| 1 | | STATE OF NEW MEXICO |
|----|-------------------|------------------------------------|
| 2 | ENERGY, MINERA | S AND NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT |
| 3 | OIL CONSERVAT | ON DIVISION SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | IN THE MATTER OF | THE HEARING |
| 6 | CALLED BY THE OIL | CONSERVATION |
| 7 | DIVISION FOR THE | PURPOSE OF |
| 8 | CONSIDERING: | |
| 9 | Case Nos. 24277, | 24278, 23755, |
| 10 | 24018, 24019, 240 | 20, 24022, |
| 11 | 24023, 24024, 240 | 26, 24027, |
| 12 | 24025, 23614, 236 | 5, 23616, |
| 13 | 23617, 23655 | |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | V: | DEOCONFERENCE HEARING |
| 16 | DATE: The | ursday, March 18, 2024 |
| 17 | TIME: 9: | 01 a.m. |
| 18 | LOCATION: Peo | cos Hall |
| 19 | Wes | ndell Chino Building |
| 20 | 12: | 20 St. Francis Drive |
| 21 | Sai | nta Fe, NM 87505 |
| 22 | REPORTED BY: Jai | nes Cogswell |
| 23 | JOB NO.: 64 | 2301 |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| | | Page 1 |

| 1 | APPEARANCES |
|----|--|
| 2 | ON BEHALF OF GOODNIGHT MIDSTREAM PERMIAN, LLC: |
| 3 | ADAM G. RANKIN, ESQUIRE |
| 4 | Holland & Hart LLP |
| 5 | 110 North Guadalupe Street #1 |
| 6 | Santa Fe, NM 87501 |
| 7 | agrankin@hollandhart.com |
| 8 | (505) 988-4421 |
| 9 | (303) 900-4421 |
| | ON DELIALE OF EMPIRE DEEDOLEUM. |
| 10 | ON BEHALF OF EMPIRE PETROLEUM: |
| 11 | DANA S. HARDY, ESQUIRE (by videoconference) |
| 12 | Hinkle Shanor LLP |
| 13 | 218 Montezuma Avenue |
| 14 | Santa Fe, NM 87501 |
| 15 | dhardy@hinklelawfirm.com |
| 16 | (505) 982-4554 |
| 17 | |
| 18 | ERNEST L. PADILLA, ESQUIRE |
| 19 | Padilla Law Firm, P.A. |
| 20 | P.O. Box 2523 |
| 21 | Santa Fe, NM 87504 |
| 22 | padillalawnm@outlook.com |
| 23 | (505) 988-7577 |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| | |
| | Page 2 |

| 1 | APPEARANCES (Cont'd) | | |
|----|--|--|--|
| 2 | ON BEHALF OF EMPIRE PETROLEUM, STRATA PRODUCTION | | |
| 3 | COMPANY: | | |
| 4 | SHARON T. SHAHEEN, ESQUIRE | | |
| 5 | Montgomery & Andrews P.A. | | |
| 6 | 325 Paseo De Peralta | | |
| 7 | Santa Fe, NM 87501 | | |
| 8 | sshaheen@montand.com | | |
| 9 | (505) 986-2678 | | |
| 10 | | | |
| 11 | ON BEHALF OF OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION: | | |
| 12 | DANIEL R. RUBIN, ESQUIRE | | |
| 13 | Oil Conservation Commission | | |
| 14 | 1220 South St. Francis Drive | | |
| 15 | Santa Fe, NM 87505 | | |
| 16 | drubin@nmag.gov | | |
| 17 | (505) 537-4477 | | |
| 18 | | | |
| 19 | ON BEHALF OF EOG: | | |
| 20 | DEANA M. BENNETT, ESQUIRE (by videoconference) | | |
| 21 | Modrall Sperling | | |
| 22 | 500 4th Street Northwest #1000 | | |
| 23 | Albuquerque, NM 87102 | | |
| 24 | deana.bennett@modrall.com | | |
| 25 | (505) 848-1800 | | |
| | Page 3 | | |
| | 1436 3 | | |

| 1 | APPEARANCES (Cont'd) |
|----|--|
| 2 | ON BEHALF OF OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION: |
| 3 | JESSE K. TREMAINE, ESQUIRE |
| 4 | Oil Conservation Division |
| 5 | 1220 South St. Francis Drive |
| 6 | Santa Fe, NM 87505 |
| 7 | jessek.tremaine@emnrd.nm.gov |
| 8 | (505) 231-9312 |
| 9 | |
| 10 | ON BEHALF OF OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION, JOINT INDUSTRY |
| 11 | TECHNICAL COMMITTEE, STRATA PRODUCTION COMPANY: |
| 12 | MICHAEL H. FELDEWERT, ESQUIRE |
| 13 | Holland & Hart LLP |
| 14 | 100 North Guadalupe Street #1 |
| 15 | Santa Fe, NM 87501 |
| 16 | mfeldewert@hollandhart.com |
| 17 | (505) 988-4421 |
| 18 | |
| 19 | ON BEHALF OF WILDEARTH GUARDIANS: |
| 20 | TIMOTHY M. DAVIS, ESQUIRE |
| 21 | WildEarth Guardians |
| 22 | 301 North Guadalupe Street, Suite 201 |
| 23 | Santa Fe, NM 87501 |
| 24 | tdavis@wildearthguardians.org |
| 25 | (205) 913-6425 |
| | Page 4 |
| | |

| 1 | APPEARANCES (Cont'd) |
|----|--|
| 2 | ALSO PRESENT: |
| 3 | Dylan Fuge, Commissioner/Chair, Oil Conservation |
| 4 | Commission |
| 5 | Greg Bloom, Commissioner, Oil Conservation |
| 6 | Commission |
| 7 | Dr. William Ampomah, Commissioner, Oil |
| 8 | Conservation Commission |
| 9 | Sheila Apodaca, Law Clerk, Oil Conservation |
| 10 | Division |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| | Page 5 |

| 1 | INDEX | |
|----|------------------|--------|
| 2 | WITNESSES: | Page |
| 3 | GREG CARAWAY | |
| 4 | By Mr. Bloom | 76 |
| 5 | By Dr. Ampomah | 77 |
| 6 | By Mr. Tremaine | 82 |
| 7 | By Dr. Ampomah | 83 |
| 8 | ALEXEY PODUST | |
| 9 | By Mr. Bloom | 86 |
| 10 | By Dr. Ampomah | 90 |
| 11 | By Mr. Feldewert | 94 |
| 12 | By Dr. Ampomah | 98 |
| 13 | BRANDON POWELL | |
| 14 | By Dr. Ampomah | 105 |
| 15 | By Mr. Tremaine | 107 |
| 16 | WILLIAM MORGAN | |
| 17 | By Dr. Ampomah | 98 |
| 18 | DAN MOREHOUSE | |
| 19 | By Mr. Feldewert | 111 |
| 20 | By Dr. Ampomah | 115 |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| | | Page 6 |

| 1 | | EXHIBITS | |
|----|------------|-------------------------------|--------|
| 2 | NO. | DESCRIPTION | ID/EVD |
| 3 | JIT: | | |
| 4 | Exhibit 1 | Marked-Up Version of R-111-P | |
| 5 | | Showing Proposed Changes | 58/70 |
| 6 | Exhibit 2 | Clean Version of Exhibit 1 | 58/70 |
| 7 | Exhibit 3 | Redline Version of Exhibit 2 | 58/70 |
| 8 | Exhibit 4 | Clean Version of All Proposed | |
| 9 | | Modifications to Order | |
| 10 | | R-111-P | 58/70 |
| 11 | Exhibit 5 | Self-Affirmed Statement of | |
| 12 | | Witness Dan Morehouse | 64/70 |
| 13 | Exhibit 6 | Self-Affirmed Statement of | |
| 14 | | Witness William Morgan | 64/70 |
| 15 | Exhibit 7 | Self-Affirmed Statement of | |
| 16 | | Witness Greg Caraway | 64/70 |
| 17 | Exhibit 8 | Self-Affirmed Statement of | |
| 18 | | Witness Alex Podust | 64/70 |
| 19 | Exhibit 9 | Ellipse of Uncertainty and | |
| 20 | | Separation Factor | 67/70 |
| 21 | Exhibit 10 | Overview of Well Design | |
| 22 | | Safeguard Options | 67/70 |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | | | |
| 25 | | | |
| | | | Page 7 |
| | | | raye / |

| 1 | | EXHIBITS (Cont'd) | |
|----|------------|----------------------------|--------|
| 2 | NO. | DESCRIPTION | ID/EVD |
| 3 | Exhibit 11 | Self-Affirmed Statement of | |
| 4 | | Michael H. Feldewert | 67/70 |
| 5 | Exhibit 12 | Affidavits of Publication | 67/70 |
| 6 | | | |
| 7 | | | |
| 8 | | | |
| 9 | | | |
| 10 | | | |
| 11 | | | |
| 12 | | | |
| 13 | | | |
| 14 | | | |
| 15 | | | |
| 16 | | | |
| 17 | | | |
| 18 | | | |
| 19 | | | |
| 20 | | | |
| 21 | | | |
| 22 | | | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | | | |
| 25 | | | |
| | | | Page 8 |
| | | | |

| 1 | PROCEEDINGS |
|----|--|
| 2 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Good morning, |
| 3 | everyone. I think we're going to go ahead and get |
| 4 | started. |
| 5 | Sheila, are we recording? |
| 6 | MS. APODACA: Yes. We are. |
| 7 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: All right. Good |
| 8 | morning, everyone, to the March 14, 2024, meeting of |
| 9 | the New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission. For the |
| 10 | commissioners, this is the first time we've had the |
| 11 | chance to use the new room set-up. |
| 12 | Would remind everyone, some of you who |
| 13 | have been in Division's hearing, are familiar with |
| 14 | this. You have mics in front of you. Just click the |
| 15 | button on the right when it lights up green. You |
| 16 | speak, you'll be able to hear out in the crowd. And |
| 17 | when you're done speaking, I'd ask that you turn off |
| 18 | your microphone. |
| 19 | And with that, I'll do a quick roll |
| 20 | call. |
| 21 | Commissioner Ampomah. |
| 22 | DR. AMPOMAH: Present. |
| 23 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Commissioner |
| 24 | Bloom. |
| 25 | MR. BLOOM: Present. |
| | |

| 1 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Let the record |
|----|---|
| 2 | reflect a quorum of the Oil Conservation Commission's |
| 3 | here. First item on the agenda is approval of the |
| 4 | agenda for today's meeting. Do we have any questions, |
| 5 | comments, or additions? |
| 6 | MR. BLOOM: No, Mr. Chair. |
| 7 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Can I get a |
| 8 | motion to approve the agenda? |
| 9 | MR. BLOOM: I so move. |
| 10 | DR. AMPOMAH: I second. |
| 11 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Quick roll call |
| 12 | vote. |
| 13 | Dr. Ampomah. |
| 14 | DR. AMPOMAH: Approved. |
| 15 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Commissioner |
| 16 | Bloom. |
| 17 | MR. BLOOM: Approved. |
| 18 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Let the record |
| 19 | reflect that the agenda was approved unanimously. |
| 20 | Next item on the agenda, approval of |
| 21 | the meeting minutes from our last meeting, which was |
| 22 | on January 11, 2024. Those were circulated to the |
| 23 | commissioners yesterday evening. Are there any |
| 24 | comments or additions to the minutes? |
| 25 | MR. BLOOM: No, Mr. Chair. |
| | Page 10 |
| | |

| 1 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Can I get a |
|----|--|
| 2 | motion? |
| 3 | MR. BLOOM: I so move. |
| 4 | DR. AMPOMAH: I second. |
| 5 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Dr. Ampomah, |
| 6 | roll call vote. |
| 7 | DR. AMPOMAH: Approved. |
| 8 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Commissioner |
| 9 | Bloom. |
| 10 | MR. BLOOM: Approved. |
| 11 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Let the record |
| 12 | reflect that the minutes were unanimously approved by |
| 13 | the Commission. I think as everyone knows, but I'll |
| 14 | just restate it here, we did not meet in February at |
| 15 | the previously scheduled special hearing for the PFAS |
| 16 | rulemaking, due to an unopposed motion to vacate that |
| 17 | scheduling order and pull that hearing down. |
| 18 | We're going to start. We've got a |
| 19 | number of items set up for a status conference. We're |
| 20 | going to start with Case Number 23580. That's the |
| 21 | application of WildEarth Guardians to consider |
| 22 | proposed amendments to address perfluoroalkyl and |
| 23 | perfluoroalkyl substances and their use in oil and gas |
| 24 | extraction and amending 19.15.2, 19.15.16, 19.15.31, |
| 25 | and 19.15.32. |
| | |

| 1 | Are all the parties who've entered an |
|----|--|
| 2 | appearance in that case here today? Can we start |
| 3 | with well, have the parties decided who's making a |
| 4 | report on the status of the case and what the next |
| 5 | steps are? |
| 6 | Mr. Tremaine. |
| 7 | MR. TREMAINE: I think I can start |
| 8 | there, Mr. Chair. This is Jesse Tremaine for the Oil |
| 9 | Conservation Division. The primary reason for |
| LO | postponing the previous hearing was to allow |
| L1 | additional time for the Oil Conservation Division to |
| L2 | obtain expert witnesses. |
| L3 | We are in the very final stages of |
| L4 | that, finalizing contracts for those services. Expect |
| L5 | that to be completed any day. Additionally, we have |
| L6 | started stakeholder engagement on aspects of the |
| L7 | petition and structure, specifically, with the other |
| L8 | parties entered into the case, related to aspects of |
| L9 | that petition and structure that don't require the |
| 20 | expert services. |
| 21 | So OCD has been talking with both the |
| 22 | industry stakeholders and the petitioners to suggest a |
| 23 | potential alternative petition structure. So far, |
| 24 | those discussions have been, I think, productive. We |

expect to need another 30 days or so to try to hammer

25

| 1 | out some areas of consensus, and I put together a very |
|----|--|
| 2 | brief kind of outline of alternative dates. |
| 3 | But where we are right now is that |
| 4 | we're seeing the OCD has some availability constraints |
| 5 | in early July, and we think that hearing dates in June |
| 6 | might be a little difficult to provide enough time for |
| 7 | the parties to work through the process. And I |
| 8 | believe that the petitioners may have some conflicts |
| 9 | in witness conflicts in July. |
| 10 | So my suggestion and then I'll turn |
| 11 | over to the other parties is to that we continue |
| 12 | to work through a schedule and agree here to submit a |
| 13 | revised pre-hearing or a scheduling order, as we |
| 14 | did previously, to the Commission once we can kind of |
| 15 | hammer out some of those conflicting availabilities. |
| 16 | And so, essentially, as of right now, |
| 17 | the Division would be proposing, potentially, the week |
| 18 | of June 24th but I think that's going to be, you |
| 19 | know, tight for a lot of the parties to work |
| 20 | through or one of the last two weeks in July. And |
| 21 | I think the other parties have some conflicts there. |
| 22 | So we're going to need a little bit of time to work |
| 23 | through that. |
| 24 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Mr. Davis, or |
| 25 | anyone else, any comments on Mr. Tremaine's |
| | Page 13 |

| 1 | presentation? |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, |
| 3 | Commissioners. We agree with Mr. Tremaine about |
| 4 | continuing talks about potential revised petition. |
| 5 | The petitioners do have some witness conflicts in late |
| 6 | June through July and early August. |
| 7 | But I spoke with Mr. Tremaine, and |
| 8 | we're going to go back and speak with one of our |
| 9 | witnesses and see if we can either work that out with |
| 10 | him or potentially work it out with the parties and |
| 11 | either bump the hearing up by a few days or a week, if |
| 12 | possible. And if not, we'll, you know, hammer out a |
| 13 | new procedural order to present to the Commission. |
| 14 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Mr. Feldewert, |
| 15 | for the industry parties. |
| 16 | MR. FELDEWERT: You know, I agree. I |
| 17 | know that there has been some movement towards, you |
| 18 | know, having some discussions and having stakeholder |
| 19 | meetings. That may take a little time to see what we |
| 20 | can what consensus we can reach. Obviously, we |
| 21 | have not had any discussions about any particular |
| 22 | dates. |
| 23 | So it does seem to me that we need some |
| 24 | time to have those stakeholder discussions, try to |
| 25 | figure out if we can come to a consensus on when |
| | |

| 1 | witnesses can be available on for a hearing date. |
|----|--|
| 2 | So it might be premature to schedule something at this |
| 3 | point. |
| 4 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Hearing the |
| 5 | discussion and I'll turn it over I would suggest |
| 6 | to the parties maybe email myself and the hearing |
| 7 | clerk some weeks that you're looking at. We can |
| 8 | circulate that among the Commission via email to |
| 9 | confirm commissioner availability for a special |
| LO | hearing. |
| L1 | Based on prior discussions, I suspect |
| L2 | we'll probably want to reserve a week. And I think |
| L3 | the Commission's preference would be to reserve a |
| L4 | continuous week so, you know, no party has a weekend |
| L5 | overlap one way or another, depending on you're |
| L6 | looking at, as we're managing it. And if you give us, |
| L7 | you know, two or three options, the Commission can |
| L8 | confer and tell you what works for our schedule at |
| L9 | this juncture. |
| 20 | But it sounds like it would be helpful. |
| 21 | And absent any additional discussion or questions from |
| 22 | my fellow commissioners, I think we'll just put this |
| 23 | on the agenda for the April meeting, which maybe the |
| 24 | parties, if everything's worked out, can just present |
| 25 | an updated scheduling order that just has changed |
| | |

| 1 | dates and other components. |
|----|--|
| 2 | But if there are any other changes the |
| 3 | parties would like to discuss, you're obviously free |
| 4 | to propose those as well. Do I have any other |
| 5 | questions from my fellow commissioners? |
| 6 | MR. BLOOM: No, Mr. Chair. |
| 7 | DR. AMPOMAH: No, Mr. Chair. |
| 8 | MS. BENNETT: Mr. Chair, this is Deana |
| 9 | Bennett. And I apologize I'm not there in person. |
| 10 | I'm a little sick today. But I did just want to enter |
| 11 | my appearance on the record for EOG. We are in this |
| 12 | rulemaking for EOG. And I don't have anything |
| 13 | substantive to add to the discussions, but I did just |
| 14 | want to enter my appearance on the record. Thank you. |
| 15 | THE CHAIR: Thank you. Sorry I missed |
| 16 | your hand. I just didn't check the screen. But duly |
| 17 | noted, and I assume the parties will reach out and |
| 18 | coordinate with Ms. Bennett, now that she's entered an |
| 19 | appearance. |
| 20 | With that, we will move onto we |
| 21 | actually have a slate of cases involving similar |
| 22 | parties, similar parties having entered appearances. |
| 23 | Those are cases 24277, 24278, 23755, which was a |
| 24 | referral to the Commission of a number of Division |
| 25 | cases by the director of the Oil Conservation |
| | |

