 3 fed coms.

Q And that well adds 1,000,000 barrels on the 2-mile basis, approximately 1,000,000 barrels in a 2-mile basis. So you know, I understand this is probably accidental. It wasn't intentional to leave that out. Not saying it is. I'm just saying that that would increase -- now, I'm not really good with colors here. Is this those three Lea Norths?

A Yes, sir.
Q So if you added 1,000,000 barrels -- you added that one well, that would kick this up pretty significantly.

A It would bring up some. But again, the point of this plot is that the black and tans change substantially. The adding the Lea federal will not increase the black and tans --

Q And so I'm going with the slide 11. And the D12. The parry.

A Yes, sir.
Q Now, this is an edge well with no offset boundaries as described by Mr. Behm. Do you agree with that?

A No offset boundaries in the Wolfcamp. Yes,
sir. I agree.
Q And so using the EUR for this well, isn't that kind of an inflated number, since it is an edge well and there's no competition?

A If I'm not mistaken, I believe the assertion Cimarex is making is that the development of the Wolfcamp is uneconomic.

Q Yes, but the --
A This appears to be a very economic Wolfcamp well.

Q Yes. Because it's an edge well with no competition; agreed?

A That is certainly helping. I'm sure. But you would have to be a lot worse than this well to be uneconomic by Mr. Behm's math.

Q But this was in a full development with four sand Bone Springs and four Wolfcamp wells. The EUR would be -- the economics of it would be somewhat less profitable. Would you agree?

A It's difficult to say less powerful, but certainly the -- the possibility that it -- it's worse because of competition exists.

Q And did you hear Mr. Behm's testimony about the issues with the Batman well at eight days?

A I did.

| 1 | Q And do you have any comment upon that? |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A We were subpoenaed and supplied all of our |
| 3 | data, including all of the choke data. I -- I believe |
| 4 | that the -- pointing to that and adding a question |
| 5 | mark is -- is a false flag. You know, we -- within |
| 6 | that subpoena are plenty of email correspondence |
| 7 | questioning the rates ourselves and multiple responses |
| 8 | regarding people going out and -- and checking meters. |
| 9 | And from all the information we have, these meters are |
| 10 | correct. But early data always looks funky. I agree. |
| 11 | Q And looking at slide 9, the paloma 214H. |
| 12 | $A \quad Y e s, ~ s i r$. |
| 13 | Q Isn't the decline there materially different |
| 14 | from the parry wells? |
| 15 | A Yes, sir. Are you saying does the decline |
| 16 | Of -- which well? |
| 17 | Q The paloma. |
| 18 | A So the -- the orange third bone. Is it |
| 19 | different than the parry wells being the blue one and |
| 20 | the red one? |
| 21 | Q Correct. |
| 22 | A It is -- it is -- I really can't infer if |
| 23 | that decline is different than the blue parry third |
| 24 | bone. |
| 25 | Q And the slide 14. The Batman. There's five |
|  | Page 178 |

wells there; correct?
A Yes.
Q In that one section.
A Yes, sir.
Q Why haven't you drilled the eight wells?
A You're asking why we haven't drilled eight wells?

Q Yeah.
A Based on the very encouraging data from the Batman.

Q Yes.
A Batman was our original appraisal, which is giving us the data to increase density.

Q And so that data may end up showing that a four or five well per section is better than what you're actually planning for the Joker and for the Bane; correct?

A Yes, sir.
Q Now, going to slide 13.
A That's 15.
Q Oh. Fifteen. Yeah. It's, I guess, slide 13 from the earnings presentation. And you would agree this is like a high-level outline?

A Absolutely.
Q And there's a difference between the

Wolfcamp within -- where they say it's prolific. There's different producing stratigraphic levels in the Wolfcamp such as the sand, which is where, I guess, you're landing your Joker and Bane wells; correct?

A Joker and Bane wells are currently planned with the XY.

Q Yes. And so then there's the shale directly below that; correct?

A Yes, sir.
Q So because you heard the testimony that Cimarex believes that the Bone Spring -- their third sand wells will be draining efficiently the Wolfcamp, the $X Y$ sand. So I think your testimony was about why aren't they drilling in the Wolfcamp or the subject lands. And they are drilling -- going to be producing from the Wolfcamp wells; correct?

A That -- that is what they are claiming. Yes, sir.

Q Now, do you think your Bone Spring third sand wells are going to be drying from the Wolfcamp, the XY sand?

A I think there will likely be mixing between the $X Y$ and the third bone sand.

Q And that same goes with your Wolfcamp wells.

It will get the $X Y$ and also the third sand; correct?
A The -- both wells developed in the third bone sand and wells developed in the XY will share -have some resource from either formation.

Q Is that affecting the correlative rights of people that own different percentages in the third sand vis-a-vis the XY Wolfcamp?

A Believe so.
Q Now, going back to slide 9. The decline in the paloma. That occurred -- that was pretty parity for its completion; is that correct?

A I'm unsure as what you're asking.
Q The decline in the paloma. Do you see this 180 -- there was this decline here; right? The orange is the paloma?

A There is a sporadic piece of data right there. One of many $I$ see in that same well.

Q And then after the 4 H was completed -- and here's the 4H. There was a decline in the paloma. It's materially different than what it was before, 'cause it's all the way down here. And it went back up to here; is that correct?

A I'm having a little bit of trouble following.

Q For two years, it's kind of flat. There's
some decline. And then after this, the decline is much steeper. Would you agree with that? In the paloma.

A It's -- it's difficult to -- to see that in this plot. But when you produce more oil, you're generally going to decline more.

MR. ZIMSKY: I believe that's all the questions I have. Thank you, Mr. Fechtel. Appreciate it.

THE HEARING EXAMINER: Thank you, Mr. Zimsky. Sorry. Can you hear me? Thank you. Are there any other parties who have questions of this witness? No. All right.

Mr. Rankin, do you have any follow-up?
MR. RANKIN: I do. I just want to re-share my screen here real fast, 'cause we just ended on this topic, and I just want to make sure I understand and the nature of the record is clear. REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. RANKIN:
Q Mr. Fechtel, do you see my screen up here? We're showing again your Exhibit $K$, slide 9.

A Yes, sir.
Q Do you recall Mr. Behm -- I think there was some discussion about -- there definitely was.

Cimarex's position is that the third Bone Spring basil sand and the $X Y$ sand are all one tank. That's Cimarex's position; right?

A I believe so. One of -- one of many positions.

Q And so the paloma 214 H , as you said -- it was a preexisting well; right? So tell me. Was the fact that the parry was drilled subsequently -- does that make it a -- how does that affect the sequencing? You know, sounds like that would be a delayed development, not a -- explain how that might impact the paloma in terms of the sequencing.

A At minimum, the -- the parry 224 H is not a -- a standalone. You know, it's also not fully delayed, since it's only partially bound. But certainly, it is after the Paloma 214 H and -- and could interact with the -- the 214 H .

Q Explain what you mean by partially bound. How does that affect the assessment of the production here among these wells?

A The -- partially bound versus fully bound is just that there's only, you know, one paloma 214 H. Then another on the other side would've been a little, you know, more fully bound. But yes. The -- the paloma was drilled before the 214 H and -- and the
parry was -- was developed subsequent to that, and that's the uplift in the production.

Q Explain how true co-development might've made a difference in terms of SRVs in the --

A Right. So it's tough to -- it's tough to -I can't, you know, speak to the completion, you know, of the paloma 24 H and everything that went on there. But you know, developing the parry afterwards does, you know, pose risk to the 214 H . Fortunately, it worked out for this.

And you know, it's our -- it's our position that developing them together would've -- would've been a far better proposition. Would've, you know, undoubtedly -- you know, some of the energy in the parry 224 H went to the paloma's network for its depletion area. In this case, it got better.

It may've been that there was an inefficient simulation on the paloma. And so growing towards that fracture network actually helped the paloma. But I think if these had been done together with a modern design, they both would've benefitted.

MR. RANKIN: No further questions. THE WITNESS: Thank you, sir.

MR. RANKIN: Are you there, Felicia? THE HEARING EXAMINER: I'm right here.

Can you hear me?
MR. RANKIN: We can now.
THE HEARING EXAMINER: Okay. Sorry. I keep hitting mute, and it doesn't unmute. And it goes to speaker, and it does weird stuff. I'm sorry.

So if Mr. Rankin is done, Mr. Garcia, do you have questions of Mr. Fechtel?

MR. GARCIA: I do have a few.
THE HEARING EXAMINER: All right.
Thank you.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. GARCIA:
Q Good afternoon, Mr. Fechtel. Is that how you say it?

A It is. John Fechtel.
Q Bear with me, because $I$ will probably say it wrong a few times.

A You will not be the first today.
Q Quick question. How did you determine the spacing vertically and horizontally for design of the Wolfcamp and Bone Springs, lower Bone Springs wells in particular?

A So as far as horizontally -- right. I mean, four wells per section is -- is common in, you know, individual targets here. It also -- it -- you know,
by nature of the OCD rules -- right. Four wells per section is somewhat encouraged without having to get through a bunch more.

And then as far as interval targeting, we do think that near well bore rock matters. And so we have -- we have landed both of these wells in -- in what we view to be the optimal landing zone.

Q All right. And earlier I had asked Cimarex, you know, concerns about preventing waste, which OCD can be defined as reservoirs left in place or unnecessary cost. And do you think there's any unnecessary cost with the four wells at Bone Springs and four wells in Wolfcamp?

A So I think that -- that our approach is designed to minimize that. Had we gone out and done four and four immediately without any kind of scientific process, then that would've been a far greater risk. We have started with four wells in the third bone and one bone in the $X Y$. We are collecting a ton of data and are spending a lot of money to continue this.

We will spend several hundred million dollars in units just over the lease line by the time we get to the Joker and Bane to -- to make sure that -- that we ground truthed all of our assumptions.

And -- and so I think in terms of capital waste, we are equally -- equally eager not to waste capital and to do things prudently. "Incentivize" I guess is probably the -- the appropriate word. So -so no, sir. I -- I don't think that our approach is -- is kind of wasteful in terms of capital.

And $I$ think that the language that -Mr. Macha will testify about we are requesting a change in pooling order to make sure that -- that our thoughtful, methodical approach to permitting and development is not overly burdensome to working at your centers. Also ensures that.

Q Did you guys evaluate any other designs like -- I know it's not too common. I guess I'm just curious because of the relatively thin -- such as like a 2-by-2 wine rack pattern. Two in Bone Spring, Two in Wolfcamp. Just due to the near verticalness of these two far walls.

A Yes. So you know, if -- that certainly could be a possibility. Right now, we -- we kind of -- we like where this is, and we were encouraged about kind of -- like, you know, the belief or the assertion that the four well section is -- is optimal.

I -- I don't think it's fully founded in the offsets. We do see other pads. Even some rigs, how
it's Delo wells, which are -- despite inefficient development, original two well pad and four wells later -- they're very strong wells at -- at six wells per section.

So I think if -- if four wells per section were optimal, two wells in the third bone and two in the Wolfcamp makes a lot more sense, especially with regard to correlative rights. But we -- we have not arrived at the position that we think that four wells is optimal.

Q Okay. Do you have any concerns with the current design of taking "frackets" integrity casing undoing previous frac?

A We think that the co-development is the -by far the best method we have of -- of protecting integrity of our well bores.

Q Assuming you guys will drill the bone springs at Wolfcamp together, do you plan on zipper fracketing the Wolfcamp and Bone Springs together, or will they be fracked by formation or?

A So they'll be -- they'll be zippered in the sense that all of them will be completing at the same time. But -- but we do sequence within completions from time to time. And usually, that was not discretely done within this pad.

But it is -- it's definitely something that we -- we look at. And -- and often, we'll try to get ahead, especially in the third bone. And I think that will be something we're focused on within the next -next occupation of our development plan.

MR. GARCIA: I believe overall, that's all my questions for now. Thank you.

THE HEARING EXAMINER: All right. Is there any reason not to excuse Mr. Fechtel?

MR. GARCIA: I'm going to see if Hailee has any questions, Ms. Felicia.

THE HEARING EXAMINER: Oh. Thank you.
MS. THOMSPON: I don't have questions.
THE HEARING EXAMINER: Sorry?
MS. THOMPSON: I have no questions.
THE HEARING EXAMINER: Yes. Thank you, Ms. Thompson. All right. Is it time for a 15-minute break? All right. We'll see you in 15 minutes. Thank you.
(Off the record.)
THE HEARING EXAMINER: Thank you. And, Mr. Rankin, if you're ready to call in the next witness, please.

MR. RANKIN: Thank you, Madame Hearing Officer. We'll call our next witness. And again,
going out of order to make sure we get our witnesses in line here. We're calling Mr. Ira Bradford.

THE HEARING EXAMINER: All right.
Thank you.
Mr. Bradford, would you please raise
your right hand.
WHEREUPON,

## IRA BRADFORD,

called as a witness and having been first duly sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

THE HEARING EXAMINER: Thank you. Your voice is nice and strong there.

And go ahead, Mr. Rankin.
MR. RANKIN: Thank you.
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. RANKIN:
Q Mr. Bradford, will you please state your full name for the record. And for the benefit of the court reporter, spell your last name.

A My full name is Ira Andrew Bradford. And my last name is $B-R-A-D-F-O-R-D$.

Q By whom are you employed and in what capacity?

A I'm employed by Permian Resources as a
senior staff geologist.

Q Have you previously testified before the Division and had your credentials as an expert in petroleum geology accepted as a matter of record?

A I have.
Q At this time, have you conducted a study of the geology of the lands in the subject area at issue in these competing cases?

A I have.
MR. RANKIN: At this time, Madame
Examiner, I would move Mr. Bradford and re-tender him as an expert in petroleum geology.

THE HEARING EXAMINER: All right. Let me pause for a moment to ask if there are any objections. Sorry?

MR. SAVAGE: No objections.
THE HEARING EXAMINER: Thank you.
MR. RANKIN: Thank you.
BY MR. RANKIN:
Q Mr. Bradford, did you prepare a self-affirmed statement of your testimony in these contested matters?

A I did.
Q And is that marked as Exhibit E that was filed back on July 14 th with the Division?

| 1 | A Yes, sir. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q And did you also prepare some slides or |
| 3 | exhibits that go along with your testimony? |
| 4 | A Yes. |
| 5 | Q And were those marked as Exhibit E1 through |
| 6 | E29? |
| 7 | A Yes, sir. |
| 8 | Q Did you have any additions or changes, |
| 9 | modifications to either your testimony or any of your |
| 10 | exhibits that you presented previously? I missed that |
| 11 | one. |
| 12 | A Oh. I said -- I said no. |
| 13 | MR. RANKIN: Okay. Madame Examiner, at |
| 14 | this time, I would then move the admission of Exhibit |
| 15 | E with the attachments E1 through E29. |
| 16 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Thank you. Let |
| 17 | me pause a moment to ask for objections. |
| 18 | MR. SAVAGE: No objection. |
| 19 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Thank you. The |
| 20 | exhibits are admitted. |
| 21 | (Exhibit E was marked for |
| 22 | identification and received into |
| 23 | evidence.) |
| 24 | / / |
| 25 | BY MR. RANKIN: |
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Q Mr. Bradford, in addition to your direct testimony and the exhibits you prepared in association with your direct testimony, have you now also had a chance to review Cimarex's updated geology and testimony in the exhibits and testimony that they provided last week?

A I have.
Q And did you prepare yourself some additional slides and some testimony and rebuttal to certain aspects of that testimony?

A Yes, I did.
Q Were those marked as rebuttal Exhibit J?
A Yes.
Q At this time, $I$ will ask you -- I'm going to pull them up so everyone can see. And I'm going to do it in such a way as we can hopefully enjoy a bigger view. Mr. Bradford, if you would, I've got here on the screen -- hopefully, you can see it. Exhibit J.

And we have filed these with the Division and circulated to all parties. If you would just explain what this exhibit shows and explain what it's responding to in Cimarex's counter-development plan testimony.

A Thank you, Adam. So this slide I put together to help kind of further dive into the geology
in this area to show some of the nuances and kind of where I think the oil charges -- and maybe help shed some light on why Permian Resources is leaning into doing this third Bone Spring Wolfcamp XY stagger co-development plan.

The rebuttal exhibit -- you know, Cotera has been insinuating or in their exhibits saying that the third Bone Spring is a primary hydrocarbon tank providing hydrocarbons to the well bores drilled in this area.

And they made repeated statements that -especially in the pre-hearing statements that the Wolfcamp XY is a poor quality reservoir with minimum reserves. I -- I tend to disagree with that interpretation. Let me kind of walk everyone here through why using this slide right here.

I want to take a minute to start just to talk for one minute about phi height maps. I think phi height maps are great. I use them myself extensively when I'm prospecting a mapping. But there are some nuances with those maps that you have to understand to properly interpret what they're trying to tell you.

They really only show storage capacity in geologic units. And I think as we have heard in
various other testimonies, they do not typically account for what is in the pours. Whether to fill with oil or filled with water. And we need to do more in-depth analysis to understand kind of where -- where water and oil are concentrated in these different formations.

I also think -- you know, like porosity height map is -- you know, the second part of it is height. I do think it's slightly misleading when you are showing maps where one map has a height that is way greater than the other map. I think it's -- it's not -- it tends to make one look really good and the other not look really good, and that's -- and that's more based off of that $H$ part. Not really if there's good oil or good -- or good reservoir in -- in the other reservoir unit.

It is my personal interpretation from the data that we have collected and I have interpreted that the three Bone Spring basil in Wolfcamp XY are the primary hydrocarbon tanks in this system. And this is based off the production results we saw in the Batman and the log and core data we collected in these zones from the Batman pilot hole, which we're going to share with the commission here today.
So if you direct your attention to the
right-hand side -- or the left-hand side. I'm sorry. The left-hand side of the slide here. We have the Batman fed 132H pilot hole. This is a triple combo pilot hole that we collected from the -- from the Batman fed 132H. And it's focused in on kind of the area of interest here. The third Bone Spring. The -and the upper part of the Wolfcamp.

And I have -- and just 'cause -- it looks like $I$ forgot to label the tracks. The first leftmost track is gamma ray, followed by depth, followed by resistivity, followed by porosity. I would also like to point out the rotary side well core plugs that we took are marked as the little red boxes on the left edge of the resistivity track. I annotated some of the different formations and units I'm going to talk about today on the slide in here.

So I -- I kind of broke in the third bone spring into two different units. The third Bone Spring upper, which is the upper 210 feet of the third Bone Spring. And then the third Bone Spring basil low, which is kind of the bottom 70 feet of the -- of the third Bone Spring right above the Wolfcamp top. And this is -- and this is like, usually picked off of that higher gamma ray marker. Slightly lower porosity marker you see. That -- that is fairly
reasonably correlatable throughout kind of northern Lea County. The -- and this is also the -- like, primary third Bone Spring target that is targeted when the third Bone Spring is prospective.

I have also flagged it with a red star so that it's easy to see as we move from spot to spot which one correlates back to this interval. Below that, I have the Wolfcamp XY highlighted in purple with the $X$ sand and $Y$ sand loads there. And then, $I$ have a top there segregated in the Wolfcamp XY out from the Wolfcamp A shale below it.

I do want to point out that in these areas, the third Bone Spring basil and the Wolfcamp XY are very similar in thickness within about 10 feet of each other. And then just to hit on the Wolfcamp A shale, based on the core data we've taken, in -- in my experience working the Wolfcamp in Lea County, this is a high-quality organic resource rock that is most likely the primary hydrocarbon source for the $X Y$ and third bone spring in this area.

So if we move to the center exhibit here that's in kind of the green box, it says rotary side wall, core porosity, and water saturation. On the left-hand side, I have a -- a graph that has porosity on the left and saturations on the right for the core
points that we took. On the saturations, just note that the red dots are oil and the blue dots are water saturations values that were measured directly from the core samples.

And on the left-hand side -- or on the right-hand side, I have a table with just some average or -- value ranges just to make this easier to understand. So if you look at the -- start talking about the porosity in these zones. If you look at the porosity in all of these zones, it's all very similar porosity range.

The third Bone Spring basil is slightly higher porosity. Maybe -- maybe one to -- maybe one porosity unit greater than the upper third or Wolfcamp XY. And that's -- that's kind of a given. But with the Wolfcamp ranging from 6.5 to 8.2 percent porosity, it's still, in my opinion, a high-quality reservoir unit on par with the third Bone Spring basil.

As we look at the saturations, I think this is where the data is really most interesting. So like I said, if you look at the blue dots, those are -they measure water saturations. And the red dots are the measured oil saturations. So you can see, like, the average $S W$ value in the third Bone Spring basil and Wolfcamp XY is very similar coming in.

The average was like, 42 to 44 percent water saturation. And immediately as we get above that marker bed in -- that separates out the basil from the upper, we see divergence in the saturations where the oil saturations drop down. So the oil saturations in the other two units are averaging 20 to 30 percent.

And then as they -- as we go up in the third bone, oil saturation is dropped down to 10 percent and below, and the water saturations jump up to 60-ish percent plus. What this is telling me is that -- is the primary hydrocarbon tanks in this area is the Wolfcamp XY in the third Bone Spring basil. That is where the lion's share of the oil is stored in this hydrocarbon system.

There is some oil stored in the upper third Bone Spring, but it's going to be a more minor contributor to the overall production of the wells than from the third Bone Spring basil in the Wolfcamp XY. In my interpretation -- this is -- this is driven mainly by proximity to source rock. I think most of the oil is coming from the Wolfcamp shale.

It is a mature hydrocarbon generative rock, and it pushes oil up into the Wolfcamp XY and third bone basil, which cause them to have a higher oil saturation and better oil charge than the upper third

Bone Spring.
Mr. Behm testified that there probably is some migration laterally from deeper in the basin. I don't disagree with that. But $I$ think when you have high-quality, organic, rich source rock sitting right below the reservoir intervals, that is probably where most of the oil is being sourced from in these units.

All right. So going to the final part of this slide, which are the maps on the right-hand side. Going back into phi height here. So I have a third Bone Spring basil and a Wolfcamp XY phi height. And I think going into phi height here is good, because I'm -- I'm normalizing out the $H$ pours.

And these are about the same thickness, so we're really just looking at the overall relative reservoir quality of these two different intervals across the subject area of the hearing. You can see the third Bone Spring basil is -- has very widespread, high-quality rock across this whole area.

I -- really think that's probably one of the main drivers between the historic targeting of the third Bone Spring to the east and to the southeast of here. But when we look at the Wolfcamp XY, we see that there is a pretty significant accumulation of high-quality reservoir rock in the Batman Robin Bane

Joker area.
And it's this uplift in rock being almost the same -- same phi height values as the basil third Bone Spring, which makes me think that this is a sweet spot in the XY. This area, you can definitely handle more -- we can definitely drill more wells and export that reservoir in a more meaningful way than it's been exported in other parts of this area and make highly economic wells for Permian Resources.

You know, I think this slide demonstrates that Permian Resources has taken a thoughtful delineation and appraisal approach in this area where we have acquired 3 D seismic -- we drilled a pilot hole to -- complete with core data. And have successfully executed a direct analogous co-development test in the Batman that is performing our proposed development plan on this acreage.

Q Anything additional on this particular slide, Mr. Bradford?

A I think I covered most of it. It's a lot for one slide. Yes.

Q I don't have anything. I don't think you missed anything. So I'm going to move to the next one. Tell me about this slide, and explain just if you would, how it relates to what we've been
discussing as far as that HFTS2 project.
A Sure. This slide is really -- it was really
just to kind of give some like -- a high-level perspective of where HFTS2 was located, what wells were targeted, and -- and kind of the differences in the petroleum system between the Joker Bane area and where the study was conducted down in Texas. It is 43.7 miles to the south of our Joker Bane location.

I think the HFTS has a lot of really cool data in it that can really help us -- we can take and extrapolate and help inform our understanding of what's going on on the subsurface when we frac a well. But at the same time, it's -- you know, the -- the play style and hydrocarbon down there is -- is very different than what's going on in the Joker Bane area. So I have the Joker Bane as a red dot on the map and the HFTS2 location as a blue dot on the map.

So I just kind of made a quick slide up here or a quick comparison over on the other side with -on the top, we have the red dot, which is the Joker Bane, showing the Joker proposed development by Permian Resources. Showing that. We are targeting the Wolfcamp XY. We are targeting the third Bone Spring basil low.

And then the other target is going up
through the system. The other -- the other capture below the blue dot was taken directly from the HFTS final report on the DOE website. And it shows that -and it's really just meant to show that when you get that far down south in the basin, the Wolfcamp A shales take over as the primary targets for Wolfcamp development.

There was -- there was a Y -- a Wolfcamp Y and Wolfcamp $X$ well. Wolfcamp $Y$ as a direct part of the project and then an offset Wolfcamp $X$ well that was a parent well to the project. But third Bone Spring is not typically exploited down there. The "certigraphy" is similar, but the hydrocarbon system in the third Bone Spring is typically fairly wet in that area, which is why it's not commonly targeted as part of it.

That's -- that was really the main point of this slide, was just to kind of give some perspective on the fact that -- you know, like, there's a lot of cool stuff we can take out of this study to help inform our decisions that we're making and models that we might be doing in house. But using it as a direct analog of what's going on in Joker Bane is probably not 100 percent accurate. I can't hear you, Adam.

Q That's because I'm on mute. Mr. Bradford, I
do want to ask one question, only because it came up substantially in Ms. Mueller's testimony. And I think you mostly addressed it here, but only tangentially. I just kind of want you to address it head on.

Ms. Mueller testified that essentially, because there's no frac baffle or barrier between the basil third bone sand in Wolfcamp XY that it's -- in their view, it's deemed to be one tank and can be drained by -- or can be accessed by a single or flat well development. I guess if you would, just explain in your opinion why a staggered or wine rack development here is appropriate.

A Okay. I'd be happy to. So I don't disagree with the statement that third Bone Spring wells are going to tap in access reserves in the Wolfcamp XY. I think based off of the local geology, a four well per section third Bone Spring single bench test isn't going to adequately drain the reserves that are present in the Wolfcamp XY in this area.

Because of the increase in -- in storage capacity and -- and the fact that it is a charged, high porosity hydrocarbon bearing unit, it needs more wells to adequately produce the reserves that are present here.

Q I know you're not an engineer, but those

| 1 | additional wells are not going to be just accelerating |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | recovery? |
| 3 | A No. It's my belief that we will be tapping |
| 4 | into additional reserves in the Wolfcamp XY and |
| 5 | possibly in the -- the Wolfcamp shale as well. |
| 6 | Q Thank you, Bradford. |
| 7 | MR. RANKIN: At this time, Madame |
| 8 | Examiner, I would move the admission of rebuttal |
| 9 | Exhibit J. |
| 10 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: I'll pause for a |
| 11 | moment to see if there are objections. Exhibit J is |
| 12 | admitted. What? |
| 13 | MR. SAVAGE: I'm sorry, Madame |
| 14 | Examiner. Yeah. We don't have an objection, but I |
| 15 | just wanted to reiterate that we would like to be able |
| 16 | to talk to our expert witnesses in regarding to these |
| 17 | exhibits. |
| 18 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Okay. All |
| 19 | right. Mr. Rankin, Exhibit $J$ is admitted. |
| 20 | (Exhibit J was marked for |
| 21 | identification and received into |
| 22 | evidence.) |
| 23 | MR. RANKIN: Thank you. No further |
| 24 | questions. And I will offer Mr. Bradford for |
| 25 | questioning by counsel and the Division. |
|  | Page 205 |

Mr. Savage, do you have questions of Mr. Bradford? MR. SAVAGE: I do have a few questions.

And bear with me a little bit. Since our expert witnesses have not been able to address these, at this point, I will do my best to ask the questions on the rebuttal. But $I$ also want to go to the original testimony and talk about that a little bit as well.
CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. SAVAGE:
Q So, Mr. Bradford, you talked a little bit about that you do agree with Ms. Mueller that there is substantial communication between the third Bone Spring and the upper Wolfcamp; is that correct?

A Yes.
Q And it sounded to me like you agreed that there is no frac baffles between the third Bone Spring and the upper Wolfcamp?

A That is correct.
Q So there's no evidence that there are frac baffles in between the two?

A No.
Q Okay. And yet you seem to suggest that there is some difference between that. You do seem to suggest that there is some distinction that affects
production or affects the pay?
A Could you clarify the question for me?
Q Yes. So even though you agree there's no baffles, did you agree that the sink tank -- a single reservoir?

A I think there's a distinction between reservoirs and tank. I think the third Bone Spring basil and Wolfcamp XY are all individual sand loads that are individual reservoirs. And without modern horizontal completion, you do tie them into a tank.

Q So you think that there's two reservoirs, one for the third Bone Spring and one for the upper Wolfcamp?

A They are distinct sand loads. Yes.
Q Did you choose where the wells are landed?
A I'm part of the team that makes a decision. Yes.

Q Okay. And how do you choose where the wells are landed?

A We typically try to target high porosity with oil saturation.

Q So do you rely mostly on the permit and the OCD website regarding the formation --

A Oh. I'm sorry. I thought you were talking about how we choose our landings for wells we operate,
not how we land wells that are not operated by us. Is that what you're asking, is how we land over wells?

Q How do you land -- let's see. How are you responsible for finding where offset wells are landed?

A Okay. Excellent. Yes. No. We -- we use a combination of -- of grids and offset wells, directional surveys from the OCD, and then pooling orders and whatnot to help figure out where -- where wells are landed.

Q Okay. I want to direct your attention to your Exhibit E3 in your testimony. And that is also paragraph 7.

A E3. Okay.
Q In that paragraph, you say that the Permian's plan will maintain optimal spacing and co-development across this acreage, including -- you see that language?

A I have the -- I have the exhibit up. I don't have the language right in front of me.

Q Okay. So I'll recite it slowly. Paragraph seven. Permian's plan will maintain optimal spacing and co-development across this acreage, including with respect to existing offsetting production in the Verna Rae and Riddler units, which will prevent waste and maximize recovery across this acreage. Do you agree
that that's a fair statement, what you wrote?
A Yes.
Q And when you refer to the Riddler unit, do you agree that those are 1 -mile third sand wells?

A Yes.
Q So if the Riddler unit third sand wells are an example of preventing waste and maximizing recovery, as you say, then why are you co-developing with Wolfcamp and Bane and Joker, if you use those as analogs?

MR. RANKIN: Objection,
mischaracterization of Mr. Bradford's testimony.
THE HEARING EXAMINER: I'm sorry. Say
that again.
MR. RANKIN: I said I was objecting to
Mr. Savage's -- I think he mischaracterized what Mr. Bradford had testified to in his statement.

THE HEARING EXAMINER: Okay.
Mr. Bradford, make sure you don't let anyone else mischaracterize your statement. And if it's a mischaracterization, correct it, please.

THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.
MR. SAVAGE: Madame Examiner, may I state the comparison and statement again?

THE HEARING EXAMINER: Certainly.

BY MR. SAVAGE:
Q Okay. So in your statement in paragraph 7, you point out the Riddler units. And you showed them as an example in this quote, which will prevent waste and maximize recovery across all this acreage. Do you see that?

A Yes, sir.
Q And you say you agree that the Riddler unit -- you did agree, as $I$ understand, that those are 1-mile third sand wells, not Wolfcamp wells; is that correct?

A Yes, sir.
Q Okay. So I'm going to ask the follow-up question that Mr. Rankin objected to. But I believe it's a fair and valid question. So if the Riddler third sand wells are an example of preventing waste and maximizing recovery, why are you co-developing with Wolfcamp in the Bane and Joker?

A The language in the paragraph is meant to, I think, insinuate that we are -- our development is cognizant of offset parent wells and -- and is -- and is responsive to the fact that there is possibly edge well degradation due to the presence of existing wells. Not that it is an ideal development style for this area.

Q On your Exhibit 4, can you tell me why you chose to map phi $H$ as pay in Exhibit 4?

A Yes. I chose to map $P H$ as pay because it is a -- like I said in my earlier testimony, it is a -- a very good way to show where the reservoir tank is in a geologic formation. And it is also -- and it's very easy map to create from a readily available data that's available to everybody. It doesn't require special interpretation or model to generate these maps.

Q Okay. Thank you. And I just want to point out. I'll come back to this. But it looks to me -am I correct that even in your rebuttal exhibits, you still use the phi $H$ mapping?

A That is correct.
Q And I apologize. I may be a little bit redundant. I have some questions for the rebuttal. But it seemed like there were some changes that you -adjustments you had made, and I'd like to talk about both. But first, I'd like to talk about your original testimony. Why did you use the density porosity cutoff of 4 percent in Exhibit 4?

A It was a way just to knock out any -- any tight rock in the formation. Because it's not -'cause the tight rock is not a contributing reservoir.

Q Okay. So you basically limited it, as I understand, to the third sand, and any tight rock below was excluded; is that fair?

A Yeah. It's -- yeah. It's a standard cutoff we use internally just to help us focus on where the good rock is instead of mapping from zero to infinity from the porosity.

Q Okay. And I apologize. I'm not a geologist, so I'm trying to adapt to the terminology as best $I$ can. So then would it be fair to say that your third sand map and Ms. Mueller's map are equivalent because they both focus on the same area?

A I -- I -- from reviewing Ms. Mueller's exhibits, I feel that our third Bone Spring maps are similar and show the same depositional and reservoir distribution trends in the area.

Q Okay. In the rebuttal, you kind of talked a little bit about the water saturation, the oil saturation. Is it true that like, the $S O$ phi $H$ is a measurement of those kinds of issues as opposed to PH?

A Yes. It is. But $S O$ phi $H$ requires a -requires an oil saturation model to be run, and I was relying on direct measurements from core for my testimony.

Q Okay. So those are direct data. And a SO
phi $H$ requires some kind of interpretation?
A Right.
Q Okay. In your Exhibit 4, you show a 5H map of the total third Bone Spring and a 5 H map of the Wolfcamp sands plus the Wolfcamp A shale; correct?

A Yes, sir.
Q Okay. So why did you choose -- apparently, you made an adjustment here. But why did you choose to map the whole third sand?

A Because it was a similar thickness to the other map that $I$ was making of the Wolfcamp sands and Wolfcamp shale.

Q And why did you choose the map the Wolfcamp sands the shale below?

A Because the shale is a hydrocarbon target that $I$ believe is providing reserves into the Wolfcamp sand landing target.

Q Okay. So in your opinion, will the Wolfcamp Y sand Bane Joker wells effectively drain the Wolfcamp A shale?

A I believe there will be contribution from the A shale in those wells.

Q Would you describe it as a significant contribution or minimal contribution?

A It's -- it's very difficult -- it's very
difficult to tell.

Q Would you agree it might be no contribution if it's difficult --

A No. I think that there is contribution from the A shale. I -- I don't feel that I could put a number or percentage number on it, but $I$ do believe that there is oil coming from that.

Q Okay. We talked about baffles. In your Exhibit E7, you show a gun barrel diagram comparing Permian Resources development versus Cimarex's development; correct?

A That is correct.
Q And your statement for Exhibit E7. And that's paragraph 11. It looks like you state the following. I want to make sure I provide a fair representation or accurate representation of this. But Permian's plan demonstrates that spacing assumes maximum development of all prospective zones?

A Yes.
Q So can you tell me what you mean when you say that the spacing assumes maximum development of all prospective zones?

A Based off our current interpretation of the rock in this area, we feel that this would be the maximum number of wells that we could drill in this
section, given what we know today.
Q Okay. And this may be, you know, more appropriate for the land man. Are you familiar with the applications and how you categorize these in the pooling applications?

A Very tangentially. I don't feel comfortable testifying on it.

Q Okay. Are you familiar with the commencement deadline on the pooling order if it's issued?

A No. Not offhand.
Q I'll reserve those questions for the land man. So I'll just ask. Does Permian Resources intend to drill all the wells in the proposed development scenario within the next year?

A All proposed wells in all zones?
Q Depending the outcome of this hearing, yes. If you happen to prevail in this hearing, do you intend to drill all the wells in the proposed development scenario within the next year?

A That is not our intent. And I do not believe that is what we were required to do by the pooling order either. But $I$ would defer to Travis for details on that.

Q Okay. So if that's the case that you do not
intend to drill all the wells, which wells would you drill first? I'm sorry. Let me ask. Are there geological criteria considerations in which wells you drill first?

A Yes. We would likely drill the third Bone Spring and $X Y$ target wells first. It's best to develop the deepest target in an area first.

Q Between those two, which would take priority? Would you drill the third Bone Spring first and then the Wolfcamp, or would you drill them simultaneously?

A Simultaneously.
Q Okay. In your Exhibit 8. If you can direct your attention to that.

A Yes, sir.
Q You show all the offset wells in the area color coded by landing zone; correct?

A Yes, sir.
Q So most of the wells on this map are third sand shown in red.

A Yes, sir.
Q Okay. And there are no upper second sand wells shown on this map; correct?

A There are upper second bone sand wells shown in the Huckleberry development, but we didn't break
out upper and lower targets. We just showed them all as second Bone Spring wells.

Q Okay. So are there any third carbonate wells shown on this map?

A We have two interpreted third carbonate wells landed on Section 7 right directly adjacent to the Joker section -- by legacy.

Q Okay. Thank you. So these additional landing zones. Third carb and second sand. Would these be step-out test wells? Is that correct?

A I believe we collected enough data to prove that there are functioning hydrocarbon systems in both of those zones. We do need to do delineation work, which we are working through right now, to understand the ideal spacing and if those are viable targets or not. And we are currently leveraging our data and knowledge in the area to figure that out.

Q Okay. Mr. Bradford, I'm going to shift gears a little bit, and I'm going to ask some questions about your rebuttal exhibits, since that was covered extensively.

A Yes, sir.
Q And some of this may be a little bit redundant, because you know, there's some changes and adjustments. And I apologize in advance if I'm
repeating myself. So on your Exhibit 1. So you now show PH map of the basil third sand and the Wolfcamp XY, whereas before, looks like you covered more of the Wolfcamp and the other one, but --

A This is more focused. Yes.
Q Yes. This is more focused. So is this Wolfcamp sands map more representative of your upper Wolfcamp target compared to -- so by making this adjustments, are you representing that you are narrowing what those wells in the Wolfcamp XY would produce?

A No. I narrowed the windows more to -- more to have an apples to apples comparison of the sand reservoirs in this area and their relative quality and oil charge. It's not meant to infer drainage.

Q Okay. Do you think that drainage from the third sand well stops in the middle of the third sand?

A Could you be more specific?
Q So you have your third sand wells. Do you think the drainage is going to stop in the middle of the third sand, or do you think it expands beyond that?

A Up into the upper third bone spring?
Q Yes. That's correct.
A Yes. You -- yeah. I believe you would be
draining the whole third Bone Spring interval with those landings.

Q So then why did you chose to map just the third sand instead of the whole sand interval?

A Because I believe that's where the primary hydrocarbon in the third -- the primary hydrocarbon charges in the third Bone Springs sand. The upper third Bone Springs seems to have much more water and much less oil in it, so it's going to be less of a contributor to the overall production of the wells, whereas the Wolfcamp -- third bone spring basil and Wolfcamp XY are the two primary hydrocarbon drivers in this area.