| 1 | Division. |
|----|--|
| 2 | At this point, I'm not proposing that |
| 3 | any of those cases or the Chair is not suggesting |
| 4 | that any of those cases go together, other pieces. |
| 5 | I'm actually looking to the parties for some robust |
| 6 | discussion about the best way to handle these cases |
| 7 | and other components so we can look at scheduling a |
| 8 | hearing on the merits for them. |
| 9 | So have all the parties who have |
| LO | entered appearance in those cases, are they either in |
| L1 | the room or online? |
| L2 | MS. HARDY: Yes, Mr. Examiner. Dana |
| L3 | Hardy. I'm here on Webex on behalf of Empire |
| L4 | Petroleum. And I believe Ms. Shaheen and Mr. Padilla |
| L5 | are in the hearing room. |
| L6 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: They are. And I |
| L7 | see Mr. Tremaine for the Oil Conservation Division and |
| L8 | Mr. Rankin for Goodnight Midstream. I'm going to open |
| _9 | it up to discussion, and I think I'll start with Mr. |
| 20 | Rankin and then move to Empire and then to OCD to |
| 21 | provide some perspective on these or some suggestions |
| 22 | about how we want to unpack scheduling questions |
| 23 | surrounding these cases. |
| 24 | MR. RANKIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair, |
| 25 | Commissioners. Good morning. Adam Rankin with the |
| | |

| 1 | law firm of Holland & Hart here in Santa Fe, |
|----|--|
| 2 | representing Goodnight Permian Midstream, LLC. |
| 3 | Yes, Mr. Chair, we have 18 cases now |
| 4 | that have been referred to the Commission. One of |
| 5 | them is a de novo case that is on appeal. Two of them |
| 6 | are direct applications to the Commission, in which |
| 7 | Goodnight Midstream is seeking to amend Eunice |
| 8 | Monument's South Unit orders, addressing the unitized |
| 9 | interval and the special pool that was designated for |
| 10 | that unit. |
| 11 | I think it would be helpful, given the |
| 12 | scope of these cases, Mr. Chair, if I would be |
| 13 | permitted to have a few minutes just to kind of give a |
| 14 | historical review. Think putting this into context |
| 15 | would be very helpful. It will lay out a basis for |
| 16 | what we think is important and the procedure and the |
| 17 | issues that we think need to be addressed by the |
| 18 | Commission. |
| 19 | So with permission, I may just, if I |
| 20 | may, take a few minutes to walk through the history a |
| 21 | little bit here and explain why we think these cases |
| 22 | are so important. |
| 23 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: I'm comfortable |
| 24 | with that, and similar time will be given to the other |
| 25 | parties to help with some perspective on scheduling |
| | |

| 1 | and other pieces. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. RANKIN: Thank you. Mr. Chair, |
| 3 | these 18 cases before you are much more than just a |
| 4 | dispute between Empire and Goodnight. |
| 5 | On their face, the cases represent a |
| 6 | dispute over whether disposal in the San Andres |
| 7 | Formation within and around the unit is doing two |
| 8 | things; watering out the overlying Grayburg within the |
| 9 | unit, due to purported communication with the San |
| 10 | Andres, where water is being injected for disposal; or |
| 11 | impairing waterflood operations due to the chemistry |
| 12 | of the water that's being injected, and somehow |
| 13 | impairing Empire's ability to recover residual oil |
| 14 | that's allegedly locked away in the San Andres and |
| 15 | immobilized after millennia of water sweeping through |
| 16 | the zone. |
| 17 | These are the claims Goodnight's |
| 18 | making, and they give rise to highly technical issues |
| 19 | that we're going to have to deal with on the merits at |
| 20 | a hearing, when we get to that point. Our view is |
| 21 | that these claims have no basis, and we're eager to |
| 22 | get forward to the hearing. But there's a lot to work |
| 23 | through before we do. |
| 24 | Exactly how it got to this point in |
| 25 | this dispute, how injection into the San Andres has |
| | Page 19 |

| 1 | given rise to this conflict, is extremely important to |
|----|--|
| 2 | understand. And I think that's why I just want to |
| 3 | walk through the history here. The dispute is a |
| 4 | culmination of an historic error, in our view, that |
| 5 | was committed early on, decades ago, by the Commission |
| 6 | and has been repeated and perpetuated through time. |
| 7 | The and by "historic," I mean in |
| 8 | both senses of the word. It was from decades ago and |
| 9 | also historic in the sense of the scale and proportion |
| 10 | of the error. Now, the consequences were maybe unseen |
| 11 | at the time or not understood or appreciated. But |
| 12 | nevertheless, it was an error, and haven't been |
| 13 | corrected. |
| 14 | The San Andres in this area, in and |
| 15 | around EMSU, was first designated as a pool when the |
| 16 | Eunice pool was discovered back in 1989. The |
| 17 | UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm not Irish, |
| 18 | dude, and if I did |
| 19 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Chris. |
| 20 | UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oop, sorry. |
| 21 | MR. RANKIN: So the well the pool |
| 22 | was discovered by a well drilled about two miles south |
| 23 | of the unit. Okay. And that well was drilled and |
| 24 | completed in the Grayburg. But at the time, the |
| 25 | Division included the entire pool, going down to the |
| | Page 20 |

| 1 | base of the San Andres, as part of the oil pool. |
|----|--|
| 2 | However, all documented production in |
| 3 | this area is from the Grayburg or Lower Penrose. |
| 4 | There is no documented production from the San Andres. |
| 5 | There never has been. The starting in at least the |
| 6 | early 1950s, if not earlier, the Division started |
| 7 | authorizing disposal into the San Andres in this area. |
| 8 | By the 1960s, the Division had approved disposal in |
| 9 | the San Andres in and immediately adjacent to what |
| 10 | later became the EMSU. |
| 11 | In 1965, the state engineer declared |
| 12 | the Capitan Basin an underground aquifer. It included |
| 13 | the San Andres within its definition of that basin |
| 14 | almost two decades before the unit was ever created. |
| 15 | The Division, to this day, recognizes the authority of |
| 16 | the state engineer to approve wells and completions |
| 17 | that would draw water from the San Andres. |
| 18 | By 1984, nearly 30 SWDs have been |
| 19 | approved for disposal into the San Andres in this |
| 20 | area. That means for each of these SWD wells, the |
| 21 | Division must have ascertained that the disposal into |
| 22 | that zone would not cause waste, would not impair |
| 23 | correlative rights, would not remain and the |
| 24 | injection would remain in the targeted injection zone. |
| 25 | Okay. All that would have had to have |
| | |

| 1 | been discerned for approval of each of those wells. |
|----|---|
| 2 | Then, in 1984, the Commission issued three orders on |
| 3 | applications that were filed by Gulf Oil. The first |
| 4 | one created the special pool within what was defined |
| 5 | as the EMSU unit. That included the Lower Penrose, |
| б | going down into the Grayburg, and below that, the San |
| 7 | Andres. |
| 8 | A second order approved the statutory |
| 9 | water flow that unitized for waterflood operations |
| 10 | those same intervals, the Lower Grayburg sorry, the |
| 11 | Lower Penrose, the Grayburg down to the base of the |
| 12 | San Andres. |
| 13 | The third order even though in that |
| 14 | order the source of the waterflood water was the San |
| 15 | Andres, and the waterflood operation was authorized |
| 16 | only for the Grayburg, because that was the only zone |
| 17 | where the oil column was located the third order |
| 18 | authorized waterflood operations and injection within |
| 19 | the Grayburg using San Andres water, water within the |
| 20 | unitized interval below the Grayburg. |
| 21 | Our view is that creating the special |
| 22 | pool and the unit, to include the San Andres, was |
| 23 | legally invalid. Express testimony at the unit |
| 24 | hearing was that the oil column was limited to the |
| 25 | Grayburg and the Lower Penrose formation. It did not |

| 1 | extend into the San Andres. Waterflood operations |
|----|--|
| 2 | would target the oil column in the Grayburg and Lower |
| 3 | Penrose formation only. |
| 4 | Gulf proposed to include the San Andres |
| 5 | in the unitized interval in the testimony, simply |
| 6 | because it was historically included within the pool, |
| 7 | and the San Andres would serve as the source of water |
| 8 | for the Grayburg waterflood operations. In short, the |
| 9 | unit and its special pool were erroneously approved by |
| 10 | the Commission at that time to include the San Andres, |
| 11 | when it was already an approved and active zone for |
| 12 | disposal and a known non-hydrocarbon-bearing aquifer. |
| 13 | Around this time, then, in the '80s or |
| 14 | early '90s, the Division officially designated the San |
| 15 | Andres in this area as a disposal pool, for disposal |
| 16 | of produced water. In doing so, the Division |
| 17 | confirmed what was already known about the San Andres. |
| 18 | It is a water-bearing-only zone. |
| 19 | Since then, many more SWDs have been |
| 20 | authorized for disposal in this pool, in reliance on |
| 21 | the Division's designation and its findings and the |
| 22 | history. In fact, within the designated San Andres, |
| 23 | at least 98 wells within that pool have been |
| 24 | designated for disposal, many of which are still |
| 25 | active most of them are and many additional |
| | |

1 proposed SWDs are still pending. 2 This historic -- these historic 3 contradictory determinations is what has brought us Okay. We have a unit that erroneously included 4 here. 5 the San Andres and a history of approval of salt-water 6 disposal wells and a designation of a salt-water disposal pool that overlaps that same unit. 8 Empire and Goodnight just happen to be 9 the two players on the stage at this moment, but there are many others who will be impacted by the decisions 10 11 the Commission has before it today. So what I'd like 12 to do just real quick is kind of show you what I'm 13 talking about. 14 MR. PADILLA: Mr. Chairman, I'm going 15 to object to the presentation and just argue that Mr. 16 Rankin is going into the historical -- he's not 17 limiting himself to the historical development of the Eunice Monument South Unit. He's making an argument 18 19 that is improper at this time. 20 We're here, as I understand it, to 2.1 schedule and to determine how we're going to schedule 22 all of these 18 cases. But to go into an argument 23 about the decision of Goodnight Goodstream [sic] and 2.4 attacking the original order as being an error is not appropriate at this time. 25

| 1 | This is a status conference to |
|--|--|
| 2 | determine how we're going to decide these cases, and |
| 3 | the procedural for trying this case is not opening |
| 4 | argument or closing argument of the original cases. |
| 5 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Mr. Padilla, |
| 6 | point duly noted. |
| 7 | Mr. Rankin, I appreciate the context |
| 8 | and history. I think it was helpful, and we'll allow |
| 9 | similar time for Empire to provide some perspective. |
| 10 | We do have 18 cases, deciding how we're going to |
| 11 | consolidate them, move them together, sort of carry |
| 12 | them forward. Having a little bit of background was |
| 1 2 | helpful. |
| тэ | 11016161 |
| | But I think we'll pause there, Mr. |
| 14 | - |
| 14 15 | But I think we'll pause there, Mr. |
| 14 15 | But I think we'll pause there, Mr. Rankin. I think we're verging into arguments on the |
| 14 15 16 17 | But I think we'll pause there, Mr. Rankin. I think we're verging into arguments on the merits. But the history was helpful, kind of setting |
| 14 15 16 17 | But I think we'll pause there, Mr. Rankin. I think we're verging into arguments on the merits. But the history was helpful, kind of setting it and looking it out. |
| 14 15 16 17 | But I think we'll pause there, Mr. Rankin. I think we're verging into arguments on the merits. But the history was helpful, kind of setting it and looking it out. And with that, Mr. Padilla, |
| 18 19 | But I think we'll pause there, Mr. Rankin. I think we're verging into arguments on the merits. But the history was helpful, kind of setting it and looking it out. And with that, Mr. Padilla, Ms. Shaheen, and Ms. Hardy, I'll turn it over to |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 | But I think we'll pause there, Mr. Rankin. I think we're verging into arguments on the merits. But the history was helpful, kind of setting it and looking it out. And with that, Mr. Padilla, Ms. Shaheen, and Ms. Hardy, I'll turn it over to Empire for some just initial commentary on how we |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | But I think we'll pause there, Mr. Rankin. I think we're verging into arguments on the merits. But the history was helpful, kind of setting it and looking it out. And with that, Mr. Padilla, Ms. Shaheen, and Ms. Hardy, I'll turn it over to Empire for some just initial commentary on how we should be thinking about these as then we look to |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | But I think we'll pause there, Mr. Rankin. I think we're verging into arguments on the merits. But the history was helpful, kind of setting it and looking it out. And with that, Mr. Padilla, Ms. Shaheen, and Ms. Hardy, I'll turn it over to Empire for some just initial commentary on how we should be thinking about these as then we look to think about we schedule it forward, if you would like. |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | But I think we'll pause there, Mr. Rankin. I think we're verging into arguments on the merits. But the history was helpful, kind of setting it and looking it out. And with that, Mr. Padilla, Ms. Shaheen, and Ms. Hardy, I'll turn it over to Empire for some just initial commentary on how we should be thinking about these as then we look to think about we schedule it forward, if you would like. MR. PADILLA: Thank you. |

| 1 | Padilla have anything to add this unit that's owned |
|----|--|
| 2 | by Empire in this area is approximately 40 years old. |
| 3 | It was approved by the BLM, the State Land Office, and |
| 4 | the Division and Commission. |
| 5 | So it's a longstanding unit. It can't |
| 6 | be unilaterally amended, as Goodnight seeks to |
| 7 | accomplish here. We've filed a motion to dismiss |
| 8 | their application to seek to do that, for that reason, |
| 9 | as well as the reason that they lack standing because |
| LO | they don't hold an interest in the minerals in this |
| L1 | area. |
| L2 | So the BLM, the State Land Office, and |
| L3 | the Commission all found that this unitized interval |
| L4 | was prospective for hydrocarbon production, and that |
| L5 | has been in effect for over 40 years. So to come back |
| L6 | now and allege that all of that was erroneous, I think |
| L7 | is not going to supported by the evidence. And |
| L8 | that's the history. It's a longstanding, approved |
| L9 | unit. |
| 20 | And with respect to the pools and |
| 21 | Mr. Padilla may be able to address this more |
| 22 | effectively than me but the pools have also been |
| 23 | recognized as hydrocarbon pools. It's not an aquifer, |
| 24 | as Mr. Rankin has represented disposal has been |
| 25 | authorized in certain areas but it is also an oil |
| | |

| 1 | pool that's recognized. And the nomenclature orders |
|----|--|
| 2 | discuss that and determined that the Grayburg and San |
| 3 | Andres should both be included. |
| 4 | So I think that was a well-reasoned |
| 5 | decision. It's longstanding. And Goodnight seeks to |
| 6 | undo those decisions here. It's too late, and it's a |
| 7 | collateral attack that I think is inappropriate and |
| 8 | will be unsupported by the evidence. So that's |
| 9 | Empire's position. |
| LO | And we can talk about how we would |
| L1 | propose to schedule the cases if you would like, |
| L2 | unless you'd like to hear from OCD, or Mr. Padilla and |
| L3 | Ms. Sheehan have anything else to add. |
| L4 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: I think |
| L5 | consistent with how we keyed it up, I'd turn it over |
| L6 | to Mr. Padilla or Ms. Shaheen if they'd like to add |
| L7 | any sort of historical context. |
| L8 | MR. PADILLA: Mr. Chairman, I think |
| L9 | that Ms. Hardy has pretty much expressed our position |
| 20 | in these cases. And we're looking at trying to set |
| 21 | aside something that's been in existence 40 years. |
| 22 | 1984 is when the unit was approved after notice and |
| 23 | hearing. I was astounded that I was involved in that |
| 24 | hearing in reading the transcript. So that ages me |
| 25 | considerably. |

| 1 | But the inclusion of the San Andres and |
|----|--|
| 2 | the Grayburg and pools of Southeast New Mexico is |
| 3 | common. We filed yesterday a motion to dismiss the |
| 4 | two applications. And I don't want to argue those |
| 5 | now, but including our argument on the aquifer and |
| 6 | that kind of thing, that's in the motion to dismiss |
| 7 | the two applications in cases 24277 and 24278. |
| 8 | So with that, I think we ought to get |
| 9 | back to the discussions that Mr. Rankin and Dana Hardy |
| 10 | had yesterday in terms of trying to weed out the |
| 11 | they're more informed. Or Ms. Hardy is more informed |
| 12 | about proposed scheduling, and she has been in contact |
| 13 | with our client and is more she's just more |
| 14 | informed about the proper procedure to proceed. |
| 15 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Okay. |
| 16 | Mr. Tremaine, do you have any opening |
| 17 | remarks for OCD, or? |
| 18 | MR. TREMAINE: Yes, Mr. Chair. Thank |
| 19 | you. So the Division several of these cases, many |
| 20 | of these cases were before the Division and with the |
| 21 | Division hearing examiner. And the Division did not |
| 22 | engage at that time. So we've recently entered |
| 23 | appearance and have taken up these cases due to a |
| 24 | number of concerns. |
| 25 | And basically, that's a preface to say |
| | Page 28 |

| 1 | that I think that OCD's going to require some time to |
|----|--|
| 2 | develop a fully-fledged perspective on these. There's |
| 3 | a number of issues that we've already highlighted of |
| 4 | importance to the Oil Conservation Division that we |
| 5 | need to look into. |
| 6 | At a very high level, the claims in |
| 7 | these cases may implicate formation-wide SWD |
| 8 | development, whether that's currently permitted SWDs, |
| 9 | whether that is pending applications or future |
| 10 | injection, that the details remain to be seen. But |
| 11 | clearly, those other developments are implicated by |
| 12 | these claims. |
| 13 | OCD is also looking at potential |
| 14 | implications for drinking water and any actions that |
| 15 | the Division needs to take regarding its primacy |
| 16 | agreement with the EPA. And just as a practical |
| 17 | matter, we're talking about 18 cases here. The core |
| 18 | technical issues of the claims are complex and will |
| 19 | take some time to develop in and of themselves. |
| 20 | But I do note some variation in the |
| 21 | fact patterns between the various cases. And so I |
| 22 | think when we start stacking disputes over the various |
| 23 | fact patterns, we're looking at either a series of |
| 24 | hearings or potentially a very long single hearing |
| 25 | here, which creates some scheduling concerns for the |