Q And between those two, it sounds to me like the third Bone Spring is the more primary preserves?

A It is. It is slightly better, but you can't discount the storage in the hydrocarbon in the Wolfcamp XY either.

Q So to some extent, you agree with Ms. Mueller and Mr. Behm in that regard about the third Bone Spring being a primary -- probably the primary. And then possibly, even though as you point out, the Wolfcamp XY -- you believe it is productive, it may be a little bit less. A third. Is that fair?

A Very -- very minor. I think there's a very
minor distinction. I think in the area that we are here to talk about this hearing, they are very similar in charge and storage capacity.

Q Okay. There is a difference in the phi H based on these maps between the Batman development and the subject lands; correct?

A Yes. I mean, it varies across the area.
Q And in both the Wolfcamp sands and the third sand. Correct?

A Yes.
Q You can see that difference from these maps. Do you agree?

A Yes.
Q Okay. So you see phi $H$ differences between Batman and the subject lands, and yet you're saying the Batman development is a geologic analog to the subject lands; correct?

A That is correct.
Q Okay. If $I$ can direct your attention to Exhibit J. On your Exhibit J, you now label the black and tan development on your phi $H$ maps; is that correct?

A Yes, sir.
Q Okay. In both the basil third sand map and the Wolfcamp XY sand map, the values of the black and
tan are very similar to the Batman development. Do you agree with that?

A I would say for where we drilled our Wolfcamp XY well on the Batman, it's much more similar to Joker Bane than it is to black and tan. But the third Bone Spring is very similar across this whole area.

Q Okay. And then in that sense, you again agree with Ms. Mueller and Mr. Behm in his testimony that there is a consistency in that regard across the area of interest? I'm sorry. Did you understand that question?

A Oh. I said yes.
Q I'm sorry. There must be some kind of delay. And I apologize for my video blinking red. I don't know what's going on with that, but it seems to flash like that, so. And last couple questions here. And this is on your Exhibit J2. In this exhibit, you compare the thickness of the HFTS2 site versus the subject lands. Is that correct?

A It's not intended to be a thickness comparison. It's more meant to show where wells are landed in -- we think the targets are in one area versus another area.

Q Can the conclusions about thickness be
derived from the data that you're showing on this?
A I -- I'm not entirely sure what you're asking there.

Q Looking at what you provided, are there inferences regarding what the thicknesses would be between the two?

A I'm sorry. I still don't -- I still don't understand what the question -- what you mean by inferring stuff about the thicknesses.

Q So from this exhibit -- and I assume it's the logs that we're talking about -- you cannot infer anything about which site, the subject lands or the HFTS2 -- you cannot infer if there's any thickness difference from this exhibit; is that correct?

A It would be difficult to. Yes.
MR. SAVAGE: Okay. Madame Examiner, let me check my notes real quick.

THE HEARING EXAMINER: Okay.
MR. SAVAGE: Thank you, Madame Examiner. I think I'm finished with cross-examination.

And, Mr. Bradford, I appreciate your time.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
THE HEARING EXAMINER: Thank you,

Mr. Savage.
Mr. Rankin, do you have any redirect
before I go to the technical examiner?
MR. RANKIN: I do not.
THE HEARING EXAMINER: All right.
Mr. Garcia, do you have any questions of Mr. Bradford?
MR. GARCIA: I have a few.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. GARCIA:
Q Good afternoon, Mr. Bradford. I only have a few questions.

A All right.
Q You can get your core sample data.
A Yes, sir.
Q When you guys take cores, do you guys evaluate the cores in house, or do you hire an external party to evaluate the cores?

A We use -- we use premier laboratories to do the core analysis. But we do most of the interpretation in house on the actual data that comes back.

Q All right. And I guess maybe Mr. Rankin can help answer this one too. Are those core reports deemed sensitive or confidential, or is that something you can provide to us?

A They are deemed proprietary. I think we'd have to discuss with our legal counsel if we were able to provide them to you or not.

Q That's not a necessary thing. I was just more curious. I think this table will work for these purposes. Going back to Cimarex's Bone Spring design. Because really the debatable topic here is there are bone springs on top of the Wolfcamp. What are your thoughts on their four well placement in the bottom of the Bone Springs per section in how they will drain the Wolfcamp XY? Do you think it's going to drain effectively, partially, not at all?

A I -- I think -- I think because the proximity of the targets and the reservoirs, it will partially drain the reservoir. Based on what $I$ interpreted on the reservoir quality in the Wolfcamp XY in this direct area, $I$ do not believe that it is going to effectively drain all the reserves that are present there.

Q Okay. And on the flip side -- I know I asked your engineer that just testified. Do you think Permian's plan with the A wells in this area for the Bone Springs and Wolfcamp is a little overkill? I mean, they're very close, I guess, is my concern. And I'm still concerned about extra cost. You don't think
it's too many?
A I think eight is the maximum that we would drill in -- in the area. I think, like, the black and tan shows pretty definitively that -- that 12 is way too many. And I think that this area could support 8 on an upward -- as a maximum development to make highly economic wells.

Q Okay. Again, I asked your engineer a second ago about wine rack -- two and two wine rack. Did you guys evaluate maybe a two two or a three by three wine track? Did you?

A Like a six well per section wine rack?
Q Yeah. Three in Bone Spring. Three in Wolfcamp staggered. Or not staggered. Wine racked.

A I would say, like, if we're evaluating that in tandem with the -- with the eight walls, I think that the -- the two and two or four well -- I do think that this area can support more than just four wells in this -- in this reservoir tank.

Q So if this order was approved in your favor, is eight wells not a set plan? Are you guys still evaluating, I guess, is my next question based off that.

A I think we are -- we are leaning into permitting and -- and prepping all of our developments
for the eight wells per section test. But I -- I think we do reserve the right to change our mind in light of new data. We are going to be doing more testing to the south in our Robin Section and -- and to help us inform our decisions on what we develop up here.

Q Mr. Savage brought it up. And it might have been better suited for your production, but I'll ask you. How many wells total does this whole subject area have for you guys?

A Wells total. On the Batman, we have five wells total. In the direct area around here, I think that's all the wells PRs drilled.

Q I guess projected to be drilled.
A Oh. Projected. Gosh. Between all the zones and -- and our footprint in this area, we have -- I can't do the math in my head real fast. But it's -- it's a significant number of wells that we're going to be drilling in this area.

Q Okay. How long do you think it would take you to drill all those wells together?

A To fully develop the whole queue, the entire zone? Like -- like, the third, second, first --

## Q Correct.

A -- any other zones in between? It would
probably take -- it would probably take us -- take us several years as we -- as we work our -- we probably start at the base and work our way up through the --

Q Okay. And what if we talk about just the Wolfcamp and Bone Springs? Would it still take several years? Because I think there's less concern about effects on the upper Bone Springs as there are Bone Springs on top of the Wolfcamp.

A No. We would get after -- our plans are to get after drilling the -- the XY third Bone Spring tank as soon as possible.

Q I had asked Cimarex's geologist, because they had testified a little bit about potential to come back and add Wolfcamp wells in the future. I believe they stated somewhere along the lines of -they would try to aim those wells as low as possible to avoid any parent/child effects from happening in the future.

Do you think if they did lower those zones that there would be parent/child effects, negatively parent/child effects?

A I do. I think you can see that on the black and tans. And I think that the third bone is even still too close to the Wolfcamp A shale. If you came back later, you can see significant degradation
because of the depletion above you. I agree with everything John said about that in his testimony.

Q And sorry for my memory. Who's John again?
A John Fechtel. Our reservoir engineer. He just testified.

MR. GARCIA: I'm horrible with names. I'm sorry about that. I believe that is all my questions for now.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
THE HEARING EXAMINER: All right.
Thank you, Mr. Garcia.
Ms. Thompson, do you have questions?
MS. THOMSPON: I have no questions.
Thank you.
THE HEARING EXAMINER: All right.
Thank you. Any reason not to excuse Mr. Bradford?
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
THE HEARING EXAMINER: Thank you very much, Mr. Bradford.

Mr. Rankin, are we moving to final
witness?
MR. RANKIN: We are, Madame Examiner. We do have two witnesses left, but it seems like in the interest of time, we would only call one so that we could try to complete our side of the case today.

THE HEARING EXAMINER: Okay. I'm sorry. I lost count there.

MR. RANKIN: It's okay. Yeah. We had four, but you know, I think we're going to focus on what matters here. So I will say, however, Madame Examiner, I do need the fourth witness to adopt his testimony so $I$ can admit his exhibits to the record. I'm happy to wait to do that to the very end.

I would like to get Mr. Macha's
testimony in, so $I$ would ask that Mr. Macha be called to the stand. And then, we can deal with Mr. Clement's[ph] testimony at the very end.

THE HEARING EXAMINER: All right.
Thank you.
So, Mr. Macha, would you raise your right hand, please.

WHEREUPON,

## TRAVIS MACHA,

called as a witness and having been first duly sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

THE HEARING EXAMINER: All right.
Thank you very much. And I'm sure Mr. Rankin will ask you to spell your name for the record.

MR. RANKIN: I will.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. RANKIN:
Q Mr. Macha, can you please state your full name for the record. Spell your last name for the benefit of the court reporter.

A My name is Travis Macha. My last name is spelled $\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{A}$.

Q By whom are you employed and in what capacity?

A I am employed by Permian Resources as a New Mexico land lead.

Q Have you previously testified before the Division, and have you had your credentials as an expert in petroleum land matters accepted?

A Yes, I have.
Q Are you familiar with the applications that were filed in these cases on behalf of Permian and Reed and Stevens and the competing cases filed by Cimarex?

A Yes.
MR. RANKIN: Madame Examiner, I move to tender Mr. Macha as an expert in petroleum land matters.

THE HEARING EXAMINER: Okay. I've definitely heard his testimony before, but I'll pause
momentarily for an objection.
MR. SAVAGE: No objection.
THE HEARING EXAMINER: He is so
recognized. Oh. Thank you, Mr. Savage. BY MR. RANKIN:

Q Mr. Macha, in preparation for today's hearing, did you prepare a self-affirmed statement?

A Yes, I did.
Q And was that submitted as part of the exhibit packet in these cases and marked as Exhibit C?

A Yes.
Q Yeah. Got you. Good. And did you also prepare some exhibits to go along with your testimony?

A Yes, I did.
Q And were those marked as Exhibits C1 through C14?

A Yes.
Q And in addition to the exhibits that were filed, did you also have an exhibit that was filed after -- I think it was filed on -- let me see if I can get the date. A supplemental exhibit that was filed on July 14 th marked as Exhibit $C$. One moment. I believe it was supplement exhibit to C12, which was, I think, a letter from Chase.
A C12. A letter from Chase. Yes.

Q And other than that, do you have any changes, supplements, or additions to your testimony or the exhibits that were filed previously?

A No, I do not.
MR. RANKIN: At this time, Madame
Examiner, I would move the admission of Exhibit $C$ along with the attachments C1 through C14, along with the supplement Exhibit C12 that was filed previously. THE HEARING EXAMINER: All right. I'll pause for a moment for an objection.

MR. SAVAGE: No objection.
THE HEARING EXAMINER: All right.
Thanks, Mr. Savage. Exhibit $C$ and its attachments are admitted. And, Mr. Rankin, just a reminder. As I mentioned a couple hours ago, we do have to stop at 4:30 again.
(Exhibit $C$ was marked for identification and received into evidence.)

MR. RANKIN: I understand. And I don't know. I can't guarantee we're going to get through Mr. Macha's direct. I apologize for that. I anticipated we would. I'll do my best to do it.

THE HEARING EXAMINER: Okay. You know, I'm available most of tomorrow. We can have a
discussion about kind of next available date when you ask Mr. Macha some questions.

MR. RANKIN: Thank you, Madame
Examiner. And I appreciate the opportunity to confer with my folks here in Santa Fe. And I think there may be an opportunity for us to try to complete this in the morning if that's an option.

THE HEARING EXAMINER: Yes.
BY MR. RANKIN:
Q Mr. Macha, have you had an opportunity to review the land testimony and exhibits that were provided in this case by Cimarex?

A Yes, I have.
Q And did you prepare a set of rebuttal exhibits and testimony in response to those?

A Yes, I have.
Q Are those marked as rebuttal Exhibit I?
A Yes.
Q At this time, Mr. Macha, I'm going to go ahead and share my screen. And I'm going to ask you -- you know, I may interject here and there and maybe have some questions. But I'm going to ask you to refer to each page of your Exhibit I.

And we can discuss as we go through them. And I'm going to put these on a screen so that we can
see them properly. One moment. Are you able to see my screen now, Mr. Macha?

A Yes.
Q Real quickly, explain what this shows. I think this is essentially a timeline. And there's been some discussion about what happened in the past. Just explain the point of this exhibit in response to Cimarex's testimony.

A Yeah. So Cimarex's testimony kind of sets forth a brief timeline from kind of 2018 to present. I just thought it might be beneficial for everyone to kind of see the whole broad picture of the history of these four sections and kind of the lease hold as well as the high-level development that's taken place over -- over the years.

Q Okay. So I think we were going to spend a little more time on this. But $I$ think in the interest of time, we're going to go ahead and bypass any further discussion here. On your next slide, Mr. Macha, just explain what this slide shows and what it's in response to.

A So these -- we felt a strong need to kind of talk about the bottom-right statement to -- that Cimarex has now repeated three times, first in their July 26th brief about how they claim that we've only
filed on single Wolfcamp application in the vicinity, whereas we've filed 17.

You know, and just kind of pointing out the fact that that is wildly incorrect. And you know, on the left side, we break out the actual Bone Spring and Wolfcamp cases between Batman, Robin, and Riddler. I also will note that four of the ten Bone Spring cases that Cimarex cites that we have all filed are actually four of the Bane cases that we're hearing today. So I'm not really sure the intent of -- of the statement. But obviously, we wanted to address it.

The other part of that is they claim that if, you know, by pulling these Bone Spring cases, we are inhibiting correlative rights of the Wolfcamp owners. And kind of just following that little -little line onto the bottom left. I've kind of indicated that, you know, while there -- there are depth severances and it's very common in Joker and Bane -- you know, Batman, Robin, Riddler.

We've been fortunate enough to not to have to, you know, deal with too many of those. There is one single one in the -- in -- in Batman, in the northeast corner of Section 19, whereas Permian itself doesn't own more -- more interest than Wolfcamp.

Q So as a consequence, because for most of
these other spacing units, there's no difference in the Wolfcamp, explain how that does or doesn't impact correlative rights in those other cases.

A So you know, if -- if you've got uniform interest between the Bone Spring and Wolfcamp formations and you pull both of them or you pull one of them. All owners have been noticed thoroughly and are very aware of their -- their rights and what would be impacted and what wouldn't be and what -- what the potential development plans would be as -- as to their -- their interest respectively.

Q And can you explain in this -- according to these pooling cases -- the other point of this, I think, Mr. Macha -- I wanted you to just make sure we understood it. Can you explain -- not only are these cases pulling the Wolfcamp as well, but can you explain the development plan for these Wolfcamp applications and how they relate to the Joker Bane?

A Right. So as you know, John Fechtel and Ira have kind of detailed with the Batman development. That was kind of our first appraisal of co-development between the third bone and Wolfcamp in this area.

We're transitioning that into Robin -- the Robin unit, where we are going to be plugging more Wolfcamp wells into that, utilizing those pulling
orders. Riddler. That one's a little weird. Obviously, the legacy Reed and Stevens Company has drilled six bone wells in that. But there is their way of third bone left in -- in the west half of section ten. One mile that we are intending on developing, co-developing with the Wolfcamp there.

Q So we just explained, I guess, in each of these cases. You're proposing the same wine rack co-development pattern between -- explain whether you are developing the same wine rack co-development pattern between the third Bone Spring and the Wolf Camp XY.

A Correct. So I think, you know, just exhibiting this is -- is a clear intent of us to be co-developing the Bone Spring and Wolfcamp across this entire area.

Q Okay. We talked a little bit about correlative rights in the last exhibit there and how it's not an issue when there's uniform ownership between pools. Explain how that's different here, if you would.

And I'm going to just ask you to -- we're going to slowly kind of walk through this. And I want to start with -- if you would just, at the far left on this top chart, explain who these owners are and what
the different colors and bold type and asterisks mean.
A Yeah. So on the owners -- so you know, I kind of -- you know, I've highlighted Delmar Hudson, Magnum Hunter, and Cimarex the same color. They -they're all owned by Cimarex themselves. The Avalon Energy Corp., Reed and Stevens, and First Century are owned by Permian.

The asterisks indicate pooled parties. Bold type is intended to clarify owners that are owning a differential interest between the Bone Spring Wolfcamp. I did neglect Hog Partnership, LP. And William A. Hudson should be bolded as well.

Q Now, at the top of this, you're obviously indicating here that you're going to make a comparison between contractual versus lease sold. Explain why you're doing that, and then walk through if you would the main body of the chart and explain how this shows the differences in ownership.

A Yeah. So on that left side of that black line, $I$ kind of detail the lease hold interest. You know, I give the net acres normalized across all four sections in each the Bone Spring and Wolfcamp. And I also provide the delta there.

The negative deltas indicate a higher interest in the Wolfcamp, and the positive deltas
indicate a higher interest in the Bone Spring. And I've also indicated a higher interest in the Wolfcamp by the blue rose and the higher interest in the Bone Spring by the orange rose.

And hopping over to the right side of that black line, $I$ detailed the exact same, but broken out by contractual interest. The point of -- of this kind of summary is that -- you know, Cimarex has detailed that they have issue with the original division of interest that we set forth based on lease hold title.

This is kind of just to show that whether you look at lease hold title or contractual title, it paints a very similar picture. Whereas half the parties almost, if not have, are going to be negatively impacted via their correlative rights if indeed Cimarex's plan is -- is adopted.

Q Just briefly, Mr. Macha, would you just explain why it is that, in your understanding -- for purposes of compulsory pooling, why it is that you were using the lease hold interest and represented those in your direct testimony exhibits?

A Right. So it's -- it's our understanding that per OCD statute that for the purposes of pooling, the OCD cares about the underlying lease hold rather than voluntary agreements between the working interest
parties.
Q Now, I want to just make sure I understand again. I know you talked about this, but $I$ want to walk through these columns real quickly. I know we're almost at 4:30. But going from left to right, let's look at the lease hold interest. Okay. Because I think that's what matters for compulsory pooling orders.

You've indicated here on a full development basis for both Bone Spring and Wolfcamp what the net ownership is for both pools; correct?

A Correct.
Q And explain to me why you did that on a full development basis, just so I understand. Individual space units for the purposes of this chart.

A So for the purpose of -- of this chart, I just wanted to give a high-level overview of the entire area and why -- and why and how exactly each of these owners might prefer a co-development strategy or why they might actually prefer a -- only developing the Bone Spring.

As you can see, there are several owners, including Cimarex, that -- or at least the Magnum Hunter entity -- that own substantially more acres in the Bone Spring. And at least on a land
perspective -- I'm not speaking towards a technical perspective -- in my opinion, would be a motivation as to why you might want to inhibit the drawing of the Wolfcamp and try to capture those rights by drilling the Bone Spring.

Q Okay. So based on this chart, where you have the delta column where it's negative, explain what that means versus where it's positive and how that's reflected in the next column where it says formation favor.

A Right. So just take an MRC permit at the top as an example. Normalize cross all four sections in the Bone Spring. 14.40 acres. And the Wolfcamp, they own 43.23. That delta -- just a negative -negative delta indicates more interest in that Wolfcamp formation. It's just a simple subtraction.

Q And explain there's no difference when you do that between the --

THE HEARING EXAMINER: Mr. Rankin, I think we've reached the end of our time.

MR. RANKIN: Yes, we did.
THE HEARING EXAMINER: We're clearly not going to finish with Mr. Macha today. I'm sorry about that.

```
                        MR. RANKIN: Madame Examiner, may I
```

have a moment to confer with --
BY MR. RANKIN:

Q Or, Mr. Macha, is there any issue with us continuing in the morning, to your knowledge?

A Not to my knowledge, no.
MR. RANKIN: Madame Chair, I would ask that we be permitted to resume the hearing on this matter in the morning at 8:30.

THE HEARING EXAMINER: Yes, sir. 8:30
is the time $I$ would propose.
Mr. Savage or Mr. Zimsky, are you available?

MR. SAVAGE: I believe Mr. Zimsky has been conferring with our client to see if we are available. And I'm getting some feedback here. And it looks like we are all available.

THE HEARING EXAMINER: All right.
Terrific. Marlene will send out another -- if she hasn't already. She's so efficient, she probably already sent it out. There'll be another link, and we will resume the hearing at 4:30. Thank you all.
(Whereupon, at 5:32 p.m., the
proceeding was concluded.)
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| 1,000,000 176:4 |  | 189:18 | 015 121:16 |
| 176:5,12 |  | 1500 115:24 | 2016 50:19 |
| $1.0 \quad 39: 25$ |  | 153:22 | 2018 63:20 |
| 1.0. $38: 5$ |  | 15th 92:19 | 77:10 127:17 |
| 1.3 39:3,6 92:5 |  | 16 174:10 | 234:10 |
| 101:5 102:15 |  | 16-23 1:7 | 2019 29:17 |
| 1.37 45:18 |  | 167 5:15 | 121:20 134:18 |
| 1.4 101:5 |  | 167/167 6:15 | 2020 30:18 |
| 1.4. $39: 7$ |  | 17 235:2 | 52:7,11 |
| 10 2:2 27:13 |  | $178148: 6$ | 2021 52:7,11 |
| 31:6 37:10 |  | 180 114:12 | 2022 30:19 |
| 42:9 46:2 72:8 |  | 151:6 181:14 | 63:7,20 121:22 |
| 74:25 101:10 |  | 182 5:16 | 2023 2:2 40:17 |
| 103:23 128:20 |  | $185 \quad 5: 17$ | 2023-011 47:22 |
| 128:23 159:8 |  | 19 70:25 77:25 | 204h 17:11 |
| 197:14 199:8 |  | 78:10,13 79:25 | 88:9 |
| 10,000,000 |  | 107:13 132:16 | 205/205 6:13 |
| 100:22 101:13 |  | 235:23 | 206 5:20 |
| 102:14 |  | 190 5:19 | $\begin{array}{lll}21 & 78: 5\end{array}$ |
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[210-58]

| 210 196:19 | 23516 1:15 | 3 | 40 26:22 39:5,9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 214 3:5,20 | 23517 1:15 | 3 35:1 64:14 | 39:22 40:4 |
| 214h 32:9 | 23518 1:15 | 99:3 175:25 | 76:22 108:22 |
| 150:25 178:11 | 23519 1:16 | 176:2 | 127:17 148:20 |
| 183:6,16,17,22 | 23520 1:16 | 3,000 113:4 | 149:8 |
| 183:25 184:9 | 23521 1:16 | $30 \quad 39: 21 \quad 72: 12$ | 402 30:23 |
| 221a12 32:10 | 23522 1:16 | 199:6 | 40s 136:5 |
| 223 5:21 | 23523 1:17 | $300 \quad 16: 18$ | 42 72:13 199:1 |
| 224h 150:19,24 | 23591 11:10 | 26:16 69:19,21 | 43 53:3 72:13 |
| 183:13 184:15 | 23594 1:11 | 69:23 | 74:2 79:16 |
| 23 99:12 | 11:9 | $30177: 18,21$ | 131:25 149:6 |
| 230 5:23 | 23595 1:11 | 302 30:24 75:1 | 43.23. 241:14 |
| 232/232 6:4 | 23596 1:11 | 144:6 | 43.7 139:12 |
| 23448 1:9 11:9 116:24 | $235971: 12$ 11:10 | 302h 143:20 | $152: 6202: 8$ $44 \quad 53: 4,8$ 199:1 |
| 23449 1:9 | 23598 1:12 | 308 | 45 26:20 73:3 |
| 23450 1:9 | 23599 1:12 | 31 39.6 | 450 129:24 |
| 23451 1:10 | 23600 1:12 | 3314 | 4600 148:8 |
| 11:9 116:24 | 23601 1:13 | $3414: 23$ | 478 31:21 |
| 23452 1:10 | 11:11 116:25 | $340 \quad 69: 24$ | 4:30 118:22 |
| 11:10 116:24 | 242 28:17 | $34516: 18$ | 232:16 240:5 |
| 23453 1:10 | $245151: 8$ | 26:18 | 242:21 |
| 23454 1:10 | 248 18:7 | 36 82:9 | 4h 32:12,25 |
| 23455 1:11 | 24h 184:7 |  | 181:18,19 |
| 11:10 116:25 | 2500 31:22 | $367157: 16$ | 5 |
| 23494 116:25 | 26522 243:19 | 37 132:3 | 5 18:14 110:8 |
| 23508 1:13 | 269,000,000 | 37,000,000 45:5 | 5,000 32:10 |
| 23509 1:13 | 44:24 | 38 79:21 | 50 21:15,17 |
| 23510 1:13 | 26th 234:25 | $38.5148: 10$ | 72:17 108:22 |
| 23511 1:14 | 27 67:22 71:24 | 3d 201:13 | 5100 32:10 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}23512 & 1: 14 \\ 23513 & 1: 14\end{array}$ | 27123 244:16 | 4 | 54 149:22 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}23513 & 1: 14 \\ 23514 & 1: 14\end{array}$ | 28 14:23 63:7 | 4 19:11 40:15 | 55 44:16 |
| $\begin{array}{ll} 23514 & 1: 14 \\ 23515 & 1: 15 \end{array}$ | 109:21 2h 136:18 | 116:24 117:16 | 56 44:16 |
| 235151.15 | 144:13 | $\begin{aligned} & 211: 1,2,22,22 \\ & 213: 3 \end{aligned}$ | 58 5:9 |
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[5:32 - accurate]

| 5:32 242:22 | 92,000,000 45:6 | 73:5 79:3 | access 13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5h 54:15 213:3 | 95 68:14 | 91:17 104:23 | 14:13 16:16,22 |
| 213:4 | 9500 49:5 | 118:7,19 | 18:21 19:8 |
| 6 | 149:20 | 165:24 173:23 | 27:10,15 36:9 |
| 6 65:19 169:15 | 9700 165:3 | 205:15 206:5 | 36:20 38:25 |
| $6.5198: 16$ | 9:45 2:3 | 224:2 234:1 | 67:9 69:1 73:5 |
| 60 170:6199 | a | above 95:5 | 87:6 204:15 |
| 6031756 2:8 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 117: 16149: 21 \\ & 161: 1 \quad 196: 22 \end{aligned}$ | accessed 24:2 $26: 17 \text { 28:9 }$ |
| 67 157:12 |  | 161:1 196:22 | 26:17 28:9 |
| 7 |  | absence 105:6 | 54:5 80:8 |
| 7 49:19,21,22 |  | 109:9 135:25 | 82:24 83:8 |
| 65:19 72:8 |  | absolutely | 107:9 112:1 |
| 78:9 101:11 |  | 40:11 140:16 | 204:9 |
| 208:12 210:2 |  | 150:24 159:4 | accessing 33:4 |
| 217:6 |  | 159:18 163:25 | 35:11 55:3 |
| $70 \quad 196: 21$ |  | 168:14 172:14 | 69:15 75:2 |
| 760 32:12 |  | 179:24 | 113:13 158:5 |
| 8 |  | accelerate | accidental |
| 8 5:8 18:14 |  | 21:10 33:21 | 176:7 |
| 27:3,16 216:13 |  | 158:21 | account 91:10 |
| 225:5 |  | accelerated | 159:7 195:2 |
| 8.2 198:16 |  | 58:15 | accrued 149:9 |
| 837 149:19 |  | accelerating | accumulate |
| 85 149:20 |  | 36:13 205:1 | 52:23 |
| 87102 2:6 |  | acceleration | accumulation |
| 87501 3:6,21 |  | 21:1 33:12 | 200:24 |
| 87504 3:13 |  | 34:2 35:18 | accurate 8:22 |
| 4:14 |  | 37:8 158:11 | 9:4 10:20 11:2 |
| 87505 4:7 |  | 159:12,13,16 | 30:14 44:12 |
| 890 148:4,5 |  | accept 116:11 | 84:8 85:1 86:2 |
| 9 |  | accepted | 98:6 203:24 |
| 9 17:10 19:17 |  | 118:17 191:4 | 214:16 243:9 |
| 64:9,14 178:11 |  | :14 | 244:5 |
| 181:9 182:22 |  |  |  |

[achieve - adopted]

| achieve 27:22 | 99:10 109:19 | adding 107:7 | addressed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 91:20 | 118:6 129:6 | 137:16 154:18 | 80:15 92:13 |
| acknowledge... | 130:7,12 | 171:7 176:17 | 99:21 204:3 |
| 59:22 | 132:14 135:9 | 178:4 | addressing |
| acquired | 135:14 136:4 | addition 34:21 | 118:16 |
| 201:13 | 136:20 138:2 | 137:22 193:1 | adds 176:4 |
| acreage 18:15 | 138:10,25 | 231:18 | adequately |
| 19:5 23:8 | 139:9 140:12 | additional | 137:24 162:24 |
| 37:13,16 43:5 | 141:22 147:14 | 21:14 23:2 | 163:17 204:18 |
| 43:9,16 46:17 | 149:3 156:10 | 25:18,22 26:20 | 204:23 |
| 48:10 50:18,23 | 156:12 158:22 | 26:22 27:15,17 | adjacent 23:8 |
| 67:6 94:2 96:9 | 163:19 168:7 | 29:6,16 30:2 | 34:4 36:18 |
| 96:19 201:17 | 179:16 184:19 | 33:21 34:8,10 | 99:4 100:16 |
| 208:16,22,25 | 235:8 240:20 | 35:18 37:8 | 217:6 |
| 210:5 | adam 7:23 | 40:10 41:6 | adjustment |
| acres 238:21 | 12:16 193:24 | 42:17 43:20 | 213:8 |
| 240:24 241:13 | 203:24 | 47:15 51:21 | adjustments |
| action 243:12 | adapt 212:9 | 66:18,20,24 | 211:19 217:25 |
| 243:16 244:8 | add 27:16 28:7 | 75:3,7,9 83:18 | 218:9 |
| 244:12 | 33:8 34:10 | 87:16 91:4 | admission |
| active 50:16 | 39:4 69:15,20 | 96:17,25 97:2 | 125:3 165:17 |
| 71:7 | 75:10 83:18 | 101:25 107:12 | 165:21 192:14 |
| activities 50:13 | 87:16 101:25 | 137:21 146:22 | 205:8 232:6 |
| activity 48:11 | 107:11 109:10 | 147:5 158:17 | admit 229:7 |
| 50:11 64:4 | 124:2 132:10 | 193:8 201:18 | admitted 9:10 |
| 127:4 | 133:14 154:19 | 205:1,4 217:8 | 11:15 117:16 |
| actual 66:8 | 156:9 227:14 | additionally | 117:22 125:10 |
| 111:16 130:24 | added 29:16 | 18:2 30:1 | 166:25 192:20 |
| 134:2 155:21 | 38:16 39:14 | additions | 205:12,19 |
| 169:22 223:20 | 70:10 107:11 | 123:24 192:8 | 232:14 |
| 235:5 | 130:7 134:20 | 232:2 | admittedly |
| actually 65:7 | 154:11 156:15 | address 70:12 | 152:19 161:1 |
| 72:13 75:4,9 | 158:7 176:12 | 76:25 166:9,20 | adopt 229:6 |
| 84:20 86:24 | 176:13 | 204:4 206:5 | adopted 239:16 |
| 88:4 98:16,23 |  | 235:11 |  |
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[adopting - answered]

| adopting 10:9 | 76:5 78:14 | 129:4 167:14 | 131:19 203:23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| advance 217:25 | 79:8 80:25 | 168:2,3 171:19 | 220:16 |
| advantages | 81:2 82:14,19 | 175:7 189:3 | analogous 24:6 |
| 146:4 | 83:22 84:1,4 | 190:14 233:20 | 25:4,5 26:9 |
| afe $45: 1$ | 86:5,14 87:11 | 234:18 | 27:5,6 28:2,20 |
| afes 44:4,7 | 88:12,14,17,21 | aim 227:16 | 28:25 30:20 |
| affect 26:10 | 89:9 91:11 | aimed 114:14 | 107:5 131:22 |
| 27:5 183:9,19 | 92:9,16 93:7 | air 164:22 | 201:15 |
| affecting 181:5 | 96:13 98:11 | albuquerque | analogs 131:9 |
| affects 206:25 | 100:2,11,15 | 2:6 | 209:10 |
| 207:1 | 101:18 102:21 | align 164:16 | analysis 46:19 |
| affidavit 10:9 | 102:24 103:2 | allocate 46:8 | 46:20 48:5 |
| affirm 8:6 | 167:19 168:11 | allocation | 52:25 91:20,24 |
| affirmed 6:3,5 | 169:9 170:25 | 20:24 93:22 | 92:1,7,8,15 |
| 6:8,10 8:18 | 171:4 176:23 | allowed 51:10 | 98:11 100:7,11 |
| 11:664:15 | 177:1,19 | alternations | 100:20 128:22 |
| 123:16,21 | 178:10 179:23 | 61:3 | 132:20 133:2,3 |
| 191:21 231:7 | 182:2 206:12 | altogether | 133:19 135:17 |
| afternoon | 207:3,4 208:25 | 144:20 169:8 | 136:16 139:6 |
| 167:17 185:13 | 209:4 210:8,9 | amalgamation | 143:11 159:9 |
| 223:10 | 214:2 219:19 | 112:8 | 170:12 195:4 |
| aggregate | 220:12 221:2,9 | ambivalent | 223:19 |
| 36:15 41:22 | 228:1 | 97:9 | analytical |
| 65:9 78:25 | agreed 12:12 | amended | 46:16,24 49:13 |
| 93:4,5 | 177:12 206:16 | 109:20 | 93:14 |
| ago 147:20 | agreement | amount 18:18 | analyze 105:19 |
| 164:12 225:9 | 24:17 103:3 | 46:5 57:2 | analyzing |
| 232:15 | agreements | 146:25 | 67:12 |
| agree 15:12 | 239:25 | amounts | andrew 190:21 |
| 60:1 61:13,21 | ahead 59:7 | 111:12 | annotated |
| 66:9,25 67:16 | 63:8,9 90:9 | analog 27:11 | 196:14 |
| 70:18,22 71:4 | 115:8 116:15 | 31:5 41:21 | answer 7:20 |
| 71:21,25 72:9 | 116:19 119:4 | 70:15 73:25 | 91:2 223:23 |
| 72:15,21 74:3 | 120:1 122:19 | 79:14 80:4 | answered |
| 74:22 75:19,25 | 123:8 126:4 | 105:24 106:2 | 85:25 |

[anticipated - areas]

| anticipated | apples 218:13 | approaching | 71:7,11 79:3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 232:23 | 218:13 | 72:17 | 82:3,14 91:9 |
| anyway 115:4 | application | appropriate | 93:12,21 94:15 |
| 128:25 | 51:15 163:23 | 24:12 57:14 | 96:22 97:6,11 |
| aoi 126:24 | 171:10 235:1 | 89:4 130:16 | 97:25 104:3 |
| 128:12,21 | applications | 131:19 132:18 | 105:18 109:3 |
| 131:16 | 96:3 122:3 | 174:5 187:4 | 112:24 113:17 |
| aol.com 3:14 | 215:4,5 230:16 | 204:12 215:3 | 126:20 127:4 |
| 4:15 | 236:18 | approval 10:25 | 127:11,15 |
| apache 78:11 | applied 32:3 | 46:9 114:5 | 129:12 130:16 |
| 79:10 131:7,18 | applies 62:17 | approve 163:22 | 138:25 147:4 |
| 132:10 137:15 | apply 33:7 | approved | 149:18 152:12 |
| 138:12 143:13 | 53:11,13 102:5 | 225:20 | 152:17 162:25 |
| 145:10 156:18 | 102:21 | approximately | 165:11 169:10 |
| apart 153:12 | appraisal | 39:5 70:20 | 174:18 184:16 |
| 153:14 165:1 | 179:12 201:12 | 92:24 93:5 | 191:7 194:1,10 |
| apd 47:8 | 236:21 | 128:20 132:3 | 196:6 197:20 |
| apis 130:24 | appraised | 176:5 | 199:11 200:17 |
| apologize 22:15 | 127:22 | area 13:20 14:7 | 200:19 201:1,5 |
| 87:22 97:22 | appreciate 62:3 | 14:19 16:1,1,3 | 201:8,12 202:6 |
| 171:20 211:16 | 65:10 70:6 | 16:4,8 18:19 | 202:15 203:15 |
| 212:8 217:25 | 83:25 90:25 | 21:10 22:8 | 204:19 210:25 |
| 221:15 232:22 | 91:3 182:8 | 23:12 35:2 | 212:12,16 |
| apparently | 222:22 233:4 | 44:7 46:9,21 | 214:24 216:7 |
| 213:7 | appreciated | 48:5 50:13 | 216:16 217:17 |
| appeal 174:2 | 138:4 | 51:21 55:4,13 | 218:14 219:13 |
| appear 83:8 | approach | 56:8 59:10,13 | 220:1,7 221:7 |
| 153:20 164:15 | 46:16,24 47:1 | 59:16,18,23 | 221:11,23,24 |
| appeared 7:5 | 49:13 67:3 | 60:1,7,19,22,25 | 224:17,22 |
| 27:20 | 134:5 152:25 | 61:13,16 62:16 | 225:3,5,18 |
| appears 25:8 | 155:2 162:19 | 62:25 63:1 | 226:10,12,16 |
| 26:17 31:16 | 163:4 171:5 | 64:1,7 65:21 | 226:19 236:22 |
| 32:5 68:1 | 186:14 187:5 | 65:21,24 66:15 | 237:16 240:18 |
| 117:10 163:20 | 187:10 201:12 | 66:20 67:15 | areas 16:18,21 |
| 167:22 177:9 |  | 68:13 70:21 | 55:15 60:1 |
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[areas - back]

| 72:15,22 74:3 | assessing 37:7 | asterisks 238:1 | 242:15,16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 109:3 197:12 | assessment | 238:8 | avalon 238:5 |
| argue 150:20 | 30:14 86:25 | $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { a t a x }}$ 46:1 | average 22:20 |
| argued 150:2 | 91:20 93:9 | attached 8:24 | 26:5,6 48:8,21 |
| argument | 98:25 102:2 | 10:22 11:7 | 49:2 104:12,13 |
| 100:9 126:19 | 129:7 149:13 | 121:8 123:21 | 148:8,9 165:3 |
| 148:20 150:2 | 160:7 183:19 | 127:6 | 198:6,24 199:1 |
| 153:16 161:3 | asset 121:17,17 | attachments | averages 16:10 |
| arguments | 122:1,1 | 125:4,10 | averaging |
| 156:23 | assign 103:6 | 192:15 232:7 | 199:6 |
| arps 136:5 | assigned | 232:13 | avoid 87:13 |
| arrangements | 138:17 | attempted | 145:19 227:17 |
| 118:8 | association | 154:5 | aware 111:1 |
| arrived 188:9 | 193:2 | attempting | 116:1 236:8 |
| asked 10:8 98:4 | assume 69:14 | 153:6 175:24 | awesome |
| 186:8 224:21 | 70:2 92:11 | attention 13:18 | 132:23 139:14 |
| 225:8 227:12 | 94:17 113:25 | 37:9 195:25 | 162:11,12 |
| asking 26:4 | 222:10 | 208:10 216:14 | 164:17 |
| 61:17 179:6 | assumes 214:17 | 220:19 | axis 22:21 |
| 181:12 208:2 | 214:21 | attorney 3:11 | 48:24,25 49:5 |
| 222:3 | assuming 66:11 | 4:12 116:21 | 49:7 77:8,9 |
| aspect 55:13 | 79:1 114:11 | 167:18 243:14 | 90:20,20 151:9 |
| aspects 121:22 | 133:11 135:23 | 244:10 | b |
| 193:10 | 168:16 188:17 | attribute 134:8 | b 6:1 8:17 |
| assertion 132:9 | assumption | audience | 190:22 |
| 143:24 152:2 | 26:20 68:4,21 | 151:22 169:24 | b10 71:17 |
| 154:18 156:9 | 69:6,16,18 | audio 9:23 | b20 16:20 25:7 |
| 156:19 159:3 | 80:8 83:10 | 120:6 243:8 | 42:19 |
| 169:5 177:5 | 135:19 136:16 | 244:4 | b6 16:20 25:7 |
| 187:23 | assumptions | august 2:2 | 71:17 81:25 |
| assertions | 53:7 59:17 | 30:18 | back 7:13 |
| 151:23 | 67:24,25 68:2 | available 44:12 | 12:14 13:8 |
| asserts 23:15 | 68:18,19 92:2 | 83:16 117:17 | 22:15 23:13 |
| 127:17 143:15 | 134:12 186:25 | 211:7,8 232:25 | 24:22 29:8 |
|  |  | 233:1 242:12 | 31:3 39:24 |

[back - batman]

| 42:8 57:15,21 | 79:15,17 91:8 | 109:9 204:6 | basil 74:14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 70:5,7,9 73:21 | 131:17 132:1 | barriers 26:19 | 75:15,16 76:9 |
| 74:878:13 | 149:1 171:13 | 76:3,8,11 | 87:14 93:2 |
| 83:9 86:19 | 171:17 173:10 | 97:13 154:1 | 94:20 95:21 |
| 87:10 102:13 | 179:17 180:4,6 | base 92:4,7 | 161:23 183:1 |
| 104:10 109:21 | 186:24 200:25 | 102:15 227:3 | 195:19 196:20 |
| 112:11,13,21 | 202:6,8,15,16 | based 21:15 | 197:13 198:12 |
| 126:17 132:11 | 202:21 203:23 | 30:6 37:22 | 198:18,24 |
| 132:23 136:12 | 209:9 210:18 | 41:20 66:19 | 199:3,12,18,24 |
| 150:14 154:18 | 213:19 221:5 | 67:24 68:5,13 | 200:11,18 |
| 158:25 159:1 | 235:9,19 | 70:1 80:2 | 201:3 202:24 |
| 160:23 163:9 | 236:18 | 82:17 84:6 | 204:7 207:8 |
| 169:13,25 | banning 113:7 | 88:21,25 92:3 | 218:2 219:11 |
| 170:5 171:25 | barrel 100:22 | 92:8,22 93:9 | 220:24 |
| 171:25 181:9 | 214:9 | 94:8,22 96:25 | basin 52:9 |
| 181:21 191:25 | barrels 25:25 | 100:10,12 | 55:14 60:16 |
| 197:7 200:10 | 26:25 27:15,17 | 101:11,17,21 | 200:3 203:5 |
| 211:12 223:21 | 28:5 30:15 | 103:24 109:2 | basis 54:24 |
| 224:6 227:14 | 33:4,22 34:1 | 111:6,7 116:22 | 55:22,23 92:14 |
| 227:25 | 34:22 35:11,12 | 126:20,20 | 94:18 95:2 |
| background | 37:25 38:19,21 | 162:20 167:11 | 135:24 163:21 |
| 62:2 124:16,21 | 39:1 40:4,6,9 | 167:23 172:9 | 176:5,6 240:10 |
| bad 43:2 49:24 | 41:16 69:14 | 173:11 179:9 | 240:14 |
| 52:3 134:4 | 75:3,10 80:9 | 195:14,21 | batch 42:25 |
| 153:11 | 87:16 90:6 | 197:16 204:16 | batman 19:16 |
| baffle 53:14 | 107:11,15 | 214:23 220:5 | 19:19,22 20:1 |
| 84:12 86:7 | 113:14 114:8 | 224:15 225:22 | 20:3,5,14 |
| 161:2,4 163:10 | 148:10 149:21 | 239:10 241:6 | 22:18 37:1 |
| 204:6 | 149:22 151:6,8 | basement | 91:16 155:9 |
| baffles 76:3,8 | 154:19 156:10 | 129:20 | 157:8 162:21 |
| 206:17,21 | 157:11,16 | bases 149:10 | 170:5,10,20 |
| 207:4 214:8 | 159:16 176:4,5 | basic 135:19 | 172:6,7 173:9 |
| bane 17:5,8 | 176:12 | basically 58:15 | 175:9 177:24 |
| 45:16 70:22 | barrier 85:7 | 109:21 110:2 | 178:25 179:10 |
| 72:5,9 74:1 | 86:6,10 95:5 | 111:20 212:1 | 179:12 195:22 |

[batman - better]

| 195:23 196:3,5 | 114:24 115:4 | 131:12,19 | 99:25 103:4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 200:25 201:16 | 116:5 134:14 | 132:9 136:11 | 120:21 190:19 |
| 220:5,15,16 | 135:3 137:8 | 139:12 147:19 | 230:5 |
| 221:1,4 226:11 | 138:6 144:16 | 149:24 151:19 | benefits 32:19 |
| 235:6,19,22 | 147:19,25 | 154:2,3 157:2 | benefitted |
| 236:20 | 148:13 151:16 | 161:5,8 168:15 | 184:21 |
| battery 30:2 | 158:10 159:1 | 176:2 177:5 | best 9:5 10:20 |
| bear 13:21 | 159:25 160:2 | 178:3 181:8 | 11:3 14:9 |
| 14:20,22 15:11 | 166:11 176:23 | 182:7 183:4 | 16:16,21 24:4 |
| 35:9 136:18 | 182:24 200:2 | 189:6 210:14 | 29:14 31:16 |
| 138:17 185:16 | 219:20 221:9 | 213:16,21 | 38:24 58:15,22 |
| 206:4 | behm's 6:15 | 214:6 215:22 | 67:4,5,8 70:15 |
| bearing 204:22 | 125:25 126:18 | 217:11 218:25 | 73:24 80:4 |
| beaten 147:10 | 131:12 132:9 | 219:5,23 | 87:20,22 95:3 |
| bed 199:3 | 132:21 134:24 | 224:17 227:15 | 95:8,22 114:2 |
| beginning 71:5 | 151:23 157:3 | 228:7 231:23 | 188:15 206:6 |
| begins 38:17 | 170:20 175:24 | 242:13 | 212:10 216:6 |
| 111:3 | 177:15,23 | believes 41:3 | 232:23 243:9 |
| behalf 3:2,8,16 | belief 11:3 | 136:20 180:12 | 244:6 |
| 4:2,9 110:12 | 187:22 205:3 | bench 34:11 | better 7:8,10 |
| 230:17 | believe 22:14 | 69:13,15,20 | 15:10 16:19 |
| behm 5:7 6:6 | 25:3,11 30:21 | 204:17 | 17:17 18:5 |
| 7:5,11,14,19,24 | 32:16 37:5,22 | benches 66:16 | 23:11 25:9 |
| 8:5,9,15,19 9:7 | 40:6 45:5,11 | 66:17,20,24 | 32:3,5 42:7 |
| 10:7,7,8,15 | 49:12 52:18 | 71:15,20 79:2 | 49:8 61:25 |
| 11:7,21 12:4 | 53:4,18 55:1 | 96:23 | 68:13 73:10,11 |
| 12:11,23 13:16 | 57:5 62:11 | benchmark | 85:19 91:19 |
| 24:20,22 25:2 | 65:8 67:7,14 | 148:12 | 95:20 97:13 |
| 54:14 57:6,23 | 67:21 68:3 | benchmarks | 104:20,20,21 |
| 58:4,14 62:4 | 70:16 71:17,24 | 148:19 | 106:8 120:14 |
| 68:17 78:20 | 75:1 78:19,21 | beneficial | 120:20 139:1 |
| 83:13 90:25 | 78:24 91:14 | 234:11 | 150:7,7,8,10 |
| 97:21,22 99:12 | 108:8 109:21 | benefit 25:21 | 168:7 179:15 |
| 103:9,12,15,22 | 118:18 127:7 | 33:12,25 35:18 | 184:13,16 |
| 107:19 108:1,6 | 130:12 131:3 | 36:12 43:18 | 199:25 219:16 |
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| 226:8 | 217:19,23 | 148:25 149:12 | 17:16,19 19:21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| beyond 18:20 | 219:24 227:13 | 153:24,24 | 19:23 23:16 |
| 131:8 146:5 | 237:17 | 154:10,13 | 33:15 35:4 |
| 173:6,17 | biz 51:20 | 156:14,15,17 | 37:12,21 38:14 |
| 218:21 | black 23:22 | 156:18,20 | 40:25 41:5,9 |
| bias 86:16,17 | 24:6 25:3 26:6 | 157:22 163:8 | 41:10,12,18 |
| 140:12 | 26:11,13,14 | 168:19 169:23 | 42:1 45:4,5,19 |
| biased 140:18 | 27:2,5 28:1,20 | 170:2 176:16 | 52:15 53:22 |
| biasing 143:4 | 28:24 30:17,20 | 176:18 220:20 | 56:11,24 64:20 |
| big 86:6 99:9 | 34:13,22 37:23 | 220:25 221:5 | 65:2,8,25 66:5 |
| 154:9 163:25 | 39:13,21 49:23 | 225:3 227:22 | 66:13 67:4 |
| bigger 193:16 | 65:6,7 67:12 | 238:19 239:6 | 69:17,21 71:20 |
| biggest 73:22 | 67:23 69:24 | blend 49:3 | 72:21 74:14 |
| bill 38:4 | 70:4,14 71:23 | blinking | 75:15,16 76:8 |
| bit 21:2 $25: 2$ | 72:2,4,23 73:6 | 221:15 | 77:16 78:2,12 |
| 28:4 42:7 51:2 | 73:24 74:1,10 | blm 47:17,21 | 80:1 81:12,18 |
| 59:21,23 60:5 | 76:18 77:17 | 47:24 | 83:15 84:2 |
| 61:7 64:12 | 79:15,22,24 | block 34:15 | 89:2,4,8 90:8 |
| 66:3 67:11 | 80:3 82:21 | 43:16 | 92:25 93:1,2,3 |
| 73:14,21 79:4 | 83:5,6 84:15 | blocked 50:17 | 94:12 95:20 |
| 82:6 85:4 | 86:25 89:10,13 | blue 16:4,11 | 98:1,20,24 |
| 87:23 102:17 | 89:15,21 90:3 | 31:19 90:22 | 102:19,23 |
| 120:10 127:13 | 91:8 92:3,8,13 | 157:6 178:19 | 103:4 105:8 |
| 130:9 131:11 | 100:11,14 | 178:23 198:2 | 107:1 108:12 |
| 132:24 138:5 | 101:11,14,18 | 198:21 202:17 | 108:20,21 |
| 138:15,23 | 101:20 103:24 | 203:2 239:3 | 109:5,22 110:3 |
| 139:2 147:20 | 104:2,13,25 | bo 38:7 | 113:6,10 127:1 |
| 149:16 151:16 | 105:20 107:2,5 | body 238:17 | 127:5 129:23 |
| 152:1 153:1 | 107:6 111:14 | boe 48:9,22 | 130:2,12 131:2 |
| 154:7,7 155:19 | 131:7,14,18 | bold 238:1,8 | 132:11,15 |
| 157:19 158:10 | 132:21 133:9 | bolded 238:12 | 133:20 134:22 |
| 159:1 160:6 | 133:19 134:14 | bolster 93:15 | 136:22,22 |
| 169:25 181:23 | 141:4,4 143:12 | 93:17 | 137:10,11,23 |
| 206:4,8,11 | 143:13,24 | bone 15:4,15 | 138:10,13,17 |
| 211:16 212:18 | 144:13,21 | 15:16,25 16:2 | 138:18,21 |
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| $139: 4141: 6,7$ | $204: 7,14,17$ | $194: 9$ | $222: 22223: 6$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $144: 3145: 5$ | $206: 13,17$ | bottom $13: 22$ | $223: 10228: 16$ |
| $147: 3,4149: 13$ | $207: 7,12$ | $17: 438: 6$ | $228: 19$ |
| $149: 14150: 6,7$ | $212: 14213: 4$ | $39: 2540: 1$ | bradford's |
| $150: 17,25$ | $216: 5,9,24$ | $48: 2564: 15$ | $209: 12$ |
| $151: 2,4,5$ | $217: 2218: 23$ | $84: 2285: 3$ | bread $132: 25$ |
| $153: 8,11154: 2$ | $219: 1,7,8,11,15$ | $94: 2295: 1$ | break $39: 18,22$ |
| $154: 3,12$ | $219: 21221: 6$ | $108: 20,21,23$ | $57: 10,2289: 8$ |
| $156: 20157: 9$ | $224: 6,8,10,23$ | $130: 6133: 14$ | $118: 2137: 18$ |
| $160: 9161: 18$ | $225: 13227: 5,7$ | $196: 21224: 9$ | $143: 10145: 16$ |
| $161: 21,24$ | $227: 8,10,23$ | $234: 23235: 16$ | $163: 11,14$ |
| $162: 5,10,11,12$ | $235: 5,7,13$ | bound $144: 2$ | $189: 18216: 25$ |
| $162: 23163: 6$ | $236: 5,22237: 3$ | $183: 15,18,21$ | $235: 5$ |
| $163: 12,18$ | $237: 4,11,15$ | $183: 21,24$ | breakdown |
| $168: 20169: 10$ | $238: 10,22$ | boundaries | $41: 11$ |
| $171: 16172: 4$ | $239: 1,3240: 10$ | $33: 9176: 23,25$ | breaking |
| $172: 11177: 17$ | $240: 21,25$ | bounded $18: 21$ | $110: 23140: 23$ |
| $178: 18,24$ | $241: 5,13$ | $19: 1,1$ | $142: 15143: 6$ |
| $180: 12,20,24$ | bone's $145: 4$ | bounds $27: 9$ | $146: 25155: 9,9$ |
| $181: 3183: 1$ | bones $131: 2$ | box $3: 124: 13$ | $160: 25$ |
| $185: 21,21$ | $134: 1,3137: 13$ | $9: 20197: 22$ | brief $234: 10,25$ |
| $186: 12,19,19$ | $137: 14153: 21$ | boxes $8: 1$ | briefly $121: 11$ |
| $187: 16188: 6$ | $156: 4,6157: 5$ | $196: 13$ | $136: 12239: 17$ |
| $188: 17,19$ | bore $30: 2550: 8$ | bracket $100: 25$ | bring $30: 348: 5$ |
| $189: 3194: 4,8$ | $52: 469: 23$ | $101: 10,24$ | $174: 11176: 15$ |
| $195: 19196: 6$ | $93: 10146: 16$ | $103: 25$ | bringing $72: 24$ |
| $196: 17,18,20$ | $186: 5$ | bradford $5: 18$ | broad $140: 8$ |
| $196: 20,22$ | bores $19: 4$ | $6: 9,13190: 2,5$ | $169: 4234: 12$ |
| $197: 3,4,13,20$ | $25: 1851: 23$ | $190: 8,18,21$ | broader $151: 22$ |
| $198: 12,18,24$ | $139: 22,24$ | $191: 11,20$ | broke $57: 22$ |
| $199: 8,12,16,18$ | $140: 1,2141: 23$ | $193: 1,17$ | $196: 17$ |
| $199: 24200: 1$ | $143: 14,17,19$ | $201: 19203: 25$ | broken $16: 7$ |
| $200: 11,18,22$ | $145: 24146: 6$ | $205: 6,24206: 2$ | $127: 4139: 21$ |
| $201: 4202: 23$ | $146: 13163: 13$ | $206: 11209: 17$ | $140: 25143: 7$ |
| $203: 11,14$ | $163: 13188: 16$ | $209: 19217: 18$ | $153: 19,20,25$ |
|  |  |  |  |
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| 239:6 | cadence 175:9 | capital 22:23 | 228:25 233:12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| brought 157:2 | calculating | 22:24 35:2 | cases 11:9,9,10 |
| 226:7 | 43:21 | 39:18 46:10 | 11:10 94:2 |
| bruce 3:10,11 | calculation | 47:2,4 52:9,23 | 116:24 117:16 |
| 4:11,12 | 21:22 93:20 | 187:1,3,6 | 122:4 161:17 |
| bubble 133:20 | 94:1 | capitals 44:10 | 191:8 230:17 |
| buffer 115:7 | calculations | capture 37:24 | 230:18 231:10 |
| built 46:18 | 44:15 148:25 | 41:18 56:11 | 235:6,7,9,13 |
| 47:7 | call 10:3 15:18 | 203:1 241:4 | 236:3,13,16 |
| bullet 39:3 | 24:21 77:25 | captured 41:16 | 237:8 |
| 51:24 52:14 | 95:15 111:20 | 41:23 113:11 | cash 147:6 |
| 64:16,17 65:12 | 119:4,7 164:15 | 132:18 141:19 | casing 29:10 |
| 133:24 | 168:23 189:22 | carb 217:9 | 50:7 188:12 |
| bum 17:6 | 189:25 228:24 | carbonate | catching |
| bumper 115:11 | called 1:68:10 | 84:12 86:7 | 102:17 125:20 |
| bunch 114:8 | 18:12 23:6 | 217:3,5 | categorize |
| 145:7 186:3 | 111:13 119:16 | carbonates | 215:4 |
| burdensome | 137:5 138:8 | 61:3 | cause 21:11,12 |
| 187:11 | 142:4 174:22 | cares 239:24 | 27:18 33:1 |
| butchered | 190:9 229:10 | carolina 121:15 | 34:19 49:5 |
| 115:22 | 229:19 | 123:1 | 52:20,20 63:17 |
| butter 133:1 | calling 7:5 10:3 | cartoon 82:13 | 79:2 89:20 |
| bypass 234:18 | 190:2 | 83:11 84:7,10 | 99:23 112:18 |
| c | callout 164:22 | 84:22,25 85:5 | 134:8 145:6 |
| 16 | calls 168:23 | 152:19 | 181:21 182:16 |
| 95:15 99:8 | camera 10:2 | case 1:9 11:11 | 196:8 199:24 |
| 119:24 120:25 | camp 17:13 | 12:25 15:6 | 211:25 |
| 230:7 231:10 | 237:12 | 44:17 55:22,22 | caused 112:5 |
| 231:22 232:6 | cancellation | 55:23,23 66:14 | 134:3 140:6 |
| 232:13,17 | 159:22 | 78:23 92:4,5,7 | causes 135:20 |
| c1 231:15 232:7 | capacity 121:2 | 102:15 115:24 | causing 51:3 |
| c12 231:23,25 | 190:24 194:24 | 119:8,8 148:19 | cavalier 145:12 |
| 232:8 | 204:21 220:3 | 160:19,24 | centennial |
| c14 231:16 | 230:9 | 166:7,13,18 | 121:23 |
| 232:7 |  | 184:16 215:25 |  |
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| center 197:21 | 104:18 106:4 | 237:25 238:17 | 122:4 125:17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| centers 187:12 | 124:7 134:7 | 240:15,16 | 126:23 127:9 |
| century 238:6 | 136:7,13 | 241:6 | 127:14,17 |
| certain 45:25 | 146:14 172:10 | chase 231:24 | 128:13,15,17 |
| 57:1 97:25 | 176:16 187:9 | 231:25 | 129:14,19 |
| 118:8 173:13 | 226:2 | check 20:17,22 | 131:11 136:20 |
| 193:9 | changed 47:9 | 120:5 222:17 | 143:15 148:10 |
| certainly 58:13 | 50:4,7 52:4 | checking 178:8 | 149:6,11,16 |
| 139:16 177:13 | 134:23 | checks 147:7 | 152:24 160:14 |
| 177:21 183:16 | changes 50:7 | chief 144:17 | 160:16 161:18 |
| 187:19 209:25 | 60:13,24 | child 150:23 | 165:1,4 167:18 |
| certainty | 105:21 124:24 | 227:17,20,21 | 168:11,17,23 |
| 173:16 | 136:13 192:8 | choice 32:6 | 174:2 177:6 |
| certificate | 211:18 217:24 | choke 178:3 | 180:12 186:8 |
| 243:1 244:1 | 232:2 | choose 32:25 | 230:19 233:12 |
| certify 243:3 | changing 60:19 | 207:15,18,25 | 234:24 235:8 |
| 244:2 | 105:18 137:3 | 213:7,8,13 | 238:4,5 239:8 |
| certigraphy | 139:23 | choosing 32:24 | 240:23 |
| 203:13 | channel 55:9 | chose 55:18 | cimarex's 42:9 |
| cetera 108:13 | 73:7 81:24 | 211:2,3 219:3 | 50:13 58:18 |
| chair 242:6 | characteristics | chosen 130:8 | 63:4 65:23 |
| challenge 79:4 | 56:9 | christian 244:2 | 84:7,9,18 86:1 |
| 161:4 | characteriz | 244:17 | 86:3 96:13 |
| challenges 14:6 | 17:20,23 | cimarex 3:2,17 | 100:1 126:18 |
| 16:6 | characterizati... | 4:21 24:12 | 128:22 129:7 |
| challenging | 20:4 | 37:19 41:3 | 139:10 150:1 |
| 129:21 | charge 46:10 | 43:11 44:20 | 150:18 156:23 |
| chance 113:13 | 199:25 218:15 | 46:19,23 49:14 | 162:10 164:7 |
| 193:4 | 220:3 | 51:17 56:21 | 165:9 183:1,3 |
| change 29:24 | charged 204:21 | 63:6,6,19 | 193:4,22 |
| 33:9,10 60:8 | charges 194:2 | 86:19,24 94:19 | 214:10 224:6 |
| 61:14 71:1 | 219:7 | 94:25 96:8,17 | 227:12 234:8,9 |
| 73:3 84:25 | chart 15:24 | 96:24 97:10 | 239:16 |
| 89:22,24 90:2 | 37:4 64:2,6 | 99:17 103:3 | circle 174:5 |
| 98:5,10,15 | 89:7 91:15 | 114:7 116:21 |  |

Page 13
[circling - company]

| circling 175:15 | 155:2 182:18 | collecting | 42:2 86:19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| circulated | 237:14 | 186:19 | 87:10 112:21 |
| 124:14 193:20 | clearly 150:2 | color 130:9 | 129:20 147:23 |
| circulation | 156:7,9 241:22 | 216:17 238:4 | 156:5 160:23 |
| 117:5 | clement's | colored 129:18 | 198:25 199:21 |
| circumvent | 229:12 | 139:19 | 214:7 |
| 167:24 | client 242:14 | colors 15:25 | commenced |
| cisco 87:7 | close 30:23,24 | 154:7 176:10 | 78:3 |
| cites 235:8 | 41:14 43:9 | 238:1 | commencem... |
| claim 23:18 | 45:18 49:5 | column 35:15 | 215:9 |
| 24:5 31:12 | 60:13 89:24 | 38:7 241:7,9 | commencing |
| 156:12 234:25 | 98:12 164:23 | columns | 78:14 |
| 235:12 | 168:25 224:24 | 128:14 240:4 | comment 15:7 |
| claimed 28:22 | 227:24 | com 175:25 | 26:8 50:1 |
| claiming | closed 166:20 | combination | 151:17 178:1 |
| 180:18 | closer 21:12 | 154:21 208:6 | commentary |
| clarification | cloud 146:17 | combinations | 17:4 49:20 |
| 65:11 108:18 | 146:18 | 42:20 | comments 16:5 |
| 115:6,22 | clusters 32: | combo 196:3 | 17:9 97:22 |
| clarify 109:12 | code 127:11 | come 7:13 29:8 | 147:13 164:6 |
| 115:16 207:2 | coded 216:17 | 30:24 57:15,21 | commission |
| 238:9 | codes 168:1,5 | 63:22 70:5,7,8 | 195:24 |
| classes 123:1 | coffman 4:19 | 71:14 93:22 | common 46:2 |
| clastics 85:21 | 40:14 92:20 | 102:19 118:25 | 60:11 111:11 |
| clean 111:9 | $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { c o g }}$ 16:8 | 136:19 163:9 | 185:24 187:14 |
| 164:3 | cognizant | 175:10 211:12 | 235:18 |
| cleaning 21:2 | 210:21 | 227:14 | commonly |
| 64:10 | coincidental | comes 26:15 | 48:17 203:15 |
| clear 42:7 | 136:16 144:13 | 148:16 149:20 | communication |
| 73:23 76:16 | colgate 121:20 | 151:8 223:20 | 206:13 |
| 77:7 85:5,14 | colleague 80:19 | comfortable | companies |
| 85:23 96:7 | collect 66:19 | 21:24 96:16 | 14:13 44:5 |
| 100:9 101:2 | collected | 215:6 | 46:3 |
| 115:19 141:11 | 195:18,22 | coming 19:9 | company 3:8,9 |
| 141:15 145:20 | 196:4 217:11 | 38:19,21 41:15 | 3:16,17 4:9,10 |
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[company - conjunction]

| $4: 19,2125: 13$ | competitive | component | conditions 52:8 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $45: 2446: 5$ | $34: 5$ | $104: 19$ | $136: 7,9137: 3$ |
| $48: 1568: 12$ | compilation | composite | conducted |
| 95:17 116:22 | $9: 2$ | $133: 21,21$ | $122: 7191: 6$ |
| 117:10 237:2 | complete $79: 7$ | compulsion | $202: 7$ |
| comparable | $161: 20166: 7$ | $113: 5$ | confer $233: 4$ |
| $36: 2159: 16$ | $201: 14228: 25$ | compulsory | $242: 1$ |
| compare $44: 12$ | $233: 6$ | $239: 19240: 7$ | conferring |
| $48: 2372: 23$ | completed | computer | $242: 14$ |
| $102: 8221: 19$ | $13: 2528: 13$ | $13: 10$ | confidence |
| compared | $79: 2582: 25$ | coms $176: 3$ | $22: 4138: 18$ |
| $22: 1848: 12$ | $136: 23137: 4$ | concentrated | $170: 16173: 19$ |
| $113: 15160: 13$ | $174: 10181: 18$ | $195: 5$ | confident $14: 8$ |
| $218: 8$ | completely | concentrations | $21: 2080: 13$ |
| comparing | $136: 8145: 4$ | $41: 2$ | $95: 498: 13$ |
| $16: 2145: 3$ | completing | concept $135: 9$ | $105: 7109: 8$ |
| $48: 1963: 17$ | $55: 25106: 25$ | concern $17: 24$ | confidential |
| $75: 14102: 3$ | $172: 19174: 25$ | $21: 13224: 24$ | $223: 24$ |
| $214: 9$ | $188: 22$ | $227: 6$ | configuration |
| comparison | completion | concerned | $55: 25$ |
| $26: 1132: 1$ | $31: 2467: 25$ | $166: 17224: 25$ | confirm $70: 4$ |
| $45: 12,14$ | $144: 14,21,21$ | concerns $88: 7$ | confirmation |
| $202: 19209: 24$ | $162: 7181: 11$ | $160: 3164: 2$ | $97: 14$ |
| $218: 13221: 22$ | $184: 6207: 10$ | $186: 9188: 11$ | confused $58: 14$ |
| $238: 14$ | completions | conchos $15: 3$ | $58: 2082: 8$ |
| competing $19: 4$ | $146: 21174: 24$ | concluded | $83: 2,1385: 11$ |
| $38: 1443: 3$ | $188: 23$ | $242: 23$ | $91: 13111: 16$ |
| $46: 2251: 14,19$ | complex $60: 18$ | conclusion | confusing |
| $122: 4161: 17$ | $61: 866: 22$ | $17: 2120: 5$ | $91: 1499: 1$ |
| $191: 8230: 18$ | $71: 6105: 17$ | $37: 11118: 25$ | $154: 8166: 21$ |
| competition | complexities | conclusions | confusion |
| $38: 1790: 5,5$ | $66: 7142: 25$ | $47: 5170: 9$ | $58: 15,2170: 10$ |
| $90: 12177: 4,12$ | complexity | $221: 25$ | $160: 16$ |
| $177: 22$ | $143: 3146: 24$ | concrete $97: 9$ | conjunction |
|  |  |  | $98: 20$ |
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| connected | contents 8:21 | 98:13 | 56:12,18 59:10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 73:11 | contested | controlled | 59:11 60:7,10 |
| connectivity | 173:24 191:22 | 135:20 | 60:25 61:18 |
| 8:4 | context 162:3 | convenient | 63:2 64:20 |
| consensus | continuation | 61:22 | 65:14 66:1 |
| 65:24 67:3 | 172:7 | conversation | 67:6 69:8 72:1 |
| consequence | continue 9:21 | 1:658:9 | 72:5 73:16 |
| 235:25 | 20:13 22:9 | cool 146:11 | 74:11,19,20 |
| conservation | 121:25 135:21 | 155:1 202:9 | 75:16 76:19 |
| 1:3 4:2 11:22 | 135:24 162:21 | 203:20 | 77:14,17 81:3 |
| 121:5 | 166:12 172:15 | coordinated | 83:16 88:5,15 |
| consider 35:8 | 186:21 | 162:6 163:24 | 88:18 89:12 |
| 86:24 | continuing | core 55:6 132:9 | 91:12 94:8 |
| considerations | 242:4 | 133:15 134:5 | 95:21 102:10 |
| 104:14 216:3 | contracts 44:6 | 134:11 136:5 | 105:5 107:17 |
| considering 1:8 | contractual | 136:15,15 | 108:6 111:23 |
| considers 76:4 | 238:15 239:7 | 153:16 161:2 | 122:23,24 |
| consistency | 239:12 | 161:16 195:22 | 124:14 138:20 |
| 221:10 | contribute | 196:12 197:16 | 139:3 144:1 |
| constraint | 25:11 85:20 | 197:23,25 | 152:21 155:13 |
| 112:10 | 110:19,21 | 198:4 201:14 | 165:13 167:21 |
| constraints | contributes | 212:23 223:13 | 169:1 170:17 |
| 136:5,9 | 82:2 | 223:19,23 | 173:4,22 |
| cont'd 4:1 | contributing | cores 223:15,16 | 178:10,21 |
| contacted 34:9 | 85:18 88:7 | 223:17 | 179:1,17 180:5 |
| 40:6 | 112:6 211:25 | corner 15:24 | 180:9,17 181:1 |
| contained | contribution | 20:2 235:23 | 181:11,22 |
| 140:10 | 158:7 213:21 | corp 238:6 | 206:14,19 |
| contemplated | 213:24,24 | corporate 9:1 | 209:21 210:11 |
| 65:18 | 214:2,4 | correct 8:22 | 211:13,15 |
| contend 67:4 | contributor | 9:4,13 10:19 | 213:5 214:11 |
| 80:3 | 81:17 199:17 | 11:2 14:25 | 214:12 216:17 |
| contention | 219:10 | 20:24 42:15 | 216:23 217:10 |
| 31:11 33:15 | control 14:8,11 | 45:7 46:6,7 | 218:24 220:6,9 |
|  | 14:12,17,19 | 51:15 55:24 | 220:17,18,22 |
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| 221:20 222:14 | could've 42:6 | course 58:18 | credentials |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 226:24 237:13 | 135:6 143:22 | 62:5 66:14,22 | 191:3 230:13 |
| 240:11,12 | 143:23 144:25 | 77:13 170:18 | criteria 216:3 |
| corrections | counsel 109:20 | court 8:16 | critical 162:5 |
| 123:24 | 110:12 111:1 | 120:22 190:20 | cross 57:7 58:2 |
| correctly 14:17 | 118:5 159:2 | 230:5 | 80:18 108:4 |
| 157:21 | 167:7 205:25 | cover 97:21 | 118:20 122:20 |
| correlatable | 224:2 243:10 | 145:18 | 126:18 131:13 |
| 197:1 | 243:13 244:7 | coverage 140:9 | 131:23 134:15 |
| correlate 21:14 | 244:10 | 142:10 | 136:20 137:7 |
| 142:24 | count 23:3 | covered 16:19 | 151:16 152:1 |
| correlates | 26:21 27:16,19 | 99:12 131:14 | 167:15 185:11 |
| 149:4 197:7 | 36:7 75:7,12 | 151:20 166:10 | 206:9 222:21 |
| correlative | 78:7 99:10 | 201:20 217:21 | 223:8 241:12 |
| 42:10 181:5 | 229:2 | 218:3 | crosslink |
| 188:8 235:14 | count's 99:6 | covers 14:22 | 108:13 |
| 236:3 237:18 | counted 128:24 | crack 68:22 | crucially 128:2 |
| 239:15 | counter 193:22 | crash 52:13 | culmination |
| corresponden... | counties 159:5 | crate 163:5 | 155:13 |
| 178:6 | county 48:7,13 | create 39:4 | cume 23:1 |
| corroborates | 49:14 56:2 | 44:5 51:7 63:5 | 36:10 37:2 |
| 19:19 | 60:11 61:16 | 136:10 137:15 | 49:6,9 91:6,9 |
| cost 44:12,19 | 63:2,5,7,15 | 137:16 140:17 | 156:17 |
| 44:19,19,21,22 | 64:5 68:10 | 143:25 211:7 | cumed 33:20 |
| 44:25 45:1 | 70:1 71:6,10 | created 106:20 | cumeing 22:25 |
| 164:24 186:11 | 117:5 164:23 | 121:24 134:23 | cumes 90:24 |
| 186:12 224:25 | 165:5 174:19 | 134:24 137:21 | cumulative |
| costs 43:24 | 174:20,21 | 140:24 141:2 | 17:18 19:20 |
| 44:3,4,9 | 197:2,17 | 143:1,2 | 88:21 |
| cotera 46:4 | county's | creates 164:2 | curiosity 112:3 |
| 49:14 114:6 | 105:17 | creating 146:21 | curious 20:17 |
| 194:6 | couple 87:25 | 147:4 | 21:3 108:9 |
| cotera's 164:12 | 148:18 153:17 | creation 102:4 | 109:11 110:1 |
| coterra 3:17 | 164:9 169:3 | 134:9 | 113:21 187:15 |
| 4:19 | 221:17 232:15 |  | 224:5 |
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[current - deal]

| current 41:5 | d10 82:10,12 | d6 28:13 29:3 | 133:8,9,14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 43:24 44:7,21 | 152:18 | 77:1,2,5 | 136:14 145:8 |
| 44:24 121:25 | d11 39:2 92:6 | d7 28:14 29:16 | 155:15,17,18 |
| 188:12 214:23 | 101:5 102:13 | 77:1 | 155:19,25 |
| currently 180:6 | 148:12,13 | d9 38:2 39:24 | 157:11 169:23 |
| 217:16 | d12 31:9,10 | 92:12,13 | 170:6,13 172:5 |
| cursor 22:13 | 149:15,16 | 147:24 | 172:10 178:3,3 |
| 71:25 175:15 | 150:8 176:20 | daily 36:23,25 | 178:10 179:9 |
| cursory 131:8 | d13 18:6 88:4 | 37:4 91:15,16 | 179:13,14 |
| curve 133:10 | d14 33:14 | 155:13,15,17 | 181:16 186:20 |
| 133:11 135:21 | 153:2 | damage 112:5 | 195:18,22 |
| 154:13 170:11 | d15 22:6,15,17 | 112:19 134:3 | 197:16 198:20 |
| cut 20:18,23 | 35:3 88:19 | 150:6,9 163:13 | 201:14 202:10 |
| 29:10 58:10 | d16 35:21 | damningly | 211:7 212:25 |
| 61:23 94:16 | 36:23 91:13,15 | 154:17 | 217:11,16 |
| 106:5,7,10,12 | 110:24 154:25 | dana 2:7 243:2 | 222:1 223:13 |
| cut's 94:15 | d17 20:10 | 243:20 | 223:20 226:3 |
| cutoff 211:22 | d18 43:22 | darin 3:18,22 | date 2:2 46:21 |
| 212:4 | d2 48:20 62:20 | 116:20 | 77:24 131:8 |
| cuts 55:5,9,11 | 106:20 | darker 16:3 | 161:6 162:17 |
| 55:11 81:5,23 | d20 102:9 | data 9:2 14:7 | 162:20 175:10 |
| 94:13,18,19,23 | d21 43:14 | 14:10 21:4,15 | 231:21 233:1 |
| 111:10 | 45:12 | 22:2,6 30:7,13 | dated 40:17 |
| cx 5:6 | d22 45:12 | 46:19 48:11,15 | day 22:21 |
| d | d24 8:25 10:23 | 48:17,19 52:21 | 151:6,8 166:2 |
| d 5:1 6:57:1 | 11:8 56:23 | 52:22 53:5,16 | days 21:15 36:6 |
| 8:17,17 10:23 | 127:7 128:18 | 53:17 54:1 | 153:22 156:1 |
|  | 129:14 | 55:8 56:16,16 | 157:12,16 |
| 190:22,22 | d3 59:3,8 64:1 | 59:15 63:21 | 164:12 170:6 |
| d1 8:25 10:23 | 65:19 126:22 | 66:19 82:18 | 173:8 177:24 |
| 11:848:5 | 126:23 | 91:16 94:11,23 | dca 135:24 |
| $49: 1062: 20$ | d4 56:22 | 95:1,8 96:16 | de 104:9 |
| $106: 19,20$ | 126:22 127:3 | 96:16,17,21,22 | deadline 215:9 |
| 152:13 | d5 74:9 | 97:2,5,10,18 | deal 229:11 |
|  |  | 106:13 111:17 | 235:21 |