1 Division. 2 And lastly, at a very high level -- and this is really a trailing issue -- but it is one of 3 OCD's concerns that implications for the production 4 5 and development in the area may impact Empire's 6 ability to comply with a current agreed compliance order for inactive wells, which some portion of those 8 remaining wells are required to be returned to 9 production. 10 So, at this point, Mr. Chair and 11 commissioners, we have somewhat more -- or I should 12 say many more questions than answers. But our 13 expectations, I think, going forward, are due to the factual complexity. I would ask for, before we move 14 15 into any actual hearings, about 60 days for the OCD 16 technical team to fully develop a position and move 17 forward. I do also anticipate a potential -- the 18 need to resolve any open discovery disputes. I -- OCD 19 20 is not currently engaged in any such dispute, but being aware of the subpoena history on exchange of 2.1 22 information in this case, I do have general concerns about diving into a substantial hearing if any of 23 2.4 those issues remain open. 25 So my recommendation to the parties and Page 30

| 1 | the Commission is to engage in a somewhat more |
|----|--|
| 2 | structured approach here, where the parties can agree |
| 3 | to or the Commission can issue a scheduling order |
| 4 | providing for a somewhat more process than is typical. |
| 5 | We recommend appearing for discovery |
| 6 | briefing and then motions to help decide how these |
| 7 | cases will proceed, whether there are going to be 18 |
| 8 | of them or split up into different chunks. And I |
| 9 | think the appropriate timing for that decision is |
| 10 | probably out at the end of the discovery and briefing |
| 11 | period, and then set the cases for hearing. That's my |
| 12 | recommendation. |
| 13 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: I'll share some |
| 14 | preliminary reactions, and then or some preliminary |
| 15 | questions based on the presentation. Clearly sounds |
| 16 | like 24277 and 24278, the two applications to amend, |
| 17 | which I know are subject to a motion to dismiss, I |
| 18 | don't believe that Goodnight has had an opportunity to |
| 19 | respond to the motion to dismiss. |
| 20 | And other components may present one |
| 21 | discrete set of issues that sounds like may be |
| 22 | appropriate for resolution first. But would welcome |
| 23 | the parties' perspective on whether those two cases |
| 24 | and the resolution of them can be separated from 23775 |
| 25 | and the for lack of a better term bundle of |

| 1 | cases involved in that, you know, can go forward |
|----|--|
| 2 | separately. |
| 3 | Also, sounding from the presentation by |
| 4 | the parties, you know, information that I'm aware of |
| 5 | in my capacity as the Division director and sort of |
| 6 | other components, I think the Commission would at |
| 7 | least initially be looking at the parties to propose a |
| 8 | scheduling order to us. I think this is a more |
| 9 | substantial set even just based on the preliminary |
| 10 | presentations here a more substantial hearing than |
| 11 | just our typical one- or two-day slot allows on a |
| 12 | Thursday, Friday. |
| 13 | So, preliminarily, this I'd welcome |
| 14 | the parties' perspective on whether they think this is |
| 15 | sort of a special hearing date, what should be |
| 16 | included in the special hearings, and then prospects |
| 17 | for the parties to come in with a robust proposed sort |
| 18 | of agreed scheduling order that addresses all of those |
| 19 | issues, would sort of be my questions. |
| 20 | I'll look to my fellow commissioners to |
| 21 | see if they have anything else on those on these. |
| 22 | MR. BLOOM: No, Mr. Chair. |
| 23 | DR. AMPOMAH: No, Mr. Chair. |
| 24 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: I'll turn it |
| 25 | over to you, Mr. Rankin, to start and then go through |
| | Page 32 |

| 1 | the parties. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. RANKIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. |
| 3 | Tremaine has brought up a point that I next wanted to |
| 4 | make, and I think it's important for the Commission to |
| 5 | understand the scope understand how best to attack |
| 6 | or address these competing issues, because |
| 7 | understanding the scope will help us, I think, narrow |
| 8 | our focus to what is manageable and what is |
| 9 | appropriately addressed in the first instance. |
| LO | Mr. Chair, I agree with you, and I |
| L1 | agree with Mr. Tremaine, that the claims and issues |
| L2 | raised in these cases implicate far more than the |
| L3 | Eunice Monument South Unit. And I'd like to, if I |
| L4 | may, just show a picture, because a picture's worth a |
| L5 | thousand words and I think will help put into context |
| L6 | the issues for concerning how best to manage the |
| L7 | schedule and the procedure. |
| L8 | May I share that screen? It's just a |
| L9 | map that shows the unit and offsetting SWD wells, |
| 20 | including our wells, and wells that are not included |
| 21 | in this proceeding. If I may show it to you, I can |
| 22 | understand that may be helpful. |
| 23 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Do any of the |
| 24 | parties have any concern with the presentation of the |
| 25 | map? |

| 1 | MR. PADILLA: No, Mr. Chairman. But I |
|----|--|
| 2 | don't want him to go into an argument as to |
| 3 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Understood. |
| 4 | MR. RANKIN: I'll stay away from the |
| 5 | argument, and you can tell me if I get too much into |
| 6 | argument. But I just want to show you the map. Okay. |
| 7 | This is a map that shows the Monument trend. In red |
| 8 | outline here where my cursor is hovering over, this is |
| 9 | the EMSU unit. This is the unit at issue in these |
| LO | cases. |
| L1 | The orange triangles are the and |
| L2 | squares are the wells SWDs. The triangles are |
| L3 | active injection wells. The squares are pending or |
| L4 | proposed SWDs that and the orange color represents |
| L5 | wells operated by Goodnight. The red triangle well in |
| L6 | the center here is a disposable well operated by |
| L7 | Empire, and all of these wells inject into the San |
| L8 | Andres Formation. |
| L9 | So what's at issue in these cases are |
| 20 | the orange wells that Goodnight operates, and what's |
| 21 | excluded what hasn't been addressed by any of these |
| 22 | cases are the other SWDs injecting into the unit in |
| 23 | and around the unit. These green wells are operated |
| 24 | by Rice. This yellow well is operated by OWL. |
| 25 | And they all inject into the same zone, |
| | |

| 1 | inside the unit or immediately outside the unit, in |
|-----|--|
| 2 | many cases closer to the unit boundaries than |
| 3 | Goodnight's wells. So this, I think, map articulates |
| 4 | the problem and the scope that Mr. Tremaine referenced |
| 5 | here. |
| 6 | The claims at issue are that the |
| 7 | this area that's defined as the Artesia Fairway in |
| 8 | the within that green boundary is what Empire's |
| 9 | experts say is a potential residual oil zone. So all |
| LO | that area is potentially, according to them, subject |
| L1 | to tertiary recovery through for an ROZ. So |
| L2 | there's no principal basis to distinguish between |
| L3 | wells inside the unit or outside the unit. |
| L4 | So what I would propose, Mr. Chair, is |
| L 5 | that, in order to reasonably tackle the cases before |
| L6 | us, is that we first focus solely on wells injecting |
| L7 | into the unit only. And to do so, I think, in order |
| L8 | to accurately and fairly discern the claims, we need |
| L9 | to include more parties. It can't just be Goodnight. |
| 20 | There are three other wells and |
| 21 | operators injecting into the unit boundary currently, |
| 22 | into the same zone. Since the '60s, more than 110 |
| 23 | million barrels has been injected into that same area. |
| 24 | And if there's concerns about watering out, those |
| 5 | other parties must be included for this Commission to |

| 1 | make a fair decision about, you know, who's if |
|----|--|
| 2 | there is any communication at all, if there is any |
| 3 | watering out, we need to have all those parties |
| 4 | involved. |
| 5 | So my proposal, Mr. Chair, is to first |
| 6 | address only the unit, allow us to hear the issues |
| 7 | that are being raised. And at that point, if there's |
| 8 | a finding that there is ROZ, that there is |
| 9 | communication between the Grayburg and San Andres, |
| LO | then we can proceed to look at wells and cases outside |
| L1 | the unit. |
| L2 | Those wells and cases outside the unit |
| L3 | are going to have individualized analyses that we're |
| L4 | going to have to discern, based on the geology, the |
| L5 | engineering, other factors that would influence the |
| L6 | radius of influence of the injection in those wells. |
| L7 | That is going to bog this process down if we have to |
| L8 | get into these individualized issues, evaluating the |
| L9 | impact would potentially be to these wells on the |
| 20 | injection and whether it reaches the unit boundary. |
| 21 | So it would be far easier and a more |
| 22 | straightforward approach just to limit initially to |
| 23 | the unit boundary. Then we can address claims going |
| 24 | forward from there. So that's my pitch. I do think |
| 25 | it's |

| 1 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Mr. Rankin, what |
|----|--|
| 2 | cases just before in your view, would cover |
| 3 | wells within the unit question and wells within the |
| 4 | unit. What case numbers? |
| 5 | MR. RANKIN: So there are a total of 18 |
| 6 | cases, Mr. Chair. |
| 7 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Yep. |
| 8 | MR. RANKIN: Of the wells and cases |
| 9 | that are in unit that I think should be included in |
| 10 | one shot let me get to my list. Sorry. Moment. I |
| 11 | do have a list, because I wanted to make clear that |
| 12 | those cases were. Just let me find my list. |
| 13 | So Empire has four cases that address |
| 14 | injection within the unit boundary. Those are 24018, |
| 15 | 24020 sorry, 24018 through 24020, and 24025. Those |
| 16 | are applications to revoke current SWDs within the |
| 17 | unit boundary. |
| 18 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: And those are |
| 19 | just for the record, those are Division case |
| 20 | numbers. |
| 21 | MR. RANKIN: Those are Division case |
| 22 | numbers. |
| 23 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Yep. |
| 24 | MR. RANKIN: Now, Goodnight has a |
| 25 | number of cases that also deal with injection into the |
| | |

| 1 | unit boundary, and there are eight of them. Those are |
|----|--|
| 2 | Case Numbers 23614 through 23617, and it includes |
| 3 | 23775, which is an application to increase the rate of |
| 4 | injection in one of the wells. It also includes the |
| 5 | de novo case, which is Case 24123. I believe that's |
| 6 | the Commission case number. |
| 7 | And then it also includes our |
| 8 | Goodnight's applications to amend the EMSU orders, |
| 9 | which is Case Numbers 24277 and 24278. |
| 10 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: So, just for my |
| 11 | own clarity and obviously, we'll let the other |
| 12 | parties hear it will be Goodnight's proposal that a |
| 13 | package of cases for hearing would be Commission Case |
| 14 | Number 24277, Commission Case 24278, which is your |
| 15 | which are the applications concerning the unit; and |
| 16 | then a subset of the cases within Commission Case |
| 17 | 23755, to include Division Cases 23614 through 23617, |
| 18 | 24018 through 24020, and 24025, which is in all of the |
| 19 | cases that are currently sort of referred up as 23755; |
| 20 | and then lastly, the Commission Case 24123, which is |
| 21 | the de novo case, would be sort of a package for |
| 22 | hearing. |
| 23 | And your proposal is that anything else |
| 24 | that isn't in that enumerated list would be subject to |
| 25 | separate stand-alone hearings, subsequent to those? |

| 1 | MR. RANKIN: Yeah. I mean, I'm not |
|----|--|
| 2 | I haven't necessarily articulated a position on |
| 3 | whether those remaining six cases should be each |
| 4 | stand-alone separate cases. |
| 5 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Okay. |
| 6 | MR. RANKIN: I'm not saying that that's |
| 7 | the case, necessarily. I think we may be able to find |
| 8 | a way to streamline or address those together. But |
| 9 | there are going to be individualized issues within |
| 10 | those six cases, based on the location of the wells. |
| 11 | And I and again, I believe it's improper to address |
| 12 | those six cases without consideration of other SWDs |
| 13 | that are closer and similarly situated to Goodnight's |
| 14 | injection. |
| 15 | So I think those cases should be |
| 16 | appropriately addressed at a different time. The |
| 17 | one thing I did want to point out, Mr. Chair, and |
| 18 | there is a little it's a little confusing on the |
| 19 | agenda. But on the agenda, where it references Case |
| 20 | 23775, it doesn't actually include the description for |
| 21 | that case. |
| 22 | It seems to imply that there are other |
| 23 | cases involved with that, and I just it's a little |
| 24 | unclear. I just want to make sure that's for the |
| 25 | record that the way that the case caption was |
| | |

| 1 | articulated there for that case was incorrect. And |
|----|--|
| 2 | I'm happy to help with staff make sure that's correct |
| 3 | going forward. But that, I think, was a little |
| 4 | unclear and maybe provided some confusion about what |
| 5 | cases were currently being discussed today. |
| б | THE HEARING EXAMINER: I think we'd be |
| 7 | open to some follow-up feedback on there, and |
| 8 | obviously, the case number tracking here. Because |
| 9 | we're dealing with a number of Division cases and a |
| 10 | number of Commission cases, we need some clarity as we |
| 11 | move forward with scheduling. |
| 12 | Ms. Hardy, I'll turn it over to you, |
| 13 | for Empire's perspective on scheduling and packaging. |
| 14 | MS. HARDY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. |
| 15 | Rankin, I think, at the initial part of his discussion |
| 16 | just now recognized that there is no basis really, you |
| 17 | know, the artificial distinction to separate the wells |
| 18 | outside of the unit from the wells inside the unit, |
| 19 | because it's all one area, and the formation is the |
| 20 | same. |
| 21 | So I think that, from our perspective, |
| 22 | it would really waste resources of the parties and the |
| 23 | Commission and Division to separate out the wells |
| 24 | injecting outside of the unit from the wells injecting |
| 25 | inside the unit. They're all impacting the unit, and |
| | |

| 1 | I think you can see from Mr. Rankin's map, some of |
|----|---|
| 2 | them are right outside of the boundary. |
| 3 | So I think that would be an artificial |
| 4 | distinction that's not necessary to make. I think it |
| 5 | makes more sense to hear all of the cases at once, |
| 6 | because the issues really are the same. It's one |
| 7 | pool, and the issue is whether Goodnight's injection |
| 8 | into those wells, or proposed injection, is impairing |
| 9 | correlative rights or resulting in waste. |
| 10 | So I think that it would waste |
| 11 | resources, really, to separate those out. I don't |
| 12 | think it's necessary, and I think it's an artificial |
| 13 | distinction. So I think it would really be more |
| 14 | efficient just to hear all of the cases at once. Even |
| 15 | though there are a lot of them, I don't think the |
| 16 | issues will be that different. |
| 17 | In fact, the parties already filed |
| 18 | testimony in the Division cases, and the issues |
| 19 | overlap extensively, almost entirely. So I think that |
| 20 | would make more sense, and I think that we would |
| 21 | propose and that the parties and I had run this |
| 22 | idea by Mr. Rankin and Mr. Tremaine, and we discussed |
| 23 | it would submit written testimony, along with their |
| 24 | exhibits, as we do currently in Division cases, and |
| 25 | then submit written rebuttal, and we can work out the |

| 1 | dates for those submissions. |
|----|---|
| 2 | We were talking about a hearing |
| 3 | potentially in August, if that works for the |
| 4 | Commission. And I think that handling the testimony |
| 5 | and exhibits that way would significantly cut down on |
| 6 | the amount of time required in the hearing, and it |
| 7 | would also clarify the issues so that the Commission |
| 8 | will have everything in front of it when we go into |
| 9 | the hearing. |
| LO | And I don't think that the number of |
| L1 | cases should really control. I don't think that |
| L2 | breaking them out really makes any sense. |
| L3 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Thank you, Ms. |
| L4 | Hardy. |
| L5 | Mr. Tremaine. |
| L6 | MR. TREMAINE: Mr. Chair, I frankly can |
| L7 | see merits to both arguments, putting them all on at |
| L8 | the same time or breaking out the EMSU cases. In |
| L9 | talking with the technical team, I think that |
| 20 | they're OCD would be amenable to approaching the |
| 21 | EMSU cases I mean, we're still talking about, I |
| 22 | think it's 12 separate cases there. |
| 23 | And without making any determinations |
| 24 | or proclamations about the technical nature of the |
| 25 | various different applications, it's my understanding |
| | |

| 1 | that the parties are going to argue at least some |
|----|---|
| 2 | of the parties are going to argue that those cases, |
| 3 | not including those other six cases, have distinct |
| 4 | facts. And I do see that as the presence of that |
| 5 | argument as extending that hearing. |
| 6 | So the core technical issues and the |
| 7 | claims between all of the cases are, I think, quite |
| 8 | similar. So going forward with the EMSU cases would |
| 9 | provide a foundation for the other cases. And so I |
| LO | could see us going either way. |
| L1 | I think the hearing is likely to be |
| L2 | more efficient if we break it out with the EMSU. But |
| L3 | that's not a strong position. Frankly, we'll |
| L4 | accommodate either, the will of the Commission. |
| L5 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Next question, I |
| L6 | suppose, do the parties believe there are existing |
| L7 | discovery disputes and information sharing that need |
| L8 | to be resolved prior to hearing? |
| L9 | We'll start with Mr. Rankin again. |
| 20 | MR. RANKIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We |
| 21 | are working diligently on discovery. As you may be |
| 22 | aware, we did serve both parties served discovery |
| 23 | back in 2023, in advance of what was originally |
| 24 | scheduled to be a Division hearing. And we did pause |
| 25 | that hearing in light of discovery disputes that came |
| | |

1 to light on the eve of the hearing. 2 And so the -- as a consequence of that, 3 the cases have been stayed while we were continuing to work through the negotiations, conferring over 4 5 discovery. I think we reached the -- I think we 6 basically have -- both parties have, I think, gotten to the point where I think we've satisfied that 8 discovery request. 9 Since that time, Mr. Chair, ten new applications were filed by Empire, and we filed two 10 11 additional applications. So the scope and scale of 12 these issues has increased. We served recent 13 discovery last week on Empire. I believe that they 14 intend to serve discovery through the Division on us 15 again. 16 I believe that we have probably one 17 more round ourselves to do, to ensure that our experts have all the information they need. I do believe --18 19 and I want to flag this for your attention today, Mr. 20 Chair -- but I do believe that there's a chance, a 2.1 likely chance, that we will also move for pre-hearing 22 depositions to take certain depositions of Empire's 23 witnesses in advance of a hearing. 2.4 And we'll lay that out, as and when we 25 need to, because we believe that the circumstances

| 1 | here are extraordinary and will justify pre-hearing |
|----|--|
| 2 | depositions. But we'll want to wait to make sure that |
| 3 | we can justify that with some additional discovery. |
| 4 | So we are endeavoring to get that done. |
| 5 | So as Mr. Tremaine noted, I think |
| 6 | there's a lot left to do and sort out technically, and |
| 7 | we want to go forward with the Commission, and we're |
| 8 | eager to do so. But we want to put on a case that |
| 9 | the that is that allows the Commission to fully |
| 10 | vet these issues. And to do so, we just need to make |
| 11 | sure we have the time and the resources and get the |
| 12 | information ourselves. |
| 13 | Empire, here, is in the driver's seat. |
| 14 | They are the operator of this unit. They have all the |
| 15 | information from their predecessors, the chemistry, |
| 16 | the petrophysics, the costs, the modeling, things that |
| 17 | we would need to do, to put together an economic |
| 18 | demonstration of what they claim is not viable. |
| 19 | So we're working towards that, Mr. |
| 20 | Chair, and I think on the just want to just kind of |
| 21 | raise some of these discovery issues for you. I think |
| 22 | we're working well together, and I think we can get |
| 23 | through it, but I do think it's going to take some |
| 24 | time. So I'm hopeful that, by the end of June, we |
| 25 | will have what we need for discovery. |

| 1 | And then and that's why, when I was |
|----|--|
| 2 | speaking with Ms. Hardy yesterday, I was thinking |
| 3 | potentially August would be a good time frame. I |
| 4 | actually appreciate Mr. Tremaine's recommendation that |
| 5 | we wait and see how things go with discovery and |
| 6 | briefing, to make sure we are in a position to proceed |
| 7 | to hearing. |
| 8 | And so my recommendation would be that |
| 9 | we set monthly status conferences with the Commission, |
| 10 | just to make sure we're on track, that if there are |
| 11 | any discovery issues or disputes, that we can attend |
| 12 | to those quickly and get them addressed. And then we |
| 13 | can also I think the parties should confer and |
| 14 | propose a time frame for legal briefing. |
| 15 | I think it's important that the |
| 16 | Commission have our viewpoints, if we can't reach |
| 17 | agreement on what issues need to be decided, so we can |
| 18 | properly frame the dispute. And then we can lay out |
| 19 | the legal issues, such as what standards apply, who's |
| 20 | got the burden of persuasion and proof, how is that |
| 21 | all going to proceed, and are there additional |
| 22 | necessary parties. |
| 23 | So I think there's a lot to brief on |
| 24 | the front end, and there's a lot of discovery to do. |
| 25 | So my recommendation is that we take the next month |

| 1 | for the parties to confer on a scheduling order and |
|----|--|
| 2 | then, at the next meeting, Mr. Chair, we propose |
| 3 | either what we can agree to, and if not, that we come |
| 4 | up with a schedule for briefing to address these legal |
| 5 | issues and procedure. |
| 6 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Ms. Hardy. |
| 7 | MS. HARDY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The |
| 8 | parties are engaging in discovery. I do want to flag |
| 9 | for the Commission and I mentioned this to Mr. |
| 10 | Rankin yesterday that we will be filing a motion |
| 11 | regarding Goodnight's recent subpoena. I think it's |
| 12 | duplicative. Some of it goes way beyond the scope of |
| 13 | this proceeding. So we will be filing a motion on |
| 14 | that. |
| 15 | And I also want to flag the fact that |
| 16 | this is not a civil litigation proceeding. There is |
| 17 | civil litigation going on between Empire and Goodnight |
| 18 | in which extensive discovery, of course, is occurring |
| 19 | and will occur. But this is not that proceeding. |
| 20 | This is a Commission administrative proceeding that |
| 21 | involves impairment of correlative rights and waste |
| 22 | under the Oil and Gas Act. |
| 23 | So I think it is much more limited |
| 24 | than, of course, civil litigation. And so I |
| 25 | although the parties will engage in discovery, and I |
| | |

| 1 | agree that some discovery's needed, I think that sort |
|----|--|
| 2 | of a freewheeling inquiry into all types of matters is |
| 3 | not appropriate at a Commission proceeding. This is |
| 4 | an administrative hearing process with limited |
| 5 | discovery by rule. So I do want to mention that. |
| 6 | I think it does make sense for the |
| 7 | parties to communicate about a schedule and try to |
| 8 | propose something to the Commission. I do think that |
| 9 | an August hearing date would make sense, and I think |
| 10 | it would be helpful for the Commission to set a |
| 11 | hearing date so that the parties know what they're |
| 12 | working toward and will stay on track, because, as we |
| 13 | know, sometimes when there's not a hard deadline, |
| 14 | things don't get done. |
| 15 | So that's where I think Empire's coming |
| 16 | from. |
| 17 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Mr. Tremaine. |
| 18 | Thank you, Ms. Hardy. |
| 19 | MR. TREMAINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I |
| 20 | don't expect that OCD is going to weigh in on any |
| 21 | discovery disputes. But hearing that there is a |
| 22 | likely motion to quash, and pending further discovery |
| 23 | requests to be exchanged, I would say that OCD's only |
| 24 | real concern is that that discovery's resolved before |
| 25 | we get into briefing and hearings. |
| | |

| 1 | So just simply reiterating my request |
|----|--|
| 2 | that a hearing earlier in the summer does not seem |
| 3 | practical or effective, and we don't want to engage in |
| 4 | an extended hearing if there's discovery disputes |
| 5 | occurring on the eve of that hearing. So I think I |
| 6 | would concur with the tentatively proposed, like, |
| 7 | August date. |
| 8 | The only other thing the Commission |
| 9 | just heard about the PFAS rulemaking petition. I |
| 10 | would just like to highlight for OCD's, like, staff |
| 11 | dedication that having two separate two-week hearings |
| 12 | within the same month period of time is going to be |
| 13 | extremely taxing on the staff. So I would I will |
| 14 | be working with the parties to try and schedule those |
| 15 | relative hearings with a little bit of break in |
| 16 | between so staff can do their regular work as well. |
| 17 | That is just an overarching concern, |
| 18 | because we'll have a lot of preparation in advance. |
| 19 | So these two hearings could take three weeks out of |
| 20 | OCD staff time in the middle of the summer. |
| 21 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Thank you, Mr. |
| 22 | Tremaine. At least from where I sit and I'll turn |
| 23 | it over to my fellow commissioners I'm not I |
| 24 | think there's a little bit more work for the parties |
| 25 | to do to kind of unpack scheduling and other |
| | |

| 1 | components before the Commission just unilaterally |
|----|--|
| 2 | says we're going to do a hearing on X date and Y date |
| 3 | and other pieces. |
| 4 | So at least right now, my inclination |
| 5 | is to set these for another status conference in April |
| 6 | with the direction that I would like the parties to |
| 7 | come in with, ideally, a full scheduling order that |
| 8 | gets it, that sorts of sets it together. |
| 9 | But at a minimum, a scheduling order |
| LO | that resolves any pre-hearing motion, deadlines, |
| L1 | schedules, kind of other pieces, because I think the |
| L2 | Commission is going to need to set that in the near |
| L3 | term to move these cases along. I would also ask the |
| L4 | parties to send us some dates for the hearing. |
| L5 | Again, based on the discussion here, |
| L6 | this sounds like something where the Commission will |
| L7 | need to reserve a week, potentially, of hearing time. |
| L8 | And being mindful of my own and my fellow |
| L9 | commissioners' schedules, we're going to need some |
| 20 | proposed dates to sort of put in and look at and nest |
| 21 | it in with other components. |
| 22 | So those would be sort of the two key |
| 23 | elements that at least I would encourage the parties |
| 24 | to focus on so that we can set a robust scheduling |
| 25 | order and hearing date at the April Commission |
| | |

1 meeting. 2 It sounds like the parties are close but not quite there, and I personally am inclined to 3 allow a little more time to let the parties sort those 4 5 things out and then provide the Commission with some 6 dates that might work so we can buck that up against Commissioner ensure availability for the main hearing 8 and then set some motion hearings and other components 9 in between. 10 And if there are additional information 11 exchanges under the rules provided, for the Oil 12 Conservation Commission to sort of contemplate that in sort of the initial schedule. 13 14 Ms. Shaheen. 15 Thank you, Mr. Chair. MS. SHAHEEN: 16 just want to mention that this was originally set to 17 be heard before the Division in November. And I'm concerned, with all due respect to Mr. Rankin, that 18 Goodnight is using discovery disputes to extend the 19 20 time for hearing. And Empire's willing to go to 2.1 hearing on August. 22 But I'd just like to note for the record that the longer we take to get to hearing, the 23 2.4 more advantageous it is for Goodnight. It continues to inject water on a daily basis in large amounts, and 25

| 1 | it's a disadvantage to Empire for us to keep kicking |
|----|--|
| 2 | the hearing out. |
| 3 | So I would only note for the record |
| 4 | that I'm concerned that discovery disputes will |
| 5 | continue because it's advantageous for Goodnight. And |
| 6 | I encourage the Commission to set a hearing date in |
| 7 | August when we do reconvene in April. Thank you. |
| 8 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Thank you, Ms. |
| 9 | Shaheen. Duly noted. Again, at least from my |
| 10 | perspective, I think I understand the value of setting |
| 11 | a hearing date, if only for my co-commissioners' sort |
| 12 | of scheduling and planning purposes, but also a desire |
| 13 | to move these cases along. |
| 14 | Commissioner Bloom, Commissioner |
| 15 | Ampomah, any thoughts on these scheduling questions? |
| 16 | MR. BLOOM: Mr. Chair, I don't have |
| 17 | anything to add at this time. Thank you. |
| 18 | DR. AMPOMAH: Mr. Chair, I believe you |
| 19 | covered it well, like, we need to have all these dates |
| 20 | in advance so we can plan accordingly. So thank you. |
| 21 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Mr. Rankin. |
| 22 | MR. RANKIN: Mr. Chair, I |
| 23 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Mr. Rankin. |
| 24 | MR. RANKIN: I must address the |
| 25 | allegation that we're delaying. We are not delaying. |
| | Page 52 |

| 1 | Since that case those cases were ready to go to a |
|----|--|
| 2 | hearing there were four cases ready to go to a |
| 3 | hearing in November. Since that time, we identified |
| 4 | some serious concerns around discovery. When we asked |
| 5 | for certain documents, they gave us documents on ROZ |
| 6 | in Lithuania. Okay? It was a joke. |
| 7 | Since that time, they filed ten |
| 8 | applications to revoke Goodnight's injection wells. |
| 9 | That's a much bigger scale. There's a lot of |
| 10 | discovery to do and to get at the root of their |
| 11 | claims. It is not a delay. So I just want to make |
| 12 | I just want to respond to that, because it is a |
| 13 | serious allegation. |
| 14 | We are interested in fully vetting the |
| 15 | claims, and there's a lot of material to go through. |
| 16 | And so that's what we want to present to Commission is |
| 17 | a full vetting of these issues. |
| 18 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Duly noted, Mr. |
| 19 | Rankin. |
| 20 | Again, I would encourage the parties, |
| 21 | when they come back in, in April, to have some more |
| 22 | specific thoughts about open information exchange, |
| 23 | issues that are there, as it pertains to the cases |
| 24 | that are currently before the Commission that are |
| 25 | potentially up for hearing. |

| 1 | And then, at a minimum, come in with a |
|----|--|
| 2 | proposal for a hearing date so that we can look |
| 3 | work backward for motion resolutions and other |
| 4 | components, because I think both the Commission and |
| 5 | I can say this, because I referred the cases up in my |
| 6 | capacity as Division director there was a desire to |
| 7 | resolve these cases, which is why they were referred |
| 8 | up. |
| 9 | And they were referred up because of |
| 10 | the cross-cutting implications for injection in |
| 11 | production operations in a significant area. So we |
| 12 | I think we're aware of the gravity here, but I think |
| 13 | that's the direction to the parties for the next one. |
| 14 | And obviously, if the parties can come to an agreement |
| 15 | on a full scheduling order, great. |
| 16 | But again, at a minimum, we will want |
| 17 | to address ultimate hearing date and some initial |
| 18 | dates for motion hearings and other components to |
| 19 | start keying up these issues for a hearing, because I |
| 20 | am persuaded by the arguments there that when we're in |
| 21 | the actual hearing, we want to get to the merits of |
| 22 | the factual disputes and have resolved sort of |
| 23 | outstanding information exchanges heading into that. |
| 24 | So with that, is there anything else to |
| 25 | add on these cases? Otherwise, we'll move on to the |
| | |

| 1 | next item on the agenda. Thank you, all. |
|----|--|
| 2 | I'm going to give us just a ten-minute |
| 3 | break, and we will reconvene to go into the case |
| 4 | that's set for hearing today, 23655. So we will |
| 5 | reconvene at 10:10. Thank you, all. |
| 6 | UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you. |
| 7 | (Off the record.) |
| 8 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: All right, |
| 9 | everyone. Let's go ahead and resume. |
| LO | Good morning. We are moving onto our |
| L1 | affirmative case that's actually set for hearing, Case |
| L2 | Number 23655, "Application of the Joint Industry |
| L3 | Technical Committee to Amend Order Number R-111-P, Lea |
| L4 | and Eddy Counties, New Mexico." I'm not going to read |
| L5 | the very long caption. |
| L6 | Order R-111-P is long established or |
| L7 | actually, Order R Number 111 and there is a |
| L8 | detailed caption in the agenda. Counsel for the |
| L9 | Commission, Mr. Rubin, had to step away for a court |
| 20 | scheduling conference. He will return or a brief |
| 21 | court hearing. He will return as soon as that's done, |
| 22 | but we'll proceed. |
| 23 | I believe there are three parties that |
| 24 | had entered an appearance in this matter; the Joint |
| 25 | Industry Technical Committee, the Oil Conservation |
| | |

| 1 | Division, and Strata Energy. Have I missed any |
|----|---|
| 2 | parties? Okay. |
| 3 | Seeing counsel for the parties here, I |
| 4 | will turn it over to the applicant, Mr. Feldewert. |
| 5 | MR. FELDEWERT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. |
| 6 | Good morning. I handed to each of you R-111-P, as it |
| 7 | appears on the Division's website. So the font and |
| 8 | the text that you see is not my doing. That's what |
| 9 | you get when you go to the Division's website. |
| LO | And that was enacted in 1988, as you |
| L1 | noted, under Case 9316. And since that time, this |
| L2 | order has governed the drilling of oil and gas wells |
| L3 | in what's called the Known Potash Leasing Area, the |
| L4 | KPLA, which sits down there in Eddy and Lea Counties. |
| L5 | When you look at this order, it |
| L6 | consists of the following components. Pages one |
| L7 | through four of R-111-P is a series of findings, |
| L8 | Paragraphs 1 through 23, which provide a background |
| L9 | for the adoption of this rule back in 1988. |
| 20 | Beginning at the bottom of page four, |
| 21 | you'll see a series of paragraphs, A through J, and |
| 22 | those are the rules and regulations that were adopted |
| 23 | back in 1988 and which currently govern the |
| 24 | exploration and development of oil and gas in this |
| 25 | Known Potash Leasing Area. |

| 1 | And it is these paragraphs some of |
|----|---|
| 2 | these paragraphs that we seek to modify here today. |
| 3 | Then you'll see an "Exhibit A" to this particular |
| 4 | order, towards the back, and it is a listing or a |
| 5 | lengthy legal description of the Known Potash |
| 6 | Leasing Area in Eddy and Lea Counties. It's about |
| 7 | eight pages. We're not changing any of that. |
| 8 | Then "Exhibit B" to this order, which |
| 9 | is at the very end, contains a ten-page statement of |
| 10 | agreement between the potash industry and the oil and |
| 11 | gas industry, which was referenced by the Commission |
| 12 | in '88, and is referenced in their order and was |
| 13 | included as what they said "background information" |
| 14 | for the adoption of the rules. So that's what we |
| 15 | currently have. |
| 16 | You should also know that this KPLA |
| 17 | area is not just governed by Order R-111-P. It's |
| 18 | there's also a secretarial order that was issued by |
| 19 | the Department of Interior in 2012 that governs |
| 20 | federal lands in the Known Potash Leasing Area. But |
| 21 | we're here today to address R-111-P, which has not |
| 22 | been without controversy over the years since its |
| 23 | enactment. |
| 24 | Some of you may have been aware of that |
| 25 | controversy. I was involved in the '90s and early |
| | Page 57 |

| 1 | 2000s in various disputes under R-111-P. However, |
|----|--|
| 2 | with the advent of horizontal drilling and the |
| 3 | establishment of BLM drilling guidelines, that |
| 4 | controversy has largely died down. And this period of |
| 5 | cooperation has resulted in the formation of the |
| 6 | applicant here, the Joint Industry Technical |
| 7 | Committee. |
| 8 | And it consists of representatives of |
| 9 | the potash industry and representatives of the oil and |
| 10 | gas industry. This particular committee is also |
| 11 | recognized in that secretarial order that I talked to |
| 12 | you about, the BLM secretarial order. And a technical |
| 13 | group of this committee has met over the last five or |
| 14 | six years to develop modifications to R-111-P. |
| 15 | And they utilized experts from both |
| 16 | industries, the potash industry and the oil and gas |
| 17 | industry, to come up with these modifications, which |
| 18 | they believe will improve the practices for the safe |
| 19 | and responsible concurrent development of oil and gas |
| 20 | within the Known Potash Leasing Area. |
| 21 | These modifications we've presented to |
| 22 | you in our filings as JIT Exhibits 1, 2, 3, and 4. |
| 23 | (JIT Exhibits 1 through 4 were marked |
| 24 | for identification.) |
| 25 | Exhibit 4 contains the rule with all |
| | Page 58 |

| 1 | the proposed modifications that we ask to be adopted. |
|----|--|
| 2 | And let me briefly discuss how we the interplay |
| 3 | here between Exhibits 1, 2, 3, and 4. |
| 4 | So what we initially did is, we took |
| 5 | this wonderful order on the Division's website, |
| 6 | converted it into Word, and then took that and began |
| 7 | to do the modifications in redline, strikeout format. |
| 8 | So if you look at what we filed, which begins on page |
| 9 | 10 of our 180-page PDF filed last week, you'll see the |
| LO | modifications to this R-111-P that were initially |
| L1 | proposed. |
| L2 | And the yellow shaded and underlined |
| L3 | text is what we had proposed to add to the rule, and |
| L4 | the red shaded text with a line or strikeout through |
| L5 | it is signifies text that this committee has |
| L6 | determined should be removed. And when you go through |
| L7 | that Exhibit 1, you're going to see significant |
| L8 | redlines. |
| L9 | And that's because the committee |
| 20 | developed new anti-collision measures, more stringent |
| 21 | well casing and cementing requirements for the surface |
| 22 | casing string, the salt protection string, the |
| 23 | intermediate casing string for deep oil and gas wells, |
| 24 | and the production casing string. They also put |
| 25 | together new notification requirements to potash |
| | |

1 operators. There's new subsidence monitoring 2 requirements in this rule. And then there were 3 4 various edits that were necessary to update, clarify, 5 and actually correct some of the text of the rule, to conform with the proposed modifications. So Exhibit 1 6 is your anchor back to the current rule. 8 And Exhibit 2, when we filed our 9 application, we took those redline strikeouts and made a clean version, and that was our Exhibit Number 2. 10 11 But you can largely ignore that now, and that's 12 because since the filing of that Exhibit Number 2, there's been a lot of discussions between the parties 13 14 who entered an appearance. 15 Strata Production Company, the 16 Division, and even the Joint Industry Technical 17 Committee, in looking at that Exhibit 2, noticed some additional corrections that needed to be made. 18 So 19 since the filing of our application, there has been 20 some good, productive wordsmithing that resulted then 2.1 in some redlines to what we filed as Exhibit Number 2. 22 And that is Exhibit Number 3. 23 So I want to be clear. That starts on page 33 of our PDF. Exhibit Number 3 shows the 2.4 25 modifications to what we filed as Exhibit Number 2.