Page 18
[debatable - describe]

| $\begin{gathered} \text { debatable } \\ 224: 7 \end{gathered}$ | deem 21:22 <br> deemed 204:8 | $217: 13$ <br> delineator | 179:13 211:21 department 1:2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| december | 223:24 224:1 | 50:17 | 4:5 |
| 121:15 | deep 60:15 | deliver 68:13 | dependent |
| decide 45:25 | 130:15 | delmar 238:3 | 171:24 172 |
| 172:9 | deeper 154:3 | delo 89:25 | depending |
| decided 7:12 | 200:3 | 188:1 | 118:19 166:23 |
| 07:5 | deepest 216:7 | delos 153:18 | 215:17 |
| decidedly | defer 112:25 | delta 10:23 | depends 159:5 |
| 127:16,22 | 215:23 | 44:10,19,19 | depicted 98:7 |
| decides 174:2 | define 44:18 | 104:6 134:2 | depiction 74:9 |
| decision 34:17 | defined 61:10 | 157:11 238:23 | 84:8 141:11,18 |
| 34:18 45:24 | 61:25 186:10 | 241:7,14,15 | depleted |
| 51:19 52:19 | definitely 66:21 | deltas 238:24 | 140:21 141:2,6 |
| 89:19 148:16 | 182:25 189:1 | 238:25 | 143:17 |
| 148:22 173:25 | 201:5,6 230:25 | demonstrate | depletion 19:10 |
| 174:1 207:16 | definitively | 153:6 | 54:3,6 140:6 |
| decisions | 225:4 | demonstrated | 140:13,17,20 |
| 203:21 226:5 | degradation | 46:20,24 48:4 | 143:3,4 144:2 |
| decline 21:5 | 28:4 101:23 | demonstrates | 146:16 161:1 |
| 22:1 29:4 | 210:23 227:25 | 156:7 201:10 | 163:10 184:16 |
| 32:21 33:11 | degraded | 214:17 | 228:1 |
| 36:11 133:2,2 | 157:25 | dense 141:5 | deployed 47:2 |
| 135:17 155:21 | degree 114:18 | denser 27:8 | deposition |
| 170:10 178:13 | 122:22 | 33:8 34:6 36:2 | 243:1 |
| 178:15,23 | degrees 114:12 | 36:21 74:23 | depositional |
| 181:9,13,14,19 | 114:12 | 75:8,12 105:1 | 212:15 |
| 182:1,1,6 | delay 22:15 | 105:2,4,6 | depressed |
| deconvolute | 51:3 78:16 | density 14:14 | 144:17 |
| 137:2 | 97:22 221:15 | 23:24 27:4,7 | depth 195:4 |
| decrease 38:17 | delayed 15:5 | 31:175:13 | 196:10 235:18 |
| decreased | 183:10,15 | 76:16,22 | derived 82:18 |
| 111:22,22 | delaying 51:12 | 104:11,14 | 152:4 222:1 |
| decreasing | delineation | 107:6 132:2,4 | describe |
| 55:5 | 172:2 201:12 | 139:20 158:13 | 213:23 |
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[described - developments]

| described | determining | development | 127:23 128:1,2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 176:23 | 46:4 | 15:5,19 16:8 | 130:16 131:15 |
| description 6:2 | develop 45:25 | 17:6 18:1,24 | 140:15,16 |
| 20:13 | 46:9 51:8,18 | 19:1,19 23:5 | 141:6 143:25 |
| design 50:7,9 | 55:16 66:17 | 23:11,15,16,19 | 146:5 149:12 |
| 77:6 184:21 | 78:21 84:19 | 23:23 25:20 | 153:7,13,25 |
| 185:20 188:12 | 96:18 145:22 | 27:6 30:20 | 157:4,7 160:8 |
| 224:6 | 161:22 164:4 | 31:13 32:7 | 161:23 162:21 |
| designated | 165:12 171:3 | 33:8,16 35:5 | 162:25 164:20 |
| 51:5,11 117:7 | 171:11,13,15 | 37:23 39:13,17 | 169:2,9 170:24 |
| designed | 174:3 216:7 | 40:9 41:21 | 174:25 177:6 |
| 186:15 | 226:5,22 | 44:22 46:6,12 | 177:16 183:11 |
| designs 187:13 | developed | 46:17,21 47:14 | 184:3 187:11 |
| despite 32:2 | 14:20 15:4 | 49:14 51:4,13 | 188:2,14 189:5 |
| 43:11 188:1 | 19:21,24 39:10 | 51:19,20 52:15 | 193:22 194:5 |
| destroyed | 44:23 55:19 | 52:19 53:23 | 201:15,16 |
| 49:21 | 79:12 107:13 | 54:22 56:2 | 202:21 203:7 |
| destroying | 113:23 115:14 | 59:17,25 66:15 | 204:10,12 |
| 151:2 | 124:11 134:16 | 67:13,15,17,23 | 208:16,22 |
| destruction | 141:5 146:3,23 | 68:16 70:17,21 | 210:20,24 |
| 134:10 | 147:3 160:21 | 74:24 75:14 | 214:10,11,18 |
| destructive | 162:6 170:22 | 77:17 78:19 | 214:21 215:14 |
| 150:24 | 172:3 181:2,3 | 82:21 83:4 | 215:20 216:25 |
| detail 25:3 | 184:1 | 84:8 86:25 | 220:5,16,21 |
| 238:20 | developing | 87:5 89:2 | 221:1 225:6 |
| detailed 236:20 | 17:16 23:20 | 90:17,22 92:3 | 234:14 236:10 |
| 239:6,8 | 28:22 37:12 | 92:9 96:9,13 | 236:17,20,21 |
| details 91:23 | 67:6 145:24 | 96:20 97:6,11 | 237:9,10 240:9 |
| 173:1,2 215:24 | 156:6 158:23 | 98:20 99:5 | 240:14,19 |
| determination | 160:24 184:8 | 100:17,20 | developments |
| 93:16,18 94:2 | 184:12 209:8 | 105:1,2,5 | 22:8 23:7,12 |
| determine | 210:17 237:6,6 | 106:15,24,24 | 34:3,6 36:22 |
| 56:17 102:5 | 237:10,15 | 121:17,17,20 | 37:6 71:14 |
| 168:7,13,14 | 240:20 | 121:22 122:1,2 | 73:3 83:12 |
| 185:19 |  | 126:19 127:12 | 93:12 104:17 |

Page 20
[developments - distinction]

| 153:10,24 | 60:6 65:3 | 37:9 118:16 | discount 159:8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 168:18 174:12 | 74:21 95:17 | 120:3 123:10 | 219:17 |
| 175:3 225:25 | 97:5 104:4 | 124:25 126:18 | discounted |
| devon 3:16 | 127:13 130:9 | 128:1 131:12 | 46:2 |
| diagnostic | 132:3,4 139:18 | 134:17 135:1 | discretely |
| 133:12 | 140:3 142:6 | 190:16 193:1,3 | 188:25 |
| diagram 214:9 | 147:21,22 | 195:25 201:15 | discuss 50:12 |
| dialogue 85:11 | 148:18 152:2,7 | 203:9,22 | 65:6 88:2 |
| diamond | 152:12,17 | 208:10 212:23 | 224:2 233:24 |
| 117:10 | 153:15 154:20 | 212:25 216:13 | discussed 62:19 |
| difference | 159:5,6 164:1 | 220:19 224:17 | 62:24 63:1 |
| 16:17 26:4,9 | 178:13,19,23 | 226:12 230:1 | 74:18 80:21 |
| 29:20,21 53:20 | 180:2 181:6,20 | 232:22 239:21 | 85:25 88:20 |
| 71:19 72:3,8 | 195:5 196:15 | direction 10:16 | 97:23 99:18 |
| 72:13,18,20 | 196:18 200:16 | 86:1 114:14 | discussing |
| 74:2,21 79:15 | 202:15 237:20 | 142:15 | 67:11 76:13 |
| 91:7 104:10,12 | 238:1 | directional | 91:11 103:23 |
| 106:23 108:16 | differential | 208:7 | 202:1 |
| 142:18,21 | 238:10 | directions | discussion |
| 179:25 184:4 | differently | 129:17 | 19:12 58:9 |
| 206:24 220:4 | 39:16 95:16 | directly 15:21 | 59:21 60:5 |
| 220:11 222:14 | difficult 14:17 | 15:22 17:13 | 70:11 92:18 |
| 236:1 241:17 | 177:20 182:4 | 180:8 198:3 | 98:2 130:14 |
| differences | 213:25 214:1,3 | 203:2 217:6 | 131:10 149:3 |
| 44:13 48:9 | 222:15 | disagree 38:1 | 166:2,6,13 |
| 56:20 66:4,7 | difficulties | 162:12 169:4 | 182:25 233:1 |
| 66:12 89:18 | 57:10 | 194:14 200:4 | 234:6,19 |
| 97:24 100:6 | digestible | 204:13 | discussions |
| 127:8,20,24 | 38:13 | disagreement | 132:21 |
| 202:5 220:14 | digital 243:8 | 167:20,25 | dispute 98:18 |
| 238:18 | 244:3 | disappeared | dissolve 51:6 |
| different 14:13 | dip 29:18 81:15 | 7:22 156:14 | distinct 207:14 |
| 14:14,14 15:25 | dire 5:3 122:17 | discern 81:16 | distinction |
| 23:4,6 34:11 | direct 8:13 | disconnect | 206:25 207:6 |
| 39:15 59:25,25 | 12:13 13:18 | 164:18 | 220:1 |

[distinguished - drills]

| distinguished | 164:24 | draining 83:14 | drillable 51:22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 75:21,23 | dollars 186:23 | 111:13 137:24 | drilled 19:6 |
| distractions | dominant | 180:13 219:1 | 21:9 23:2,24 |
| 124:21 | 90:14 | dramatic | 25:15 27:7,25 |
| distribution | door 166:20 | 142:23 | 29:7 30:6 32:9 |
| 212:16 | 171:7 | drastic 60:24 | 34:18 39:10 |
| dive 91:25 | dot 202:16,17 | drastically | 40:5 41:6 |
| 137:6 193:25 | 202:20 203:2 | 60:19 61:14 | 50:12,17,20 |
| divergence | dots 198:2,2,21 | 71:1 105:19 | 56:8,10 63:16 |
| 90:11 199:4 | 198:22 | draw 83:11 | 75:10 77:20,22 |
| divided 24:17 | double 26:21 | drawdown | 77:23 78:2,13 |
| division 1:3,7 | doubt 156:5 | 21:8 | 80:10 87:8 |
| 4:2 9:8 11:22 | downloaded | drawing 241:3 | 88:11 113:24 |
| 119:7 121:5 | 13:10 | drawn 21:11 | 127:2 130:19 |
| 124:13 163:22 | downward | 84:22,23 | 138:24 148:4 |
| 167:7 191:3,25 | 56:6 86:4,13 | draws 17:21 | 150:20 160:18 |
| 193:19 205:25 | 109:4 152:10 | 20:5 | 174:10 179:5,6 |
| 230:13 239:9 | 152:16 | drill 27:24 29:9 | 183:8,25 194:9 |
| division's 160:3 | drag 85:3 | 33:21 34:10 | 201:13 221:3 |
| docket 1:7 | drain 73:12 | 35:24 45:9 | 226:13,14 |
| doe 152:15 | 83:21 104:23 | 49:2 50:18,23 | 237:3 |
| 203:3 | 137:19 160:13 | 51:10 56:3 | drilling 29:11 |
| doing 14:9 | 204:18 213:19 | 71:9 79:7 80:7 | 32:24 34:8 |
| 22:23 27:21 | 224:10,11,15 | 86:20 96:21,24 | 35:18 40:2 |
| 29:3 30:2 36:4 | 224:18 | 107:3 114:1,6 | 43:18 66:20 |
| 38:11 43:1 | drainage 67:24 | 131:18 135:7 | 75:10,11 78:25 |
| 84:7 86:24 | 68:19 82:7 | 161:18,22 | 102:1 104:9 |
| 102:16 126:21 | 85:17 109:11 | 171:21 172:11 | 113:7,9 150:13 |
| 130:15,17 | 109:14,16,18 | 172:11 173:24 | 160:9,10 |
| 146:10 163:18 | 218:15,16,20 | 188:17 201:6 | 161:13 171:10 |
| 173:3 194:4 | drained 70:3 | 214:25 215:14 | 173:17 180:15 |
| 203:22 226:3 | 113:10 132:14 | 215:19 216:1,2 | 180:16 226:19 |
| 238:16 | 145:14 160:21 | 216:4,5,9,10 | 227:10 241:4 |
| dollar 159:10 | 204:9 | 225:3 226:21 | drills 78:12 |
| 159:10,11 |  |  | 80:7 |
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[drive - empirical]

| drive 4:6 | 208:13 | economics | efficiently |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| driven 25:8 | e7 214:9,13 | 100:7 102:3,5 | 38:25 104:24 |
| 32:17 199:19 | ea 128:18 | 102:9 114:3 | 160:13 180:13 |
| drivers 200:21 | eager 187:2 | 154:16 156:23 | egregious |
| 219:12 | earlier 24:16 | 156:24 157:14 | 156:3 |
| drop 30:7 | 30:5 52:3 | 177:18 | eight 34:7 |
| 33:22 144:11 | 56:14 72:25 | eddie 5:7 6:6 | 64:18,23 76:17 |
| 199:5 | 81:7 103:7 | 7:5 8:9,19 11:6 | 76:18 78:24,25 |
| dropped 199:8 | 112:3 135:2 | edge 17:25 18:4 | 107:2,2 171:21 |
| drops 108:12 | 136:19 186:8 | 18:19 23:23 | 171:22 172:17 |
| drying 180:21 | 211:4 | 31:25 33:6 | 172:17 174:3 |
| due 26:14 | early 19:18 | 67:18 87:24 | 177:24 179:5,6 |
| 90:12 187:17 | 20:7,8 21:9,13 | 88:7 176:22 | 225:2,16,21 |
| 210:23 | 35:17 50:16,18 | 177:3,11 | 226:1 |
| duly $8: 10$ | 57:10 157:12 | 196:14 210:22 | eighteen 175:4 |
| 119:16 190:9 | 157:15 170:13 | education | 175:5 |
| 229:19 243:5 | 173:6 178:10 | 121:12 | either 26:19 |
| dx 5:6 | earnings | effect 27:25 | 32:24 62:7 |
| e | 164:13,15 | 30:19 32:15 | 68:22 98:19 |
|  | 165:9 179:22 | 34:15 53:10,25 | 136:22 160:18 |
| 6:1,7,8 | easier 73:12 | 57:1 88:7 | 172:13 181:4 |
| 17,17,17 | 198:7 | 98:10 112:7 | 192:9 215:23 |
| 116:10,22 | east 21:2 | effective | 219:18 |
| 117:14,21,23 | 141:24 200:22 | 109:14,16 | elapsed 77:21 |
| 119:24,24 | eastern 175:20 | effectively | 78:1 |
| 120:25,25 | easy $14: 15$ | 83:21 84:3 | electric 21:7 |
| 191:24 192:15 | 197:6 211:7 | 113:19 160:13 | elements 79:13 |
| 192:21 | economic 37:25 | 213:19 224:12 | elevated 144:16 |
| e1 116:23 | 52:7 91:24 | 224:18 | eleven 76:17,17 |
| 117:14,15 | 92:1,2,8,14 | effects 87:2 | email 178:6 |
| 192:5,15 | 100:9,11,20 | 227:7,17,20,21 | emailed 24:20 |
| e2 117:13 | 105:3 113:15 | efficiency | emanate 56:5 |
| e29 192:6,15 | 114:8 149:25 | 22:23,24 | empirical |
| e3 116:23 117:6 | 150:3,11 177:9 | efficient 35:2 | 132:25 135:9 |
| 117:15 208:11 | 201:9 225:7 | 242:19 | 170:7 |
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[employed - examination]

| employed | 122:12,23,25 | especially | 223:17 225:10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 121:1 190:23 | 133:1 135:16 | 85:10 139:23 | evaluating |
| 190:25 230:8 | 148:14 164:8 | 148:12 168:4 | 86:19 225:15 |
| 230:10 243:11 | engineers | 188:7 189:3 | 225:22 |
| 243:14 244:8 | 39:15 122:2 | 194:12 | evd 6:2 |
| 244:11 | enjoy 193:16 | esps 21:4 29:23 | event 11:13 |
| employee | ensure 52:6 | esquire 3:10,18 | 12:7 49:23,24 |
| 243:13 244:10 | ensures 187:12 | 4:11 | 50:9 103:14 |
| encapsulate | enthusiasm | esqure 3:3 | 117:20 122:14 |
| 161:16 | 162:10 | essentially 64:6 | 125:8 146:18 |
| encountered | entire 24:1 | 79:6 113:6 | 146:19 |
| 142:13 | 60:18 67:15 | 204:5 234:5 | events 139:20 |
| encouraged | 105:18 131:16 | estimate 29:15 | eventually |
| 186:2 187:21 | 162:18 226:22 | 39:6 93:8 | 106:4 |
| encouraging | 237:16 240:18 | estimated | everybody |
| 170:14,15 | entirely 26:17 | 21:23 38:6 | 42:22 211:8 |
| 179:9 | 174:13 222:2 | 39:25 41:12 | everybody's |
| ended 182:17 | entirety 150:1 | 109:4 | 14:9 |
| energy 1:2 3:8 | entity 240:24 | estimates 44:21 | evidence 11:8 |
| 3:16,17,17 4:5 | enverus 34:25 | 46:11 54:22 | 11:19 46:23 |
| 4:9,19,21 | 48:14 106:21 | 103:24 | 117:25 125:13 |
| 18:18 27:19,21 | environment | et 108:13 | 147:2 167:4 |
| 32:3,18 116:21 | 18:21 | eur 36:10,15 | 192:23 205:22 |
| 184:14 238:6 | eog 89:25 | 38:18 54:21 | 206:20 232:19 |
| engineer 24:1 | equal 20:9 | 80:6 91:20 | exact 17:7 |
| 28:23 81:13 | equally 187:2,2 | 92:13 100:18 | 175:3 239:6 |
| 118:15 121:13 | equipment | 101:20,21 | exactly 39:16 |
| 121:16,17,18 | 30:9 | 103:22 148:1,4 | 133:6,15 141:9 |
| 125:18 173:16 | equivalent | 148:9 149:17 | 160:16 169:20 |
| 204:25 224:21 | 38:20 39:4 | 149:19 157:14 | 240:18 |
| 225:8 228:4 | 44:23 106:9 | 177:2,17 | examination |
| engineering | 212:12 | eurs 101:10 | 8:13 57:7 58:2 |
| 9:11,13 11:25 | es 243:4 | 111:22 | 80:18 103:20 |
| 12:1,4,5,23 | esp 21:6 $22: 1$ | evaluate | 108:4 118:20 |
| 112:10 118:12 | 50:2,6 | 187:13 223:16 | 120:3 122:20 |
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[examination - exhibit]

| 123:10 131:13 | 189:8,12,14,16 | excited 162:16 | 88:3,19 92:6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 131:23 134:15 | 189:21 190:3 | 171:8,9 | 92:12 94:5 |
| 135:3 166:11 | 190:12 191:11 | excluded 212:3 | 99:12 100:21 |
| 167:7,15 | 191:13,17 | exclusion | 101:3 102:18 |
| 182:19 185:11 | 192:13,16,19 | 162:13 | 106:19,20 |
| 190:16 206:9 | 205:8,10,14,18 | excuse 115:3 | 109:20 110:24 |
| 222:21 223:8 | 206:1 209:13 | 189:9 228:16 | 116:10 117:12 |
| 230:1 | 209:18,23,25 | execute 47:14 | 117:21,23 |
| examined 8:12 | 222:16,18,20 | executed 23:5 | 121:9,9 123:13 |
| 119:18 190:11 | 222:25 223:3,5 | 79:22 84:15 | 123:13,17 |
| 229:21 | 228:10,15,18 | 157:8 201:15 | 124:5,6,8,13,13 |
| examiner 2:4 | 228:22 229:1,6 | executing | 125:9,11 126:2 |
| 7:2,4,6,9,15,17 | 229:13,22 | 31:18 52:19 | 126:16,22 |
| 7:21,24,25 | 230:21,24 | exhibit 6:3,5,7 | 128:7,10,18,19 |
| 9:15 10:5 | 231:3 232:6,9 | 6:8,10,12,14 | 129:14 130:20 |
| 11:12 12:3,6 | 232:12,24 | 8:25 10:23 | 147:9,24 |
| 13:5,7 24:9,15 | 233:4,8 241:19 | 11:7,7,17 | 148:12 149:14 |
| 24:23 49:22 | 241:22,25 | 13:11,16 16:25 | 149:15,16 |
| 54:9,12 57:8 | 242:9,17 | 18:5,6 19:11 | 150:8 152:13 |
| 57:16,18,21 | examiners | 19:25 20:3,10 | 152:18 153:2 |
| 62:6,12 103:11 | 121:7,11 162:2 | 22:5,14 23:13 | 154:25 165:9 |
| 103:19 107:20 | example 24:4 | 23:14 24:21 | 165:18,21,23 |
| 107:23 114:21 | 26:16 33:1,6 | 25:7 28:13,14 | 166:10,23,25 |
| 115:2,5,8 | 40:10 82:21 | 29:3 31:9 | 167:2 169:15 |
| 116:3,8,14,19 | 101:9 143:1 | 33:14 35:3 | 182:22 191:24 |
| 117:18 118:2,5 | 152:15 174:14 | 36:23 38:2 | 192:5,14,21 |
| 118:21 119:3 | 209:7 210:4,16 | 39:2,24 40:15 | 193:12,18,21 |
| 119:10,19,25 | 241:12 | 42:19 43:14,22 | 194:6 197:21 |
| 120:15 122:13 | examples 17:5 | 48:5,20 49:10 | 205:9,11,19,20 |
| 122:18 123:5 | 43:13 68:11 | 49:16 51:24 | 208:11,18 |
| 125:6 159:25 | excellent 23:10 | 56:22,23 59:2 | 211:1,2,22 |
| 165:19,22 | 110:3 208:5 | 59:9 63:5 | 213:3 214:9,13 |
| 166:1,14 167:8 | except 8:2 | 65:20 71:17 | 216:13 218:1 |
| 167:14 182:10 | 124:23 | 77:1 81:25 | 220:20,20 |
| 184:25 185:3,9 |  | 82:10 87:25 | 221:18,18 |
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| 222:10,14 | 231:15,18 | 104:7 | 238:15,17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 231:10,10,19 | 232:3 233:11 | expected 136:2 | 239:18 240:13 |
| 231:21,22,23 | 233:15 239:21 | expenditures | 241:7,17 |
| 232:6,8,13,17 | exist 101:23 | 52:9 | explained |
| 233:17,23 | 142:3 | experience | 44:15 66:6 |
| 234:7 237:18 | existed 132:14 | 109:2 121:12 | 157:19 237:7 |
| exhibiting | existing 26:25 | 197:17 | explicitly |
| 237:14 | 51:11 83:22 | expert 9:10 | 134:17 |
| exhibits 6:14 | 84:4 141:5,17 | 11:24 12:4 | exploited |
| 8:24 10:22 | 142:2,20,20 | 122:12 191:3 | 203:12 |
| 11:7,15 12:13 | 143:14 150:17 | 191:12 205:16 | export 201:6 |
| 12:24 13:3,10 | 150:25 151:2 | 206:4 230:14 | exported 201:8 |
| 16:20 22:13 | 163:9,12,13 | 230:22 | extend 86:12 |
| 23:14 24:5,10 | 208:23 210:23 | explain 18:25 | extension 47:10 |
| 38:12 42:17 | exists 177:22 | 25:2 28:19 | extensions 47:8 |
| 55:10 59:21 | expanding 30:1 | 29:1,19 31:11 | 47:25 |
| 60:4 62:20,23 | expands 218:21 | 35:3 38:8 | extensive |
| 67:11 82:7 | expect $25: 25$ | 45:13,22 47:24 | 118:20 |
| 92:15 109:19 | 27:16 28:3,4 | 48:6 49:22 | extensively |
| 111:14 114:20 | 32:4 37:24 | 51:2 77:8 83:4 | 194:20 217:21 |
| 115:23 116:11 | 40:12 41:14,22 | 83:11 85:6 | extent 62:20 |
| 116:12,22 | 43:8 53:13 | 102:18 126:12 | 76:25 86:5 |
| 117:14,14 | 69:13 73:19 | 128:5 132:20 | 87:9,11 98:18 |
| 118:16 123:20 | 75:12 83:18 | 139:6 142:17 | 219:19 |
| 123:21,25 | 85:1,17,18,20 | 142:19 143:11 | external 223:17 |
| 124:25 125:4 | 86:6,8 98:15 | 144:5,6 145:18 | extra 39:9,18 |
| 125:17,23,24 | 104:20 105:2,4 | 147:12 151:15 | 40:4 224:25 |
| 125:25 130:5 | 107:11,14 | 160:6 162:2 | extrapolate |
| 131:7 147:22 | 110:19 129:21 | 183:11,18 | 202:11 |
| 165:25 192:3 | expectation | 184:3 193:21 | extremely |
| 192:10,20 | 39:7 84:13 | 193:21 201:24 | 17:11 132:2 |
| 193:2,5 194:7 | 100:18,22 | 204:10 234:4,7 | 163:4,16 |
| 205:17 211:13 | 108:14 | 234:20 236:2 | 170:13 171:8 |
| 212:14 217:20 | expectations | 236:12,15,17 | 172:14 |
| 229:7 231:13 | 97:19 100:12 | 237:9,20,25 |  |
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| eye 151:11 | factual 99:20 | favor 45:17 | federal 15:10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| f | fair 34:19 43:7 | 149:14 150:10 | 15:12 49:19 |
| f 6:10 119:24 | 59:21 67:11 | 225:20 241:10 | 50:22,25 51:3 |
| 120:25 123:17 | 111:7 158:2 | favorably | 51:9 176:17 |
| 125:4,9,11 | 161:2 209:1 | 48:23 | federals 15:3,6 |
| 190:22 | 210:15 212:3 | fdi 111:1 | feedback |
| f1 123:21 | 212:10 214:15 | fdis 32:16 | 242:15 |
| f2 12:24 13: 16 | 219:24 | fe 3:6,13,21 4:7 | feel $30: 1354$ |
| 23:14 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { fairly } 30: 13 \\ & \text { 196:25 203:14 } \end{aligned}$ | 4:14 233:5 | 212:14 214: |
| f3 15:23 23:15 |  | feature 156:24 <br> features 24:2 | 214:24 215 |
| f4 $16: 25 \quad 19: 12$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 196:25 203:14 } \\ & \text { false } 178: 5 \end{aligned}$ |  | feet |
|  | familiar 122:3 | february 45:1 | 26:20,22 32:10 |
| 19:13 23:13,14 | 215:3,8 230:16 | fechtel 5:3,12 | 32:10,12 49:5 |
| 87:25 | far 13:24 16:12 | 6:11 12:15,18 | 68:14 69:19,21 |
| f5 49:16 | 21:23 31:5 | 12:19,20,21 | 69:24 108:22 |
| f6 50:11 51:24 | 38:10 57:2 | 118:11 119:9 | 108:22 113:4 |
| f8 12:24 $20: 1$ | 61:21 127:17 | 119:12,15,23 | 129:24 148:8 |
| 123:22 | 129:12 130:13 | 120:5,20,23 | 149:20 196:19 |
| face 165:7 | 139:17 146:16 | 122:11,22 | 196:21 197:14 |
| facetious 174:1 | 146:20 151:2 | 123:12 124:4 | felicia 2:4 10:6 |
|  | 166:16 172:19 | 125:16 126:8 | 184:24 189:11 |
| 118:15 | 184:13 185:23 | 128:5 138:16 | felt $234: 22$ |
| facility 51:9 | 186:4,17 | 147:9 151:13 | fewer 138:11 |
| fact 24:17 53:8 | 187:18 188:15 | 157:17 159:24 | field 121:22 |
| 53:19 54:5 | 202:1 203:5 | 164:7 165:14 | fifteen 57:12,14 |
| 59:19 75:8 | 237:24 | 167:6,11 182:8 | 179:21 |
| 80:10 84:18 | fascinating | 182:21 185:7 | fight 33:3 |
| 86:2 104:25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 139:13 } \\ & \text { fashion } 163: 24 \end{aligned}$ | 85:13,15 | figure 208:8 |
|  |  | 189:9 228:4 | 217:17 |
| 183:8 203:19 | fast $150: 17$ | 236:19 | figured 115:22 |
| 204:21 210:22 | 182:16 $226: 1$faster $21: 2$ | fechtel's 17:20 | figures 43:25 |
| 235:4 |  | 31:12 | file 115:24 |
| factor $27: 4$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33: 23 \text { 91:1 } \\ & 158: 15 \end{aligned}$ | fechtell 167:17 | filed 110:12 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { factor } & 27: 4 \\ \text { factors } & 104: 3\end{array}$ |  | fed 175:25 | 122:4 124:13 |
|  |  | 176:3 196:3,5 | 191:25 193:19 |
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| 230:17,18 | 112:12 113:16 | 204:9 | follows 8:12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 231:19,19,20 | 114:1 119:5,7 | flexibility | 119:18 190:11 |
| 231:22 232:3,8 | 119:16 126:11 | 46:18 47:6 | 229:21 |
| 235:1,2,8 | 126:16 140:8 | flip 132:8 | foot $22: 21$ |
| filing 145:11 | 140:19,21 | 224:20 | 26:16,18 31:21 |
| filings 30:6 | 141:3 144:11 | flow 25:9 60:24 | 31:22,22 37:1 |
| fill 195:2 | 144:12 153:18 | 61:10,14 64:21 | 40:4 48:9,22 |
| filled 195:3 | 159:12 171:6 | 71:176:4 | 68:22,23 73:3 |
| final 200:8 | 185:18 190:9 | 80:12 85:21 | 90:19 148:10 |
| 203:3 228:20 | 196:9 211:20 | 90:6 104:20,21 | 149:21,22 |
| financial 52:25 | 216:2,4,6,7,9 | 105:18,21 | 164:23 165:3 |
| 150:4 | 226:23 229:19 | 110:20 147:6 | footprint |
| financially | 234:24 236:21 | flowback 173:6 | 226:16 |
| 150:4 165:12 | 238:6 | flowing 60:19 | forbidden |
| 243:15 244:11 | fit 133:10 | fluid 18:3 | 150:12 |
| financials | 134:18 135:10 | 140:22 142:14 | forecast 29:19 |
| 159:20 | 135:13 | 143:18 | 30:14 39:15 |
| find $22: 13$ | fits 139:6 | focus 64:11 | 77:19 133:12 |
| 42:24 47:7 | fitting 135:22 | 66:16 128:14 | 133:21,25 |
| 105:21 172:13 | five 25:22 | 146:8,15,16 | 134:6,18,19,23 |
| finding 208:4 | 48:12 50:12,14 | 171:12 212:5 | 135:11 136:10 |
| fine 17:24 | 50:15 65:9 | 212:12 229:4 | 136:17 137:1 |
| 83:25 | 68:6 71:8 | focused 64:4 | 170:4 |
| finish 118:7,10 | 74:14 75:19 | 189:4 196:5 | forecasted |
| 118:19 119:1 | 148:3,5 153:21 | 218:5,6 | 132:12 133:22 |
| 241:23 | 170:22 178:25 | folks 116:7 | 148:10 |
| finished 222:20 | 179:15 226:11 | 147:7 233:5 | forecasting |
| finite 46:5 | flag 178:5 | follow 149:5 | 29:4 132:25 |
| 113:25 | flagged 197:5 | 182:14 210:13 | 133:1,5 135:10 |
| first 8:10 13:4 | flash 221:17 | followed | 169:25 170:4,8 |
| 27:24 47:5 | flat 15:18 26:18 | 196:10,10,11 | forecasts $38: 12$ |
| 49:9 58:24 | 32:7 36:9,19 | following | 148:2 157:12 |
| 59:3 68:2 | 78:6 83:8 | 181:24 214:15 | foregoing |
| 78:12 96:8 | 84:16 99:9 | 235:15 | 243:3,4 244:4 |
| 97:12 105:16 | 168:18 181:25 |  |  |

Page 28
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| forever 163:6 | 74:14,18 75:15 | 136:6,17 | fractures 69:3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| forget 145:17 | 84:16 90:16,22 | 144:15 161:2,4 | 85:13 140:12 |
| 169:20 | 90:23 99:5 | 163:10 188:13 | 140:19 142:11 |
| forgot 196:9 | 104:9 105:8 | 202:12 204:6 | 143:5,7 146:22 |
| formation | 106:25 107:1 | 206:17,20 | 151:24 157:24 |
| 13:25 128:16 | 154:19 156:20 | frack 85:19 | fracturing |
| 128:17 130:25 | 161:12 172:11 | 109:13 145:25 | 137:20 |
| 131:1 181:4 | 172:11,15,16 | fracked 56:4 | framework |
| 188:20 207:23 | 173:3,3,14,14 | 77:20,23 78:4 | 59:1 62:21 |
| 211:6,24 | 177:16,17 | 111:21 134:21 | 70:13 |
| 241:10,16 | 179:15 185:24 | 134:25 143:15 | francis 4:6 |
| formations | 186:1,12,13,16 | 145:23 188:20 | frank 120:25 |
| 45:25 60:12 | 186:16,18 | fracketing | frankly 70:10 |
| 65:4 147:8 | 187:23 188:2,5 | 188:19 | front 8:19 10:9 |
| 161:23 195:6 | 188:9 204:16 | frackets 188:12 | 59:2 88:1 |
| 196:15 236:6 | 224:9 225:17 | fracking | 123:13 208:19 |
| forms 135:24 | 225:18 229:4 | 114:10,11 | full 13:8 17:25 |
| 161:10 170:12 | 234:13 235:7,9 | 174:15 | 18:24 39:13,17 |
| forth 10:18,19 | 238:21 241:12 | fracks 82:24 | 41:20 44:21 |
| 234:10 239:10 | fourth 40:24 | 84:19 85:2 | 67:17 82:21 |
| forths 159:2 | 52:14 229:6 | 86:1,1,3,12 | 120:21 126:4 |
| fortunate | frac 18:2,16 | 108:24 109:4 | 130:23 155:11 |
| 235:20 | 19:8 27:13,19 | 143:16 | 155:25 177:16 |
| fortunately | 27:21 29:5,22 | fracs 31:17,23 | 190:19,21 |
| 150:15 184:9 | 31:20 32:3,5 | 53:7 56:5 | 230:3 240:9,13 |
| forward 70:17 | 49:25 50:6 | 69:18 | fully 91:24 |
| 92:15 127:14 | 56:3,7,11 69:8 | fracture 16:22 | 129:21 137:6 |
| 140:23 144:23 | 69:17 73:5,15 | 32:17 84:9 | 138:3 149:11 |
| founded 187:24 | 73:19 76:3,3,8 | 140:21 141:3 | 170:21,24 |
| four 15:25 23:8 | 77:24 78:9 | 142:7 146:14 | 171:3 172:22 |
| 23:9 34:4 | 82:6,13,17 | 151:17 163:12 | 173:20 183:14 |
| 35:16 36:18 | 84:12,23 85:3 | 184:19 | 183:21,24 |
| 64:22,23 65:5 | 86:7 95:5 | fracture's | 187:24 226:22 |
| 65:5,12,13 | 109:15,18 | 140:18 | fulton 2:7 |
| 68:6 71:8 | 112:5 135:4 |  | 243:2,20 |
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| function 44:5 | 160:2 185:6,8 | 110:2 118:18 | 43:22 44:17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| functioning | 185:12 189:6 | 131:21 138:23 | 45:11 46:14 |
| 217:12 | 189:10 223:6,7 | 152:7 162:3 | 48:20 50:24 |
| fundamental | 223:9 228:6,11 | 191:4,7,12 | 56:7,11 59:2,7 |
| 136:4 140:14 | garcia's 115:6 | 193:4,25 | 62:4 63:8,9 |
| fundamentals | 159:25 161:9 | 204:16 | 64:9 71:2,9 |
| 132:24 170:3,7 | gather 96:21,22 | getting 29:25 | 73:16 78:20 |
| funky 178:10 | gathering | 39:21 56:1 | 80:7,17 84:20 |
| further 29:1 | 97:17 | 58:25 62:2 | 85:13,14 86:2 |
| 33:23 35:14 | gears 217:19 | 83:2 85:24 | 86:3,7 91:1 |
| 36:9 73:12 | gel 108:12 | 91:23 93:19 | 94:17 97:7,10 |
| 85:4 89:17 | general 52:8 | 106:15 112:11 | 104:10 105:25 |
| 103:9 106:3 | 68:11 117:4 | 129:20 138:4 | 113:13 114:2,6 |
| 108:15 109:24 | generally 68:7 | 155:20 158:17 | 115:8 116:15 |
| 113:12,12 | 182:6 | 172:6 242:15 | 116:17,19 |
| 151:13,17 | generate 211:9 | give $54: 10$ | 119:4 120:1 |
| 167:5 172:1 | generated | 80:22 81:1 | 122:19 123:8 |
| 184:22 193:25 | 29:20 | 118:23,24 | 126:4 129:4 |
| 205:23 234:19 | generative | 136:2 174:14 | 132:6 138:5,14 |
| 243:12 244:9 | 199:22 | 175:3 202:3 | 151:19 156:21 |
| future 86:21 | geologic 76:4 | 203:18 238:21 | 164:10 167:14 |
| 133:12,17 | 194:25 211:6 | 240:17 | 168:2,3 171:19 |
| 135:22,24 | 220:16 | given 39:20 | 172:2 173:24 |
| 175:9 227:14 | geological 56:9 | 41:4 47:11 | 175:7 190:14 |
| 227:18 | 216:3 | 66:7 86:24 | 192:3 199:7 |
| g | geologist 4:21 | 126:13 198:15 | 206:7 223:3 |
|  | 108:9 191:1 | 215:1 | 231:13 233:19 |
| gaining 22:4 | 212:9 227:12 | gives 54:4 | 233:24 234:18 |
| gamma 196:10 | geologists | giving 179:13 | goal 51:7 |
| 196:24 | 98:14 | go $12: 11,12,14$ | goals 113:18 |
| garcia 4:4 5:11 | geology 59:24 | 13:2 15:23 | goes 16:13 31:5 |
| 5:17,21 107:25 | 60:6,8 66:8,22 | 18:20 22:15 | 49:10 70:17 |
|  | 68:13 71:16 | 28:7 29:24 | 94:16 180:25 |
| 114:22 115:19 | 81:10 85:12 | 30:11 34:9 | 185:4 |
| 115:21 116:2,4 | 104:6 106:16 | 38:2 40:19 |  |
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| going $9: 20$ | $166: 24169: 12$ | $67: 18$ 90:1 | $120: 16132: 20$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $11: 1312: 7,11$ | $171: 10,11,13$ | $95: 1198: 23$ | $148: 14152: 8$ |
| $12: 12,1513: 2$ | $171: 21172: 18$ | $106: 1,5147: 17$ | $173: 18194: 19$ |
| $13: 415: 23$ | $176: 19178: 8$ | $148: 16,22$ | greater $42: 11$ |
| $16: 2522: 14$ | $179: 19180: 16$ | $159: 4,14$ | $129: 24160: 12$ |
| $23: 1324: 20$ | $180: 21181: 9$ | $167: 17176: 9$ | $186: 18195: 11$ |
| $27: 1030: 6$ | $182: 6189: 10$ | $185: 13195: 12$ | $198: 14$ |
| $37: 938: 9$ | $190: 1193: 14$ | $195: 13,15,15$ | green $18: 13$ |
| $39: 2440: 14$ | $193: 15195: 23$ | $195: 15200: 12$ | $197: 22$ |
| $42: 847: 13$ | $196: 15199: 16$ | $211: 5212: 6$ | grid $139: 3$ |
| $49: 1650: 11$ | $200: 8,10,12$ | $223: 10231: 12$ | grids $168: 6,12$ |
| $58: 14,22,24$ | $201: 23202: 12$ | goosey $23: 8$ | $208: 6$ |
| $59: 1,263: 12$ | $202: 15,25$ | $45: 1569: 25$ | ground $18: 18$ |
| $65: 1866: 23$ | $203: 23204: 15$ | $96: 1997: 1$ | $30: 932: 18$ |
| $67: 2069: 22$ | $204: 18205: 1$ | $99: 4104: 22$ | $39: 19186: 25$ |
| $70: 5,1073: 16$ | $210: 13217: 18$ | $149: 2$ | group $133: 2,2$ |
| $74: 879: 1$ | $217: 19218: 20$ | goosy $34: 4$ | $135: 17$ |
| $83: 14,2184: 3$ | $219: 9221: 16$ | gor $20: 19,23$ | grouped $157: 4$ |
| $84: 11,19,20$ | $224: 6,11,18$ | $111: 10$ | grow $84: 12$ |
| $85: 2,1486: 2,3$ | $226: 3,19229: 4$ | gosh $64: 3$ | $86: 9109: 6,7$ |
| $91: 4,2592: 15$ | $232: 21233: 19$ | $226: 15$ | $142: 11143: 7$ |
| $97: 2099: 11,13$ | $233: 20,22,25$ | govern $135: 21$ | $143: 16,16$ |
| $100: 5103: 13$ | $234: 16,18$ | grab $18: 20$ | growing $85: 8$ |
| $103: 25113: 8$ | $236: 24237: 22$ | $97: 2$ | $95: 5140: 13,20$ |
| $113: 21118: 8$ | $237: 23238: 14$ | grade $29: 11$ | $157: 25184: 18$ |
| $118: 10119: 1,8$ | $239: 14240: 5$ | grades $30: 8$ | growth $69: 2,13$ |
| $126: 4128: 3$ | $241: 23$ | graduated | $86: 4,13108: 12$ |
| $131: 10132: 23$ | golden $135: 17$ | $121: 14$ | $109: 4,8,13,14$ |
| $135: 6,15145: 8$ | good $14: 7,16$ | granting $47: 25$ | $142: 7146: 14$ |
| $145: 25147: 18$ | $14: 1917: 24$ | grants $171: 10$ | $152: 10,16$ |
| $147: 18,21$ | $20: 821: 828: 1$ | graph $197: 24$ | guarantee |
| $150: 9,24$ | $30: 1331: 6$ | graphed $34: 13$ | $232: 21$ |
| $151: 21158: 23$ | $36: 1348: 12$ | gray $8: 19: 20$ | guess $13: 20$ |
| $159: 19161: 4$ | $55: 15,16,18,21$ | great $59: 7$ | $20: 228: 5$ |
| $161: 20163: 23$ | $57: 958: 4,7,8$ | $90: 1699: 16$ | $29: 1940: 14$ |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
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| 56:23 58:24 | 73:5 132:16 | happy 58:11 | 11:12 12:6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 61:12 66:3 | 145:1 155:11 | 204:13 229:8 | 13:7 24:15,23 |
| 69:173:22 | 155:20 164:24 | hard 19:3 | 40:15 49:22 |
| 77:3,7 83:13 | 237:4 239:13 | 47:12 56:15,17 | 50:22 51:1,14 |
| 83:17 93:19 | hand 7:12 | 112:11 120:9 | 54:12 57:8,16 |
| 98:17 109:12 | 13:19 15:24 | 139:22 160:25 | 57:18,21,25 |
| 109:25 110:24 | 17:1 19:15 | 172:25 173:2 | 62:1,6,12 |
| 111:1,5 113:4 | 20:2,2 119:13 | harkey 130:10 | 103:8,11,19 |
| 158:19 166:11 | 126:14 161:21 | hartselle 244:2 | 107:20,23 |
| 170:22 179:21 | 190:6 196:1,1 | 244:17 | 114:21 115:2,5 |
| 180:4 187:4,14 | 196:2 197:24 | head 55:4 | 115:8 116:3,14 |
| 204:10 223:22 | 198:5,6 200:9 | 106:3 108:22 | 116:19,23 |
| 224:24 225:22 | 229:16 | 204:4 226:17 | 117:15,18 |
| 226:14 237:7 | handful 117:6 | heading 65:20 | 118:2,5,21 |
| gun 214:9 | 117:7 132:6 | heads 30:8 | 119:3,6,10,19 |
| guys 36:13 96:3 | handing 46:10 | 118:24 135:6 | 119:20,25 |
| 108:20 109:22 | handle 201:5 | 136:14 | 120:15 122:11 |
| 113:5 114:10 | handy 78:7 | hear 7:12,14 | 122:13,16,18 |
| 138:16 187:13 | 123:13 | 8:5 9:15,17 | 123:5 124:16 |
| 188:17 223:15 | happen 32:16 | 10:7,10 58:10 | 124:21 125:3,6 |
| 223:15 225:10 | 34:20 43:8 | 86:18 88:25 | 157:1 165:17 |
| 225:21 226:10 | 52:6 140:19 | 117:20 125:21 | 165:19,22 |
| h | 215:18 | 138:22 160:2 | 166:1,14 167:8 |
| h 6:1 8:17 74:4 | happened | 171:1,2 177:23 | 167:14 173:24 |
| 94:4 119:24,24 | 28:11 29:2 | 182:11 185:1 | 182:10 184:25 |
| 120:25 195:14 | 49:25 50:4,10 | 203:24 | 185:3,9 189:8 |
| 200:13 211:2 | 133:15 136:10 | heard 58:5 | 189:12,14,16 |
| 211:14 212:19 | 144:6,7 234:6 | 73:14 80:18 | 189:21,24 |
| 212:21 213:1 | happening | 95:25 96:15 | 190:3,12 |
| 220:4,14,21 | 127:19 136:12 | 108:8 158:9 | 191:13,17 |
| 230:7 | 143:5 159:18 | 170:20 180:11 | 192:16,19 |
| hailee 4:3 | 227:17 | 194:25 230:25 | 194:12 200:17 |
| 189:10 | happens 66:21 | hearing 1:5 2:1 | 205:10,18 |
| half $14: 22,23$ | 134:7 144:22 | 7:2,6,7,9,15,17 | 206:1 209:13 |
| 21:1,3 51:8 |  | 7:21,25 10:5 | 209:18,25 |
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[hearing - horrible]

| 215:17,18 | 94:19 120:8 | 207:20 234:14 | historic 200:21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 220:2 222:18 | 141:13 193:25 | 240:17 | history 67:19 |
| 222:25 223:5 | 194:2 202:10 | higher 17:18 | 133:3 135:23 |
| 228:10,15,18 | 202:11 203:20 | 27:19 36:3 | 234:12 |
| 229:1,13,22 | 208:8 212:5 | 37:13 44:4 | hit 29:25 50:1 |
| 230:24 231:3,7 | 223:23 226:5 | 49:7 53:14 | 85:8 86:10 |
| 232:9,12,24 | helped 184:19 | 104:19 154:14 | 138:13 197:15 |
| 233:8 235:9 | helpful 110:6 | 154:14,17 | hitting 185:4 |
| 241:19,22 | 137:8 | 156:16,17 | hobbs 117:4 |
| 242:7,9,17,21 | helping 101:16 | 170:16 196:24 | hog 238:11 |
| hearings 51:17 | 101:17 177:13 | 198:13 199:24 | hold 9:23 10:1 |
| heavily $24: 3$ | helps 45:10 | 238:24 239:1,2 | 10:3 234:13 |
| heavy 156:24 | hereto 243:14 | 239:3 | 238:20 239:10 |
| height 16:15,17 | 244:11 | highlight 30:22 | 239:12,20,24 |
| 54:4,16,24 | heterogeneous | 40:24 89:17 | 240:6 |
| 67:25 68:21,23 | 53:12 | 111:21 134:4 | holdout 90:17 |
| 68:25 69:2,8 | hf2s2 53:3 | 135:3 147:21 | hole 29:24 50:6 |
| 69:13,17,19,21 | 139:9 | 151:21 152:25 | 96:25 195:23 |
| 70:3 72:3,8,8 | hfts 146:7 | 153:17 164:14 | 196:3,4 201:13 |
| 72:14,21,25,25 | 202:9 203:2 | highlighted | honor 11:5 |
| 73:4,5 74:2 | hfts2 70:2 | 40:20 43:6 | 103:17 |
| 79:14,17 80:21 | 82:19 152:4 | 127:9 134:15 | honorable 2:4 |
| 80:25 91:7 | 202:1,4,17 | 138:7 197:8 | hopeful 118:9 |
| 93:10,10 95:13 | 221:19 222:13 | 238:3 | hopefully 38:13 |
| 104:16,17 | high 15:21 16:1 | highlighting | 168:1 193:16 |
| 108:16 131:24 | 16:2 36:11,20 | 73:8 133:6 | 193:18 |
| 131:25 148:25 | 38:14 39:23 | 148:1 153:3 | hopping 239:5 |
| 149:3,7 194:18 | 55:9,14,17,18 | highlights | horizontal |
| 194:19 195:8,9 | 81:23 95:11 | 130:3 138:6 | 51:25 74:11 |
| 195:10 200:10 | 98:23 100:23 | highly 149:25 | 207:10 |
| 200:11,12 | 108:19 111:10 | 150:11 201:8 | horizontally |
| 201:3 | 162:13 179:23 | 225:7 | 185:20,23 |
| heights 73:15 | 197:18 198:17 | hire 223:16 | horrible 156:7 |
| help 12:16 | 200:5,19,25 | histogram | 156:19 228:6 |
| 73:13 85:6 | 202:3 204:22 | 127:3 |  |
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[host - incorporating]

| host 4:18 | i | impact 29:5 | improper 49:20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { hours } 57: 11 \\ & 232: 15 \end{aligned}$ | idea 67:18 81:5 | $\begin{aligned} & 98: 5,25107: 4 \\ & 111: 2,5,24 \end{aligned}$ | improve 60:12 improved |
| house 203:22 | 137:20 156:7 | 136:23 137:2,2 | 16:13 31:17 |
| 223:16,20 | 172:24 | 137:3 183:11 | 73:8 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { huckleberry } \\ 216: 25 \end{gathered}$ | ideal 66:24 | $\begin{array}{cc} 236: 2 \\ \text { impacted } & 50: 21 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { improvement } \\ \text { 28:8 73:6 } \end{gathered}$ |
| hudson 238:3 | ideas 54:4 | 236:9 239:15 | 151:3 |
| 238:12 | identical 80:9 | impacting | improvements |
| huge 130:14 hundred | identification | 29:14 | 61:23 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { undred } \\ 186: 22 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11:18 117:24 } \\ & 125: 12 \quad 167: 3 \end{aligned}$ | impair 42: implicating | improves 74:5 <br> improving 55:8 |
| hunter 238:4 | 92:22 205:21 | 99:19 | incentivize |
| 240:24 | 2:18 | implication | 187:3 |
| hydraulic | identified | 133:25 | include 53:22 |
| 137:20 | 55:10 56:2 | implicit 133:2 | 131:7 |
| hydrocarbon | 59:14 127:20 | 159:9 | included 63:23 |
| 145:2 194:8 | 8:6,22 129:1 | implied 153:9 | 64:2 124:3,10 |
| 195:20 197:19 | 129:18 130:5 | importance | 127:23 129:1,6 |
| 199:11,14,22 | 130:25 131:15 | 157:20 | 129:7,13 |
| 202:14 203:13 | 154:1 | important | 169:10 171:6 |
| 204:22 213:15 | identifies | 18:19 21:8 | includes 164:23 |
| 217:12 219:6,6 | 144:16 | 23:22,25 25:23 | including 42:11 |
| 219:12,17 | identify 147:23 | 31:25 32:20 | 161:12,23 |
| hydrocarbons | identifying | 35:13 40:9 | 178:3 208:16 |
| 33:17 41:2,19 | 66:18 | 55:12 56:1 | 208:22 240:23 |
| 42:4,5 54:19 | imbalance 43:2 | 75:9 85:8 99:6 | inclusion |
| 83:15 84:3 | $43: 9,12,16$ | 107:8 127:25 | 132:15 |
| 105:3 194:9 | $45: 16,18$ | 128:2 130:17 | inclusive 63:2 |
| hypothetical | imbalances | 131:10 132:5 | incompatible |
| 174:4 175:11 | $43: 6$ | 135:25 140:17 | 144:3 |
| hypotheticals | immediately | 162:2 | incorporated |
| 174:8 175:8 | $17: 5 \quad 145: 22$ | impression | 104:5 |
|  | 161:24 186:16 | 118:6 158:12 | incorporating |
|  | 199:2 |  | 93:21 |
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[incorrect - interesting]

| incorrect 235:4 | indication | initial $33: 12$ | intentional |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| incorrectly | $80: 22132: 13$ | $36: 1,2078: 2$ | $176: 7$ |
| $127: 20$ | $158: 4$ | $158: 14$ | intentionally |
| increase $36: 16$ | indicative | initially $28: 9$ | $114: 8$ |
| $72: 1376: 22$ | $55: 11$ | $38: 1366: 17$ | interact $33: 3$ |
| $79: 16,2187: 4$ | individual $71: 3$ | $158: 2$ | $183: 17$ |
| $105: 11,13$ | $185: 25207: 8,9$ | input $10: 16$ | interacting |
| $120: 7132: 13$ | $240: 14$ | $20: 2391: 4$ | $68: 24143: 8$ |
| $132: 17137: 12$ | inefficient | $120: 6$ | interaction |
| $146: 23,24,24$ | $184: 17 \quad 188: 1$ | inset $141: 10,15$ | $32: 1761: 6$ |
| $148: 21149: 7,8$ | infer $178: 22$ | insignificant | $71: 13$ |
| $163: 20176: 9$ | $218: 15222: 11$ | $72: 20$ | interacts |
| $176: 18179: 13$ | $222: 13$ | insinuate | $140: 21$ |
| $204: 20$ | inferences | $210: 20$ | interest $42: 12$ |
| increased $68: 7$ | $222: 5$ | insinuating | $45: 19,1950: 13$ |
| $68: 1275: 3$ | inferior $150: 11$ | $194: 7$ | $59: 10,2360: 1$ |
| $107: 7147: 5,6$ | inferring $222: 9$ | insofar $8: 3$ | $60: 7,2262: 16$ |
| $157: 13,13,14$ | infinity $212: 6$ | install $22: 1$ | $62: 2564: 1,7$ |
| $157: 15158: 6$ | inflated $177: 3$ | installed $21: 4$ | $65: 21,2167: 15$ |
| $159: 20,20$ | influenced | instruction | $93: 2197: 25$ |
| increasing | 142:11 | $47: 17$ | $103: 7117: 1$ |
| $158: 13$ | inform $202: 11$ | integrity | $129: 13196: 6$ |
| incremental | $203: 21226: 5$ | $188: 12,16$ | $221: 11228: 24$ |
| $25: 2534: 16,17$ | information | intend $79: 6$ | $234: 17235: 24$ |
| $37: 14,1989: 18$ | $81: 1104: 1$ | $171: 15215: 13$ | $236: 5,11$ |
| $107: 14158: 17$ | $106: 10178: 9$ | $215: 19216: 1$ | $238: 10,20,25$ |
| indicate $39: 2$ | informs $141: 18$ | intended $137: 6$ | $239: 1,2,3,7,10$ |
| $238: 8,24239: 1$ | infrastructure | $221: 21238: 9$ | $239: 20,25$ |
| indicated | $79: 2113: 25$ | intending | $240: 6241: 15$ |
| $235: 17239: 2$ | $114: 4172: 19$ | $237: 5$ | interested |
| $240: 9$ | intent $39: 12$ | $243: 15244: 12$ |  |
| indicates $8: 3$ | inhibit $241: 3$ | $78: 21,2285: 6$ | interesting |
| $55: 15241: 15$ | inhibited $86: 13$ | $90: 15102: 25$ | $25: 1489: 23$ |
| indicating | inhibiting | $215: 21235: 10$ | $148: 11198: 20$ |
| $94: 11238: 14$ | $235: 14$ | $237: 14$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |
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[interference - kind]

| interference | investor 48:18 | j2 221:18 | 234:25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15:20 33:2 | ip 35:25 36:11 | james 3:11 4:12 | jump 129:22 |
| 87:13,16 | 36:20 38:14 | jamesbruc 3:14 | 147:14 199:9 |
| interject | 158:14 | 4:15 | jumping 87:23 |
| 233:21 | ips 36:3 | jim 3:10 4:11 | june 40:17 |
| internally | ira 5:18 6:9,13 | job 2:8 36:13 | 43:24 44:4,25 |
| 212:5 | 138:23,23 | 156:19 | 92:19 |
| internet 9:18 | 152:4 162:15 | john 4:4,19 5:3 | justify 26:23 |
| 13:8 59:8 | 190:2,8,21 | 5:12 6:11 | 40:2 75:7 |
| interpret 41:8 | 236:19 | 103:7 119:8,15 | 102:1 104:9 |
| 42:1 194:22 | irregardless | 119:23 120:23 | k |
| interpretation | 168:22 | 124:17,23 | k 6:14 24:21 |
| 194:15 195:17 | ish 199:9 | 125:18 185:15 | k 126:2 165:18 |
| 199:19 211:9 | issue 50:22 | 228:2,3,4 | 165:21,23 |
| 213:1 214:23 | 94:2 96:8 | 236:19 | 166:10,25 |
| 223:20 | 104:9 112:21 | joined 121:20 | 167:2 169:15 |
| interpreted | 120:17 134:10 | joker 17:5,8 | 182:22 |
| 195:18 217:5 | 155:18 161:16 | 18:4 45:13 | k12 175:12 |
| 224:16 | 170:19 191:7 | 70:22 72:4,9 | k6 169:12,14 |
| interrupt | 237:19 239:9 | 73:25 79:15,17 | keep 7:10 13:9 |
| 171:21 | 242:3 | 91:8 131:17 | 91:4 118:22 |
| interval 26:18 | issued 215:10 | 132:1 149:1 | 166:24 185:4 |
| 170:16 186:4 | issues 8:4 9:18 | 171:13,17 | key 131:21 |
| 197:7 219:1,4 | 29:13 51:22 | 173:3,9,10,14 | 146:2 |
| intervals 66:16 | 74:25 91:10 | 174:3 179:16 | kick 174:6 |
| 200:6,16 | 99:17,19,20 | 180:4,6 186:24 | 176:13 |
| introduce 11:6 | 143:21,23 | 201:1 202:6,8 | kind 24:18 47:9 |
| 82:9 | 173:6,12,13,13 | 202:15,16,20 | 47:11 58:25 |
| introduced | 177:24 212:20 | 202:21 203:23 | 60:14 61:24 |
| 10:7 | it'll 139:2 | 209:9 210:18 | 64:10,11,13 |
| introduction | j | 213:19 217:7 | 73:7 74:5 86:7 |
| 90:12 | j 6:12 119:24 | 221:5 235:18 | 87:18 89:16,22 |
| invalid 136:8 | $193: 12,18$ | 236:18 | 90:6 94:15 |
| investment | $205: 9,11,19,20$ | july 109:21 | 102:15 103:3 |
| 36:1 | 220:20,20 | 191:25 231:22 | 107:8 110:16 |
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[kind - land]

| 121:21 122:1 | 237:23 238:3 | 144:20,23 | 221:16 224:20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 126:15,16,20 | 238:20 239:7 | 145:9,10 146:2 | 229:4 232:21 |
| 126:24 127:3,4 | 239:11 | 146:8,8,14,15 | 232:24 233:21 |
| 127:12 128:12 | kinds 212:20 | 147:1,19 148:1 | 235:3,4,13,17 |
| 129:17 130:15 | knock 211:23 | 148:3,5,9,11,17 | 235:19,21 |
| 132:25 134:15 | know 9:21 | 148:19 149:1 | 236:4,19 |
| 138:13 139:19 | 28:21 29:1 | 149:11,15,20 | 237:13 238:2,3 |
| 139:21,25 | 40:4 42:22 | 150:10,22,23 | 238:21 239:8 |
| 140:8,10,12 | 45:23 54:18 | 151:2,5,8,9,10 | 240:3,4 |
| 142:13 144:15 | 57:10 58:10,11 | 151:20,23 | knowing 173:3 |
| 146:9 147:23 | 58:16 59:22 | 152:3,7,8,11,14 | knowledge 9:5 |
| 147:25 148:19 | 64:13 66:11,12 | 152:17 153:8,9 | 10:20 11:3 |
| 148:22 149:5 | 66:22,23 67:3 | 153:11,17,22 | 32:15 217:17 |
| 151:25 152:10 | 75:4 81:21 | 154:2,9,11,12 | 242:4,5 243:9 |
| 152:15 153:6 | 88:24,25 93:25 | 155:6,8,10,13 | 244:6 |
| 153:16 154:14 | 94:5,19 97:23 | 155:15,17,25 | knows 28:17 |
| 155:7 156:2 | 99:13,19 | 156:16,25 | kody 4:23 |
| 159:1,3 161:8 | 102:20 111:5 | 157:3,9,10,14 | 1 |
| 161:14,15 | 112:23 113:1,3 | 158:1,15,20 | $l$ 119:24 120:25 |
| 165:10 169:4 | 115:9,12 | 159:3,5 161:17 | label 196:9 |
| 177:3 181:25 | 121:24 124:17 | 162:1 164:13 | 220:20 |
| 186:16 187:6 | 125:19 126:7 | 164:15,20 | labeled 86:8 |
| 187:20,22 | 129:19 130:1 | 165:2 166:6,11 | 99:3 |
| 193:25 194:1 | 131:1,6 132:3 | 166:21 169:6 | laboratories |
| 194:15 195:4 | 132:8,25 | 176:6 178:5 | $223: 18$ |
| 196:5,17,21 | 133:20,23,25 | 183:10,14,22 | lack 112:6 |
| 197:1,22 | 134:8,13,17 | 183:24 184:6,6 | lag 78:16 |
| 198:15 202:3,5 | 135:1,3,5,13 | 184:8,9,11,13 | laid 64:16 |
| 202:18 203:18 | 136:19,21 | 184:14 185:24 | 149:22 |
| 204:4 212:17 | 137:9,15,16,19 | 185:25 186:9 | land 25:13 |
| 213:1 221:14 | 139:9,11,14 | 187:14,19,22 | 42:20 54:8 |
| 233:1 234:9,10 | 140:8,19 | 194:6 195:7,8 | 72:23 85:16 |
| 234:12,13,22 | 141:22 142:8 | 201:10 202:13 | 87:17 95:6 |
| 235:3,15,16 | 143:16 144:11 | 203:19 204:25 | 118:18 208:1,2 |
| 236:20,21 | 144:12,16,18 | 215:1,2 217:24 | 208:3 215:3,12 |
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[land - left]

| 230:11,14,22 | landings 15:10 | 141:7 | leaning 194:3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 233:11 240:25 | 16:9 26:15 | larger 75:5 | 225:24 |
| landed 14:16 | 27:1 35:8,10 | 80:11 81:17 | learn 71:9 |
| 26:1,1 30:23 | 39:4 96:23 | 142:10 | 172:15 |
| 30:23 35:15 | 127:24 129:21 | late 21:13 | learned 31:18 |
| 38:15 54:4,6 | 139:2 207:25 | lateral 49:1 | learning 152:3 |
| 65:7 75:5 86:9 | 219:2 | 88:5 140:3 | learnings |
| 87:3 94:14 | landman 4:19 | 165:3 | 139:15 |
| 97:25 108:14 | lands 14:25 | laterally 200:3 | lease 18:4,14 |
| 108:15 130:4 | 23:17,21 25:4 | laterals 64:18 | 19:10 32:11,23 |
| 130:10 138:22 | 26:5,12,13,22 | 141:22 | 45:16 88:12 |
| 186:6 207:15 | 28:22 33:16,17 | law 3:11 4:12 | 186:23 234:13 |
| 207:19 208:4,9 | 35:6 36:18 | laws 141:17 | 238:15,20 |
| 217:6 221:23 | 45:25 46:9 | lawyer 164:3 | 239:10,12,20 |
| landing 14:5,18 | 51:10 54:22 | layers 146:9 | 239:24 240:6 |
| 16:7,22 25:18 | 55:7,20 56:4 | layman 164:3 | leave 176:7 |
| 25:24 26:18,24 | 56:10 98:12 | layman's 45:23 | leaving 159:23 |
| 28:7 31:20 | 100:13 104:13 | lea 23:7 35:1 | 160:3,20 |
| 32:1,6,8 41:24 | 105:9,21 | 48:7 49:14,19 | left 9:25 17:1 |
| 42:25 45:8 | 106:11,11,16 | 49:21,22 52:2 | 20:2,2 37:15 |
| 54:7 55:24 | 107:1 122:8 | 60:11 61:1,7 | 48:24 113:9 |
| 57:3 59:24,25 | 126:25 180:16 | 63:5,7,15 | 126:22,22,23 |
| 60:7 65:25 | 191:7 220:6,15 | 68:10 71:6 | 129:16 131:21 |
| 66:8 67:7 71:4 | 220:17 221:20 | 90:23 99:3 | 133:7,7 134:14 |
| 80:13 83:18 | 222:12 | 101:11 105:17 | 139:7,8,25 |
| 84:17 87:12 | language 41:8 | 117:5 164:23 | 140:1,4,10 |
| 95:4,9,17,19,23 | 59:4 187:7 | 165:5 175:17 | 142:10 146:16 |
| 98:6,24 102:1 | 208:17,19 | 175:25 176:2 | 147:24 151:22 |
| 107:10 112:1 | 210:19 | 176:10,17 | 153:3 154:25 |
| 114:5,7 127:20 | large 48:19 | 197:2,17 | 156:25 163:4 |
| 158:12 168:7 | 94:23 111:12 | lead 121:18 | 169:19 186:10 |
| 168:13,15 | 130:11 169:9 | 230:11 | 196:1,2,13 |
| 180:4 186:7 | 174:12 | leads 24:13 | 197:24,25 |
| 213:17 216:17 | largely 28:9 | 147:5,6 | 198:5 228:23 |
| 217:9 | 41:23 71:7 |  | 235:5,16 237:4 |
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[left - look]

| 237:24 238:19 | limited 62:25 | 58:19 61:7 | location 2:5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 240:5 | 65:1 86:4 | 64:11 66:3 | 23:25 26:19 |
| leftmost 196:9 | 212:1 | 73:14,21 75:24 | 41:5 50:21 |
| legacy 32:5 | line 18:4,14 | 82:5 85:4 | 79:17 88:12 |
| 217:7 237:2 | 19:10,17 32:11 | 87:23 91:13 | 104:21 202:8 |
| legal 58:19 | 32:23 36:4 | 97:9 102:17 | 202:17 |
| 88:11 99:19 | 37:16 38:6 | 119:20 120:10 | locations 14:14 |
| 224:2 | 40:24 88:12 | 120:10 127:13 | locator 129:11 |
| length 33:20 | 89:22 112:2 | 130:9 132:24 | locked 120:13 |
| 49:1,2 109:5 | 134:14 135:22 | 135:18 136:17 | lockridge |
| 109:13,15,18 | 156:14,15 | 138:1,5,17 | 174:18 |
| 109:18 148:8 | 161:8 186:23 | 139:22 145:12 | $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { l o g }} 14: 1677: 13$ |
| 165:3 | 190:2 235:16 | 147:20 149:16 | 97:2,5 98:13 |
| letter 40:17 | 238:20 239:6 | 151:9,15 152:1 | 169:13 195:22 |
| 92:19 117:9 | lines 16:11 78:6 | 152:25 154:1,7 | logging 97:12 |
| 231:24,25 | 152:6 156:14 | 154:7 155:19 | logic 149:5,24 |
| letters 117:2,6 | 227:15 | 157:19 158:10 | logs 14:14,15 |
| 117:13 | link 242:20 | 160:6 166:21 | 168:6,12 |
| level 36:10 | lion's 199:13 | 174:1 181:23 | 222:11 |
| 46:20 48:4 | list 115:10 | 183:23 196:13 | lone 149:17 |
| 55:14,17,18 | 127:6 146:5 | 206:4,8,11 | long 17:17 |
| 156:11 170:16 | listed 131:21 | 211:16 212:18 | 21:21 22:9 |
| 179:23 202:3 | 149:19 | 217:19,23 | 33:25 35:23 |
| 234:14 240:17 | listening 58:16 | 219:24 224:23 | 36:4 43:8 |
| levels 180:2 | listing 24:9 | 227:13 234:17 | 90:24 112:12 |
| leveraging | lists 129:14 | 235:15,16 | 170:9 226:20 |
| 217:16 | literature | 237:1,17 | longer 47:9,11 |
| life 35:19 | 135:15 | Ilc 117:10 | 47:24 141:22 |
| lift 29:24 | lithology 60:12 | loads 197:9 | 170:16 |
| light 194:3 | little 7:7 13:21 | 207:8,14 | look 12:15 14:6 |
| 226:3 | 14:20,22 15:11 | local 204:16 | 19:3 25:6,18 |
| likely 38:22 | 21:2,11,17 | located 19:4 | 25:20 28:5 |
| 86:16 109:10 | 25:2 28:4 | 35:14 72:4,5,9 | 32:20,22 33:18 |
| 180:23 197:19 | 32:12 35:9 | 81:11 110:18 | 34:2,11 37:6 |
| 216:5 | 42:7 51:2 | 202:4 | 38:5,18,20 |
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[look - magnum]

| 46:3 47:12 | looks 14:4 | lots 14:15 23:1 | 231:6 233:2,10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 54:10 59:3 | 20:19 30:7 | 52:20 95:16 | 233:19 234:2 |
| 71:16 77:1 | 34:9 78:5 | 98:13 142:10 | 234:20 236:14 |
| 82:25 83:12 | 120:13 128:20 | 143:21 147:2,2 | 239:17 241:23 |
| 84:15 89:4,20 | 144:7 151:6 | 149:2 | 242:3 |
| 90:21 110:9 | 178:10 196:8 | louder 126:15 | macha's 229:9 |
| 112:3 141:24 | 211:12 214:14 | low 16:3,4 | 232:22 |
| 142:1 146:15 | 218:3 242:16 | 39:22 142:13 | machine 174:6 |
| 151:24 152:1 | looser 32:12 | 143:9 196:21 | madame 7:4,23 |
| 153:11 155:23 | loosey 23:8 | 202:24 227:16 | 12:3 13:5 24:9 |
| 156:10 164:11 | 34:4 45:15 | lower 20:1 | 54:9 57:13,25 |
| 175:12 189:2 | 69:25 96:19 | 27:16 29:10 | 62:1 103:8 |
| 195:12,13 | 97:1 99:4 | 35:9 55:10 | 115:5 116:8 |
| 198:8,9,19,21 | 104:22 149:2 | 65:9 75:5,24 | 119:6 122:10 |
| 200:23 239:12 | lose 43:3 89:15 | 76:12 87:3,6,7 | 122:16 125:3 |
| 240:6 | 135:12 143:9,9 | 87:13 95:6 | 165:16 189:24 |
| looked 12:23 | losing 52:4 | 97:16 106:7 | 191:10 192:13 |
| 37:23 104:3 | lost 49:25 | 107:12 113:9 | 205:7,13 |
| 138:9 | 63:12 89:16 | 113:22 115:13 | 209:23 222:16 |
| looking 20:25 | 134:24 138:11 | 185:21 196:25 | 222:19 228:22 |
| 22:8,22 25:6 | 143:18 229:2 | 217:1 227:19 | 229:5 230:21 |
| 25:14 33:19,23 | lot 32:18 37:6 | lp 3:16 238:11 | 232:5 233:3 |
| 34:20 35:7,22 | 50:17 54:17 | lunch 116:6,10 | 241:25 242:6 |
| 36:3,8,16 | 56:11 87:20 | 116:18 118:3 | made 30:7 |
| 45:22 47:3 | 91:199:16 | 131:13 | 34:17 42:17 |
| 69:24 75:19 | 120:20 126:19 | luxury 91:22 | 43:11,17 92:2 |
| 77:2 79:21 | 137:11 139:1 | 91:23 | 96:12 97:23 |
| 90:21 126:12 | 139:10,14,14 | m | 123:25 124:7 |
| 133:19 139:21 | 146:4 162:14 |  | 153:16 184:4 |
| 139:24 140:2 | 162:14 164:5 | ma'am 7:20 | 194:11 202:18 |
| 141:23 153:2 | 169:9 177:14 | $209: 22$ | 211:19 213:8 |
| 155:11 158:3 | 186:20 188:7 | macha 5:22 6:4 | magnitude |
| 163:1 164:20 | 201:20 202:9 | 187:8 229:10 | 143:2 |
| 168:11 178:11 | 203:19 | 229:15,18 | magnum 238:4 |
| 200:15 222:4 |  | 230:3,6,22 | 240:23 |
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[mailed - maximizing]

| mailed 117:8 | 141:11,12,14 | mangle $58: 12$ | $231: 15,22$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| mailing $117: 8$ | $141: 19145: 17$ | manner $135: 22$ | $232: 17233: 17$ |
| 117:11 | $145: 20158: 8$ | $155: 22$ | marker $196: 24$ |
| main 127:21 | $158: 19162: 7$ | map $19: 2$ | $196: 25199: 3$ |
| 200:21 203:17 | $163: 5164: 5,6$ | $126: 24129: 11$ | marketing |
| 238:17 | $165: 7166: 7$ | $165: 10195: 8$ | $172: 23$ |
| maintain 166:6 | $170: 8174: 7$ | $195: 10,11$ | marlene $4: 18$ |
| 208:15,21 | $182: 17183: 9$ | $202: 16,17$ | $62: 8242: 18$ |
| maintaining | $186: 24187: 9$ | $211: 2,3,7$ | massively |
| $35: 19$ | $190: 1195: 12$ | $212: 11,11$ | $157: 15$ |
| majority $31: 15$ | $198: 7201: 8$ | $213: 3,4,9,11,13$ | matador $17: 1$ |
| $37: 2541: 16$ | $209: 19214: 15$ | $216: 19,23$ | match $155: 16$ |
| $85: 17107: 9$ | $225: 6236: 14$ | $217: 4218: 2,7$ | material $28: 7$ |
| $110: 17$ | $238: 14240: 2$ | $219: 3220: 24$ | $151: 3$ |
| make $13: 11$ | makes $22: 11$ | $220: 25$ | materially |
| $20: 2421: 22$ | $61: 1180: 13$ | mapped $72: 3$ | $155: 23178: 13$ |
| $22: 1226: 9$ | $99: 10105: 7$ | mapping $55: 14$ | $181: 20$ |
| $27: 4,1828: 3$ | $109: 9158: 25$ | $194: 20211: 14$ | math $177: 15$ |
| $35: 2542: 7,21$ | $188: 7201: 4$ | $212: 6$ | $226: 17$ |
| $44: 1146: 11$ | $207: 16$ | maps $194: 18,19$ | matter $1: 5$ |
| $52: 1853: 9$ | making $44: 14$ | $194: 21195: 10$ | $47: 2597: 16$ |
| $58: 559: 3,12$ | $45: 2493: 20$ | $200: 9211: 10$ | $108: 10117: 3$ |
| $61: 2062: 15,21$ | $100: 9148: 20$ | $212: 14220: 5$ | $135: 9136: 15$ |
| $64: 2565: 10,16$ | $164: 19177: 6$ | $220: 11,21$ | $191: 4242: 8$ |
| $69: 773: 23$ | $203: 21213: 11$ | march $45: 1$ | matters $186: 5$ |
| $84: 2585: 24$ | $218: 8$ | marine $154: 10$ | $191: 22229: 5$ |
| $90: 1891: 2$ | man $215: 3,13$ | mark $44: 25$ | $230: 14,23$ |
| $92: 2395: 24$ | managed | $178: 5$ | $240: 7$ |
| $96: 197: 8,20$ | $138: 24$ | marked $11: 17$ | mature $199: 22$ |
| $99: 11,22,24$ | management | $117: 23123: 17$ | maximize |
| $101: 6109: 17$ | $53: 1$ | $125: 11126: 2$ | $157: 20208: 25$ |
| $115: 19116: 1$ | manager $121: 3$ | $167: 2191: 24$ | $210: 5$ |
| $118: 7124: 19$ | $121: 21,24$ | $192: 5,21$ | maximizing |
| $125: 20,21$ | $138: 24$ | $193: 12196: 13$ | $157: 23209: 7$ |
| $139: 22141: 8,9$ |  | $205: 20231: 10$ | $210: 17$ |
|  |  |  |  |
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[maximum - misplacing]

| maximum 31:7 | meant 81:21 | mic 170:18 | mind 116:16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 214:18,21,25 | 203:4 210:19 | micro 139:19 | 118:22 226:2 |
| 225:2,6 | 218:15 221:22 | 139:20 142:3 | mineral 147:7 |
| may've 145:6 | measure | 142:24 146:7 | minerals 1:2 |
| 184:17 | 198:22 | 146:19 152:9 | 4:5 150:13 |
| mbo 149:19 | measured | microphone | minimal 37:22 |
| mckenzie 3:5 | 198:3,23 | 120:7 126:14 | 101:22 213:24 |
| 3:20 | measurement | middle 129:10 | minimize 87:15 |
| mean 14:11 | 212:20 | 141:20 218:17 | 186:15 |
| 18:17,25 20:17 | measurements | 218:20 | minimum |
| 22:25 38:9,10 | 212:23 | midstream | 172:3 183:13 |
| 40:3 41:9 42:1 | mechanical | 173:4,6,7 | 194:13 |
| 49:24 55:19 | 122:22 | might've 184:3 | minor 199:16 |
| 59:24 60:15 | memorandum | mighty 16:13 | 219:25 220:1 |
| 64:19 65:11 | 47:18 | 18:14 69:25 | minute 189:17 |
| 71:872:17 | memory 228:3 | 96:18 97:1 | 194:17,18 |
| 73:17,22 79:5 | mentioned | 99:4 104:22 | minutes 54:10 |
| 81:8,9 83:4 | 104:11 232:15 | 149:2 | 57:12,14 |
| 85:9 87:3 91:6 | merge 36:23 | migration | 103:18 189:18 |
| 93:19 96:7 | merged 165:10 | 81:15,19,20 | mischaracteri... |
| 100:5 102:14 | merger 121:23 | 200:3 | 209:12,21 |
| 118:15 144:6 | mescalero 64:3 | mile 49:4 50:21 | mischaracteri... |
| 148:7 154:16 | meters 178:8,9 | 88:5,14,16 | 209:20 |
| 159:14 170:6 | method 33:17 | 165:1 176:5,6 | mischaracteri... |
| 171:20 183:18 | 188:15 | 209:4 210:10 | 209:16 |
| 185:23 214:20 | methodical | 237:5 | misguided |
| 220:7 222:8 | 162:20 171:5 | miles 49:3,3 | 163:3 |
| 224:24 238:1 | 187:10 | 53:4,8 60:10 | misheard |
| meaningful | metric 46:2 | 60:20 61:15 | 115:20 |
| 201:7 | 54:24 159:4 | 70:20 71:2 | misleading |
| means 19:7 | metrics 159:6 | 105:19,20 | 37:3 151:10 |
| 29:8 30:10 | mexico 1:1 | 106:1 139:12 | 153:1 155:5 |
| 77:10 128:19 | 11:22 48:15 | 152:6 202:8 | 163:2 195:9 |
| 136:6 241:8 | 109:3 117:5 | $\text { million } 164: 24$ | misplacing |
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[misrepresentative - nearly]