| 1 | And recall, Exhibit Number 2 is a clean version of the |
|----|--|
| 2 | modifications that are shown in Exhibit 1. These |
| 3 | additional changes in Exhibit Number 3, again, the |
| 4 | added language is shown in either red or blue text and |
| 5 | underlined, the language removed or changed is shown |
| 6 | with a line or strike through it. |
| 7 | And when you go through Exhibit Number |
| 8 | 3, you're going to see some language that's |
| 9 | highlighted in yellow. And the reason we left that in |
| 10 | there is because that was language that the Division |
| 11 | proposed should be added or stricken from the rule. |
| 12 | So, for example, if you go to page one of Exhibit |
| 13 | Number 3, you're going to see yellow text, where we |
| 14 | added the word "production." |
| 15 | If you go to page ten of Exhibit Number |
| 16 | 3, there's some language that was added to Paragraph |
| 17 | i5. It's highlighted in yellow, because that was |
| 18 | language that the Division requested. And I'm going |
| 19 | to let them address as needed, but I understand that |
| 20 | this limits the burden on the Division to monitor |
| 21 | drilling locations when BLM drilling islands and |
| 22 | development areas are used by oil and gas operators. |
| 23 | So that's what Exhibit 3 is. And then |
| 24 | Exhibit 4 is everything. Exhibit 4 is the final |
| 25 | proposed rule with all modifications accepted. It |

| 1 | begins on page 45 of our PDF. That's this is what |
|----|--|
| 2 | we ask the Commission to adopt as the new rules. Now, |
| 3 | when you look at that Exhibit 4, we've included within |
| 4 | that legal description, towards the end. |
| 5 | But when you go to that legal |
| 6 | description and I just noticed this the other night |
| 7 | you'll see it's an "Exhibit A," just like we took |
| 8 | it from R-111-P, but you'll see the top. It says |
| 9 | "Exhibit A, Case 9316, Order R-111-P." When you adopt |
| 10 | this rule, and we hope you do, you're probably going |
| 11 | to need to change the heading. Okay? |
| 12 | Then we've included let me share |
| 13 | here, if I may. Can you see that in front of you? |
| 14 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Okay. |
| 15 | MR. FELDEWERT: So that's that "Exhibit |
| 16 | A" in our Exhibit 4 that, you know, we'll need to |
| 17 | change that heading okay when the new rule gets |
| 18 | adopted. The other thing you'll see with our Exhibit |
| 19 | 4 and this was in our initial filings, but they've |
| 20 | been modified somewhat and that is we included an |
| 21 | "Exhibit B" to the proposed order. |
| 22 | It is a series of wellbore diagrams, |
| 23 | "Figures A through F," and they begin on page 65 of |
| 24 | our PDF. These diagrams are referenced in the |
| 25 | proposed rule, and they were referenced and they |
| | |

| 1 | are added because we believe they will assist those |
|----|--|
| 2 | who are reading the rule to understand the wellbore |
| 3 | integrity requirements. |
| 4 | So we encourage you to adopt these |
| 5 | figures as part of the rule. They make it very clear |
| 6 | what is now required or what will be required in |
| 7 | the Known Potash Leasing Area. So before I move to |
| 8 | our other exhibits, are there any questions about that |
| 9 | interplay between Exhibits 1, 2, 3, and 4? |
| 10 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Thank you. No. |
| 11 | Not on my end. And just to clarify for the record, |
| 12 | the only error are some in Exhibit 4, the proposal |
| 13 | from the JITC, is to adopt that as a R-111-Q, if we |
| 14 | were to approve it, and just some clerical errors, |
| 15 | cleaning it up. But Exhibit 4 includes everything |
| 16 | that you would propose including? |
| 17 | MR. FELDEWERT: Yes, sir. And I do |
| 18 | agree. I would and this was at the end of my spiel |
| 19 | here. But while you're on that, I would encourage you |
| 20 | to adopt to this R-111-Q for a couple reasons. One, |
| 21 | for historical reasons, so we maintain the evolution |
| 22 | of this, and also to make it easier to tie back to the |
| 23 | prior rules. |
| 24 | So if our system allows you to do it |
| 25 | which I hope it does hopefully, this could be R- |
| | Page 63 |

| Τ | III-Q. Okay? All right. |
|----|--|
| 2 | Then we have our next four set of |
| 3 | exhibits, Exhibits 4 Exhibits 5, 6, 7, and 8, are |
| 4 | the self-affirmed statements of the witnesses that we |
| 5 | have offered in support of these rules. |
| 6 | (JIT Exhibit 5 through Exhibit 8 were |
| 7 | marked for identification.) |
| 8 | There are two witnesses from the potash |
| 9 | industry, and there are two witnesses from the oil and |
| 10 | gas industry. And each witness was involved in the |
| 11 | development of these proposed modifications. |
| 12 | Exhibit 5 is the self-affirmed |
| 13 | statement of Dan Morehouse. He's here today. He was |
| 14 | the mine engineer for Mosaics Potash Mining near |
| 15 | Carlsbad for many years, and we believe his |
| 16 | credentials qualify him as an expert witness on potash |
| 17 | mining and the potential impact on mining operations |
| 18 | in potash reserves from oil and gas development. |
| 19 | Mr. Morehouse was a member of the |
| 20 | what they call the Wellbore Integrity Working Group |
| 21 | within the JITC that developed the technical aspects |
| 22 | of this proposed rule. And Mr. Morehouse, in his |
| 23 | self-affirmed statement, discusses the JITC, the |
| 24 | applicant here. He discusses the consensus |
| 25 | building the significant consensus building that |
| | Page 64 |

1 resulted in these proposed modifications. 2 And he's here today for any questions 3 that you may have about that. Okay? Exhibit Number 6 is the self-affirmed 4 5 statement of William Morgan. He's employed by 6 Intrepid Potash and was previously a completions and production engineer with Mewbourne Oil Company. 8 believe his credentials and background qualify him as 9 an expert witness in oil and gas drilling and the potential impact on potash mining and potash reserves 10 11 from oil and gas development. 12 He discusses in his statement kind of 13 what I went through with JIT Exhibits 1 through 4, and he also discusses the new subsidence monitoring 14 15 provisions that are placed within this rule. He's 16 here, present by video, if you have any questions for 17 him. Okay? Exhibit 7 is the self-affirmed 18 19 statement of Greg Caraway. He's employed by 20 Occidental Petroleum as a reservoir engineer/advisor. 2.1 We believe his credentials likewise qualify him as an 22 expert witness in oil and gas drilling, reservoir 23 engineering, and the potential impact of oil and gas 2.4 development on potash. 25 He was also a member of that working

| 1 | group that developed the technical aspects of these |
|----|--|
| 2 | proposed rules. And he addresses the changes to |
| 3 | "Section C," which is requirements for drilling in the |
| 4 | potash area. He summarizes the new anti-collision |
| 5 | measures and the new casing string requirements in |
| 6 | "Subpart D," as in David, and he addresses |
| 7 | specifically "Section E," which discusses the fluid to |
| 8 | be used while drilling through the salt section. |
| 9 | He addresses the new notification |
| 10 | requirements to potash operators in "Section F," and |
| 11 | he discusses the changes in "Section H" to the cement |
| 12 | used for plugging wells. He's also available by video |
| 13 | if you have any questions on those topics. |
| 14 | Exhibit 8, then, is our self-affirmed |
| 15 | statement from Alex Podust. He's a well-servicing |
| 16 | engineer/advisor with ExxonMobil. His credentials |
| 17 | qualify him, we believe, as an expert witness in oil |
| 18 | and gas drilling and the potential impact on potash. |
| 19 | He was a leading member of that work |
| 20 | group within the JITC that developed the technical |
| 21 | aspects of these proposed rules. And he addresses |
| 22 | most of those technical aspects in the "Key |
| 23 | Provisions." For example, the new anti-collision |
| 24 | measures in "D2," the surface casing string |
| 25 | requirements in "D3," the salt protection stream |
| | |

| 1 | requirements in "D4," as well as the two wellbore |
|----|--|
| 2 | design methods that are provided to operators and are |
| 3 | part of the figures that are attached to the rule. |
| 4 | He addresses the intermediate casing |
| 5 | string requirements in "D5," which includes the |
| 6 | wellbore diagrams associated with the four design |
| 7 | methods that the rule provides to operators. And then |
| 8 | he addresses the more stringent standards for the |
| 9 | production casing string in "D6." And you'll see that |
| 10 | he also then developed our Exhibits 9 and 10. |
| 11 | (JIT Exhibit 9 and Exhibit 10 were |
| 12 | marked for identification.) |
| 13 | Exhibit 9 talks about the separation |
| 14 | factor, which is discussed and utilized in the new |
| 15 | anti-collision provisions. And then Exhibit 10 talks |
| 16 | about, more specifically, and addresses with some text |
| 17 | the figures that you see as "A through F" in our |
| 18 | proposed modifications. Mr. Podust is here in the |
| 19 | room if you have questions for him. |
| 20 | Then our remaining exhibits deal with |
| 21 | notice issues okay my Exhibit 11 and 12. |
| 22 | (Exhibit 11 and Exhibit 12 were marked |
| 23 | for identification.) |
| 24 | And I think it's important to point out |
| 25 | that since these rules are not statewide rules |
| | Page 67 |

| 1 | okay they are limited to the Potash Area. |
|----|---|
| 2 | Therefore, the notice requirements are actually found |
| 3 | under the "Adjudicatory Provisions," which is Rule 4 |
| 4 | of the Division's rules, and, specifically, |
| 5 | 19.15.4.12A5, which is labeled "Special Orders |
| 6 | Regarding Any Division-Designated Potash Area." |
| 7 | That's what we have here. |
| 8 | And it required that notice be sent by |
| 9 | Certified Mail to all potash lessees, oil and gas |
| 10 | operators, oil and gas lessees, and unleased mineral |
| 11 | owners of record, within the designated Potash Area. |
| 12 | The Joint Interest [sic] Technical Committee compiled |
| 13 | this notice list of affected parties from the BLM |
| 14 | email list that is used for all potash notices |
| 15 | that's a pretty good source and then the records of |
| 16 | the potash companies and the oil and gas companies |
| 17 | that participated in this Joint Industry Technical |
| 18 | Committee. |
| 19 | We also included notice to the BLM and |
| 20 | to the New Mexico State Land Office. So Exhibit 11 is |
| 21 | my affidavit, reflecting that notice of this |
| 22 | application was provided to this extensive list. We |
| 23 | also note that we included more than one address for |
| 24 | some affected parties, to be overly inclusive, and we |
| 25 | included email addresses where we could not find a |
| | |

| 1 | mailing address for a particular party, again, that |
|----|--|
| 2 | email address coming from the BLM. |
| 3 | Exhibit 12, then and this is the |
| 4 | last exhibit is the affidavit of publication from |
| 5 | two local newspapers, the "Carlsbad Current-Argus" and |
| 6 | then the "Hobbs Sun News." And the notice of this |
| 7 | application, the notice of this hearing, was directed |
| 8 | by name to each of those affected parties. So that's |
| 9 | what we have provided to you. |
| 10 | And I think it's important to know that |
| 11 | these proposed modifications is a culmination of years |
| 12 | of cooperative study and collaboration between the |
| 13 | potash industry and the oil and gas industry, done by |
| 14 | experts from both industry. And I think the testament |
| 15 | to the collaborative effort is the absence of any |
| 16 | objection to these proposed modifications. |
| 17 | And we believe that the evidence |
| 18 | presented demonstrates that the adoption of these |
| 19 | proposed modifications to R-111-P will promote the |
| 20 | safe and responsible concurrent development of oil and |
| 21 | gas and potash within the Known Potash Leasing Area. |
| 22 | It'll prevent the undue waste of commercially |
| 23 | recoverable potash and oil and gas resources and |
| 24 | protect correlative rights. |
| 25 | So I request that Exhibits 1 through 12 |
| | Page 69 |

| 1 | be admitted into the record and that the Commission |
|----|---|
| 2 | adopt the new rules that are reflected in our Exhibit |
| 3 | 4. |
| 4 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Your request to |
| 5 | put those exhibits into the record is granted. |
| 6 | I'm going to turn to Mr. Tremaine for |
| 7 | some opening remarks and then Mr. Shaheen. |
| 8 | MR. TREMAINE: Mr. Chair, I'll be very |
| 9 | brief. We concur with Mr. Feldewert. This has been a |
| 10 | long collaborative and iterative process. OCD entered |
| 11 | an appearance to ensure that certain concerns and |
| 12 | updates were being proposed. |
| 13 | The Division has long engaged with the |
| 14 | JITC generally and has had input in this process, |
| 15 | generally, but more specifically, responded with |
| 16 | specific but limited editing comments to the initial |
| 17 | proposal. And so as far as the proceedings of the |
| 18 | hearing today, we intend to participate and make Mr. |
| 19 | Powell, OCD's Deputy Director, and Mr. Philip Goetz, |
| 20 | USC Program Manager, available if the Commission |
| 21 | wishes to engage with any questions regarding OCD's |
| 22 | comments, feedback. |
| 23 | But in sum, the scope and extent of |
| 24 | this process and then the inclusion and the manner in |
| 25 | which the applicant addressed OCD's concerns with the |
| 25 | which the applicant addressed OCD's concerns with |

| 1 | edits, which are now reflected in Exhibits 3 and 4, do |
|----|--|
| 2 | adequately address OCD's concerns. And so OCD is here |
| 3 | to support adoption of the of Exhibit 4, with |
| 4 | reliance on the information and testimony provided by |
| 5 | the witnesses presented by the applicant. |
| 6 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Thank you. |
| 7 | Ms. Shaheen. |
| 8 | MS. SHAHEEN: Thank you. Strata |
| 9 | likewise concurs with the proposed amendments as |
| 10 | they're set forth in Exhibits 3 and 4. It appreciates |
| 11 | both the JITC participants' and OCD's engagement with |
| 12 | Strata's concerns and joins in asking that the |
| 13 | Commission adopt the amendments to the rule as |
| 14 | proposed. |
| 15 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Thank you. |
| 16 | I guess I'll start with maybe just sort |
| 17 | of an open question both to my fellow Commissioners |
| 18 | and the parties. The JITC's application materials, I |
| 19 | found them to be comprehensive and detailed in terms |
| 20 | of written testimony and other things like that. |
| 21 | So in terms of just managing the |
| 22 | proceedings here, would like to proceed would like |
| 23 | some thoughts from the parties and other things like |
| 24 | that, areas where we have questions, need to present |
| 25 | witnesses, versus more comfortable with sort of the |

| 1 | representation and the records or other pieces. |
|----|--|
| 2 | What's the sort of plan here, since it |
| 3 | sounds like we have some consensus update or |
| 4 | suggestions about the need to put and I am mindful |
| 5 | of the need to ensure that the Commission has a robust |
| 6 | record, sort of before, and then I do want to hear |
| 7 | from my, you know, fellow commissioners about their |
| 8 | thoughts about the filings and areas where they may |
| 9 | have questions as we before moving to the next |
| 10 | steps. |
| 11 | MR. BLOOM: Mr. Chair, it is a little |
| 12 | bit different than some of our other hearings because |
| 13 | we have consensus in front of us, and, you know, kudos |
| 14 | to the parties here. It's not often that we have |
| 15 | complete agreement between oil and gas, potash, and |
| 16 | the OCD. So it is wonderful, which I know you'll |
| 17 | get into this a little bit more, Mr. Chair, about how |
| 18 | we will proceed today. |
| 19 | I may have some well, I will have |
| 20 | one question about the anti-collision measures. When |
| 21 | I reviewed that, I just couldn't quite get my head |
| 22 | around that. But my questions would be limited to |
| 23 | that. Thank you. |
| 24 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Dr. Ampomah. |
| 25 | DR. AMPOMAH: Mr. Chair, thanks so |
| | Page 72 |

| 1 | much. So I'm still reviewing through all the |
|----|--|
| 2 | materials and, as Commissioner Bloom said, it's so |
| 3 | exciting to have a consensus here. And I also do have |
| 4 | some few questions with regards to wellbore diagram, |
| 5 | and then also the subsidence monitoring. I'll |
| 6 | probably limit my questions to those pieces. Thank |
| 7 | you. |
| 8 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: So it just |
| 9 | sounds like, at least preliminarily, the commissioners |
| 10 | may have questions for Mr. Caraway, and I forget who |
| 11 | discussed subsidence, and Mr. Morgan. |
| 12 | DR. AMPOMAH: Yes. |
| 13 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: But, Mr. |
| 14 | Feldewert, question posed to you about thoughts about |
| 15 | proceeding there. But it sounds like we may want to |
| 16 | hear or at least pose some questions to those |
| 17 | witnesses. |
| 18 | MR. FELDEWERT: Yes. And that's why |
| 19 | we're here. I mean, first off, in my humble opinion, |
| 20 | the Commission has in the record what it needs to |
| 21 | adopt the rules, because we were purposely very |
| 22 | specific in making sure that we covered what we needed |
| 23 | to cover. So, you know, this can be a fairly short |
| 24 | hearing. |
| 25 | And but we do have the witnesses |
| | |

| 1 | available to discuss the topics that for which you |
|----|---|
| 2 | have questions. And when you're ready, we can proceed |
| 3 | to do that. |
| 4 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Mr. Tremaine, |
| 5 | and then Ms. Shaheen, any concern with just calling |
| 6 | the witnesses for whom the Commission has questions |
| 7 | and otherwise relying on the written statements filed |
| 8 | in the record? |
| 9 | MR. TREMAINE: No objection to adoption |
| 10 | and noting the written testimony and proceeding |
| 11 | directly to questions or any cross-examination, Mr. |
| 12 | Chair. |
| 13 | MS. SHAHEEN: No objection from Strata. |
| 14 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Even though I |
| 15 | know it was presented in a different order in the |
| 16 | filing, I think we'll call Mr. Caraway, who I believe |
| 17 | you said, Mr. Feldewert, is available online? |
| 18 | MR. FELDEWERT: Yes, sir. |
| 19 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: I'm going to ask |
| 20 | the court reporter to swear him in when we confirm |
| 21 | that he's connected to the audio. |
| 22 | Mr. Caraway, can you confirm you can |
| 23 | hear us and speak? |
| 24 | MR. CARAWAY: Yes. I can. Can you |
| 25 | hear me? |
| | |

| 1 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: We can hear you, |
|----|--|
| 2 | and we can see you. Thank you very much. |
| 3 | MR. CARAWAY: Thank you. |
| 4 | I'm going to ask the court reporter to |
| 5 | swear you in. |
| 6 | THE REPORTER: Please raise your right |
| 7 | hand. |
| 8 | WHEREUPON, |
| 9 | GREG CARAWAY, |
| 10 | called as a witness and having been first duly sworn |
| 11 | to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but |
| 12 | the truth, was examined and testified as follows: |
| 13 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: All right. And, |
| 14 | Mr. Caraway, just for the record, but I'd like you to |
| 15 | just confirm it for the record, what's in JITC Exhibit |
| 16 | 7, your self-affirmed statement, can you confirm that |
| 17 | you prepared that statement? |
| 18 | THE WITNESS: Yes. I did. |
| 19 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Did you work |
| 20 | with anyone or get help with anyone on it? |
| 21 | THE WITNESS: I think Mr. Feldewert |
| 22 | helped to adjust some of maybe the verbiage of how I |
| 23 | had written some of the some of the testimony. |
| 24 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: But it otherwise |
| 25 | reflects your opinions and positions on the matters |
| | |
| | Page 75 |

| 1 | discussed therein? |
|----|--|
| 2 | THE WITNESS: That is correct. |
| 3 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Based on the |
| 4 | self-affirmed statement, and unless there's an |
| 5 | objection from the parties, I'll just note for the |
| 6 | record that the Commission will recognize Mr. Caraway |
| 7 | as an expert in petroleum engineering for the purposes |
| 8 | of the matters discussed in his testimony. |
| 9 | And I'm going to turn it over to |
| 10 | Commissioner Bloom to pose his questions concerning |
| 11 | your written statements. |
| 12 | EXAMINATION |
| 13 | BY MR. BLOOM: |
| 14 | Q All right. Thank you, Mr. Caraway. |
| 15 | Appreciate your time today. Can you hear me okay? |
| 16 | A Yes. I can. |
| 17 | Q All right. Thank you. Could you just walk |
| 18 | me through the separation factor I believe there's |
| 19 | a simple mathematical equation that represents that |
| 20 | and explain to me how this helps prevent or ensures |
| 21 | that there are not collisions? |
| 22 | A Sure. And and I'm happy to provide the |
| 23 | testimony on this. I think Mr. Podust actually may |
| 24 | may be the better witness to testify to this. |
| 25 | MR. FELDEWERT: Yeah. Let me |
| | |

| 1 | interject. Not knowing what the question was, yes. |
|-----|--|
| 2 | The separation factor and actually the exhibit on that |
| | |
| 3 | separation factor was done by Mr. Podust. |
| 4 | MR. BLOOM: Well, then, I think we |
| 5 | should hear from Mr. Podust, yes. |
| 6 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Okay. |
| 7 | MR. FELDEWERT: Unless there's other |
| 8 | questions for Mr. Caraway. |
| 9 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Do we have any |
| 10 | other questions for Mr. Caraway? Do we have any other |
| 11 | questions for Mr. Caraway? His testimony also covered |
| 12 | surface casing strings, but I believe more detailed |
| 13 | discussion is also Mr. Podust, the salt production |
| 14 | casing strings and sort of other components. |
| 15 | Is there anything in his testimony that |
| 16 | we have questions on? Otherwise, we'll call Mr. |
| 17 | Podust. |
| 18 | DR. AMPOMAH: Yes. I do. |
| 19 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Okay. |
| 20 | Commissioner Ampomah. |
| 21 | DR. AMPOMAH: Thank you. |
| 22 | EXAMINATION |
| 23 | BY DR. AMPOMAH: |
| 24 | Q So the first question will be, you know, in |
| 25 | your statement, you talked about only new casings are |
| ر د | Jour Beacement, you carred about only new castings are |
| | |