| misrepresent... | 115:1 117:19 | move 11:5,8 | mute 62:3,4,7,9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 91:14 | 122:14 126:6 | 35:10 55:9 | 124:20,23 |
| missed 25:24 | 158:25 165:20 | 73:2 79:3 | 185:4 203:25 |
| 107:15 134:19 | 191:14 192:17 | 81:24 125:3 | muted 104:14 |
| 192:10 201:23 | 205:11 231:22 | 133:18 134:13 | muting 62:11 |
| missing 37:16 | 232:10 234:1 | 141:8 148:12 | myriad 164:2 |
| 61:20 | 242:1 | 150:14 165:17 | n |
| missouri | momentarily | 191:11 192:14 | n 3:14:1 5:1 |
| 243:22 | 125:8 231:1 | 197:6,21 | 7:1 119:24 |
| misspoke | money 35:25 | 201:23 205:8 | 128:18 |
| 173:11 | 43:10,17 159:7 | 230:21 232:6 | name 8:15 |
| mistaken 177:5 | 159:9 164:5 | moving 55:11 | 12:15 95:16 |
| misunderstan... | 186:20 | 61:24 73:6 | 116:20 119:21 |
| 104:15 112:16 | month 48:8 | 133:23 171:7 | 120:21,24 |
| mix 54:18 | 78:6 112:3,12 | 228:20 | 190:19,20,21 |
| 91:14 | 155:20,25 | mre 3:8 4:9 | 190:22 229:24 |
| mixed 169:24 | monthly 36:24 | 241:11 | 230:4,4,6,6 |
| mixing 37:4 | 37:4 91:15 | mueller 4:21 | names 130:24 |
| 180:23 | 155:14,16 | 13:21 26:4 | 228:6 |
| mode 39:17 | months 22:2,2 | 38:23 54:15 | narrative 10:19 |
| model 23:10 | 52:178:5,8,10 | 65:2 72:11 | narrowed |
| 43:7 45:20 | 78:10,13 79:25 | 75:21 79:18 | 218:12 |
| 82:6,13 84:9 | 107:3,13 112:4 | 80:19 86:18 | narrowing |
| 94:6,8,10 | 132:16 144:24 | 87:9 94:7 | 218:10 |
| 211:9 212:22 | 145:1 156:1 | 204:5 206:12 | natural 1:2 4:5 |
| modeling 82:17 | 162:22 | 219:20 221:9 | $121: 16$ |
| 151:18 | moot 168:24 | mueller's 58:17 | nature 182:18 |
| models 203:21 | morning 58:4,8 | 59:20 60:3 | 186:1 |
| modern 31:23 | 233:7 242:4,8 | 71:17 72:19 | near 106:11 |
| 184:20 207:9 | moss 15:3,6,10 | 76:2 204:2 | 186:5 187:17 |
| modifications | 15:12 | 212:11,13 | nearby 29:22 |
| 192:9 | motion 109:21 | multiple 71:15 | 106:11 |
| modified 152:1 | motions 115:22 | 178:7 | nearly 76:22 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { moment } 11: 13 \\ 12: 7103: 13 \end{gathered}$ | motivation $241: 2$ | murphy 4:23 | $151: 11$ |
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[necessarily - objections]

| necessarily | neutral 149:10 | normalized | number 13:11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 80:16 115:10 | never 27:12 | 33:20 238:21 | 13:19,20 21:20 |
| 115:18 141:1 | 160:18 | normalizing | 24:12,13 46:14 |
| 154:16 | nevertheless | 36:6 200:13 | 47:20 74:6 |
| necessary | 67:2 80:4 82:1 | normally 49:2 | 78:7 102:16 |
| 37:14 80:14 | new 1:1 11:22 | north 23:735:1 | 124:5 127:19 |
| 149:23 224:4 | 26:1 34:1,10 | 51:8 90:23 | 128:25 129:5 |
| need 21:19 | 40:9 48:15 | 141:16,23 | 131:20 169:5,7 |
| 39:17 80:17 | 51:7 66:18,24 | 142:4 175:17 | 173:20 175:4 |
| 87:18 96:17 | 109:3 117:5 | 175:25 | 177:3 214:6,6 |
| 99:20 101:25 | 140:23,23 | northeast 55:4 | 214:25 226:18 |
| 128:13 135:12 | 142:15 143:6 | 235:23 | numbers 44:13 |
| 195:3 217:13 | 143:10,25 | northern 197:1 | 46:13 |
| 229:6 234:22 | 157:23 158:1,5 | norths 176:10 | nvo 148:4,5,6 |
| needed 148:17 | 158:23 160:25 | nos 1:9 | 0 |
| 149:8,8 | 163:14 172:21 | notary 2:7 | ( 7:1119:24 |
| needs 204:22 | 173:5 226:3 | 243:21 | 190:22 |
| negative | 230:10 | note 131:8 | objected |
| 238:24 241:7 | news 117:4 | 135:25 164:13 | 210:14 |
| 241:14,15 | newspaper | 198:1 235:7 | objecting |
| negatively | 117:4 | noted 67:10 | 209:15 |
| 227:20 239:15 | nice 36:9,19 | notes 54:10 | objection 11:14 |
| neglect 238:11 | 190:13 | 222:17 | 12:8 24:8 |
| negligible | night 24:20 | notice 6:7 9:24 | 117:20 122:15 |
| 27:20 28:5 | nine 63:1 | 116:9 117:2,2 | $123: 4 \text { 125:5,9 }$ |
| 39:14 | 150:14 | 117:3,13 | 165:23 166:6 |
| neither 19:6 | nineteen 107:3 | noticed 236:7 | 166:19 192:18 |
| 25:13 243:10 | nm 2:6 3:6,13 | notwithstandi... | 205:14 209:11 |
| 244:7 | 3:21 4:7,14 | 57:10 59:19 | 231:1,2 232:10 |
| net 141:2 143:9 | noise 62:2,9 | nuance 138:1 | 232:11 |
| 159:6 238:21 | 124:17 | 139:2 145:3 | objections |
| 240:10 | non 146:15 | 150:16 | 165:20 191:15 |
| network | normal 31:23 | nuances 194:1 | 191:16 192:17 |
| 184:15,19 | $\begin{gathered} \text { normalize } \\ 241: 12 \end{gathered}$ | 194:21 | $205: 11$ |
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[observation - okay]

| observation | 122:16 125:3 | 61:23 80:22 | 77:16 79:10,13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19:19 | 165:17 189:25 | 81:1,11,17,23 | 80:15,25 82:8 |
| observe 81:6 | 243:1,2 | 88:21 90:19 | 83:20 84:6,21 |
| obviously | offset 17:5 29:5 | 92:24 93:25 | 85:23 86:11,18 |
| 50:25 51:13 | 29:22 47:2 | 94:1,11,15 | 87:9,24 88:11 |
| 102:20 113:19 | 50:6 78:9 81:3 | 106:6,8,13 | 88:19 89:2 |
| 126:17 161:17 | 101:23 126:20 | 121:4 145:5 | 90:11 91:3,5 |
| 163:25 235:11 | 127:11 128:2,3 | 182:5 194:2 | 91:21,22,24,25 |
| 237:2 238:13 | 135:4 136:23 | 195:3,5,15 | 92:23 93:25 |
| occidental 49:4 | 137:2 150:17 | 198:2,23 199:5 | 94:7,10 95:19 |
| occupation | 151:6 162:21 | 199:5,8,13,15 | 96:7 99:11 |
| 189:5 | 163:1 176:22 | 199:21,23,24 | 101:2,7,9 |
| occurred 90:8 | 176:25 203:10 | 199:25 200:7 | 102:8,17 |
| 181:10 | 208:4,6 210:21 | 207:21 212:18 | 104:25 105:11 |
| occurrence | 216:16 | 212:22 214:7 | 107:23 109:2 |
| 52:5 | offsets 187:25 | 218:15 219:9 | 110:11 111:15 |
| occurs 20:20 | offsetting 32:11 | oily $94: 17$ | 111:19 112:2 |
| ocd 1:7 29:6 | 67:12 100:19 | okay $7: 6,21,25$ | 112:15,18,23 |
| 30:6 127:11 | 141:17 208:23 | 9:19 12:11,21 | 113:3,18 114:9 |
| 128:9,11 131:1 | oh 7:18 20:12 | 13:2,18 15:2 | 119:2 124:7,12 |
| 167:23 168:2,4 | 63:9 64:3 | 15:23 18:8,12 | 125:2,7,24 |
| 168:5,23 171:9 | 84:21 96:6 | 23:13 24:19 | 126:4 128:20 |
| 186:1,9 207:23 | 99:15 116:14 | 28:19 40:13,19 | 128:25 129:5 |
| 208:7 239:23 | 145:3 147:16 | 40:24 45:11,12 | 132:20 142:17 |
| 239:24 | 147:17 179:21 | 48:6 49:10 | 150:15 169:12 |
| ocd's 51:19 | 189:12 192:12 | 51:17 59:5,6 | 169:16,19 |
| ode 145:11 | 207:24 221:13 | 60:22 62:12,15 | 170:5 171:9,20 |
| odd 28:6 | 226:15 231:4 | 63:4,13,25 | 173:25 185:3 |
| offer 24:13 | oil $1: 3,64: 2$ | 64:6,25 65:16 | 188:11 192:13 |
| 27:20 205:24 | 11:22 17:18 | 65:21 66:11 | 204:13 205:18 |
| offered 24:11 | 20:23 22:21 | 68:2,17 69:7 | 206:23 207:18 |
| offhand 215:11 | 23:1,2 31:15 | 70:5,6,14,20 | 208:5,10,13,20 |
| officer 58:1 | 31:16 33:19 | 71:16 74:8 | 209:18 210:2 |
| 62:1 103:8 | 35:14 48:22 | 75:13 76:15,21 | 210:13 211:11 |
| 119:6 122:11 | 54:18 55:12 | 76:24 77:5,13 | 212:1,8,17,25 |
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[okay - overfilling]

| 213:3,7,18 | operations 30:4 | opposed 168:8 | original 131:6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 214:8 215:2,8 | 50:8 | 212:20 | 138:9 157:1 |
| 215:25 216:13 | operator 20:16 | optimal 23:20 | 168:5 179:12 |
| 216:22 217:3,8 | 50:11 51:5,11 | 28:21 33:16 | 188:2 206:7 |
| 217:18 218:16 | 127:5 168:9 | 57:3 186:7 | 211:20 239:9 |
| 220:4,14,19,24 | operators 29:9 | 187:23 188:6 | originally |
| 221:8 222:16 | 31:17 48:7,13 | 188:10 208:15 | 124:10 137:6 |
| 222:18 224:20 | 63:14,19 65:24 | 208:21 | orphan 114:7 |
| 225:8 226:20 | 66:15 71:14 | optimally 41:4 | orth 2:4 10:6 |
| 227:4 229:1,3 | 126:21 | optimize 97:18 | outcome |
| 230:24 232:24 | opinion 17:19 | optimum 23:16 | 215:17 243:15 |
| 234:16 237:17 | 18:22 19:16 | 28:23 32:8 | 244:12 |
| 240:6 241:6 | 20:3,14 21:20 | option 109:22 | outcomes |
| old 31:20 | 21:21 22:3,4 | 113:5 115:15 | 100:25 |
| older 44:3 | 23:18 26:10 | 233:7 | outdated 67:25 |
| omitted 169:8 | 30:12 33:18 | options 161:11 | outline 55:17 |
| once 21:4 33:2 | 34:16 35:4 | 161:11 163:5 | 68:9 165:8 |
| 74:25 78:19 | 36:22 37:18 | orange 178:18 | 179:23 |
| 126:6,7 135:12 | 39:8,14,21,23 | 181:14 239:4 | outperform |
| 172:2,20,21 | 42:14,19 53:11 | order 39:3 | 26:14 32:4 |
| one's 237:1 | 53:15 56:7,21 | 43:17 69:15,19 | 43:11 75:12 |
| ones 131:21 | 57:2,4 61:7,25 | 91:196:18 | outperforming |
| 146:20 155:22 | 66:4,7,13 | 108:19 118:10 | 19:23 |
| online 112:21 | 68:15 69:12,20 | 147:17 150:15 | outside 112:9 |
| open 110:25 | 69:25 80:2 | 157:20 165:24 | overall 109:15 |
| operate 207:25 | 97:24 98:5,10 | 167:24 187:9 | 112:23 132:12 |
| operated | 98:15,25 | 190:1 215:9,23 | 155:2 189:6 |
| 150:18 208:1 | 136:23 160:11 | 225:20 | 199:17 200:15 |
| operational | 198:17 204:11 | orders 171:25 | 219:10 |
| 29:13 30:12 | 213:18 241:2 | 172:24 208:8 | overcapitalize |
| 31:2 52:5 90:9 | opinions 64:16 | 237:1 240:8 | 159:15 |
| 136:7,9,13 | opportunity | organic 197:18 | overdrilling |
| 137:3 143:23 | 166:12 233:4,6 | 200:5 | 45:21 |
| 144:5 | 233:10 | organize 87:21 | $\begin{gathered} \text { overfilling } \\ 114: 3 \end{gathered}$ |
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[overkill - particular]

| overkill 224:23 | p | 178:11,17 | 142:2,4,6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| overly 187:11 | p 3:1,1 4:1,1 | 181:10,13,15 | 146:15 203:11 |
| overperforma... | P $7: 1$ | 181:19 182:3 | 210:21 227:17 |
| 19:9 101:14 | p.m. 242:22 | 183:6,12,16,22 | 227:20,21 |
| overprint | p.o. 3:12 4:13 | 183:25 184:7 | parity 181:10 |
| 18:23 30:12 | p02h 30:17 | 184:18,19 | parry 31:9 |
| 48:11 90:9 | p50 39:7 | paloma's | 32:10,12,15,25 |
| oversaw 121:21 | packages | 184:15 | 33:5 150:16,19 |
| oversee 121:25 | 110:16 | pandemic | 150:20,23 |
| oversight 122:1 | packet 40:15 | 52:13 | 176:20 178:14 |
| overview | 59:2 121:9 | papers 58:19 | 178:19,23 |
| 26:24 240:17 | 123:14,18 | 58:19 115:17 | 183:8,13 184:1 |
| owing 173:24 | 231:10 | par 198:18 | 184:8,15 |
| own 42:11,12 | packets 11 | paragraph | part 10:8 24:2 |
| 47:4 48:10 | 117:15 | 17:10 19:17 | 28:19 51:10 |
| 55:20 60:4 | pad 141:21 | 23:14 37:10 | 72:24 82:19 |
| 102:23 128:1 | 153:23 174 | 40:20 42:8 | 94:23 126:25 |
| 147:7 148:2 | 88:2 | 46:14 60:17 | 129:14,15 |
| 159:13 181:6 | pads 135:8 | 61:18,19 62:17 | 130:5 131:10 |
| 235:24 240:24 | $187: 25$ | 64:9,14 67:22 | 161:3 168:19 |
| 241:14 | page 5:2 | 67:22 70:25,25 | 175:11 195:8 |
| owned 238:5,7 | 18:7 28:17 | 82:9 105:17 | 195:14 196:7 |
| owner 45:20 | 59:4,13 62:22 | 110:8 116:10 | 200:8 203:9,16 |
| owners 42:11 | 64:14 101:7 | 135:18 208:12 | 207:16 231:9 |
| 99:25 100:6,10 | 111:15 133:19 | 208:14,20 | 235:12 |
| 102:6,9,21 | 233:23 | 210:2,19 | partial 150:22 |
| 117:1 235:15 | pages 65:19 | 214:14 | partially |
| 236:7 237:25 | 115:24 | paragraphs | 157:10 172:23 |
| 238:2,9 240:19 | paints 12 | 44:16 | 183:15,18,21 |
| 240:22 | 239:13 | paraphrasing | 224:12,15 |
| ownership | paired 93:11,13 | 66:1 100:2 | particular |
| 164:1 237:19 | pairing 93:14 | pardon 113:7 | 55:16 139:18 |
| 238:18 240:11 | pairs 15:5 | 121:21 128:18 | 146:12 163:7 |
| owning 238:9 | paloma 32:9,14 | parent 140:4,5 | 168:8 185:22 |
|  | $32: 24 \text { 150:25 }$ | 140:6 141:25 | 201:18 |
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[particularly - perspective]

| particularly | pay $26: 16,18$ | 67:19 70:1 | 87:25 88:16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15:9 42:10 | 40:12 73:4 | 89:23,25 90:3 | 96:10,12 |
| 129:22 | 207:1 211:2,3 | 92:11 100:15 | 100:14 102:13 |
| parties 103:14 | paying 40:8 | 135:23 137:12 | 105:1 106:24 |
| 124:14 182:12 | pdf 18:7 37:17 | 148:21 149:8 | 121:3,24 122:5 |
| 193:20 238:8 | peculiarities | 151:3 157:15 | 131:16 161:21 |
| 239:14 240:1 | 130:3 | 158:6 | 172:22 174:9 |
| 243:11,14 | peers 48:23 | performed | 190:25 194:3 |
| 244:8,11 | people $48: 18$ | 104:5 | 201:9,11 |
| partly 94:18 | 68:6,8 95:16 | performer | 202:22 214:10 |
| partner 173:7 | 109:17 130:17 | 17:14 | 215:13 230:10 |
| partnership | 178:8 181:6 | performing | 230:17 235:23 |
| 238:11 | percent 39:5,6 | 98:23,23 | 238:7 |
| parts 24:18 | 39:9,20,22 | 154:14 201:16 | permian's |
| 201:8 | 46:2 72:12,14 | perfs 114:11 | 70:17 75:18 |
| party 11:14 | 72:18 74:2 | period 52:10 | 88:23 96:4 |
| 12:8 117:20 | 76:22 79:16,21 | 63:16 | 100:1 109:13 |
| 122:14 125:8 | 93:6 127:18 | perm 53:14 | 208:15,21 |
| 223:17 | 128:21,23 | 73:10 | 214:17 224:22 |
| past 21:17 | 131:25 132:3 | permanently | permians |
| 50:14,15 67:12 | 148:20 149:6,8 | 30:18 51:25 | 108:10 |
| 133:16 135:21 | 159:8 198:16 | permeance | permit 47:14 |
| 234:6 | 199:1,6,8,10 | 32:13 44:24 | 207:22 241:11 |
| pattern 16:23 | 203:24 211:22 | permian 3:8 | permits 47:15 |
| 187:16 237:9 | percentage | 4:9 12:24 17:8 | 171:25 172:25 |
| 237:11 | 214:6 | 19:18 27:3 | permitted |
| patterns 74:10 | percentages | 28:23 44:20 | 242:7 |
| pause 11:13 | 181:6 | 45:4 46:15 | permitting |
| 12:7 103:13 | perfing 114:10 | 50:5 56:21 | 47:11 187:10 |
| 117:19 122:13 | 114:11 | 64:18,23 65:14 | 225:25 |
| 125:6,8 165:20 | perform 18:23 | 67:16 68:1,3 | person 173:15 |
| 191:14 192:17 | 21:3 35:17 | 73:25 74:18 | personal |
| 205:10 230:25 | performance | 76:18 78:17 | 195:17 |
| 232:10 | 17:17 20:7 | 79:23 80:4 | perspective |
|  | 21:14 33:9 | 83:3 84:14 | 88:24 202:4 |
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| 203:18 241:1,2 | picked 196:24 | 108:10 121:21 | 229:16 230:3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| petroleum 9:13 | picking 55:23 | 131:15,16 | plenty 178:6 |
| 11:25,25 12:4 | 102:3 | 172:10,25 | plot 22:23 |
| 122:25 135:16 | picture 82:20 | 173:2 188:18 | 48:21 63:24 |
| 191:4,12 202:6 | 130:23,23 | 189:5 193:22 | 90:16,21 91:6 |
| 230:14,22 | 234:12 239:13 | 194:5 201:17 | 91:9 133:14 |
| ph 16:13,14 | piece 47:6 | 208:15,21 | 154:20 156:25 |
| 26:4,14 54:20 | 136:4 140:14 | 214:17 224:22 | 175:24 176:16 |
| 72:24,25 74:6 | 146:16 152:9 | 225:21 236:17 | 182:5 |
| 93:24 94:6 | 181:16 | 239:16 | plots 16:7 |
| 100:23 101:15 | pieces 139:16 | planned 180:6 | 33:19 |
| 104:10,16 | 147:21 152:8 | planning 46:17 | plotted 91:18 |
| 211:3 212:20 | pilot 74:24 | 46:20,25 48:4 | plugging |
| 218:2 229:12 | 96:25 195:23 | 49:14 96:24 | 236:24 |
| pheasant 16:14 | 196:3,4 201:13 | 160:23 164:19 | plugs 196:12 |
| 18:14 45:13 | pink 130:8 | 179:16 | plus 38:8 55:24 |
| 69:25 96:18 | pioneer 121:16 | plans 84:11 | 55:24 199:10 |
| 97:1 99:4 | place 14:17 | 97:4,10 108:10 | 213:5 |
| 104:22 149:2 | 58:24 94:1,11 | 227:9 236:10 | pockets 66:23 |
| phi $72: 8,8,14$ | 162:14 163:17 | plastic 14:5 | point 31:7 |
| 74:2,4 79:14 | 168:10 174:7 | platform 57:11 | 34:21 39:3 |
| 79:17 80:21,25 | 186:10 234:14 | play 50:16 | 51:25 52:14 |
| 91:7 93:10 | placed 27:19 | 139:18 147:13 | 57:14 64:17 |
| 94:4 95:13 | 98:14 | 164:14 202:14 | 67:21 71:11 |
| 131:24 148:24 | placement | plays 143:11 | 72:7 73:22 |
| 149:3,7 194:18 | 224:9 | please 7:11 | 81:22 86:20 |
| 194:19 200:10 | places 53:13 | 11:14 12:8 | 88:4,20 90:15 |
| 200:11,12 | 113:4 | 28:16 57:24 | 98:17 99:24 |
| 201:3 211:2,14 | plan 42:9 43:4 | 62:9 118:24 | 115:6 140:22 |
| 212:19,21 | 43:11,20 45:4 | 119:4,12,22 | 143:18 144:23 |
| 213:1 220:4,14 | 45:17 47:15 | 120:21 121:7 | 150:4 159:24 |
| 220:21 | 67:15 70:17 | 122:19 123:12 | 165:23 166:19 |
| phone 10:6 | 84:8,14,18 | 165:6 167:14 | 168:24 169:22 |
| pick 10:12 | 96:13,21 97:12 | 189:23 190:5 | 171:3 173:11 |
|  | 102:13 106:24 | 190:18 209:21 | 174:3 176:16 |

Page 49
[point - preserves]

| 196:12 197:12 | 73:7,8 95:10 | potential 8:3 | preferred |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 203:17 206:6 | 95:12,14,20 | 35:10 97:5,11 | 65:25 |
| 210:3 211:11 | 104:16,18,19 | 227:13 236:10 | premier 223:18 |
| 219:22 234:7 | 131:25 195:7 | potentially | premise 59:16 |
| 236:13 239:7 | 196:11,25 | 60:24 86:19 | preparation |
| pointed 70:24 | 197:23,24 | 87:4,6 155:4 | 231:6 |
| 88:3 | 198:9,10,11,13 | pounds 31:21 | prepare 10:24 |
| pointing 71:24 | 198:14,16 | 31:22,22 | 123:16,20 |
| 178:4 235:3 | 204:22 207:20 | pours 54:16,17 | 125:24 191:20 |
| points 49:21 | 211:21 212:7 | 195:2 200:13 | 192:2 193:8 |
| 59:5 64:17 | portion 94:21 | powerful | 231:7,13 |
| 198:1 | 128:7 130:14 | 177:20 | 233:14 |
| pool 103:2 | 140:3 163:25 | practice 108:11 | prepared 8:25 |
| 128:9,12,15 | portions 95:20 | 148:14 | 10:15,24 59:9 |
| 131:1 136:22 | pose 184:9 | practices 50:8 | 125:17 126:10 |
| 138:17,21 | position 31:14 | 52:5 | 193:2 244:3 |
| pooled 238:8 | 58:18 65:23 | pre 111:24 | prepping |
| pooling 127:11 | 67:2,5 82:7 | 194:12 | 225:25 |
| 168:1,5 187:9 | 100:3 183:1,3 | predict 54:24 | presence |
| 208:7 215:5,9 | 184:11 188:9 | 101:15 133:17 | 210:23 |
| 215:23 236:13 | positions 183:5 | 134:24 | present 4:17 |
| 239:19,23 | positive 238:25 | prediction | 46:1 54:17,17 |
| 240:7 | 241:8 | 29:19 33:7 | 128:19 159:6 |
| pools 161:22 | possibility | predictive | 159:24 204:19 |
| 237:20 240:11 | 58:13 177:21 | 70:16 | 204:24 224:19 |
| poor 17:14 | 187:20 | predominantly | 234:10 |
| 109:24 110:1,4 | possible 42:20 | 25:8 110:14 | presentation |
| 113:7 150:3 | 105:25 147:15 | 112:22 | 46:11 164:13 |
| 194:13 | 172:9,15 | preexisting | 165:9 179:22 |
| pop 18:8 | 227:11,16 | 183:7 | presentations |
| popped 9:20 | possibly 205:5 | prefer 109:22 | 48:18 |
| pore 55:2 | 210:22 219:22 | 240:19,20 | presented |
| porosity 16:15 | post 22:1 $28: 14$ | preferentially | 128:12 192:10 |
| 54:15,23 55:9 | 82:22,23 | 140:20 157:24 | preserves |
| 72:3,20,25 |  |  | 219:15 |
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[pressure - production]

| pressure 33:22 | 93:24 131:8 | 172:19 | 180:2,16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 141:2 142:14 | primary 32:19 | procedure | production |
| 143:9,9 146:24 | 41:1 127:15 | 12:12 135:19 | 3:16 17:18,20 |
| pressurized | 194:8 195:20 | procedures | 17:22,23 19:18 |
| 30:9 | 197:3,19 | 50:5 | 19:20,21 20:4 |
| presume 64:19 | 199:11 203:6 | proceed 96:18 | 20:6,14 21:10 |
| presumption | 219:5,6,12,15 | proceeding 2:5 | 21:16 22:18 |
| 92:2 | 219:21,22 | 242:23 244:4 | 28:11 29:4,14 |
| pretend 32:23 | print 30:4 | proceedings | 29:18 32:14 |
| pretty 61:10 | prior 30:13,15 | 243:3,4,6,8 | 36:13,14,24,25 |
| 129:12 130:13 | 38:12 77:19 | 244:6 | 41:11,12,15 |
| 134:5 138:3 | 78:8 83:9 | process 47:8 | 42:2 48:15 |
| 140:14 145:21 | 97:17 109:2 | 115:23 186:17 | 52:21,22 54:25 |
| 147:10 154:17 | 150:19 151:5 | produce 31:8 | 55:8 59:15 |
| 155:1 161:2 | 243:5 | 33:17 39:17 | 63:14,17,22 |
| 164:3 174:1 | priority 216:9 | 41:1 84:3 | 78:3,14 79:18 |
| 176:13 181:10 | probability | 104:1 105:3 | 81:4 82:22 |
| 200:24 225:4 | 39:22 | 145:1 182:5 | 89:4,5,8,9 |
| prevail 215:18 | probably 9:23 | 204:23 218:11 | 91:12 93:11,13 |
| prevent 113:20 | 19:2 27:22 | produced | 93:15,17,21 |
| 208:24 210:4 | 58:21 84:22 | 30:17 78:12 | 95:18 96:16 |
| preventing | 110:4 112:15 | 92:25 93:1,6 | 101:11 104:5 |
| 186:9 209:7 | 116:5 118:12 | 143:21 144:25 | 105:12 106:13 |
| 210:16 | 118:14 128:23 | producing | 111:8,17,22 |
| previous | 130:8 132:4 | 13:25 17:18 | 112:6,19 114:3 |
| 188:13 | 151:7 176:7 | 32:18 36:6 | 117:10 132:17 |
| previously | 185:16 187:4 | 37:20 51:25 | 132:22 133:4,9 |
| 73:15 74:17 | 200:2,6,20 | 77:22 78:4 | 133:22 136:1 |
| 91:11 121:4 | 203:23 219:21 | 81:6 94:13 | 149:4 158:14 |
| 191:2 192:10 | 227:1,1,2 | 106:12 112:13 | 158:15,21 |
| 230:12 232:3,8 | 242:19 | 128:9,12,15 | 159:21 170:9 |
| price 52:13 | problem 58:8 | 129:18 136:21 | 170:17 173:12 |
| pride 3:8 4:9 | 150:12 155:3 | 138:10 144:19 | 173:18 183:19 |
| primarily 34:1 | problems | 145:4,6 154:15 | 184:2 195:21 |
| 49:4 60:16 | 145:19 172:18 | 156:16 170:23 | 199:17 207:1 |
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[production - pulling]

| 208:23 219:10 | prolific 164:14 | 136:5 158:22 | provided 37:1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 226:8 | 165:8 180:1 | 201:16 202:21 | 45:2 46:13 |
| productions | pronunciation | 215:14,16,19 | 117:12,13 |
| 20:23 104:2 | 12:17 | proposing | 126:23 129:19 |
| 134:3 | properly 160:9 | 25:13 41:10 | 148:13 149:17 |
| productive | 161:5 162:24 | 44:20 51:18 | 155:15 166:8 |
| 163:16 219:23 | 194:22 234:1 | 65:14 67:16 | 193:6 222:4 |
| productivity | properties | 73:25 74:18 | 233:12 |
| 79:19 | 25:10 104:20 | 78:17 79:23 | providing |
| proffer 12:4 | 104:21 | 80:5 88:16 | 194:9 213:16 |
| profile 19:20 | property | 89:1 99:17 | proximity |
| 36:9,19 | 126:19 | 115:11 131:17 | 199:20 224:14 |
| profitable 23:4 | proposal 27:3 | 131:20 156:18 | proxy 79:18 |
| 177:19 | 37:19 46:18,22 | 158:21 160:14 | 94:15 106:6 |
| prohibitive | 47:7 64:22 | 160:17 237:8 | prs 226:13 |
| 161:13 | 75:18 76:19 | proposition | prudent 170:8 |
| project 23:3 | 100:1,2 101:1 | 184:13 | prudently |
| 25:21 29:15 | 105:1 115:14 | proprietary | 187:3 |
| 33:19 34:25 | 115:17 161:18 | 224:1 | public 2:7 14:7 |
| 36:5,10,15,21 | 161:22 | proration | 14:9 30:7 |
| 37:2 82:19 | proposals | 15:13,16 43:19 | 48:17,19 56:16 |
| 88:21,25 90:19 | 43:10 51:19 | prospecting | 63:21 106:13 |
| 91:9 149:24 | 96:4,9,12 | 194:20 | 136:14 145:8 |
| 152:15 153:6,7 | 161:11 | prospective | 243:21 |
| 153:15 154:15 | propose 44:8 | 197:4 214:18 | publication |
| 156:11 174:22 | 96:9 145:19 | 214:22 | 117:3 |
| 202:1 203:10 | 242:10 | protect 150:9 | published |
| 203:11 | proposed 17:8 | protecting | 117:3 |
| projected | 27:8 32:13 | 42:15 188:15 | pull 16:10 88:2 |
| 226:14,15 | 40:25 43:3 | prove 217:11 | 99:13 127:11 |
| projects 27:7 | 44:11 45:17 | proven 97:15 | 193:15 236:6,6 |
| 36:2 54:21 | 51:13 64:18,22 | provide 104:7 | pulled 129:16 |
| 70:4 104:4 | 68:5 75:24 | 214:15 223:25 | pulling 113:6 |
| 157:12 | 79:22 83:4,12 | 224:3 238:23 | $235: 13 \text { 236:16 }$ |
|  | 96:3 108:15 |  | 236:25 |
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[pump - rankin]

| pump 21:7 <br> pumped 145:7 | $162: 13194: 13$ 197:18 198:17 | 57:6 70:12 80:16 91:3,5 | $\begin{gathered} \text { quote } 41: 1 \\ 210: 4 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| purple 18:13 | 200:5,16,19,25 | 103:9 107:18 | r |
| 34:3 197:8 | 218:14 224:16 | 107:25 108:18 | ( 3:14:17:1 |
| purpose 1:7 | quantify $42: 18$ | 110:23,24 | 190:22,22 |
| 22:17 34:15 | 43:1 | 114:20,23,25 | rack 17:13 |
| 240:16 | quarter 93:6,22 | 117:17 123:3 | 187:16 204 |
| purposes 42:17 | 93:22 | 159:25 161:9 | 225:9,9,12 |
| 224:6 239:19 | quarters 41:14 | 167:5,10,13,19 | 237:8,10 |
| 239:23 240:15 | 92:24 | 182:8,12 | racked 225:14 |
| push 154:18 | question 15:2 | 184:22 185:7 | rae 17:1,11,11 |
| pushes 199:23 | 24:8 28:21 | 189:7,11,13,15 | 17:12,15,21 |
| put 18:3,18 | 29:17 38:24 | 205:24 206:2,3 | 87:24 88:5,6 |
| 32:17 38:24 | 44:25 57:23 | 206:6 211:17 | 101:24 124:10 |
| 39:19 44:21 | 58:12 60:2 | 215:12 217:20 | 208:24 |
| 106:21 111:24 | 61:12 68:17 | 221:17 223:6 | raise 7:11 |
| 127:14 141:7 | 75:13 79:5 | 223:11 228:8 | 119:12 126:14 |
| 152:24 166:21 | 84:6,24 85:24 | 228:12,13 | 166:18,18 |
| 193:24 214:5 | 94:24,25 98:17 | 233:2,22 | 190:5 229:15 |
| 233:25 | 103:14 108:8 | queue 48:8 | raised 99:17 |
| pv 45:21 159:6 | 109:19 113:5 | 226:22 | 144:17 |
| pv10 39:4 | 114:9 115:6 | quick 78:8 | random 174:8 |
| 43:11,17,20,21 | 122:17 159:3 | 108:3,8 135:15 | range $14: 24$ |
| 44:14 45:22,23 | 168:21 171:1 | 135:18 138:16 | 100:23,25 |
| 46:1,11 102:13 | 178:4 185:19 | 169:13 185:19 | 104:7 198:11 |
| 149:10 159:2,8 | 204:1 207:2 | 202:18,19 | ranges 101:15 |
| q | 210:14,15 | 222:17 | 198:7 |
| quadrant 133:7 | 221:12 222:8 | quicker | ranging 198:16 |
| qualified 243:7 |  |  | rankin 5:9,13 |
| quality 16:1,2,3 | questioning | 6:9 138 | 5:14,16,19,23 |
| 16:4,12 37:13 | 40:16 44:17 54.14178 .7 | 142:12 234:4 | 11:13 12:18,20 |
| 71:3 91:10 | 54:14 178:7 | 240:4 | 24:8,20 26:3 |
| 95:3,9,11 | $\xrightarrow{205: 25}$ | quite 59:22 | 54:15 57:13,17 |
| 109:24 110:1 | questions 9:24 | 60:5 131:11 | 57:23,24,25 |
| 120:8 162:3,4 | 13:3 54:11 |  | 58:3 62:1,14 |
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[rankin - recorded]

| $103: 8,12,23$ | rather $34: 25$ | $91: 2599: 6$ | $212: 17217: 20$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $105: 16106: 18$ | $47: 370: 25$ | $109: 8131: 9$ | $233: 14,17$ |
| $118: 9119: 2,6$ | $239: 24$ | $133: 15139: 14$ | rebutting $31: 12$ |
| $120: 1,2,4,19$ | ratio $45: 19$ | $146: 22152: 8$ | recall $13: 24$ |
| $122: 10123: 7,9$ | $102: 18,21$ | $152: 11158: 16$ | $14: 326: 676: 7$ |
| $123: 11124: 19$ | ratios $102: 4,4$ | $176: 9178: 22$ | $182: 24$ |
| $124: 22125: 2$ | $102: 19144: 16$ | $194: 24195: 12$ | recalled $139: 12$ |
| $125: 14,15$ | ray $196: 10,24$ | $195: 13,14$ | recap $158: 2$ |
| $131: 22139: 23$ | rcx $5: 6$ | $198: 20200: 15$ | receipts $117: 12$ |
| $165: 16166: 4,5$ | rdx $5: 6$ | $200: 20202: 2,2$ | received $11: 18$ |
| $166: 17,19$ | reached $142: 12$ | $202: 9,10203: 4$ | $117: 24125: 12$ |
| $167: 1,5,9$ | $241: 20$ | $203: 17224: 7$ | $167: 3192: 22$ |
| $182: 14,15,20$ | reaching | $235: 10$ | $205: 21232: 18$ |
| $184: 22,24$ | $139: 11$ | reason $21: 7$ | recent $157: 10$ |
| $185: 2,6189: 22$ | read $41: 25$ | $44: 2,972: 24$ | recite $208: 20$ |
| $189: 24190: 14$ | $59: 2061: 19$ | $80: 685: 10$ | reclassified |
| $190: 15,17$ | 65:17 $135: 17$ | $99: 2110: 1$ | $124: 9$ |
| $191: 10,18,19$ | readily $211: 7$ | $115: 3146: 3$ | recognized |
| $192: 13,25$ | reading $58: 16$ | $147: 1162: 19$ | $11: 2412: 9$ |
| $205: 7,19,23$ | $90: 18$ | $189: 9228: 16$ | $123: 7231: 4$ |
| $209: 11,15$ | ready $50: 24$ | reasonable | recommend |
| $210: 14223: 2,4$ | $96: 21174: 2$ | $52: 25118: 25$ | $45: 10$ |
| $223: 22228: 20$ | $189: 22$ | $134: 9$ | recommendat.. |
| $228: 22229: 3$ | real $78: 7$ | reasonably | $95: 18105: 7$ |
| $229: 23,25$ | $127: 22133: 8$ | $197: 1$ | $127: 1$ |
| $230: 2,21231: 5$ | $135: 15138: 16$ | reasons $127: 19$ | record $10: 4$ |
| $232: 5,14,20$ | $151: 11169: 13$ | $131: 20$ | $57: 20117: 17$ |
| $233: 3,9241: 19$ | $182: 16222: 17$ | rebuttal $6: 14$ | $118: 4,17125: 4$ |
| $241: 21,25$ | $226: 17234: 4$ | $22: 1324: 5,10$ | $165: 18182: 18$ |
| $242: 2,6$ | $240: 4$ | $118: 18125: 24$ | $189: 20190: 19$ |
| rate $20: 832: 19$ | reality $136: 11$ | $165: 25166: 8$ | $191: 4229: 7,24$ |
| $36: 1237: 1$ | realized $175: 21$ | $166: 22,22$ | $230: 4243: 9$ |
| $156: 16159: 8$ | really $19: 3$ | $193: 9,12194: 6$ | $244: 5$ |
| rates $20: 8$ | $34: 1947: 12$ | $205: 8206: 7$ | recorded $243: 6$ |
| $178: 7$ | $75: 981: 23$ | $211: 13,17$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |
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[recording - representative]