| 1 | recommended instead of used. So I would like to hear |
|--|--|
| 2 | more about, you know, the process that you went |
| 3 | through to more or less come to that conclusion? |
| 4 | A Sure. So during the discussions with our |
| 5 | counterparts in the in the mining industry, we |
| 6 | talked through a little bit about what used versus new |
| 7 | casing means and and what some of those |
| 8 | implications are. |
| 9 | The the main reason that we decided to |
| 10 | adjust the verbiage to to new casing was that with |
| 11 | new casing, you are you know, there are a set of |
| 12 | standards with minimum wall thickness that that are |
| 13 | going to be achieved with that casing. |
| 14 | And so, given the criticality of the casing |
| | |
| 15 | integrity in these in these areas, we wanted to |
| 15 16 | integrity in these in these areas, we wanted to make sure that, you know, that there wasn't any |
| | |
| 16 | make sure that, you know, that there wasn't any |
| 16 17 | make sure that, you know, that there wasn't any opportunity for substandard casing to enter the |
| 16 17 18 | make sure that, you know, that there wasn't any opportunity for substandard casing to enter the wellbore and provide a potential reduction in |
| 16 17 18 19 | make sure that, you know, that there wasn't any opportunity for substandard casing to enter the wellbore and provide a potential reduction in integrity of the well design. |
| 16 17 18 19 20 | make sure that, you know, that there wasn't any opportunity for substandard casing to enter the wellbore and provide a potential reduction in integrity of the well design. So that's why we proposed that we would |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 | make sure that, you know, that there wasn't any opportunity for substandard casing to enter the wellbore and provide a potential reduction in integrity of the well design. So that's why we proposed that we would that that any casing installed should be new casing |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 | make sure that, you know, that there wasn't any opportunity for substandard casing to enter the wellbore and provide a potential reduction in integrity of the well design. So that's why we proposed that we would that that any casing installed should be new casing to to maintain the integrity and to make sure that |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | make sure that, you know, that there wasn't any opportunity for substandard casing to enter the wellbore and provide a potential reduction in integrity of the well design. So that's why we proposed that we would that that any casing installed should be new casing to to maintain the integrity and to make sure that we do meet the minimum requirements that are desired |

| 1 | question will be, are there any proposed modification |
|----|--|
| 2 | to existing well completions, you know, based on the |
| 3 | response that you gave? |
| 4 | A I don't I don't believe so. Not at this |
| 5 | time in in the way that we complete the wells. |
| 6 | Q Yeah. So, then, in that case, what is the |
| 7 | impact of the existing completions? You know, so you |
| 8 | have new completions coming in with more advanced |
| 9 | completion technique, and you do have existing wells, |
| LO | more or less probably with suboptimal completions. |
| L1 | So what is the impact, you know, where you |
| L2 | have new ones and then existing ones? So what is the |
| L3 | impact, you know, in terms of the integrity on what we |
| L4 | are trying to prevent here? |
| L5 | A And I'm I'm not sure that I understand |
| L6 | the question. |
| L7 | Q Let me rephrase that. |
| L8 | A Can you clarify? |
| L9 | Q So you do have new completion techniques |
| 20 | that you want to let's say the new any new |
| 21 | completion, any new drilling would have to follow |
| 22 | these new completions. My concern is, what about the |
| 23 | existing completions? And how are they, you know, |
| 24 | going the overall program that you're trying to |
| 25 | more like the amendments? |
| | |

| 1 | How are we going to achieve the objectives |
|----|---|
| 2 | of these amendment when you have these existing |
| 3 | completions still in existence? |
| 4 | A Sure. So I think that with the way that |
| 5 | we've did reworded the requirements, I think |
| 6 | that, in my opinion, the the current and potential |
| 7 | future completions designs need to fit within those |
| 8 | design requirements. |
| 9 | And and under the current conditions or |
| 10 | design requirements, they they do fit within the |
| 11 | design. And then to make sure that we do have a sound |
| 12 | engineering design to to maintain the integrity of |
| 13 | the well. |
| 14 | Q So you talked about evidence-based waiting |
| 15 | time of the cement. So how are you going to quantify |
| 16 | that? Or how are you going to measure that? |
| 17 | A Sure. So what can be done is on a batch. |
| 18 | When we run a a cement blend, prior to running it, |
| 19 | we can start doing a a test as well on that actual |
| 20 | cement through a laboratory test and model it under |
| 21 | the same conditions that are going to be present in |
| 22 | the wellbore. |
| 23 | And we can monitor what that cement |
| 24 | integrity will look like at a specified time and |
| 25 | understand the compressive strength that that cement |
| | |

1 has gained over that time period. 2 So I presume we will run something like CBL 3 to quantify the integrity of the cement as part of the process, too? 4 5 Not necessarily. No. Okay. Yeah. So if "not necessarily," then 6 7 what is the evidence based? Because you talked about 8 so you can do -- when -- as you are planning, you can 9 do all this modeling in the lab to more or less know 10 the cement integrity. 11 But what is the evidence based right at the 12 site, the field, whilst we are drilling, that we are 13 going to use here? 14 Α Sure. So for -- as an example, for the salt 15 string, the -- that's of concern, the -- the cement 16 should achieve -- cement returns to surface. And then 17 we did have some modification to the language, with the Division's input, that if and when cement is not 18 19 returned to surface, then additional things, like a 20 CBL, would be required. 2.1 You know, I looked through the wellbore 22 designs. These are really comprehensive. So are these options for operators to choose, or there is 23 24 more stringent option? Are all these -- so you 25 presume multiple of them.

| 1 | So are these authorities, and are they new |
|----|--|
| 2 | processes for, let's say, an operator to choose which |
| 3 | option they want to use? |
| 4 | A Correct. So the the intent was to give |
| 5 | operators flexibility, but also, again, maintaining |
| 6 | the integrity of the design and the processes, to make |
| 7 | sure that we would maintain the integrity of the |
| 8 | design. So as an example, in general, the the |
| 9 | one of the requests from the potash miners was to be |
| 10 | able to monitor for potential pressure on the back |
| 11 | side. |
| 12 | And so all of these designs reflect the |
| 13 | ability to do so, to understand long-term what is the |
| 14 | integrity of the well. |
| 15 | Q Thank you so much. |
| 16 | DR. AMPOMAH: Mr. Chair, thanks. |
| 17 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Any other |
| 18 | questions for this witness? |
| 19 | Seeing none, Mr. Caraway, you are |
| 20 | Oh, Mr. Tremaine. |
| 21 | MR. TREMAINE: Yes. Sorry, Mr. Chair. |
| 22 | EXAMINATION |
| 23 | BY MR. TREMAINE: |
| 24 | Q Just a clarifying question here. I'd just |
| 25 | like to clarify with the witness that the proposal |
| | Page 82 |

| 1 | would require a four string in the capital reef. Oh, |
|----|---|
| 2 | sorry, Capitan Reef. |
| 3 | A Yes. I believe that that was one of the |
| 4 | modifications that we made with the Division's input. |
| 5 | MR. TREMAINE: That's my only question, |
| 6 | Mr. Chair. Thank you. |
| 7 | DR. AMPOMAH: Mr. Chair, can I clarify? |
| 8 | EXAMINATION |
| 9 | BY DR. AMPOMAH: |
| 10 | Q So but I do see three strings in there as |
| 11 | an option. So not necessarily four. Four is an |
| 12 | option, but three, too, is an option here. So if we |
| 13 | can clarify that? |
| 14 | A Sure. So the the Capitan Reef is does |
| 15 | not cover the entirety of the KPLA area. And so areas |
| 16 | outside of the Capitan Reef, a three string is |
| 17 | possible. The Division's concern was in areas where |
| 18 | the the Capitan Reef is present that there be a |
| 19 | four-string requirement. |
| 20 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Mr. Caraway, for |
| 21 | the record, can you tell us where that requirement is |
| 22 | reflected in the proposed order? |
| 23 | MR. FELDEWERT: I may be able to help. |
| 24 | Go ahead, Mr. Caraway. I believe I |
| 25 | have it up on |
| | |

| 1 | THE WITNESS: It's |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. FELDEWERT: Do I have it up on the |
| 3 | screen, Mr. Caraway? |
| 4 | THE WITNESS: I believe so. Yes. |
| 5 | That's the and and then that's actually |
| 6 | highlighted. I think it's the the verbiage that we |
| 7 | included at the request of the Division, that a second |
| 8 | intermediate casing string required in areas of the |
| 9 | Capitan Reef. |
| 10 | MR. FELDEWERT: And I believe that's |
| 11 | page 39 of our 180-page PDF. |
| 12 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Perfect. |
| 13 | Any additional questions for Mr. |
| 14 | Caraway? |
| 15 | Hearing one none or seeing none, |
| 16 | Mr. Caraway, you may be excused. |
| 17 | THE WITNESS: Thank you so much. |
| 18 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: I'm going to |
| 19 | call next Mr. Alexey Podust. Please come up. |
| 20 | And then I would ask the court reporter |
| 21 | to swear Mr. Podust in. |
| 22 | THE REPORTER: Please raise your right |
| 23 | hand. |
| 24 | // |
| 25 | // |
| | Page 84 |
| | |

| 1 | WHEREUPON, |
|----|--|
| 2 | ALEXEY PODUST, |
| 3 | called as a witness and having been first duly sworn |
| 4 | to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but |
| 5 | the truth, was examined and testified as follows: |
| 6 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Mr. Podust, as I |
| 7 | did with Mr. Caraway, just for the record, because of |
| 8 | the nature of how we're posting it, can you confirm |
| 9 | that well, give me one second that the statement |
| 10 | provided in Exhibit 8 was prepared by you? |
| 11 | THE WITNESS: Yes. It is. |
| 12 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Did anyone |
| 13 | assist you with the statement? |
| 14 | THE WITNESS: Yes. Mr. Feldewert |
| 15 | helped me, you know, modify some of the wording. But |
| 16 | the the you know, statement is all mine. |
| 17 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Okay. Thank |
| 18 | you. For the record and based on the statements in |
| 19 | your self-affirmed affidavit, the Commission will |
| 20 | recognize you as an expert in the field of well |
| 21 | development, petroleum engineering, and other pieces |
| 22 | for purposes of the matters covered in your statement, |
| 23 | unless there's an objection. |
| 24 | Seeing none, I'm going to turn it over |
| 25 | to Commissioner Bloom for his questions about the |
| | |

| 1 | anti-collision measures. |
|----|--|
| 2 | EXAMINATION |
| 3 | BY MR. BLOOM: |
| 4 | Q Okay. Thank you, Mr. Podust, for your time |
| 5 | today. Not sure to begin with this one, but I know |
| 6 | there's an equation, and I think Mr. Feldewert said |
| 7 | that it might be referenced here in one of the |
| 8 | exhibits. Is that correct? |
| 9 | MR. FELDEWERT: Let me give me a |
| 10 | minute, and I'll try to get to the language. Here we |
| 11 | go. Can you see that? |
| 12 | MR. BLOOM: Yes. I see the language. |
| 13 | THE WITNESS: Believe it's going to be |
| 14 | in the it's the PowerPoint slide attachments in |
| 15 | that's part of my witness testimony. |
| 16 | MR. FELDEWERT: Okay. So I'm going to |
| 17 | move to JIT Exhibit 9. |
| 18 | THE WITNESS: Yep. I think it's the |
| 19 | next page there. Is that the one that you were |
| 20 | talking about right there on this slide? |
| 21 | BY MR. BLOOM: |
| 22 | Q That is the one. Yes. So perhaps if you |
| 23 | could walk us through that, I'd actually when I was |
| 24 | doing a little bit of research found a slightly |
| 25 | different equation and but if you could walk us |
| | |

1 through that, that would be a great start. Thank you. 2 Α Well, I can just -- do I need to provide any background on what's, you know -- on wellbore --3 wellbore surveying, or just talk to the -- to the 4 5 specific equation here? 6 Yeah. I mean, I -- and let me tell you 7 where I'm going with that. So you could have a 8 situation where a separation factor of 1 or just 9 greater than 1 could be wells -- wellbores just essentially right next to each other. Correct? 10 11 So it's -- when you're talking about 12 wellbore surveying -- right -- it -- it's a 13 statistical analysis -- right. So where your wellbore survey is calculated at, and then the -- the ellipse 14 15 of uncertainty separation forms a three-dimensional 16 shape, where with 95-percent certainty you can say 17 that the wellbore is -- is located. 18 0 Okay. And I quess where I'm going is, I just want to understand what ensures that there's not 19 20 a collision? And is there a minimum distance, for 2.1 example, that has to separate the wellbores? 22 There's not a minimum distance, because Α it -- it comes back to the ellipse of uncertainty, and 23 24 the specific tools that were used for the surveying, and the errors that are associated with those tools. 25 Page 87

| 1 | The the ellipse of uncertainty is formed because |
|----|---|
| 2 | the surveying tools that you use are not perfect. |
| 3 | There's errors associated with them. |
| 4 | And the survey is a series of measurements |
| 5 | as you go down the well, and those errors accumulate. |
| 6 | So the ellipse of uncertainty grows. And you cannot |
| 7 | really say with 100-percent certainty where a given |
| 8 | wellbore is located. So the 95-percent rule is the |
| 9 | industry adopted commonly adopted number. |
| 10 | Q Okay. Is there perhaps the language is |
| 11 | elsewhere. Perhaps it's in OCD regulations that shows |
| 12 | how wellbores are separated. |
| 13 | A Mm-hmm. |
| 14 | Q You know, the equation that I saw for |
| 15 | separation factor was this AD divided by AB plus CD, |
| 16 | where AB and CD are the wellbore radii, and AD is the |
| 17 | distance between the centers of the wellbores. |
| 18 | A Mm-hmm. |
| 19 | Q And, I mean, if you're at a separation |
| 20 | factor of 1, I mean, essentially, those wellbores are |
| 21 | just about kissing. Right? I mean, they're real |
| 22 | close. |
| 23 | A No. Not necessarily. So the separation |
| 24 | factor of 1 means that the ellipses touch, that |
| 25 | there's there's contact between the ellipses. And |
| | |

| 1 | the each ellipse of two wellbores represents a 95- |
|----|--|
| 2 | percent certainty where that wellbore is located. So |
| 3 | a separation factor of 1 means contact of the ellipses |
| 4 | but does not mean contact of the wellbores. |
| 5 | Q And is there any minimum distance required |
| 6 | between wellbores? |
| 7 | A Again, it it's we don't define the |
| 8 | minimum distance between the wellbores, because it, |
| 9 | again, depends on the size of the ellipses. If you |
| 10 | have a very inaccurate tool, then that ellipse is |
| 11 | going to be very large, whereas if you have a very |
| 12 | accurate tool, like a gyro survey, then that |
| 13 | then then you have a lot of certainty where that |
| 14 | well is located, and that ellipse is going to be |
| 15 | small. |
| 16 | That's why, when we talk about anti- |
| 17 | collision, we don't talk about distance between wells, |
| 18 | because of that statistical uncertainty concept. We |
| 19 | talk about ellipses of uncertainty in the the |
| 20 | separation factors or sometimes distance between the |
| 21 | ellipses of uncertainty. |
| 22 | Q Okay. Well, I don't understand how we know |
| 23 | our wellbores aren't colliding, but if we haven't seen |
| 24 | protests from the OCD, I'll be I'll take their word |
| 25 | for it that we're not going to see collisions out |
| | |

| 1 | there. Maybe Dr. Ampomah will explain that to me at |
|----|--|
| 2 | some future date. |
| 3 | DR. AMPOMAH: Okay. |
| 4 | MR. BLOOM: No further questions. |
| 5 | Thank you. |
| 6 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Dr. Ampomah. |
| 7 | EXAMINATION |
| 8 | BY DR. AMPOMAH: |
| 9 | Q Yeah. Let me try to rephrase my question |
| 10 | that I asked earlier. So we do have the existing |
| 11 | rules, which was enacted in 1988. So I presume there |
| 12 | are existing wellbores in this area that is producing |
| 13 | oil and gas in this area. Is that correct? |
| 14 | A That's correct. Yes. |
| 15 | Q So my concern or question is, with this new |
| 16 | regulation or more, like, advanced completion |
| 17 | techniques that we're going to more or less implement |
| 18 | to safeguard the existing or to safeguard the |
| 19 | potash, what will be the impact of these existing |
| 20 | wellbores that do not follow this new improvement that |
| 21 | we are more or less passing through this hearing? |
| 22 | A Mm-hmm. I will say that this this |
| 23 | regulation, you know, it it mostly deals with new |
| 24 | wells that are being drilled and are being completed |
| 25 | in the the practices of contemporary wells. And, |
| | |

| 1 | you know, it's it sets requirements for well |
|----|--|
| 2 | design, the well operations practices of the wells |
| 3 | being drilled today. So it does not really talk about |
| 4 | the the wells that are currently in existence |
| 5 | and and producing at this point. |
| 6 | Q So do you believe that this new |
| 7 | definitely, we all believe that this new completion is |
| 8 | going to ensure integrity of our wells that we are |
| 9 | going to drill into the future. |
| 10 | Now, assuming I have existing wellbore, |
| 11 | 1,000 feet, that does not conform to this new |
| 12 | completion style that we are proposing today, I just |
| 13 | want to understand the impact of that, you know, |
| 14 | comparable to, let's say, the new wellbores that |
| 15 | conform to the high standard? |
| 16 | A You know, again, this standard mostly deals |
| 17 | with the drilling and the hydraulic fracturing |
| 18 | operations on on new wells. So it does not I |
| 19 | don't believe it's going to put any existing wells out |
| 20 | of conformance. |
| 21 | Q So just to understand that, then it means we |
| 22 | are learning from the drilling of the old wells and |
| 23 | then the problems that were that occurred during |
| 24 | those drilling periods, more or less assisted the |
| 25 | Joint Industry Team to come up with a new design to |
| | |

| 1 | more or less support to improve the integrity, you |
|----|--|
| 2 | know, to more or less any previous problems that |
| 3 | occurred in the past? |
| 4 | A Yes. I mean, absolutely. We incorporated |
| 5 | all the learnings that we have collected since 1988. |
| 6 | You know, this this R-111-P has been in place for a |
| 7 | very long time, and the industry has moved on |
| 8 | significantly since then. And there's a lot of new |
| 9 | technologies and new new operating methods that |
| 10 | have been developed. |
| 11 | And all that has been incorporated into |
| 12 | this into this update. So we have incorporated all |
| 13 | of those learnings into this new standard. |
| 14 | Q So the monitoring techniques that were |
| 15 | proposed in the new rule, is that going to apply to |
| 16 | the existing wells, too? |
| 17 | A The monitoring rules which which |
| 18 | section are you referring to? |
| 19 | Q So I will ask more about the subsidence, but |
| 20 | I do know that in the completion, we do have open |
| 21 | section where we are saving that, I guess, more or |
| 22 | less, for monitoring |
| 23 | A Mm-hmm. |
| 24 | Q in the new wellbores that I've seen. So |
| 25 | those monitoring in the old wells going to be required |
| | Page 92 |

| 1 | to also implement the same monitoring strategies, or |
|----|--|
| 2 | not? |
| 3 | A You talking about "Section G, Subsidence |
| 4 | Monitoring." Right? Is that what you're referring |
| 5 | to? Just clarifying. |
| 6 | Q So I'm more or less looking at the |
| 7 | completions, so "Exhibit B", the wellbore diagrams. |
| 8 | I'm looking at those. And you see that there is open |
| 9 | annulus that is going to be more or less for |
| LO | monitoring purposes. I believe that is what I read. |
| L1 | A Okay. |
| L2 | Q So I just want to know, the existing |
| L3 | wellbores, are these monitoring strategies proposed |
| L4 | monitoring strategies also going to apply to that |
| L5 | as well? |
| L6 | A I understand your question. So it depends |
| L7 | on the well design. So this is applicable to new |
| L8 | wells being drilled. Once a well is drilled, you I |
| L9 | mean, if it doesn't incorporate an open annulus, if |
| 20 | the annulus was cemented up, then, no. That |
| 21 | monitoring's not possible. |
| 22 | So so the wells that are currently in the |
| 23 | ground are grandfathered in, if you will. |
| 24 | Q Oh, and let's talk about that. So if you |
| 25 | have so I do know that these new completion style |
| | Page 93 |