| recording | redundant | 20:4 23:18 | 168:6 212:23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 243:8 244:4 | 211:17 217:24 | 31:12 127:14 | remain 118:9 |
| records 9:1 | reed 23:7 34:25 | 151:17 159:2 | remedy 164:3 |
| 29:6 167:23 | 36:17 42:11 | 165:24,25 | remember |
| recover 35:25 | 46:15 90:22 | 178:8 205:16 | 40:13 47:20 |
| 37:14 38:9 | 100:17,19 | 207:23 222:5 | 81:25 94:4 |
| 144:19 | 108:10 230:18 | regional 121:18 | 98:2,7 166:4,5 |
| recovered | 237:2 238:6 | reinforces | reminder |
| 94:23 | refer 44:16 | 107:9 | 232:14 |
| recoveries | 65:18 83:5 | reiterate | remote 2:5 |
| 153:7 | 135:15 209:3 | 205:15 | repeat 163:7 |
| recovers 27:13 | 233:23 | relate 236:18 | repeated |
| recovery 21:23 | reference 13:11 | related 133:8 | 194:11 234:24 |
| 28:8 31:7 38:6 | 47:7 59:5,9 | 148:23 166:23 | repeating |
| 38:10 40:1,3 | 126:24 | 243:11 244:7 | 218:1 |
| 104:3 160:12 | referenced | relates 141:10 | rephrase 41:9 |
| 205:2 208:25 | 48:18 81:7 | 201:25 | replace 124:2 |
| 209:8 210:5,17 | 92:19 127:6 | relation 141:15 | replaced 135:7 |
| red 16:3,11 | referencing | relative 42:15 | replacement |
| 45:6,8 134:19 | 111:2 | 72:20 200:15 | 124:12 |
| 144:7,9 157:8 | referred 13:22 | 218:14 243:13 | replicate 155:8 |
| 178:20 196:13 | 18:13 71:17 | 244:10 | report 117:8,11 |
| 197:5 198:2,22 | referring 47:17 | relatively 59:15 | 203:3 |
| 202:16,20 | 47:22 60:17 | 187:15 | reported 2:7 |
| 216:20 221:15 | 68:18 87:25 | relevance | 106:14 168:9 |
| redirect 103:20 | 88:6 | 74:23 | reporter 8:16 |
| 135:2 182:19 | refers 68:10 | reliable 21:23 | 120:22 190:20 |
| 223:2 | 102:13 | 136:2 | 230:5 |
| redirects | reflected 241:9 | reliance 53:17 | reports 117:12 |
| 103:16 | reflects 44:6 | rely $23: 23$ | 223:23 |
| redistributed | 49:12 | 170:7 207:22 | representation |
| 40:7 | regard 188:8 | relying 53:6,16 | 77:6 85:1 |
| reduced 243:6 | 219:20 221:10 | 53:17 54:20 | 214:16,16 |
| reduces 145:24 | regarding 17:9 | 68:1,3 128:1 | representative |
|  | 17:20 19:16 | 149:11 163:3 | 116:21 218:7 |
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[represented - reviewing]

| represented | 107:7,9 111:25 | resistivity | 164:7 233:15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 239:20 | 132:10,12,13 | 196:11,14 | 234:7,21 |
| representing | 147:6 158:17 | resolve 50:23 | responses |
| 218:9 | 159:23 160:3 | 50:25 51:22 | 178:7 |
| represents 55:1 | 160:12 194:14 | resource | responsible |
| reproduce | 204:15,18,23 | 162:14 181:4 | 208:4 |
| 154:5 | 205:4 213:16 | 197:18 | responsive |
| reproducing | 224:18 | resources 1:2 | 210:22 |
| 175:23 | reservoir 9:11 | 4:5 12:24 17:8 | rest 110:16 |
| request 30:7 | 11:25 12:5 | 19:18 27:3 | 130:11 |
| requesting | 16:17,24 18:20 | 28:23 44:20 | restate 58:11 |
| 187:8 | 21:11 23:25 | 46:5 56:21 | 60:2 |
| require 26:21 | 26:16 31:8 | 64:18 68:1 | result 27:22 |
| 211:8 | 33:23 38:25 | 83:3 84:14 | 37:23 52:4 |
| required | 39:15 67:9 | 106:24 113:8 | 70:16 160:11 |
| 215:22 | 69:1 95:7 | 113:19,20,22 | results 17:15 |
| requirements | 109:25 110:3 | 121:3,16,24 | 17:17 31:10 |
| 114:6 | 112:9 121:3,12 | 131:16 172:22 | 34:20 37:11 |
| requires | 121:15,18,23 | 174:9 190:25 | 47:3 68:14 |
| 212:21,22 | 122:7,12 | 194:3 201:9,11 | 93:11,14,15,17 |
| 213:1 | 125:18 133:1 | 202:22 214:10 | 95:18 136:2 |
| reserve 39:6 | 145:13 150:3 | 215:13 230:10 | 195:21 |
| 110:17 166:12 | 173:16 194:13 | respect 23:17 | resume 121:8 |
| 215:12 226:2 | 195:15,16 | 48:3 208:23 | 242:7,21 |
| reserves 20:9 | 198:17 200:6 | respectively | retrieve 50:3 |
| 21:5,14,19 | 200:16,25 | 236:11 | return 27:21 |
| 25:21,24 33:25 | 201:7 207:5 | respond 46:19 | returned 117:9 |
| 34:10 36:20 | 211:5,25 | 52:1,16 | 117:12 |
| 37:8,14,19 | 212:15 224:15 | responding | review 61:14 |
| 39:5,7,9 40:10 | 224:16 225:19 | 131:5 193:22 | 121:7,11 193:4 |
| 54:21,24 56:12 | 228:4 | response 6:14 | 233:11 |
| 69:20 83:7,18 | reservoirs | 12:14 28:20 | reviewed 64:1 |
| 83:21 92:4 | 109:23 186:10 | 96:4,12 111:8 | 125:16,23 |
| 101:25 104:8 | 207:7,9,11 | 125:25 126:11 | reviewing |
| 105:13,14 | 218:14 224:14 | 144:15 152:23 | 59:20 212:13 |
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[rich - runtime]

| rich 200:5 | 133:18,24 | rights 42:10,15 | 158:1,5,7,17,23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| riddler 208:24 | 134:5,19 140:2 | 181:5 188:8 | 159:19 160:20 |
| 209:3,6 210:3 | 140:5,11 141:4 | 235:14 236:3,8 | 160:25 163:14 |
| 210:8,15 235:6 | 141:20,24 | 237:18 239:15 | 186:5 197:18 |
| 235:19 237:1 | 142:9,23 | 241:4 | 199:20,22 |
| rig 29:11 135:7 | 143:20 146:17 | rigs 187:25 | 200:5,19,25 |
| 172:1 | 146:19,19 | rises 151:5 | 201:2 211:24 |
| right 7:10,12 | 154:4 156:13 | risk 15:20 | 211:25 212:2,6 |
| 7:19 11:12,15 | 159:8,13,15 | 30:25 31:3 | 214:24 |
| 12:6 13:15,19 | 163:5 165:19 | 37:15,20 39:23 | rocks 143:6 |
| 15:24 19:15 | 166:14,15 | 42:18 47:3 | rod 37:14 |
| 20:19 24:15,23 | 169:21 174:16 | 52:25 70:7 | role 104:11 |
| 31:3 39:3 | 175:19 181:14 | 71:13 96:23 | 121:25 |
| 48:24 54:12 | 181:16 182:13 | 99:9 145:24 | rolling 155:16 |
| 56:1 57:18 | 183:3,7 184:5 | 184:9 186:18 | rose 239:3,4 |
| 61:9 62:6 69:4 | 184:25 185:9 | risked 52:23 | rotary 196:12 |
| 73:178:11 | 185:23 186:1,8 | risking 47:4 | 197:22 |
| 83:2 87:18 | 187:20 189:8 | risks 30:22 | rotated 114:12 |
| 89:21 92:13,18 | 189:17,18 | risky 163:4 | rough 115:24 |
| 96:24 97:2 | 190:3,6 191:13 | robbing 137:14 | roughly 38:20 |
| 101:12 102:2 | 194:16 196:1 | robin 172:8 | 76:21 112:4 |
| 103:11,15,19 | 196:22 197:25 | 175:9 200:25 | routine 48:1 |
| 108:6 110:8,9 | 198:6 200:5,8 | 226:4 235:6,19 | row 29:7,9 |
| 110:11 111:2 | 200:9 205:19 | 236:23,24 | rude 90:25 91:3 |
| 114:21 115:2 | 208:19 213:2 | rock 53:12 71:3 | 91:5 |
| 116:3,10 | 217:6,14 223:5 | 73:11,12 81:11 | ruinous 150:4 |
| 117:18 118:21 | 223:12,22 | 82:2,23 83:7 | rule 135:17 |
| 118:23 119:3 | 226:2 228:10 | 84:14 91:10 | rules 186:1 |
| 119:10,13,19 | 228:15 229:13 | 95:22 106:9 | run 108:24 |
| 122:18 123:5 | 229:16,22 | 137:17,18,25 | 212:22 |
| 124:16 125:9 | 232:9,12 | 139:21 140:23 | running 92:5 |
| 126:10,13 | 234:23 236:19 | 142:16 143:6 | 165:12 |
| 128:8 129:10 | 239:5,22 240:5 | 143:10 145:16 | runtime 30:4 |
| 129:11,20 | 241:11 242:17 | 146:25 157:18 |  |
| 131:4 133:16 |  | 157:23,25 |  |
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[s - screen]

| S | 99:3,5,7,8 | santa 3:6,13,21 | 98:22 110:13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S 3:14:16:17:1 | 107:10 108:23 | 4:7,14 233:5 | 115:13 134:18 |
| safety $29: 12$ | 110:14,14,15 | sat 172:22 | 145:3 148:2 |
| salvidrez 4:18 | 110:19 112: | saturation | 150:5 158:1 |
| 9:17 10:1 | 113:16 114:1 | 55:12 80:22,23 | 162:9 168:22 |
| 118:7,24 | 115:12 129:23 | 81:1,5 94:16 | 176:8,8 178:15 |
| sample 117:13 | 145:7 171:12 | 106:8 197:23 | 194:7 220:15 |
| 223:13 | 171:22 177:17 | 199:2,8,25 | says 15:3 35:13 |
| samples 19 | 180:3,13,14,21 | 207:21 212:18 | 38:22 40:11,25 |
| sand 16:9 18:3 | 180:22,24 | 212:19,22 | 50:12 109:24 |
| 19:6 23:10 | 181:1,3,7 | saturations | 137:9 141:16 |
| 25:16 27:24 | 183:2,2 197:9 | 94:17 106:6 | 197:22 241:9 |
| 28:12 31:16,20 | 197:9 204:7 | 197:25 198:1,3 | scale 77:13 |
| 32:8 37:24 | 207:8,14 209:4 | 198:19,22,23 | 151:9 |
| 38:7,18,21 | 209:6 210:10 | 199:4,5,5,9 | scenario |
| 40:7 41:15,17 | 210:16 212:2 | savage 3:18 | 70:24 215:15 |
| 41:19,22,24 | 212:11 213:9 | 5:20 99:18 | 215:20 |
| 50:2 54:3,6 | 213:17,19 | 116:8,15,16,20 | scenarios |
| 55:5,8,15 | 216:20,22,2 | 116:20 117:19 | 172:14 |
| 56:12,18 57:3 | 217:9 218:2,13 | 118:1 191:16 | schill 3:4,19 |
| 61:4,9,23 | 218:17,17,19 | 192:18 205:13 | science 96:25 |
| 64:19,20 65:2 | 218:21 219:4,4 | 206:2,3,10 | 46:9 162:17 |
| 65:13,25 67:8 | 219:7 220:9,24 | 209:23 210:1 | 162:20 |
| 68:24,25 69:24 | 220:25 | 222:16,19 | scientific |
| 72:21 73:7,19 | sands 2 | 223:1 226: | 186:17 |
| 74:5,15 75:15 | 41:20 53:14 | 231:2,4 232:11 | screen 7:2 |
| 76:9 78:24 | 73:9,18,19 | 232:13 242:1 | 18:10 38:4 |
| 81:7,12,23,24 | 75:16 81:4 | 242:13 | 59:7 62:24 |
| $83: 684: 16$ | 83:16 84:4 | savage's 209:16 | 82:12 99:14 |
| 85:16,22 89 | 85:19,21 87:13 | save 70:10 | 126:6,7,8 |
| 93:2,3 94:14 | 87:14,14 89:3 | saw 91:7 | 139:10 175:13 |
| 94:16,20,21,22 | 93:7 161:24,24 | 111:22 137:13 | 182:16,21 |
| 95:1,11,15,17 | 213:5,11,14 | 137:13 195:21 | 193:18 233:20 |
| 95:19,21 96:20 | 218:7 220:8 | saying 63:10 | 233:25 234:2 |
| 97:14 98:1 |  | 69:6 70:8 90:2 |  |
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[screenshare - separately]

| screenshare | $19: 3,1221: 5$ | $156: 16161: 1$ | seismic $139: 19$ |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $110: 4,25$ | $21: 19,2523: 24$ | $164: 3169: 17$ | $139: 20142: 3$ |
| screenshot | $25: 17,21,25$ | $175: 12,15$ | $142: 24146: 7$ |
| $139: 19$ | $28: 733: 235: 7$ | $181: 13,17$ | $146: 19152: 9$ |
| second 40:19 | $35: 16,1936: 2$ | $182: 4,21$ | $201: 13$ |
| $69: 15,2080: 13$ | $36: 1938: 4,17$ | $187: 25189: 10$ | self $6: 3,5,8,10$ |
| 97:14,16,17 | $40: 1742: 24$ | $189: 18193: 15$ | $8: 1811: 6$ |
| $113: 15130: 12$ | $43: 1847: 1,4$ | $193: 18196: 25$ | $64: 15123: 16$ |
| $195: 8216: 22$ | $48: 1749: 17$ | $197: 6198: 23$ | $123: 21191: 21$ |
| $216: 24217: 2,9$ | $54: 3,1055: 4$ | $199: 4200: 17$ | $231: 7$ |
| 225:8 226:23 | $61: 2362: 8$ | $200: 23205: 11$ | send $242: 18$ |
| section 14:23 | $67: 2171: 25$ | $208: 3,17210: 6$ | senior $121: 18$ |
| $14: 23,2419: 10$ | $74: 2,9,1375: 6$ | $220: 11,14$ | $191: 1$ |
| $23: 9,927: 3,4$ | $75: 780: 12$ | $227: 22,25$ | sense $22: 11,12$ |
| $27: 2034: 3,5,7$ | $84: 2388: 3$ | $231: 20234: 1,1$ | $27: 1861: 11$ |
| $35: 11,1636: 19$ | $89: 2290: 24$ | $234: 12240: 22$ | $99: 10158: 8,25$ |
| $45: 2164: 19$ | $97: 2099: 14,15$ | $242: 14$ | $188: 7,22221: 8$ |
| $68: 1071: 5,24$ | $100: 25104: 7,8$ | seeing $8: 2$ | sensitive |
| $90: 16,23107: 2$ | $107: 11,14$ | $33: 25139: 8,25$ | $223: 24$ |
| $155: 12170: 23$ | $110: 22111: 9$ | $142: 3,25$ | sensitivities |
| $172: 3179: 3,15$ | $111: 11126: 7,8$ | $155: 21,22,23$ | $148: 18$ |
| $185: 24186: 2$ | $128: 18130: 11$ | $155: 25158: 5,6$ | sensitivity |
| $187: 23188: 4,5$ | $133: 13,16,20$ | $160: 19163: 20$ | $39: 12,1642: 16$ |
| $204: 17215: 1$ | $133: 24140: 6,7$ | seem $160: 17$ | $100: 25102: 16$ |
| $217: 6,7224: 10$ | $140: 8,9,11,12$ | $206: 23,24$ | $120: 7148: 13$ |
| $225: 12226: 1,4$ | $141: 3,20142: 6$ | seemed $211: 18$ | $148: 15$ |
| $235: 23237: 5$ | $142: 8,8143: 18$ | seems $29: 17$ | sent $92: 20$ |
| sectioned $67: 18$ | $143: 21144: 11$ | $39: 2257: 9$ | $117: 2242: 20$ |
| sections $18: 14$ | $144: 11,15,18$ | $91: 21116: 5$ | sentence $40: 22$ |
| $155: 11234: 13$ | $146: 3,6,13$ | $219: 8221: 16$ | $41: 2567: 22$ |
| $238: 22241: 12$ | $147: 2148: 15$ | $228: 23$ | $105: 17$ |
| see $7: 3,13,16,17$ | $148: 17,20,24$ | seen $110: 5$ | separate $89: 22$ |
| $7: 238: 19: 20$ | $150: 15151: 1,3$ | $136: 25162: 18$ | separately |
| $9: 2213: 6,9,10$ | $152: 13,18$ | segregated | $34: 14155: 10$ |
| $17: 218: 6,9$ | $154: 13156: 13$ | $197: 10$ | $166: 9$ |
|  |  |  |  |
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[separates - sides]

| separates $199: 3$ | $240: 22$ | shell $25: 12$ | $195: 10202: 21$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| separation $68: 7$ | severances | 60:16 61:3 | $202: 22222: 1$ |
| $68: 12,14$ | $235: 18$ | shift $20: 18$ | shown $117: 5$ |
| $129: 25156: 3$ | shale $85: 20$ | $34: 2235: 9$ | $216: 20,23,24$ |
| sequence | $86: 5108: 15$ | $217: 18$ | $217: 4$ |
| $118: 11188: 23$ | $110: 16115: 13$ | short $32: 19$ | shows $15: 24$ |
| sequencing | $180: 8197: 11$ | shortly $10: 10$ | $43: 8,1955: 8$ |
| $27: 2328: 3$ | $197: 15199: 21$ | shot $118: 23$ | $63: 14,1664: 6$ |
| $49: 2050: 1$ | $205: 5213: 5,12$ | should've | $77: 16,18107: 8$ |
| $76: 2479: 24$ | $213: 14,15,20$ | $130: 8$ | $131: 5141: 10$ |
| $106: 23132: 7$ | $213: 22214: 5$ | show $16: 8,20$ | $141: 15193: 21$ |
| $145: 18146: 13$ | $227: 24$ | $19: 2222: 17$ | $203: 3225: 4$ |
| $154: 20157: 20$ | shales $85: 19$ | $25: 2533: 11$ | $234: 4,20$ |
| $157: 21160: 8,9$ | $86: 14,20203: 6$ | $43: 6,1749: 16$ | $238: 17$ |
| $162: 6183: 9,12$ | shallower | $50: 1151: 20$ | shut $30: 10$ |
| series $70: 12$ | $130: 1$ | $74: 2583: 1$ | $112: 4,6,18$ |
| serves $92: 14$ | share $13: 4$ | $84: 1188: 4,21$ | $151: 7$ |
| set $10: 18,19$ | $16: 2518: 9$ | $89: 7102: 18$ | side $13: 1917: 1$ |
| $50: 23,2570: 13$ | $19: 1220: 10$ | $126: 11128: 10$ | $19: 1520: 2$ |
| $80: 15146: 1$ | $22: 1428: 14$ | $129: 9130: 21$ | $55: 6111: 1$ |
| $149: 6225: 21$ | $31: 1033: 14$ | $139: 5147: 12$ | $133: 18134: 14$ |
| $233: 14239: 10$ | $38: 340: 15,15$ | $152: 16194: 1$ | $139: 25140: 4,5$ |
| sets $48: 19$ | $42: 12,22,23$ | $194: 24203: 4$ | $140: 10,11$ |
| $234: 9$ | $59: 7126: 6$ | $211: 5212: 15$ | $141: 24142: 1,2$ |
| setting $27: 9$ | $160: 15162: 9$ | $213: 3214: 9$ | $142: 4,5,5$ |
| settings $120: 12$ | $181: 3182: 16$ | $216: 16218: 2$ | $144: 5169: 21$ |
| setup $61: 22$ | $195: 24199: 13$ | $221: 22239: 11$ | $183: 23196: 1,1$ |
| seven $22: 226: 7$ | $233: 20$ | showed $101: 4,5$ | $196: 2,12$ |
| $52: 1104: 13$ | shared $13: 6$ | $210: 3217: 1$ | $197: 22,24$ |
| $134: 13208: 21$ | $18: 5$ | showing $22: 5,7$ | $198: 5,6200: 9$ |
| several $60: 20$ | sharing $13: 15$ | $22: 1639: 16$ | $202: 19224: 20$ |
| $60: 2361: 14$ | $13: 1682: 12$ | $49: 162: 23$ | $228: 25235: 5$ |
| $71: 2105: 19$ | $110: 22$ | $83: 3101: 10$ | $238: 19239: 5$ |
| $140: 7153: 5$ | shed $194: 2$ | $152: 10158: 14$ | sides $141: 10$ |
| $186: 22227: 2,6$ |  | $179: 14182: 22$ | $155: 10$ |
|  |  |  |  |

[sign - slideshow]

| sign 137:23 | similarly 73:20 | 169:18,21 | skip 74:8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| signature | simple 241:16 | 170:19 173:5 | skipping |
| 243:19 244:16 | simpler 71:12 | 174:11 175:2,6 | 152:20 |
| significant 18:3 | simply 69:1 | 175:14,18,20 | slick 31:23 |
| 18:18,22 20:18 | 93:15 158:21 | 176:11,21 | slide 16:5 102:8 |
| 23:24 25:19 | simulation | 177:1 178:12 | 102:9 111:15 |
| 33:2 43:18 | 108:24 184:18 | 178:15 179:4 | 111:16 124:2,2 |
| 44:10,18 91:7 | simultaneously | 179:18 180:10 | 124:4 126:11 |
| 101:22 107:15 | 216:11,12 | 180:19 182:23 | 129:9,11 131:4 |
| 200:24 213:23 | single 16:16 | 184:23 187:5 | 132:22 133:23 |
| 226:18 227:25 | 25:17 38:22,25 | 192:1,7 210:7 | 134:13 138:5 |
| significantly | 42:25,25 45:16 | 210:12 213:6 | 138:14 139:5 |
| 25:11 32:3 | 50:9,20 51:8 | 216:15,18,21 | 143:12 150:14 |
| 33:8 45:21 | 52:5 54:7 67:7 | 217:22 220:23 | 151:13,17 |
| 68:23,24 69:19 | 76:4 82:2 99:9 | 223:14 242:9 | 152:20 153:1,5 |
| 87:2 113:1 | 153:21 204:9 | sit 81:16 | 164:21 165:2,6 |
| 176:14 | 204:17 207:4 | site 135:16 | 168:5 169:12 |
| similar 16:23 | 235:1,22 | 221:19 222:12 | 169:15 176:19 |
| 22:10 25:7 | sink 207:4 | sitting 173:21 | 178:11,25 |
| 27:22 43:10 | sir 9:12,14 | 200:5 | 179:19,21 |
| 46:20 48:4 | 13:17 17:3 | situation 28:2 | 181:9 182:22 |
| 59:18 67:16,24 | 26:24 40:21 | 28:20,25 74:1 | 193:24 194:16 |
| 74:6 82:25 | 49:11,15 53:21 | 76:15 78:11 | 196:2,16 200:9 |
| 84:16 90:24 | 58:7 61:11 | 169:2 | 201:10,19,21 |
| 92:11 94:6 | 62:18 64:8 | six 22:125:15 | 201:24 202:2 |
| 100:16 101:13 | 65:15 72:1 | 34:7 43:9 65:8 | 202:18 203:18 |
| 101:19,20 | 77:4 105:10 | 74:14 75:14 | 234:19,20 |
| 105:24 106:16 | 108:7 110:10 | 112:8,12,17 | slides 6:12 24:3 |
| 131:16 197:14 | 123:15 124:15 | 188:3 225:12 | 132:6,19 |
| 198:10,25 | 125:1 126:3 | 237:3 | 152:23 164:10 |
| 203:13 212:15 | 129:8 130:22 | sixteen 172:19 | 164:19 192:2 |
| 213:10 220:2 | 144:9 151:14 | 172:21 | 193:9 |
| 221:1,4,6 | 152:22 154:24 | skills 243:10 | slideshow |
| 239:13 | $\begin{array}{ll} 158: 3 & 160: 5 \\ 164: 9 & 167: 22 \end{array}$ | 244:6 | 154:22 |
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[slight - spring]

| slight 174:12 | 108:18 116:16 | 141:16,19 | spell $8: 15$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| slightly 150:10 | 125:18 129:2,4 | 142:1,5 202:8 | 119:21 120:24 |
| 195:9 196:24 | 137:13 147:16 | 203:5 226:4 | 190:20 229:24 |
| 198:12 219:16 | 150:14 169:13 | southeast | 230:4 |
| slope 36:4 | 170:18 173:8 | 200:22 | spelled 230:7 |
| slow 138:15 | 182:11 185:3,5 | space $22: 24$ | spend 46:6 |
| slowdown 52:8 | 189:14 191:15 | 33:10 55:2 | 64:12 67:11 |
| slowed 52:11 | 196:1 205:13 | 74:24 101:20 | 128:13 149:15 |
| slowly 208:20 | 207:24 209:13 | 142:9 240:15 | 186:22 234:16 |
| 237:23 | 216:2 221:11 | spacing 17:7 | spending |
| small 31:21 | 221:14 222:7 | 32:13 37:7 | 186:20 |
| 72:12 146:18 | 228:3,7 229:2 | 55:24 64:17 | spent 131:11 |
| smaller 146:18 | 241:23 | 74:8,11,11,22 | split 79:2 |
| soft 120:11 | sort 9:19 59:13 | 77:6 79:20,21 | 153:12 |
| sold 238:15 | 93:20 100:17 | 97:18 105:6 | splitting 153:14 |
| solely 90:12 | 111:25 159:9 | 185:20 208:15 | spoke 63:10 |
| solve 42:20 | 161:15 166:8 | 208:21 214:17 | 97:17 |
| solving 43:15 | sound 97:9 | 214:21 217:15 | sporadic |
| somebody 23:2 | 120:8,14,20 | 236:1 | 181:16 |
| 23:4 31:3 46:8 | sounded | speak 11:14 | spot 197:6,6 |
| 47:2 124:18 | 206:16 | 12:8 15:9 | 201:5 |
| something's | sounds 116:15 | 54:23 85:9 | spreading |
| 37:7 | 120:16 183:10 | 119:21 139:1 | 33:22 |
| somewhat | 219:14 | 174:8 184:6 | spring 15:4,15 |
| 104:14 177:18 | source 60:13 | speaker 185:5 | 15:16,25 16:2 |
| 186:2 | 62:9,10 81:11 | speaking 241:1 | 17:6,16 19:21 |
| soon 141:7 | 82:2 163:19 | special 211:9 | 19:23 23:19 |
| 142:13 143:8 | 197:19 199:20 | specific 43:13 | 31:13 33:16 |
| 174:1 227:11 | 200:5 | 56:9 83:24 | 35:4 37:12,21 |
| sorry 7:20 | sourced 200:7 | 218:18 | 40:25 41:5,9 |
| 12:18 47:19 | south 4:6 14:22 | specifically | 41:10,12,18 |
| 58:7 63:8,9,12 | 53:4 61:1,7 | 44:7 68:18 | 42:1 45:4,5,19 |
| 78:6 81:20 | 71:6 105:17 | 96:20 | 52:15 53:22 |
| 83:23 84:21 | 106:3 113:2 | specifies 65:5 | 56:24 64:20 |
| 85:9,10 101:4 | 121:14 123:1 |  | 65:2,8,25 66:5 |
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[spring - statement]

| 66:13 67:4 | 199:12,16,18 | 140:24,25 | standalone |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 69:17,22 71:20 | 200:1,11,18,22 | 142:18,21,23 | 150:21 157:9 |
| 72:21 74:14 | 201:4 202:24 | 143:1,25 147:5 | 183:14 |
| 75:15,16 76:9 | 203:12,14 | 147:13 157:13 | standard 37:6 |
| 77:16 78:2,12 | 204:14,17 | 157:18,21,23 | 212:4 |
| 80:1 81:12,18 | 206:14,17 | 160:20 163:19 | standpoint |
| 83:15 84:2 | 207:7,12 | srvs 184:4 | 42:16 |
| 89:3,4,9 90:8 | 212:14 213:4 | stabilized | stands 18:16 |
| 92:25 93:1,2,3 | 216:6,9 217:2 | 136:1,25 | star 117:10 |
| 94:12 95:21 | 218:23 219:1 | stable 29:4 | 197:5 |
| 98:1,21,24 | 219:11,15,21 | staci 4:21 15:9 | start 22:2,4 |
| 102:20,24 | 221:6 224:6 | 16:19 38:23 | 27:14 58:25,25 |
| 103:4 105:8 | 225:13 227:10 | 55:10 97:17 | 66:18,19 |
| 107:1 108:12 | 235:5,7,13 | 112:25 | 129:10 138:20 |
| 109:5 113:6,10 | 236:5 237:11 | staci's 25:7 | 138:21 139:7 |
| 127:1,5 130:2 | 237:15 238:10 | 73:7 81:24 | 140:20 143:8 |
| 130:12 131:2 | 238:22 239:1,4 | 104:6 | 157:17 162:9 |
| 132:11 133:21 | 240:10,21,25 | stack 61:6 | 194:17 198:8 |
| 136:22,22 | 241:5,13 | stacked 15:14 | 227:3 237:24 |
| 138:10,13,17 | springs 17:19 | 15:22 168:20 | started 78:4,14 |
| 138:18,21 | 23:16 38:14 | stacking 169:1 | 139:3 142:14 |
| 139:4 160:9 | 108:20,21 | staff 191:1 | 186:18 |
| 161:24 162:5 | 109:23 110:3 | stage 152:17,17 | starts 90:6 |
| 162:10,11,12 | 134:22 137:10 | stagger 27:15 | 134:20 140:22 |
| 162:24 163:6 | 137:11,23 | 34:23 40:11 | state 1:1 |
| 163:12,18 | 156:20 161:19 | 75:3 80:11 | 120:21 190:18 |
| 167:21 168:18 | 161:21 172:11 | 87:4,17 107:7 | 209:24 214:14 |
| 168:20 171:16 | 177:17 185:21 | 194:4 | 230:3 243:22 |
| 180:12,20 | 185:21 186:12 | staggered | stated 76:2 |
| 183:1 187:16 | 188:18,19 | 68:15 75:24 | 227:15 |
| 194:4,8 195:19 | 219:7,8 224:8 | 204:11 225:14 | statement 6:3,5 |
| 196:6,18,19,20 | 224:10,23 | 225:14 | 6:8,10 8:19,22 |
| 196:20,22 | 227:5,7,8 | staggers 174:12 | 8:24 10:9,15 |
| 197:3,4,13,20 | srv 137:16,16 | stand 229:11 | 10:19,23 11:6 |
| 198:12,18,24 | 137:21,21 |  | 12:13 15:8 |
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[statement - subsequent]

| 17:10 19:17 | 90:22 100:17 | stratigraphic | subexhibits |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23:14 37:10 | 100:19 230:18 | 180:2 | 116:23 117:15 |
| 42:9,15 46:15 | 237:2 238:6 | street 3:5,20 | 117:21 |
| 48:3 60:18 | stimulate | 4:6 | subject 14:25 |
| 61:13,17,21 | 163:10 | strong 17:12 | 23:17,20 25:4 |
| 62:17 64:10,15 | stimulated | 140:12 158:4 | 26:5,11,13,22 |
| 116:11 123:17 | 82:23 83:7 | 188:3 190:13 | 28:22 33:16,17 |
| 123:21 124:1 | 84:14 137:17 | 234:22 | 35:5 36:18 |
| 157:1 191:21 | 157:18 | strongest 86:17 | 46:9 51:18 |
| 204:14 209:1 | stimulating | 153:23 | 54:8,22 55:7 |
| 209:17,20,24 | 158:1 161:5 | strongly $32: 7$ | 56:4,10 70:21 |
| 210:2 214:13 | stimulation | 37:11 157:13 | 72:23 98:12 |
| 231:7 234:23 | 160:10,11 | structure 55:11 | 100:13 104:13 |
| 235:10 | stop 110:22 | 61:24 | 105:8,21 |
| statements | 118:22 126:15 | struggle 144:18 | 106:11,16 |
| 8:21 10:18 | 218:20 232:15 | studies 70:2 | 107:1 122:8 |
| 82:17 164:8 | stopped 100:14 | 130:15 | 180:15 191:7 |
| 194:11,12 | 142:15 145:4,6 | study 53:3 | 200:17 220:6 |
| states 17:10 | stops 144:19 | 59:13 122:7 | 220:15,17 |
| 19:18 42:9 | 218:17 | 126:25 129:15 | 221:20 222:12 |
| 64:17 | storage 55:2 | 130:5 139:13 | 226:9 |
| statute 239:23 | 110:18 194:24 | 146:11 191:6 | submersible |
| steeper 33:11 | 204:20 219:17 | 202:7 203:20 | 21:7 |
| 33:11 36:11 | 220:3 | stuff 97:14 | submitted |
| 155:24 182:2 | stored 199:13 | 108:19 142:10 | 12:25 109:20 |
| step 47:6 | 199:15 | 146:7 155:8 | 231:9 |
| 126:17 132:23 | story 127:13 | 185:5 203:20 | submitting |
| 136:12 147:18 | straight 96:1 | 222:9 | 116:12 |
| 158:25 169:25 | 163:12 | stuffs 110:17 | subpoena |
| 217:10 | stranded | 113:16 | 178:6 |
| steps 36:5 | 113:22 | style 202:14 | subpoenaed |
| steven's 108:10 | stranding | 210:24 | 178:2 |
| stevens 23:7 | 113:20 114:8 | subexhibit | subsequent |
| 35:1 36:17 | strategy 240:19 | 117:6 | 184:1 |
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[takeaway - targets]

| takeaway | 65:20 68:19 | 103:24 104:2 | tap 204:15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 112:10,21 | 73:15 74:4 | 104:14,25 | tapping 205:3 |
| 127:21 143:22 | 76:16 79:16,23 | 107:3,5,6 | target 16:24 |
| 154:9 172:18 | 86:11 87:10 | 111:14 132:21 | 25:8 27:11 |
| 173:4,12,20 | 95:12,14 | 133:9 143:12 | 31:7 32:6 |
| taken 82:7 | 106:18 109:14 | 144:13,21 | 42:25,25 60:16 |
| 162:19,19 | 129:23 132:2 | 149:12 153:24 | 61:6 67:4,5 |
| 197:16 201:11 | 137:9 142:18 | 153:25 156:14 | 71:14 87:2 |
| 203:2 234:14 | 154:23 159:22 | 157:22 168:19 | 94:19 95:2,7 |
| 243:3,12 244:9 | 173:10 198:8 | 170:2 220:21 | 95:22 97:5,11 |
| takes 112:12 | 207:24 222:11 | 221:1,5 225:4 | 98:19 99:9 |
| 159:7 | talks 13:19 | tan's 131:7 | 113:2 127:15 |
| takeway 173:5 | 19:15 20:1 | tandem 225:16 | 127:22 150:8 |
| talk 47:21 73:4 | 49:19 109:21 | tangentially | 150:10,11 |
| 74:7 82:5 | $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { t a n }}$ 23:22 24:6 | 204:3 215:6 | 154:4 162:14 |
| 88:24 109:13 | 25:3 26:6,11 | tank 24:1 28:9 | 163:15 197:3 |
| 109:17 132:24 | 26:14 27:2,6 | 35:10 38:23 | 202:25 207:20 |
| 194:18 196:15 | 28:1,20,24 | 61:25 65:3 | 213:15,17 |
| 205:16 206:8 | 30:17,20 34:13 | 75:5 82:3 | 216:6,7 218:8 |
| 211:19,20 | 34:23 37:24 | 105:20 183:2 | targeted 61:2 |
| 220:2 227:4 | 39:13,21 65:6 | 194:8 204:8 | 66:16 73:4 |
| 234:23 | 65:7 67:12,23 | 207:4,7,10 | 75:5 127:16 |
| talked 33:6 | 69:25 70:4,14 | 211:5 225:19 | 163:16 197:3 |
| 56:14 66:3 | 71:23 72:2,4 | 227:11 | 202:5 203:15 |
| 71:18,18 79:14 | 72:23 73:6,24 | tanks 195:20 | targeting 17:7 |
| 79:20 81:9 | 74:1,10 76:18 | 199:11 | 25:15,22 26:15 |
| 103:7 105:16 | 77:17 79:16,22 | tans 131:14,18 | 80:11,11 81:6 |
| 157:18 158:10 | 79:24 80:3 | 133:19 141:4,4 | 94:21,22,25 |
| 206:11 212:17 | 82:21 83:5,6 | 143:13,24 | 127:18 130:18 |
| 214:8 237:17 | 84:15 86:25 | 148:25 154:10 | 186:4 200:21 |
| 240:3 | 89:10,13,15 | 154:13 156:17 | 202:22,23 |
| talking 16:15 | 90:3 91:8 92:3 | 156:18,20 | targets 61:2 |
| 18:15 19:5 | 92:8,14 100:11 | 163:8 169:23 | 66:18,18 97:15 |
| 25:5 30:5 | 100:14 101:11 | 176:16,18 | 113:17 158:7 |
| 37:10 60:23 | 101:14,18,20 | 227:23 | 185:25 203:6 |
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| 217:1,15 | 191:11 230:22 | 84:2 92:24 | 125:17,25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 221:23 224:14 | tends 195:12 | 94:7 106:5 | 126:10 127:10 |
| $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { t a x }}$ 46:1 | term 17:17 | 110:2 116:22 | 131:12 134:17 |
| tbd 129:25 | 22:9 32:19 | 119:18 121:4 | 138:9 139:10 |
| team 121:19 | 33:25 36:4 | 190:11 191:2 | 156:24 157:3 |
| 138:24 172:23 | 90:24 170:9 | 200:2 204:5 | 157:17 158:2 |
| 173:19 207:16 | termed 169:20 | 209:17 224:21 | 164:8 165:10 |
| teams 174:6 | terminology | 227:13 228:5 | 167:11 170:21 |
| technical 137:1 | 212:9 | 229:21 230:12 | 170:25 171:2 |
| 223:3 241:1 | terms 21:1 | testify 86:18 | 177:23 180:11 |
| technically | 43:10 45:23 | 115:18 165:25 | 180:14 191:21 |
| 136:8 | 59:4 80:6 | 173:21,23 | 192:3,9 193:2 |
| technique | 183:12 184:4 | 187:8 | 193:3,5,5,9,10 |
| 136:1 | 187:1,6 | testifying | 193:23 204:2 |
| tell 8:7,11 | terrible 145:15 | 158:10 215:7 | 206:8 208:11 |
| 14:15 69:5 | 145:16 | 243:5 | 209:12 211:4 |
| 73:10 119:17 | terrific 116:14 | testimonies | 211:21 212:24 |
| 129:9 130:20 | 242:18 | 195:1 | 221:9 228:2 |
| 131:4 158:11 | test 18:3,16 | testimony 6:12 | 229:7,10,12 |
| 175:23 183:7 | 25:14 35:13 | 6:15 12:13 | 230:25 231:13 |
| 190:10 194:23 | 52:19 97:10 | 18:6 24:9,11 | 232:2 233:11 |
| 201:24 211:1 | 149:17 150:16 | 40:13 44:15 | 233:15 234:8,9 |
| 214:1,20 | 150:21,23 | 53:5 56:14 | 239:21 |
| 229:20 | 171:6,8 172:2 | 58:16,17,17,18 | testing 46:17 |
| telling 199:10 | 172:7 201:15 | 59:20 60:3,4 | 46:25 49:13 |
| tells 28:8 | 204:17 217:10 | 60:20 65:1,4 | 96:25 146:12 |
| ten 26:6 57:12 | 226:1 | 65:18,19,22 | 226:4 |
| 104:12 235:7 | tested 52:14 | 66:1 67:10,14 | tests 47:2 157:7 |
| 237:5 | 162:24 | 67:20 70:6,24 | texas 48:16 |
| tenant 136:15 | testified 8:12 | 72:7,19,19 | 53:19 202:7 |
| tend 56:5 85:13 | 9:7 11:21 | 73:24 75:22 | text 10:18 |
| 95:6 101:15 | 13:21,24 24:14 | 76:2,7,25 82:6 | thank 7:19 8:18 |
| 114:2,4 194:14 | 38:23 65:2 | 82:9,16 87:19 | 11:15 12:9 |
| tender 57:6 | 70:25 72:11 | 88:20 92:15,22 | 24:24 42:8 |
| 122:11 167:6 | 79:18 83:14 | 99:24 124:25 | 47:19 57:8,19 |
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| 57:25 62:12,19 | that've 27:7 | 44:16 55:21 | 165:15 166:20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 95:25 103:12 | 161:11 | 57:13 58:5 | 168:22 169:5,7 |
| 107:19,23 | thicker 37:13 | 70:7,9 72:11 | 171:1 180:14 |
| 110:6 114:20 | thickness 25:7 | 72:12 73:14,22 | 180:20,23 |
| 114:22 115:3 | 112:24 113:1 | 76:21 80:15,16 | 182:24 184:20 |
| 115:21 116:1,2 | 162:15 197:14 | 85:24 86:15,17 | 186:5,11,14 |
| 116:4,4,5 | 200:14 213:10 | 91:19 94:7 | 187:1,5,7,24 |
| 117:19,22 | 221:19,21,25 | 97:23 99:16,20 | 188:5,9,14 |
| 118:1 119:4,11 | 222:13 | 99:23 101:15 | 189:3 194:2,18 |
| 119:20,25 | thicknesses | 104:11 106:18 | 194:25 195:7,9 |
| 120:2 123:6,9 | 16:20 222:5,9 | 106:19 108:9 | 195:11 198:19 |
| 125:7,14 | thin 61:3 | 109:4,6,7 | 199:20 200:4 |
| 147:16 153:3 | 187:15 | 111:13,20 | 200:12,20 |
| 167:8 168:16 | thing 16:12 | 112:2,5,7,18,20 | 201:4,10,20,22 |
| 182:8,10,11 | 20:15,16,25 | 113:8,11 114:9 | 202:9 204:2,16 |
| 184:23 185:10 | 69:4 95:25 | 114:19 115:11 | 207:6,7,11 |
| 189:7,12,16,19 | 137:5,7 155:8 | 115:17,23 | 209:16 210:20 |
| 189:21,24 | 168:23 224:4 | 116:11 118:14 | 214:4 218:16 |
| 190:4,12,15 | things 25:6 | 120:15 124:16 | 218:20,21 |
| 191:17,18 | 29:23 39:15 | 127:13,19,25 | 219:25 220:1 |
| 192:16,19 | 51:12 53:11 | 129:10 130:14 | 221:23 222:20 |
| 193:24 205:6 | 56:1 71:9 81:7 | 131:9 132:4,18 | 224:1,5,11,13 |
| 205:23 206:1 | 87:25 99:22 | 135:1 137:8 | 224:13,21,25 |
| 211:11 217:8 | 106:4 111:11 | 138:1,2,2,5,6 | 225:2,3,5,16,17 |
| 222:19,24,25 | 112:9 113:21 | 141:17 144:23 | 225:24 226:2 |
| 228:9,11,14,16 | 129:22 140:7 | 145:11 147:10 | 226:12,20 |
| 228:17,18 | 153:17 155:1,6 | 148:23 150:4 | 227:6,19,22,23 |
| 229:14,23 | 187:3 | 151:14,25 | 229:4 231:20 |
| 231:4 233:3 | think 9:18 | 152:19,25 | 231:24 233:5 |
| 242:21 | 13:15 18:22 | 154:25 156:2 | 234:5,16,17 |
| thanks 173:10 | 24:12,16,19 | 158:4,8,25 | 236:14 237:13 |
| 232:13 | 26:24,25 27:10 | 159:17,18 | 240:7 241:20 |
| that'd 33:1 | 28:13 31:9 | 161:2,16 | thinking 88:25 |
| 41:21 86:16 | 34:24 37:16 | 162:23 163:1,3 | thinner 113:1 |
|  | 42:6 43:13 | 164:9,16,21,25 |  |
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| third $15: 4,15$ | $94: 16,20,21,22$ | $183: 1186: 19$ | $189: 15,17$ <br> $15: 16,2516: 2$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $95: 1,2096: 20$ | $188: 6189: 3$ | $228: 12$ |  |
| $16: 9,1417: 6$ | $98: 1,2099: 3,5$ | $194: 4,8196: 6$ | thomspon |
| $17: 1819: 6,21$ | $99: 8104: 6$ | $196: 17,18,19$ | $189: 13228: 13$ <br> 19:23 23:10,15 |
| $107: 10108: 23$ | $196: 20,22$ | thoroughly |  |
| $23: 1925: 16$ | $110: 14,19$ | $197: 3,4,13,20$ | $147: 11151: 21$ |
| $27: 2428: 12$ | $112: 1113: 15$ | $198: 12,14,18$ | $236: 7$ |
| $31: 3,13,16,19$ | $114: 1127: 5$ | $198: 24199: 7$ | thought $9: 22$ |
| $32: 833: 15$ | $129: 23130: 2$ | $199: 12,15,18$ | $83: 395: 25$ |
| $35: 437: 12,21$ | $131: 2132: 11$ | $199: 23,25$ | $96: 2,15111: 19$ |
| $37: 2438: 7,14$ | $132: 15133: 20$ | $200: 10,18,22$ | $112: 16173: 9$ |
| $38: 18,2140: 7$ | $134: 1,3,22$ | $201: 3202: 23$ | $207: 24234: 11$ |
| $41: 5,15,17,22$ | $137: 10,11,13$ | $203: 11,14$ | thoughtful |
| $41: 2445: 4,5$ | $137: 14,23$ | $204: 7,14,17$ | $46: 16,2449: 13$ |
| $51: 2452: 15$ | $138: 9,12139: 4$ | $206: 13,17$ | $162: 20171: 5$ |
| $53: 2254: 3,6$ | $141: 5,6144: 2$ | $207: 7,12209: 4$ | $187: 10201: 11$ |
| $55: 5,8,15$ | $144: 3145: 4,5$ | $209: 6210: 10$ | thoughts $87: 21$ |
| $56: 12,18,24$ | $147: 3,4149: 13$ | $210: 16212: 2$ | $224: 9$ |
| $57: 361: 9,22$ | $149: 14150: 6,7$ | $212: 11,14$ | thread $154: 24$ |
| $64: 19,20,21$ | $150: 17,25$ | $213: 4,9216: 5$ | three $38: 12$ |
| $65: 2,8,12,25$ | $151: 2,4,5$ | $216: 9,19217: 3$ | $41: 1456: 1$ |
| $66: 5,1367: 3,8$ | $153: 8,10,21$ | $217: 5,9218: 2$ | $74: 1375: 4,23$ |
| $68: 24,2569: 5$ | $154: 2,3,12$ | $218: 17,17,19$ | $79: 1390: 23$ |
| $69: 9,10,17,21$ | $156: 4,6157: 5$ | $218: 21,23$ | $92: 2493: 22$ |
| $71: 2072: 21$ | $157: 9160: 9$ | $219: 1,4,6,7,8$ | $131: 21175: 19$ |
| $73: 7,1874: 5$ | $161: 24162: 4$ | $219: 11,15,21$ | $176: 10195: 19$ |
| $74: 1475: 15$ | $162: 10,10,12$ | $219: 24220: 8$ | $225: 10,10,13$ |
| $76: 878: 24$ | $162: 23163: 12$ | $220: 24221: 6$ | $225: 13234: 24$ |
| $81: 4,6,12,18,22$ | $163: 17167: 21$ | $226: 23227: 10$ | thrown $161: 12$ |
| $81: 23,2483: 6$ | $168: 17169: 10$ | $227: 23236: 22$ | thrust $65: 22$ |
| $83: 1584: 2,16$ | $171: 12,16,22$ | $237: 4,11$ | thursday $2: 2$ |
| $85: 7,18,22$ | $172: 4178: 18$ | thirteen $164: 24$ | tie $207: 10$ |
| $86: 987: 14$ | $178: 23180: 12$ | $175: 4,5$ | tied $161: 10$ |
| $89: 2,4,1693: 1$ | $180: 20,24$ | thompson $4: 3$ | tier $113: 16$ |
| $93: 2,394: 14$ | $181: 1,2,6$ | $114: 23,25$ | $163: 15$ |
|  |  |  |  |
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| tight $68: 15$ | $174: 10175: 1,5$ | $215: 1228: 25$ | total $31: 855: 2$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $211: 24,25$ | $175: 11186: 23$ | $235: 9241: 23$ | $148: 4153: 15$ |
| $212: 2$ | $188: 23,24,24$ | today's $231: 6$ | $157: 4163: 19$ |
| tighter $53: 12$ | $189: 17191: 6$ | together $17: 17$ | $213: 4226: 9,11$ |
| $73: 12$ | $191: 10192: 14$ | $21: 1230: 25$ | $226: 12$ |
| time $2: 319: 18$ | $193: 14202: 13$ | $45: 1889: 5$ | totally $74: 21$ |
| $20: 7,821: 9,13$ | $205: 7222: 23$ | $144: 4145: 22$ | $77: 783: 25$ |
| $21: 14,2422: 10$ | $228: 24232: 5$ | $146: 1153: 13$ | touch $19: 834: 1$ |
| $27: 1428: 10$ | $233: 19234: 17$ | $156: 11163: 18$ | $40: 980: 17$ |
| $31: 1733: 20,24$ | $234: 18241: 20$ | $164: 4165: 10$ | $95: 5118: 17$ |
| $35: 17,2344: 5$ | $242: 10$ | $184: 12,20$ | $132: 5159: 12$ |
| $44: 645: 10$ | timeline $96: 1$ | $188: 18,19$ | $162: 8$ |
| $52: 957: 9,22$ | $234: 5,10$ | $193: 25226: 21$ | touched $30: 15$ |
| $58: 20,22,23$ | timely $117: 2,3$ | tomorrow | $52: 3113: 14$ |
| $64: 1266: 19$ | times $16: 15$ | $159: 11232: 25$ | $131: 22151: 15$ |
| $67: 1177: 9,21$ | $36: 754: 15,23$ | ton $128: 13$ | $163: 19$ |
| $78: 179: 1,8$ | $72: 25104: 16$ | $151: 19186: 20$ | touching |
| $81: 2282: 5$ | $139: 11142: 22$ | took $143: 17$ | $137: 25158: 16$ |
| $87: 2189: 17$ | $153: 15185: 17$ | $145: 5196: 13$ | $158: 23159: 19$ |
| $90: 8,10,20$ | $234: 24$ | $198: 1$ | tough $25: 21$ |
| $91: 2,22100: 8$ | timing $111: 6$ | top $22: 2431: 4$ | $184: 5,5$ |
| $103: 10111: 8$ | $174: 12$ | $32: 248: 7,12$ | towards $56: 5$ |
| $112: 11,13$ | tiny $158: 25$ | $76: 1285: 7$ | $64: 15140: 13$ |
| $115: 4116: 6$ | title $239: 10,12$ | $86: 8101: 17$ | $140: 18,20$ |
| $117: 11,14$ | $239: 12$ | $126: 23129: 16$ | $143: 5184: 18$ |
| $118: 13122: 10$ | today $18: 15$ | $133: 7139: 7,8$ | $241: 1$ |
| $125: 2128: 13$ | $19: 544: 958: 4$ | $146: 7147: 23$ | township $14: 24$ |
| $131: 11136: 10$ | $58: 1667: 13$ | $148: 24153: 3$ | $51: 863: 1$ |
| $139: 10144: 12$ | $81: 1682: 17$ | $153: 18196: 22$ | townships $60: 9$ |
| $144: 13149: 15$ | $87: 8116: 22$ | $197: 10202: 20$ | $60: 2381: 21,22$ |
| $157: 15159: 7,9$ | $118: 7,10,19$ | $224: 8227: 8$ | track $48: 15$ |
| $160: 25164: 22$ | $119: 1132: 2$ | $237: 25238: 13$ | $156: 22196: 10$ |
| $165: 16170: 13$ | $159: 10173: 21$ | $241: 12$ | $196: 14225: 11$ |
| $171: 14,23$ | $175: 21185: 18$ | topic $182: 17$ | tracks $196: 9$ |
| $173: 6,7,14$ | $195: 24196: 16$ | $224: 7$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |
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| trades 51:21 <br> train 149:6 <br> transcriber <br> 244:1 <br> transcript 8:6 <br> 119:22 244:3,5 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { trouble } 7: 78: 2 \\ & 119: 20181: 23 \\ & \text { true } 42: 19 \\ & 160: 8184: 3 \\ & 212: 19243: 9 \\ & 244: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { turn } 47: 15 \\ & 164: 21 \quad 166: 17 \\ & \text { turned } 10: 2 \\ & \text { two } 15: 4 \quad 18: 4 \\ & 18: 23 \quad 24: 13,18 \\ & 32: 22 \quad 33: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { typewriting } \\ & 243: 7 \\ & \text { typical } 144: 15 \\ & \text { typically } \quad 195: 1 \\ & 203: 12,14 \\ & 207: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| transcriptionist | trust 165:4 | 36:5 43:5,18 | u |
| 243:7 | truth 8:7,11,11 | 44:10,13 47:10 | ultimate 21:23 |
| transferred | 8:12 119:17,17 | 47:13 57:11 | 38:6 40:1 |
| 156:1 | 119:18 190:10 | 66:16 71:20 | ultimately |
| transit 117:7 | 190:10,11 | 72:14 73:2 | 99:19 144:10 |
| transitioning | 229:20,20,21 | 74:3,13 101:4 | 144:19 158:16 |
| 236:23 | truthed 186:25 | 102:20 104:17 | 175:10 |
| translate | try 42:18 51:7 | 110:15 112:4 | unable 50:2 |
| 159:20 | 85:6 88:2 91:4 | 118:14 128:14 | uncertainty |
| translates | 108:19 113:18 | 133:24 141:10 | 57:2 |
| 100:24 152:13 | 113:19 125:21 | 157:5,9,11 | uncommon |
| translation | 126:14 138:15 | 163:5 172:13 | 145:21 |
| 152:18 | 155:8 161:15 | 181:25 187:16 | unconventio |
| travis 5:22 6:4 | 172:17 189:2 | 187:16,18 | 137:20 140 |
| 215:23 229:18 | 207:20 227:16 | 188:2,6,6 | under $9: 1$ |
| 230:6 | 228:25 233:6 | 196:18 199:6 | 10:16,24 38:7 |
| tree 30:8 | 241:4 | 200:16 206:21 | 40:1 43:20 |
| trend 22:9 | trying 13:9 | 207:11 216:8 | 45:4,4 51:9 |
| 133:5 135:10 | 28:6 38:11 | 217:5 219:12 | $65: 19 \text { 69:11,12 }$ |
| 135:12,13,20 | 43:1 51:22 | 219:14 222:6 | 77:5 115:14 |
| 135:21,23 | 61:5 71:11 | 225:9,9,10,10 | 137:10 143:14 |
| 136:8,25 | 83:1,11,24 | 225:17,17 | 157:2,2 163:9 |
| trends 136:1 | 84:11 100:24 | 228:23 | underestimati... |
| 155:21 212:16 | 101:24 104:7 | tying 141:2 | $69: 2,12$ |
| tried 68:9 | 111:20,24 | 170:5 | underfill 30:24 |
| 77:24 103:25 | 115:23 194:22 | type 168:6,12 | 83:10 111:3 |
| 147:22 | 212:9 | 238:1,9 | underfilled |
| triple 196:3 | tune 157:15 | types 170:9 | 25:19 |

[underlying - use]

| underlying | understood | 170:10 $195: 16$ | updated $44: 12$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| $239: 24$ | $62: 1672: 18$ | $198: 14,18$ | $46: 19157: 10$ |
| underneath | $74: 1782: 16$ | $204: 22209: 3,6$ | $193: 4$ |
| $27: 1331: 4$ | $84: 185: 12$ | $210: 9236: 24$ | updates $123: 25$ |
| $161: 25$ | $86: 1188: 19$ | units $60: 24$ | $124: 25$ |
| understand | $95: 2496: 2$ | $61: 1471: 1$ | uplift $39: 14$ |
| $24: 158: 12$ | $99: 23157: 22$ | $72: 576: 4,5$ | $75: 780: 12$ |
| $59: 1461: 5$ | $162: 7236: 15$ | $105: 18,22$ | $100: 24101: 22$ |
| $62: 2564: 13,25$ | undertaken | $132: 1,1149: 1$ | $105: 6151: 10$ |
| $65: 2369: 7$ | $46: 16$ | $149: 2158: 22$ | $151: 12184: 2$ |
| $70: 8,1578: 16$ | undeveloped | $162: 22169: 6$ | $201: 2$ |
| $79: 680: 18$ | $158: 1$ | $186: 23194: 25$ | upper $27: 9$ |
| $82: 2,1388: 23$ | undoing $188: 13$ | $196: 15,18$ | $41: 365: 13$ |
| $89: 592: 1,23$ | undoubtedly | $199: 6200: 7$ | $75: 19,2576: 9$ |
| $96: 4,897: 13$ | $184: 14$ | $208: 24210: 3$ | $76: 1189: 3$ |
| $100: 8128: 3$ | uneconomic | $236: 1240: 15$ | $94: 2197: 14,17$ |
| $130: 17138: 19$ | $177: 7,15$ | university | $98: 1109: 25$ |
| $141: 9142: 19$ | unfortunately | $121: 14123: 1$ | $110: 15115: 12$ |
| $144: 8158: 20$ | $154: 6155: 7$ | unknown | $163: 7196: 7,19$ |
| $163: 22168: 21$ | uniform $95: 15$ | $108: 17175: 9$ | $196: 19198: 14$ |
| $176: 6182: 18$ | $236: 4237: 19$ | unlocatable | $199: 4,15,25$ |
| $194: 22195: 4$ | uniformed | $117: 11$ | $206: 14,18$ |
| $198: 8210: 9$ | $135: 22$ | unmute $185: 4$ | $207: 12216: 22$ |
| $212: 2217: 14$ | unique $85: 13$ | unmuted $58: 6$ | $216: 24217: 1$ |
| $221: 11222: 8$ | $174: 13$ | unnecessary | $218: 7,23219: 7$ |
| $232: 20240: 2$ | uniquely $55: 3$ | $41: 6186: 11,12$ | $227: 7$ |
| $240: 14$ | unit $15: 13,16$ | unproduced | upset $20: 19$ |
| understanding | $19: 2220: 5$ | $37: 15$ | upside $104: 23$ |
| $74: 1078: 22$ | $43: 1949: 19$ | unsuccessful | upward $86: 16$ |
| $81: 9,10,14$ | $50: 2251: 3,9$ | $75: 2$ | $108: 11109: 8$ |
| $82: 1891: 24$ | $51: 1161: 10$ | unsure $181: 12$ | $152: 10,16$ |
| $96: 10,19134: 9$ | $64: 2170: 11$ | untangle $58: 15$ | $225: 6$ |
| $152: 3166: 2$ | $74: 178: 25$ | $58: 21$ | urged $163: 22$ |
| $202: 11239: 18$ | $80: 4,1290: 6$ | update $44: 7$ | use $13: 1627: 5$ |
| $239: 22$ | $129: 24158: 16$ |  | $35: 240: 2$ |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
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| 45:24 53:10 | value $34: 17$ | 68:14 69:2 | 137:17 142:21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 54:1 67:12 | 46:1 49:21 | 71:12 74:11 | 157:18 |
| 91:17 99:24 | 107:6 134:9,9 | vertically 56:5 | volumes 79:3 |
| 100:19 104:1 | 159:6,7,9,13,16 | 87:5 185:20 | voluntary |
| 136:8 154:6 | 165:8 198:7,24 | verticalness | 239:25 |
| 159:5 194:19 | values 198:3 | 187:17 | w |
| 208:5 209:9 | 201:3 220:25 | viable 86:23 | waikiki 174:23 |
| 211:14,21 | variable 60:14 | 98:19 113:24 | wait 116:13 |
| 212:5 223:18 | 60:15 | 149:24 217:15 | 229:8 |
| 223:18 | variation 59:23 | vicinity 235:1 | waited 107:3 |
| used 44:2 47:10 | 60:6 71:3 | video 7:59:22 | waived 117:2 |
| 47:25 53:4 | varies 220:7 | 221:15 | walk 58:8 |
| 63:5 106:21 | various 161:11 | videoconfere... | 87:18,22 126:5 |
| 129:15 134:11 | 195:1 | 2:1 3:3,10,18 | 127:12 194:15 |
| 150:5 155:4,17 | verify $21: 5$ | 4:3,4,11,18,20 | 237:23 238:16 |
| useful 27:9 | verna 17:1,11 | 4:22,23 | 240:4 |
| 53:9 | 17:11,12,15 | view 16:16,23 | walked 147:19 |
| uses 159:8 | 87:24 88:4,6 | 90:11,14 93:16 | walking 135:7 |
| using 14:7 | 101:24 124:10 | 93:18 98:9 | wall 55:6 |
| 28:24 30:19 | 208:23 | 158:20 186:7 | 197:23 |
| 37:3,20 43:24 | versus 16:18 | 193:17 204:8 | walls 187:18 |
| 54:23 56:16 | 18:23 22:7,21 | viewed 154:21 | 225:16 |
| 102:12 168:2 | 25:18 26:18 | viewing 154:6 | want 15:2 |
| 177:2 194:16 | 33:20 34:5 | 155:1 | 21:25 38:5 |
| 203:22 239:20 | 37:1 39:5,7 | vintage 31:20 | 40:19 58:25 |
| usually 188:24 | 60:15 72:23 | violates 136:15 | 59:3,12 62:15 |
| 196:23 | 75:15 76:17,18 | violations | $62: 20 \text { 64:11,12 }$ |
| utilized 67:25 | 79:23 83:8 | 134:11 | 64:13,25 65:10 |
| utilizing 236:25 | 89:25 100:23 | vis $29: 18,18$ | 65:16 69:6 |
| v | 105:1 107:2 | 181:7,7 | 70:8 73:23 |
| valid 54:24 | 183:21 214:10 | voice 7:10 | 74:7 80:17 |
| 55:1 135:14 | 221:19,24 | $164: 25190: 13$ voir 1 | 82:5 85:14,24 |
| 168:12,14 |  | volume 82.23 | 87:21,25 92:1 |
| 210:15 | $61: 2,568: 7,12$ | 83:7 84:14 | 92:23 96:1 |
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| 104:10 109:17 | water 20:18,22 | 134:23 162:19 | 33:5,9,13,21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 110:25 115:19 | 31:23 54:18 | 162:19 173:5,5 | 34:2,4,7,8,10 |
| 116:1,13 | 55:5,9,11,11 | 175:2,2 197:16 | 34:19 35:1,15 |
| 124:19 141:8,9 | 80:23 81:5 | 201:25 234:25 | 35:16,18,22,24 |
| 141:11,14,19 | 94:13,15,16,18 | 235:2,20 | 36:16,17,18 |
| 144:8 145:17 | 94:19,23 106:5 | 241:20 | 38:15,16,20,24 |
| 145:20 150:9 | 106:7,10,12 | wealth 55:7 | 39:11 40:5,8 |
| 152:24 161:14 | 108:13 111:10 | 81:3 127:10 | 40:12,25 41:1 |
| 161:15 162:7 | 111:12 144:16 | website 203:3 | 41:6,10,18 |
| 163:21 164:6 | 145:7 173:8 | 207:23 | 42:2 43:18 |
| 166:7 182:15 | 195:3,5 197:23 | wedge 89:24 | 49:2,4 51:18 |
| 182:17 194:17 | 198:2,22 199:1 | wedged 50:2 | 52:20 54:4,6 |
| 197:12 204:1,4 | 199:9 212:18 | week 21:18 | 55:3,5,25 |
| 206:7 208:10 | 219:8 | 173:25 193:6 | 56:22 59:14 |
| 211:11 214:15 | way $29: 11$ | weeks 161:12 | 61:6 63:4,7,16 |
| 237:23 240:2,3 | 33:18 35:23 | weird 185:5 | 63:19,25 64:22 |
| 241:3 | 37:6 67:8 81:4 | 237:1 | 64:23 65:8,9 |
| wanted 13:18 | 85:21 90:19 | wells 13:22 | 65:12,13 67:18 |
| 42:20 44:11 | 91:19 104:4 | 14:8,16 15:14 | 67:24 68:25 |
| 89:17 95:24 | 105:3 106:1 | 17:16,21,24,25 | 69:16 74:14,18 |
| 99:22 115:16 | 116:17 120:6 | 18:4,13,13,19 | 74:25,25 75:4 |
| 158:19 169:24 | 127:8 134:10 | 18:23 19:4,7 | 75:6,9,11,14,15 |
| 205:15 235:11 | 136:22 138:3 | 19:22,22,23 | 75:19,24 76:17 |
| 236:14 240:17 | 155:1,3,4 | 20:5,7,22 21:3 | 76:17,17,18 |
| wants 24:21 | 156:21 164:16 | 21:8,9,10,12,25 | 77:16,19,22,23 |
| 46:8 | 167:22 168:7 | 22:19 23:1,3,9 | 78:2,3,12 79:7 |
| ward 174:19,21 | 168:12,14 | 23:9,24 25:15 | 79:25 80:10 |
| waste 159:21 | 181:21 193:16 | 25:22 26:1,1 | 81:6 82:24 |
| 159:22 161:10 | 195:11 201:7 | 27:2,12,12,13 | 83:9,15 84:2 |
| 186:9 187:2,2 | 211:5,23 225:4 | 27:14,21,24,25 | 87:5 89:25 |
| 208:24 209:7 | 227:3 237:4 | 28:12,12 29:6 | 90:1,3,8,13,16 |
| 210:4,16 | we've 12:12 | 29:16 30:3,5 | 90:23,23 91:16 |
| wasted 161:7 | 61:8 64:22 | 30:11,15,16 | 92:25 94:13 |
| wasteful 187:6 | 68:12 71:6 | 31:6 32:15,20 | 96:22,22 97:25 |
|  | 82:20 126:13 | 32:22,25 33:3 | 98:12,16 99:2 |
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| 99:7,8 101:23 | $172: 12,20,21$ | wellspring | $57: 23115: 10$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $103: 1,5104: 9$ | $173: 20174: 3$ | $65: 13$ | $115: 18118: 12$ |
| $105: 8106: 12$ | $174: 10175: 1,5$ | went $79: 13$ | $119: 5,7,16,23$ |
| $106: 25107: 12$ | $175: 10,17,19$ | $83: 8126: 17$ | $120: 17167: 6$ |
| $108: 20,25$ | $177: 17178: 14$ | $144: 1181: 21$ | $182: 13184: 23$ |
| $109: 5111: 9,21$ | $178: 19179: 1,5$ | $184: 7,15$ | $189: 23,25$ |
| $111: 25112: 3$ | $179: 7180: 4,6$ | west $14: 2321: 1$ | $190: 9209: 22$ |
| $112: 11,12,13$ | $180: 13,17,21$ | $32: 10237: 4$ | $222: 24228: 9$ |
| $113: 10114: 6$ | $180: 25181: 2,3$ | wet $203: 14$ | $228: 17,21$ |
| $114: 10126: 20$ | $183: 20185: 21$ | whatnot $208: 8$ | $229: 6,19243: 4$ |
| $127: 18,21$ | $185: 24186: 1,6$ | white $142: 8$ | witnesses $5: 6$ |
| $128: 4,6,11,21$ | $186: 12,13,18$ | whoever's | $118: 11,15$ |
| $128: 25129: 5$ | $188: 1,2,3,3,5,6$ | $46: 10164: 18$ | $165: 24190: 1$ |
| $129: 12,14,17$ | $188: 9199: 17$ | $164: 19$ | $205: 16206: 5$ |
| $129: 23130: 1,2$ | $201: 6,9202: 4$ | wholeheartedly | $228: 23$ |
| $130: 4,11,12,18$ | $204: 14,23$ | $162: 11$ | wolf $17: 13$ |
| $130: 23131: 17$ | $205: 1207: 15$ | wider $87: 17$ | $237: 11$ |
| $132: 11,15$ | $207: 18,25$ | widespread | wolfacmp |
| $133: 13136: 24$ | $208: 1,2,4,6,9$ | $200: 18$ | $75: 22$ |
| $137: 4,10,12,22$ | $209: 4,6210: 10$ | wildly $235: 4$ | wolfcamp $14: 5$ |
| $138: 10,11,13$ | $210: 10,16,21$ | william $3: 3$ | $14: 515: 4,15$ |
| $138: 25141: 5,7$ | $210: 24213: 19$ | $167: 17238: 12$ | $16: 1,1,2,3,4,4,9$ |
| $142: 2,20,20$ | $213: 22214: 25$ | win $42: 21$ | $16: 1417: 7,16$ |
| $143: 22145: 1$ | $215: 14,16,19$ | wind $22: 10$ | $19: 7,2223: 16$ |
| $145: 22,23$ | $216: 1,1,3,6,16$ | windows | $23: 1925: 20,22$ |
| $146: 1,22148: 2$ | $216: 19,23,24$ | $218: 12$ | $25: 2426: 2,23$ |
| $148: 3,5,7$ | $217: 2,4,6,10$ | wine $17: 13$ | $27: 2528: 12$ |
| $154: 10,18$ | $218: 10,19$ | $187: 16204: 11$ | $30: 1631: 4,13$ |
| $155: 17156: 19$ | $219: 10221: 22$ | $225: 9,9,10,12$ | $31: 1532: 1$ |
| $156: 20157: 9$ | $224: 22225: 7$ | $225: 14237: 8$ | $34: 13,1435: 8$ |
| $158: 13163: 2,6$ | $225: 18,21$ | $237: 10$ | $37: 12,1338: 8$ |
| $165: 2,4167: 20$ | $226: 1,9,11,12$ | wise $109: 5$ | $38: 10,15,16,20$ |
| $168: 8,16,25$ | $226: 13,18,21$ | wish $58: 20$ | $39: 4,1040: 1,2$ |
| $169: 5,7170: 22$ | $227: 14,16$ | witness $7: 3$ | $40: 3,7,1141: 2$ |
| $171: 7,22,22$ | $236: 25237: 3$ | $8: 1012: 16$ | $41: 3,7,13,19,23$ |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
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| $42: 3,4,6,12,13$ | $131: 24132: 9$ | $197: 10,11,13$ | $145: 14,15$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| $45: 6,1952: 16$ | $132: 15136: 21$ | $197: 15,17$ | $148: 21149: 9$ |  |
| $55: 16,17,18,19$ | $137: 4,10$ | $198: 14,16,25$ | $156: 3,8$ |  |
| $55: 2156: 4,8$ | $138: 19143: 15$ | $199: 12,18,21$ | wondering |  |
| $56: 10,18,24$ | $143: 24144: 3$ | $199: 23200: 11$ | $116: 9$ |  |
| $64: 21,2465: 9$ | $144: 21147: 3$ | $200: 23202: 23$ | word $99: 25$ |  |
| $65: 1366: 6,14$ | $148: 1,3149: 7$ | $203: 5,6,8,9,9$ | $165: 7187: 4$ |  |
| 68:22 71:21 | $149: 13,17,23$ | $203: 10204: 7$ | worded $42: 6$ |  |
| $74: 475: 4,19$ | $149: 25150: 3,5$ | $204: 15,19$ | words $15: 14$ |  |
| $75: 2576: 9,12$ | $153: 8,10,20,21$ | $205: 4,5206: 14$ | $94: 2097: 4$ |  |
| $76: 1277: 19,23$ | $153: 24154: 2,4$ | $206: 18207: 8$ | $168: 19171: 18$ |  |
| $78: 3,14,25$ | $154: 11,12$ | $207: 13209: 9$ | work $30: 2,11$ |  |
| $79: 2580: 7$ | $156: 6157: 5$ | $210: 10,18$ | $68: 8114: 4$ |  |
| $81: 14,1882: 1$ | $160: 4,10,12,13$ | $213: 5,5,11,12$ | $116: 6121: 12$ |  |
| $82: 8,2483: 7,9$ | $160: 18,21,24$ | $213: 13,16,18$ | $156: 12217: 13$ |  |
| $83: 19,2284: 19$ | $161: 5162: 4,13$ | $213: 19216: 10$ | $224: 5227: 2,3$ |  |
| $84: 20,2385: 4$ | $162: 13,16,23$ | $218: 2,4,7,8,10$ | worked $184: 10$ |  |
| $86: 5,9,14,20$ | $163: 6,7,11,11$ | $219: 11,12,18$ | working $50: 22$ |  |
| $87: 1,6,1089: 3$ | $163: 14,15$ | $219: 23220: 8$ | $50: 2451: 21$ |  |
| $89: 5,890: 3,13$ | $164: 14165: 8$ | $220: 25221: 4$ | $62: 21117: 1$ |  |
| $93: 694: 12$ | $165: 11167: 21$ | $224: 8,11,16,23$ | $187: 11197: 17$ |  |
| $98: 1,17,19,24$ | $168: 17,20$ | $225: 14227: 5,8$ | $217: 14239: 25$ |  |
| $99: 25100: 6,10$ | $169: 11171: 6,7$ | $227: 14,24$ | works $35: 24$ |  |
| $101: 1102: 1,20$ | $171: 12,15,22$ | $235: 1,6,14,24$ | world $164: 16$ |  |
| $106: 25109: 12$ | $172: 4,12$ | $236: 2,5,16,17$ | $173: 19$ |  |
| $109: 25110: 4$ | $176: 25177: 7,9$ | $236: 22,25$ | worried $29: 24$ |  |
| $110: 15111: 3$ | $177: 17180: 1,3$ | $237: 6,15$ | worse $28: 4$ |  |
| $112: 7,20,22,23$ | $180: 13,15,17$ | $238: 11,22,25$ | $137: 11177: 14$ |  |
| $113: 3,7,9,22$ | $180: 21,25$ | $239: 2240: 10$ | $177: 21$ |  |
| $115: 12,13$ | $181: 7185: 21$ | $241: 4,13,16$ | worst $43: 5,16$ |  |
| $124: 11127: 5$ | $186: 13187: 17$ | wolfcamps | $114: 2148: 19$ |  |
| $127: 14,16,18$ | $188: 7,18,19$ | $38: 19107: 4$ | worth $159: 10$ |  |
| $127: 21128: 7$ | $194: 4,13$ | $134: 1,16,21,25$ | $159: 11$ |  |
| $128: 11,21$ | $195: 19196: 7$ | $135: 8137: 13$ | would've $29: 15$ |  |
| $129: 6130: 1$ | $196: 22197: 8$ | $137: 24145: 5$ | $124: 6133: 13$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
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| 134:1,6 142:2 | 197:10,13,19 | 138:20 139:7 | zimsky 3:3 5:4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 148:17 183:23 | 198:15,25 | 141:14 143:13 | 5:8,10,15 7:4,7 |
| 184:12,12,13 | 199:12,19,23 | 145:21 147:16 | 7:8,16,23 8:14 |
| 184:21 186:17 | 200:11,23 | 152:22 158:24 | 9:15,19 10:6,8 |
| wow 7:21 | 201:5 202:23 | 159:4 160:15 | 10:12,13,14 |
| write 163:6 | 204:7,15,19 | 164:11 165:6 | 11:5,16,20 |
| written 58:17 | 205:4 207:8 | 169:4 175:8,16 | 12:3,9,10,19,21 |
| 58:18 67:13 | 216:6 218:3,10 | 179:8,21 | 12:22 13:5,13 |
| 82:16 | 219:12,18,23 | 205:14 212:4,4 | 13:14 24:9,16 |
| wrong 138:2,3 | 220:25 221:4 | 218:25 225:13 | 24:19 25:1 |
| 158:11 185:17 | 224:11,17 | 229:3 231:12 | 54:9,13 57:5,9 |
| wrote 209:1 | 227:10 237:12 | 234:9 238:2,19 | 62:10,24 71:19 |
| x | y | year 15:6 22:3 | 85:11,25 87:19 |
| x 5:16:1 22:21 | y 49:5,7 85:16 | 47:10,16 49:9 | 92:19 96:2 |
| - 48:24,25 77:8 | 85:22 90:19 | 63:17,18,23 | 98:4 103:16,17 |
| 77:9 85:18,22 | 109:7,10 | 77:10 132:16 | 103:21 107:18 |
| 90:20 99:7 | 110:20 113:11 | 144:24 151:11 | 107:20,22 |
| 109:10 110:20 | 197:9 203:8,8 | 215:15,20 | 115:5,9,25 |
| 113:11 151:9 | 203:9 213:19 | years 47:13 | 116:4 122:16 |
| 197:9 203:9,10 | yeah 7:9 9:19 | 48:12 50:12,14 | 122:21 123:3,6 |
| xy 41:21,23 | 10:1 21:17 | 50:15 68:6 | 125:5 165:22 |
| 61:9 68:22 | 28:14,16 40:23 | 71:8 150:19 | 166:16 167:10 |
| 69:871:21 | 42:23 45:3,15 | 181:25 227:2,6 | 167:12,16,18 |
| 73:18 76:9,11 | 57:17 60:8 | 234:15 | 182:7,11 |
| 83:16,23 84:4 | 63:6 69:11,23 | yellow 89:22 | 242:11,13 |
| 84:20 87:14 | 72:1 73:17 | 53:19 | zimsky's |
| 93:7 109:23 | 83:17,17 90:10 | yeses 125:20 | 166:10 |
| 110:15 112:25 | 92:10,10 93:10 | yesterday | zipper 188:18 |
| 147:3 160:10 | 95:13 97:7 | 38:23 40:13 | zippered |
| 161:24 180:7 | 101:19 102:15 | 99:18 108:9 | 188:21 |
| 180:14,22,24 | 106:3 109:11 | 110:2 166:2 | zone 14:18 16:7 |
| 181:1,3,7 | 110:13 111:7 | z | 26:24 32:6 |
| 183:2 186:19 | 111:14 113:3 | zero 114:18 | 55:24 57 |
| 194:4,13 | 120:10,12,14 | 212:6 | 65:25 81:19 |
| 195:19 197:8 | 120:15 126:16 |  | 87:12 95:4,9 |
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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.
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