| 1 | more or less support strict monitoring. Now, the |
|----|--|
| 2 | existing ones, if we cannot, let's say, monitor |
| 3 | through the annulus, what about if it is present |
| 4 | that we are measuring is that not can we not put |
| 5 | it along the tubing of the production well? |
| 6 | A Yes. I mean, the the tubing by |
| 7 | production annulus is going to be monitored, and the |
| 8 | wells that, you know, I can speak for for |
| 9 | ExxonMobil. The wells that we are currently |
| 10 | producing, we are able to monitor those wells. |
| 11 | So this introduces additional means of |
| 12 | monitoring the wells. This is an additional annulus |
| 13 | that can be monitored. So it's not saying that the |
| 14 | existing wells are unsafe. We're just saying we're |
| 15 | introducing additional safeguards to make new wells |
| 16 | that we're drilling even safer. |
| 17 | Q Thank you. |
| 18 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Any other |
| 19 | questions for this witness? |
| 20 | Mr. Feldewert. |
| 21 | EXAMINATION |
| 22 | BY MR. FELDEWERT: |
| 23 | Q Mr. Podust, I'm want to go back to the |
| 24 | separation factor. |
| 25 | A Mm-hmm. |
| | |

| 1 | Q Okay. Now, was there any discussion about, |
|----|---|
| 2 | you know, adding a set minimum distance within the |
| 3 | group? |
| 4 | A "Set minimum distance" between the |
| 5 | separation factors? |
| 6 | Q Between wells? Between wells? |
| 7 | A No. And that's really not the industry |
| 8 | standard. That's really not appropriate for the |
| 9 | reason I I discussed. It really depends on the |
| 10 | size of that ellipse of uncertainty. |
| 11 | Q All right. |
| 12 | A How how accurate your survey of that well |
| 13 | is. |
| 14 | Q So you and the other experts that were on |
| 15 | the what was it, the Wellbore Integrity Working |
| 16 | Group right? |
| 17 | A That's right. Yes. |
| 18 | Q Thanks. Those included experts from the |
| 19 | industry and the potash companies? |
| 20 | A Correct. Yes. |
| 21 | Q Both of which had their own means to ensure |
| 22 | that there's sufficient rules to prevent wellbore |
| 23 | collision. Right? |
| 24 | A Yes. So each company's going to have their |
| 25 | own set of anti-collision rules. This just sets the |
| | Page 95 |

| 1 | minimum requirements. And I'll just point out, this |
|----|--|
| 2 | is an entirely new section. So there was nothing on |
| 3 | anti-collision in the R-111-P at all. So this is all |
| 4 | new requirements. |
| 5 | And again, this is minimum requirements that |
| 6 | are set forth and the and each operating company is |
| 7 | going to have their requirements that will often |
| 8 | supersede these minimum standards. |
| 9 | Q And was it the opinion of the Wellbore |
| 10 | Integrity Working Group that this separation factor |
| 11 | would protect against collisions? |
| 12 | A Yes. |
| 13 | Q And is it your personal opinion that this |
| 14 | separation factor that has been developed in |
| 15 | collaboration with the other experts, that it will |
| 16 | prevent wellbore collisions? |
| 17 | A It will minimize the risk of of a |
| 18 | collision event. Yes. |
| 19 | Q Okay. Thank you. That's all I have. Thank |
| 20 | you. |
| 21 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Thank you. |
| 22 | Any additional questions for Mr. |
| 23 | Podust? |
| 24 | Ms. Shaheen? |
| 25 | MS. SHAHEEN: None from Strata. |
| | |
| | Page 96 |

| 1 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Thank you, Mr. |
|----|--|
| 2 | Podust. You may be excused. |
| 3 | I think the last witness we spoke about |
| 4 | wanting to pose some questions to was Mr. Morgan, |
| 5 | concerning the subsidence monitoring. |
| 6 | I believe Mr. Morgan is available |
| 7 | online, Mr. Feldewert? |
| 8 | MR. FELDEWERT: Yes. |
| 9 | THE HEARING EXAMINE: Mr. Morgan, can |
| 10 | you confirm that you can hear us and have audio? |
| 11 | MR. MORGAN: I can confirm I hear you, |
| 12 | and can you hear me? |
| 13 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: We can hear you, |
| 14 | and we can see you. I'm going to ask the court |
| 15 | reporter to swear you in. |
| 16 | THE COURT REPORTER: Please raise your |
| 17 | right hand. |
| 18 | WHEREUPON, |
| 19 | WILLIAM MORGAN, |
| 20 | called as a witness and having been first duly sworn |
| 21 | to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but |
| 22 | the truth, was examined and testified as follows: |
| 23 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Good morning, |
| 24 | Mr. Morgan. Just like with the prior witnesses, can |
| 25 | you confirm what's been entered as applicant's Exhibit |
| | Page 97 |

| 1 | 6 reflects the statement that you prepared? |
|----|--|
| 2 | THE WITNESS: Yes. |
| 3 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Did anyone |
| 4 | assist you in the preparation of that statement? |
| 5 | THE WITNESS: Mr. Feldewert helped with |
| 6 | some language, but the content is mine. |
| 7 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: And based on |
| 8 | statements in your self-affirmed written statement |
| 9 | that was filed, the Commission will recognize you as |
| 10 | an expert in the field of completions and engineering |
| 11 | and production engineering. |
| 12 | And with that, I'm going to turn it |
| 13 | over to Dr. Ampomah with some questions. |
| 14 | DR. AMPOMAH: Thank you, Mr. Chair. |
| 15 | EXAMINATION |
| 16 | BY DR. AMPOMAH: |
| 17 | Q So I'm looking at the "Section G," and I'm |
| 18 | looking on page nine, where we do have the subsidence |
| 19 | monitoring. So my first question will be, do you |
| 20 | believe that the content there is significantly enough |
| 21 | to really address any potential subsidence issues? |
| 22 | A So it's it's my opinion and keep in |
| 23 | mind, you know, this is a a new provision here that |
| 24 | requires subsidence monitoring, where otherwise, that |
| 25 | would not have been in place. So it's it's truly a |
| | |

| 1 | provision to observe and be able to collect data on |
|----|--|
| 2 | any potential subsidence activity in and around the |
| 3 | in and around the Potash Area. |
| 4 | But this would allow for warning signs of |
| 5 | any subsidence activity that can have negative effect |
| 6 | on producing wells in the area. So not so much that |
| 7 | it is preventative of subsidence, but it is an alert. |
| 8 | So, you know, that new provision being in there is |
| 9 | is all aimed to alert operators within the Potash Area |
| LO | to potential subsidence concerns that can be monitored |
| L1 | and reported. |
| L2 | Q Yeah. So in the write-up, I did not see any |
| L3 | recommended tools that have been tested, you know, to |
| L4 | be more, like, effective in actually measuring or |
| L5 | monitoring subsidence. So based on your discussion, |
| L6 | was it more, like, let it open to the operator to |
| L7 | decide whichever tool they want to use? |
| L8 | A That's correct. That is that is my |
| L9 | understanding. There's there's various subsidence |
| 20 | monitoring tools. I'm certainly not an expert in that |
| 21 | field. However, that is that is my understanding. |
| 22 | It's it's left up to the operator to make |
| 23 | the decision on how to fulfill that requirement, |
| 24 | knowing that subsidence monitoring for wells within |
| 25 | one mile of an active mine in the KPLA needs to be |
| | |

1 observed. 2 So would you agree with me that, to be 0 appropriate, if we add, let's say, a statement in 3 there, saying giving the authority to NMOCD to more or 4 less vet that tool, that is actually going to be 6 utilized, you know, to catch up, more or less, with technology? 8 Α I think that it needs to be probably Yeah. 9 discussed more. But as far as who has the authority 10 to observe or oppose what specific tools or 11 observation tools need to be put in place, it would 12 need to be a collective effort. But I can't speak on 13 who should have authority to implement specific tools and devices. 14 15 So at least you believe that there Yeah. 16 should be the wording in there. You know, more or 17 less I don't know who's going to discuss with regards to who has the authority to assist. So I'm not saying 18 19 that NMOCD should impose which technique. But at 20 least they have to have an oversight on which device 21 that the operator is more or less going to use. 22 I -- I definitely see the reasoning for --Α for input on that from all parties that are a part of 23 2.4 the -- the group. And one concern I have with this is that you 25 0 Page 100

| 1 | stopped right at the end, where you said "just an |
|----|--|
| 2 | alert" right it's just going to provide an |
| 3 | alert. But what happens if we see a subsidence? And |
| 4 | what is the magnitude of the subsidence or the |
| 5 | displacement that we should see that should be of a |
| 6 | concern? And if there is a concern, what are the next |
| 7 | steps that needs to be followed? |
| 8 | A Yeah. That that is a fair point. And, |
| 9 | you know, in my discussions with the working group, |
| 10 | that that piece of what next has not necessarily |
| 11 | been addressed in this new provision. |
| 12 | Q So how do we address that? |
| 13 | A Good question. I I don't know how to |
| 14 | answer that at this time. |
| 15 | Q I really, really want us to think about |
| 16 | that, because it is a good and it is a great |
| 17 | provision. But I feel like it is short, you know, of |
| 18 | the device and then also, what is the displacement |
| 19 | magnitude that we should look out for? |
| 20 | And if we supersede that magnitude or |
| 21 | displacement, what are the next steps? This is a |
| 22 | critical monitoring tool or monitoring strategy that I |
| 23 | believe needs to be completed. |
| 24 | A Understood. |
| 25 | DR. AMPOMAH: Thank you, Mr. Chair. |
| | |

| 1 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Mr. Tremaine, do |
|----|--|
| 2 | any of the witnesses for OCD would they be in a |
| 3 | position to answer some of these questions, how that |
| 4 | information might be used? |
| 5 | MR. TREMAINE: Mr. Chair, I think the |
| 6 | OCD witnesses could speak, potentially, to OCD's |
| 7 | response. You know, Mr. Powell can speak to how OCD |
| 8 | would respond to an alert, you know, shut-ins, |
| 9 | emergency orders, et cetera, when that occurs. |
| 10 | My understanding is a subsidence is |
| 11 | more of a mining concern, and the actual monitoring of |
| 12 | subsidence may not squarely be within the expertise of |
| 13 | the OCD. But if you wish, we can make Mr. Powell |
| 14 | available to flesh that out more. |
| 15 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Thank you, Mr. |
| 16 | Tremaine. |
| 17 | Any additional questions for this |
| 18 | witness? |
| 19 | Seeing none, Mr. Morgan, you are |
| 20 | excused. |
| 21 | Mr. Tremaine, is Mr. Powell online? |
| 22 | MR. TREMAINE: Mr. Powell is available |
| 23 | through Webex. Yes. |
| 24 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Mr. Powell, can |
| 25 | you confirm that you can hear us and have audio? |
| | Page 102 |

| 1 | MR. POWELL: I can. Can you hear me |
|----|--|
| 2 | okay? |
| 3 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: We can hear you |
| 4 | and see you. I'm going to ask the court reporter to |
| 5 | swear you in. |
| 6 | THE REPORTER: Please raise your right |
| 7 | hand. |
| 8 | WHEREUPON, |
| 9 | BRANDON POWELL, |
| 10 | called as a witness and having been first duly sworn |
| 11 | to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but |
| 12 | the truth, was examined and testified as follows: |
| 13 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Mr. Powell, can |
| 14 | you just briefly state for the Commission your current |
| 15 | job and your background? |
| 16 | THE WITNESS: Currently, I'm the deputy |
| 17 | director for the Oil Conservation Division overseeing |
| 18 | engineering and environmental programs. I've been |
| 19 | with the Division for almost 18 years now, ranging |
| 20 | from an environmental specialist to engineering bureau |
| 21 | chief, district supervisor. So lots of different |
| 22 | avenues with the OCD. |
| 23 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Okay. Would you |
| 24 | care to comment on Dr. Ampomah's questions about |
| 25 | regulatory oversight in this area and how the OCD |
| | |

1 might respond to subsidence issues or the like? 2 THE WITNESS: Sure. So, subsidence monitoring isn't something OCD typically monitors. 3 We think it's a good addition to this, 'cause it starts 4 5 setting a baseline, starts setting something that we 6 can watch as far as what levels we would take action at. 8 I think we would work with operators and work with the mines to look at that if we started 9 seeing issues, similar that we've done with seismic 10 11 monitoring. So if there's subsidence that is being 12 viewed or being seen during this, I -- I would say the 13 general expectation is for the operators that are 14 seeing that to then get with the potash mines and with 15 the OCD to report those and see if -- what actions 16 need to be taken, whether that be additional 17 monitoring. Whether that is actual action of --18 regarding individual wells or how that is played out, 19 20 I don't have that information, since we haven't done 2.1 subsidence. But I would think the first step would be 22 is if we've seen something significant to report it both to the mines and to the OCD and then look at 23 24 possible work with --25 THE HEARING EXAMINER: So, Mr. Powell, Page 104

| 1 | just to clarify, it's your read of that provision that |
|----|--|
| 2 | we're basically collecting data, establishing a |
| 3 | baseline, but if there were actions needed to be taken |
| 4 | in response to the data that was collected, that would |
| 5 | require further collaboration and coordination between |
| 6 | various parties? |
| 7 | THE WITNESS: That is correct. |
| 8 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Okay. |
| 9 | Any additional questions for Mr. |
| 10 | Powell? |
| 11 | DR. AMPOMAH: Yes. |
| 12 | EXAMINATION |
| 13 | BY DR. AMPOMAH: |
| 14 | Q I want to follow up and ask, so looking at |
| 15 | that provision "G," do you believe and based on the |
| 16 | discussions that I had with Mr. Morgan do you |
| 17 | believe that that provision currently in the rule is |
| 18 | good enough, at least for now? |
| 19 | A I think the provision attempts to provide |
| 20 | that notice as it refers to early warning conditions. |
| 21 | But it could potentially use some revisions to |
| 22 | identify, if there are those conditions viewed, how |
| 23 | the operator is to react to those. |
| 24 | Q Thank you for that. And do you also believe |
| 25 | that at least NMOCD should have some oversight, not |
| | |

| 1 | necessarily imposing, but oversight, on what |
|----|--|
| 2 | techniques is going to be utilized in the monitoring? |
| 3 | A I think the OCD should be involved in that |
| 4 | process, yes, because it will affect the wells and |
| 5 | future development, potentially in an individual area |
| 6 | or on a larger fashion, to see if there's trends, |
| 7 | those kinds of things looked at. So yes. I think OCD |
| 8 | should be involved. |
| 9 | Q Thank you. |
| 10 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Mr. Powell, can |
| 11 | you tell me what the OCD's obligations are, generally, |
| 12 | with respect to potash development? |
| 13 | THE WITNESS: It's to ensure that oil |
| 14 | and so I didn't prep anything. So this is just |
| 15 | going off general memory. It's to make sure that oil |
| 16 | and gas drilling and production don't negatively |
| 17 | impact the potash drilling. |
| 18 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: And, Mr. Powell, |
| 19 | what are our general what's the OCD's general |
| 20 | obligations with respect to oil and gas development? |
| 21 | THE WITNESS: It's protecting |
| 22 | correlative rights. It's ensuring wellbore |
| 23 | integrities. It's it's generally making sure |
| 24 | operations aren't threatening in the environment. |
| 25 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Thank you. |
| | |

| 1 | Any additional questions for Mr. |
|----|--|
| 2 | Powell? |
| 3 | MR. TREMAINE: Mr. Chair, I just have a |
| 4 | couple clarification questions for Mr. Powell. |
| 5 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Okay. |
| 6 | EXAMINATION |
| 7 | BY MR. TREMAINE: |
| 8 | Q Mr. Powell, if OCD became aware of a |
| 9 | significant, like, an emergency issue, does OCD have |
| 10 | the ability to issue temporary cessation orders to the |
| 11 | well operators in the area? |
| 12 | A We do. |
| 13 | Q And does OCD also have the ability to |
| 14 | promptly issue emergency orders that may require |
| 15 | operators to take additional steps rather than ceasing |
| 16 | a current operational activity? |
| 17 | A We do. |
| 18 | Q And if such a situation arose, that there |
| 19 | was a significant subsidence alert or other minor |
| 20 | issue that threatened either potash or correlative |
| 21 | rights or presented the opportunity for waste, do you |
| 22 | believe that the Division is situated to respond |
| 23 | promptly to issue either a temporary cessation order |
| 24 | or an emergency order? |
| 25 | A They do. And I believe industry is also |
| | Page 107 |

| 1 | committed to that, through the formation of the Joint |
|----|---|
| 2 | Industry Task Force Committee. In looking at that, I |
| 3 | think it's in everybody's best interest to to take |
| 4 | appropriate actions. |
| 5 | Q No further questions. Thank you. |
| 6 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Any additional |
| 7 | questions for this witness? |
| 8 | Mr. Powell, you are excused. |
| 9 | Mr. Feldewert, are there any other |
| 10 | witnesses you'd like to call or question? They |
| 11 | talking to their some sidebar discussions |
| 12 | surrounding the discussions we're having here on |
| 13 | subsidence monitoring? |
| 14 | MR. FELDEWERT: What I would suggest is |
| 15 | maybe we could take an early lunch break, if that |
| 16 | works for you? |
| 17 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Sure. |
| 18 | MR. FELDEWERT: And then I may or may |
| 19 | not have something when we come back. But I don't |
| 20 | anticipate taking very long. |
| 21 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: I think I'm fine |
| 22 | with that. It's 11:30. We will reconvene at 12:30 |
| 23 | back in here and continue the hearing on this matter. |
| 24 | Thank you. |
| 25 | MR. FELDEWERT: Thank you. |
| | |

| 1 | (Off the record.) |
|----|--|
| 2 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Sheila, have we |
| 3 | resumed recording? |
| 4 | MS. APODACA: Yes. We're recording |
| 5 | again. |
| 6 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Mr. Feldewert, |
| 7 | are you ready to resume, or are we giving another |
| 8 | couple minutes for folks to return? |
| 9 | MR. FELDEWERT: I a couple minutes |
| 10 | would be great, because my battery just died, and so |
| 11 | I'm plugging in. |
| 12 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: All right. |
| 13 | MR. FELDEWERT: Should have shut it off |
| 14 | when I left. |
| 15 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: All right. Good |
| 16 | afternoon, everyone. We're resuming the March 14, |
| 17 | 2024, Oil Conservation Commission hearing. We're on |
| 18 | Case Number 2365 [sic], the application of the Joint |
| 19 | Industry Technical Committee to amend Order R-111-P |
| 20 | Lea and Eddy Counties, New Mexico. |
| 21 | We had prior to lunch had some witness |
| 22 | testimony, mostly to address questions posed by the |
| 23 | Commission. And I think where we left off was, there |
| 24 | were some questions about the subsidence monitoring |
| 25 | provisions and other pieces and how that data might be |
| | |

| 1 | used or responded to. And I think there was an open |
|----|--|
| 2 | question to the parties, whether they wanted to |
| 3 | supplement any of the information they provided in |
| 4 | response to those questions from Dr. Ampomah. |
| 5 | MR. FELDEWERT: Mr. Chair, if I may, |
| 6 | Michael Feldewert, for the applicants, I would like to |
| 7 | call Dan Morehouse, who has not testified yet. He |
| 8 | came all the way up from Carlsbad, so I'm like to have |
| 9 | him come to the stand and address some of the issues. |
| 10 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Would the court |
| 11 | reporter please swear Mr. Morehouse in? |
| 12 | THE REPORTER: Please raise your right |
| 13 | hand. |
| 14 | WHEREUPON, |
| 15 | DAN MOREHOUSE, |
| 16 | called as a witness and having been first duly sworn |
| 17 | to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but |
| 18 | the truth, was examined and testified as follows: |
| 19 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Mr. Morehouse, |
| 20 | like we've done with other witnesses, did you prepare |
| 21 | the self-affirmed statement submitted as or |
| 22 | introduced as applicant's Exhibit 5? |
| 23 | THE WITNESS: Yes. With assistance |
| 24 | from counsel. |
| 25 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: And do we need |
| | Page 110 |

| 1 | to |
|--|--|
| 2 | Mr. Feldewert, do we need to recognize |
| 3 | him as an expert, based on the questions you want him |
| 4 | to discuss? |
| 5 | MR. FELDEWERT: I would like to |
| 6 | recognize him as an expert, based on the credentials |
| 7 | that he has in his self-affirmed statement. |
| 8 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Okay. Based on |
| 9 | the credentials listed there, we will the |
| 10 | Commission will recognize the witness as an expert in |
| 11 | mine engineering and engineering management. |
| 12 | And with that, I'll open it up to |
| 13 | questions. |
| | |
| 14 | EXAMINATION |
| 14 15 | EXAMINATION BY MR. FELDEWERT: |
| | |
| 15 | BY MR. FELDEWERT: |
| 15 16 | BY MR. FELDEWERT: Q Mr. Morehouse, you were involved with the |
| 15 16 17 | BY MR. FELDEWERT: Q Mr. Morehouse, you were involved with the development of these proposed modifications? |
| 15 16 17 18 | BY MR. FELDEWERT: Q Mr. Morehouse, you were involved with the development of these proposed modifications? A Yes. Since the inception. |
| 15 16 17 18 | BY MR. FELDEWERT: Q Mr. Morehouse, you were involved with the development of these proposed modifications? A Yes. Since the inception. Q Okay. And a member of that Wellbore |
| 15 16 17 18 19 | BY MR. FELDEWERT: Q Mr. Morehouse, you were involved with the development of these proposed modifications? A Yes. Since the inception. Q Okay. And a member of that Wellbore Integrity Working Group? |
| 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | BY MR. FELDEWERT: Q Mr. Morehouse, you were involved with the development of these proposed modifications? A Yes. Since the inception. Q Okay. And a member of that Wellbore Integrity Working Group? A Yes. |
| 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | BY MR. FELDEWERT: Q Mr. Morehouse, you were involved with the development of these proposed modifications? A Yes. Since the inception. Q Okay. And a member of that Wellbore Integrity Working Group? A Yes. Q Okay. And did you then assist, or were you |
| 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | BY MR. FELDEWERT: Q Mr. Morehouse, you were involved with the development of these proposed modifications? A Yes. Since the inception. Q Okay. And a member of that Wellbore Integrity Working Group? A Yes. Q Okay. And did you then assist, or were you involved on behalf of the potash industry in the |

| 1 | A I was involved with all the discussion that |
|------------|--|
| 2 | led up to it, anyway. Yes. |
| 3 | Q Okay. Okay. And there were some questions |
| 4 | here about the language that's used, et cetera. First |
| 5 | off, the current R-111-P does not have any provisions |
| 6 | dealing with subsidence monitoring. Correct? |
| 7 | A That's correct. |
| 8 | Q And is this something that the potash |
| 9 | industry thought would be a good start to obtaining |
| LO | information? |
| L1 | A Yeah. Potash and oil and gas. It was it |
| L2 | was in one of those consensus items that we all |
| L3 | thought it was keep our eye on that. |
| L 4 | Q Okay. And the way this is written, what's |
| L5 | the purpose of this provision? |
| L6 | A Subsidence measuring has been done in |
| L7 | various ways over the years. But about 2010, and then |
| L8 | a little after, the new ways of using LiDAR and InSAR |
| L9 | come along to make it very much easier to do a broad |
| 20 | subsidence. |
| 21 | And we have looked at some information from |
| 22 | that stuff, but we have no real conclusions drawn yet. |
| 23 | We we think we need to continue to watch it, and |
| 24 | that's how this language got to be in the in the |
| 25 | rule maintenance that we felt it was just necessary to |
| | |

| 1 | keep our eye on that, when the issues come up, to |
|----|--|
| 2 | bring it to the overall JITC or any other interested |
| 3 | parties and follow through. |
| 4 | Q Okay. So if I break that down, if I look at |
| 5 | the rule, it says "shall be monitored." So it's a |
| 6 | requirement now. Correct? |
| 7 | A Yes. |
| 8 | Q Okay. And as part of that monitoring, will |
| 9 | the JITC be able to gather data? |
| 10 | A We expect it to be used by yeah. It |
| 11 | data will be gathered, and it will be available to the |
| 12 | JITC and everyone. |
| 13 | Q And then the JITC can take that data and |
| 14 | begin to analyze it? |
| 15 | A Yes. |
| 16 | Q Okay. And in that sense, then, begin the |
| 17 | process of determining when action should be taken and |
| 18 | what action should be taken? |
| 19 | A Yes. |
| 20 | Q So is this, like, a first step in towards |
| 21 | that process, is you got to get the data first? |
| 22 | A Yeah. A continuation of that step. We've |
| 23 | barely begun it. It needs to be carried further. |
| 24 | Q Okay. And I think you testified, but just |
| 25 | to make it clear, this data that's obtained by this |
| | |

| 1 | mandatory provision, that is then going to be analyzed |
|----|--|
| 2 | and utilized by the Joint Industry Technical |
| 3 | Committee? |
| 4 | A Yes. |
| 5 | Q Okay. That's all I have. Oh, let me one |
| 6 | last question. And, Mr. Morehouse, as an expert here |
| 7 | and having been involved in potash mining for a lot of |
| 8 | years, in your opinion, is this the appropriate first |
| 9 | step in dealing with this type the issues that you |
| 10 | intend to address with this provision? Is this a good |
| 11 | first step? |
| 12 | A It it's a good continuation of the steps. |
| 13 | I can't say this is the first step, 'cause we we've |
| 14 | attempted to look at it in the past. It's it's a |
| 15 | good way of moving forward. |
| 16 | Q Okay. Great. Thank you. That's all I |
| 17 | have. |
| 18 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Mr. Morehouse, |
| 19 | so the data that will be required to be collected |
| 20 | under "G" and will be available to the JITC, do you |
| 21 | envision that the data will be reported to BLM and |
| 22 | OCD, or just available to them upon request? |
| 23 | THE WITNESS: I don't know that we've |
| 24 | researched that, but it's definitely available on |
| 25 | request, and I'll bet we'd be willing if you wanted |
| | Page 114 |

| 1 | it set up that way, we'd just send it whenever we have |
|----|--|
| 2 | it. |
| 3 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Dr. Ampomah, do |
| 4 | you have a question? |
| 5 | DR. AMPOMAH: Exactly. Yes. I do have |
| 6 | a question. |
| 7 | EXAMINATION |
| 8 | BY DR. AMPOMAH: |
| 9 | Q So based on the testimony, it sounds to me |
| 10 | that that provision is mostly for the JITC. But |
| 11 | there's no provision, you know, as to the role that |
| 12 | the regulator is going to play in this. |
| 13 | So I feel like this needs to be clarified in |
| 14 | there to make sure that the regulator also has a role |
| 15 | to play, other than just the JITC, to just review the |
| 16 | data to come up with the next steps. The regulator |
| 17 | needs to have a role to play in that. Would you |
| 18 | assent to that statement or not? |
| 19 | A My my answer would be that the the |
| 20 | good thing about having something in here about it is |
| 21 | that if if we show a subsidence somewhere, where |
| 22 | people that aren't members of the JITC or it should |
| 23 | be every every operator in the area out there |
| 24 | should be you know, if we look if we want to |
| 25 | look at measurement casing deformation measurements |
| | |

| 1 | along the wellbore or something, it's any well out |
|----|---|
| 2 | there. |
| 3 | And I guess maybe you guys can do that |
| 4 | independently if we bring up an issue. But having it |
| 5 | in the rule here means that anybody that's out there |
| 6 | drilling may have to who may have issues, and this |
| 7 | is in there that they will have to measure their |
| 8 | wellbore or whatever comes up out of the decisions. |
| 9 | But I understand I don't we don't know |
| 10 | what those decisions are yet. We just haven't gotten |
| 11 | that far. |
| 12 | Q So let me ask you with regards to the rule, |
| 13 | is it give me a second. Is the JITC going to |
| 14 | enforce it, or is the regulators going to enforce it? |
| 15 | A JITC will do it, whether you guys tell us to |
| 16 | or not. Just put it that way. But it's good to have |
| 17 | it now that we know we need to do it. |
| 18 | Q Yeah. I'm just saying that the whole |
| 19 | provision, the whole object that we are working |
| 20 | through now, who is going to who is enforcing it |
| 21 | as do you know? |
| 22 | A I don't know. |
| 23 | Q Okay. |
| 24 | MR. FELDEWERT: Dr. Ampomah, I can |
| 25 | probably address that. I mean, if we look at the |
| | Page 116 |

| rule, it says "subsidence shall be monitored." Okay? |
|--|
| So it's now mandatory, which means, just like any |
| other provision in this rule, it is enforced by the |
| Division. |
| DR. AMPOMAH: Exactly. If it is |
| enforced by the Division, but according to the |
| testimony, the data is going to be shared with JITC, |
| and then generally, they are going to discuss and come |
| up with steps as to what are the next steps, you know. |
| But I feel like the regulator has to be involved in |
| that. |
| MR. FELDEWERT: Well, I mean, you know, |
| you can look at this a number of ways. But, you know, |
| as Mr. Morehouse testified, I mean, the first step is |
| to get the data. So they don't have data now. And if |
| you don't have data, you don't know what exactly you |
| need to look for, you don't know what the thresholds |
| need to be, and you don't know what needs to be done |
| at each threshold. That needs to be examined. |
| And that's the purpose of the Joint |
| Industry Technical Committee. So they determined |
| again, this is something that's new right not |
| previously required. The JITC said "Look, we want to |
| make it mandatory that any well that meets this |
| requirement, it shall be monitored so that we can |
| |

| 1 | obtain so that we have the data, and we can start |
|----|---|
| 2 | studying the data." |
| 3 | And then, from that point, you know, |
| 4 | and remember, now, this JITC is made up of the |
| 5 | industry oil and gas industry, potash industry. |
| 6 | Everybody's got the incentive to make sure it's done |
| 7 | right okay and to make sure that's action's |
| 8 | taken when actions need to be taken. |
| 9 | So they set it up to get the data |
| 10 | first. Now, what needs to be done at what threshold |
| 11 | is we don't they don't really know yet. That |
| 12 | needs that's still being examined. |
| 13 | DR. AMPOMAH: So subsidence is not |
| 14 | really new. You know, it's been around for quite some |
| 15 | time. So based on your response, it sounds to me, my |
| 16 | question will be, what were the best practices that |
| 17 | were considered in drafting the language? |
| 18 | Because if you look at our industry, a |
| 19 | lot of casing collapse, you know, a lot of let's |
| 20 | say even communication between injections or |
| 21 | productions or in productions or specifically with |
| 22 | regards to this and then also let's say about |
| 23 | formation and all of that, subsidence cause some kind |
| 24 | of issues, you know, in relation to those. |
| 25 | So definitely there has been a |
| | |

| precedence. There has been a lot of studies on that. |
|--|
| So my question is, in terms of what were the best |
| practices that the team that put this together, you |
| know, considered before coming up with the language? |
| MR. FELDEWERT: That's a question I |
| can't answer. I don't know if Mr |
| Mr. Morehouse, can you address what was |
| looked at by the committee? |
| THE WITNESS: To a certain extent. |
| The the evidence we had for subsidence previously |
| is, you know, is usually done with survey you know, |
| instrument surveys of some kind. And they're kind of |
| anecdotal. You don't know everywhere subsidence is |
| occurring, until you go out there and measure in |
| places. |
| And we haven't universally measured |
| anywhere. And this the advent of LiDAR and InSAR |
| has made it available to us to see where where all |
| is it going on and give us a more comprehensive |
| this is just much more comprehensive than anything |
| ever done before on subsidence. |
| THE HEARING EXAMINER: So I maybe have |
| a question and a proposal, listening to the |
| discussion, you know, back and forth. Agree that the |
| provision here requires data monitoring and other |
| |

| 1 | collection. Acknowledge that, obviously, at least on |
|----|--|
| 2 | the OCD side, OCD has plenary authority to request |
| 3 | data that's generated in the field. |
| 4 | But I would wonder what the parties |
| 5 | would think as a sort of subsequent, additional |
| 6 | amendment to "G," listening to this, something along |
| 7 | the lines of "Such data shall be reported at least |
| 8 | quarterly to the BLM and the OCD as appropriate, |
| 9 | except in the event of conditions that threaten the |
| 10 | integrity of any active wells, which shall be reported |
| 11 | within 24 hours of confirmation. |
| 12 | "Any remedial steps will be developed |
| 13 | in coordination with the impacted operators, JITC, |
| 14 | OCD, and the BLM." I think that provides a pathway |
| 15 | for data coming in. |
| 16 | Since the purpose here is to go to |
| 17 | wellbore integrity questions, you know, that's why I |
| 18 | had a sort of separate reporting period there, because |
| 19 | in you know, OCD's concerns at least jump up with |
| 20 | wellbore integrity beyond sort of impact on potash |
| 21 | components. So, you know, preferably wanted to get |
| 22 | parties' reactions, at least conceptually, to that |
| 23 | sort of addition to "G." |
| 24 | MR. FELDEWERT: Obviously, the first |
| 25 | I mean, I don't know where you pulled that, but I'm |
| | Page 120 |

| 1 | impressed that you had that. Very good. And | | | |
|----|---|--|--|--|
| 2 | secondly, you know, if you want to give me five | | | |
| 3 | minutes, we could talk about it, see if there's any | | | |
| 4 | issues there. Do you mind sharing that with me, or is | | | |
| 5 | it | | | |
| 6 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Yeah. | | | |
| 7 | MR. FELDEWERT: Okay. Is that all | | | |
| 8 | right? | | | |
| 9 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: I mean, to the | | | |
| 10 | extent that you can read it. | | | |
| 11 | MR. FELDEWERT: Okay. Yeah. So if you | | | |
| 12 | give me can you give me five minutes? | | | |
| 13 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Yeah. | | | |
| 14 | MR. FELDEWERT: Okay. Great. Thank | | | |
| 15 | you. | | | |
| 16 | (Off the record.) | | | |
| 17 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: All right. | | | |
| 18 | We're back. | | | |
| 19 | MR. FELDEWERT: Mr. Chair, couple of | | | |
| 20 | comments. First, as you have gleaned from the rule, | | | |
| 21 | there is and this may go to some of the concerns. | | | |
| 22 | There's an existing provision that has a quarter-mile | | | |
| 23 | and a half-mile setback from mines. Okay? And that | | | |
| 24 | purpose of that was to address concerns in part about | | | |
| 25 | subsidence. | | | |
| | | | | |

| So, in other words, if there's |
|---|
| something that happens quickly, that setback was |
| designed to address that. So what we're dealing with |
| here, then, is beyond that in dealing with trying to |
| study on a long-term basis and I mean a long-term |
| basis the subsidence that occurs further away from |
| these mines. |
| So what has been contemplated by the |
| JITC is that they want to gather this data, and it's |
| not it's going to be more on a longer-term scale. |
| You're talking about, you know, yearly or so. So what |
| would make sense to them is to provide the data on a |
| yearly basis to the Division. |
| THE HEARING EXAMINER: Okay. |
| MR. FELDEWERT: Because that fits more |
| with, you know, the long-term nature of the study. |
| The second part of the rule of your proposed |
| language, it seems to me, is already addressed with |
| other provisions in the Division's rules that deal |
| with casing integrity issues, which are required to be |
| reported on other aspects of the Division's rule. |
| So the point being here that any |
| gubaidanga arraw tima ia nat gaing ta harra a 24 harra ar |
| subsidence over time is not going to have a 24-hour or |
| a 48-hour impact on casing. Right? It's going to be |
| |

| 1 | going to be 24 or 48 hours in nature is already going |
|----|--|
| 2 | to be addressed by the Division's integrity rule. |
| 3 | So our suggestion would be that really |
| 4 | all you need is to add a sentence that, you know, the |
| 5 | data will be provided to the Division and the BLM on a |
| 6 | yearly basis. Because that's kind of when the JITC |
| 7 | was planning on looking at it, anyway, because you're |
| 8 | talking about long-term, miles away from any mine. So |
| 9 | that's our response. |
| 10 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Okay. I'd be |
| 11 | open to that, and I take the point about the casing |
| 12 | integrity components. |
| 13 | Any other questions for Mr. Morehouse? |
| 14 | Mr. Tremaine. |
| 15 | MR. TREMAINE: I had just a general |
| 16 | response to the gone back and forth, and not a |
| 17 | question. |
| 18 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Go, both. |
| 19 | MR. TREMAINE: So OCD is amenable to |
| 20 | the structure. The yearly reporting does make sense. |
| 21 | I think the line of questions from Commissioner |
| 22 | Ampomah, I think, really break down into two |
| 23 | considerations. There is what to do with the data, |
| 24 | and then there is, how does the regulator know about |
| 25 | the data. |

| 3 regolves that The only | And this updated proposal | | | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| J TOBOTYCE CHAC. THE OHLY | hesitation we have is that | | | | |
| 4 this most recently propos | this most recently proposed structure relies on the | | | | |
| 5 representation of the ope | erator to indicate whether the | | | | |
| 6 subsidence was related to | subsidence was related to a casing, because we | | | | |
| 7 actually were talking abo | actually were talking about that, and we think that | | | | |
| 8 OCD's casing integrity ru | OCD's casing integrity rules would likely apply to | | | | |
| 9 these scenarios. | these scenarios. | | | | |
| 10 Subsidence | e may very well be related to | | | | |
| 11 casing integrity. The or | aly issue with that is that it | | | | |
| 12 puts OCD in a position wh | puts OCD in a position where it may not be able to | | | | |
| determine whether it's as | sociated with casing | | | | |
| 14 integrity or not. And so | I think it would be more | | | | |
| 15 straightforward and simpl | e if, you know, there was a | | | | |
| 16 significant subsidence th | at caused a concern for | | | | |
| 17 potential casing integrit | y that there was a shorter | | | | |
| 18 notification window. | notification window. | | | | |
| 19 So the sec | cond section, more similar to | | | | |
| 20 the Chair's original prop | osal, I think that would | | | | |
| 21 kind of thread the needle | there. | | | | |
| | IG EXAMINER: Do you have a | | | | |
| 22 THE HEARIN | question for the witness? | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| question for the witness? | NE: No questions for the | | | | |

| 1 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Okay. | | | |
|----|--|--|--|--|
| 2 | Mr. Morehouse, you're excused. Thank | | | |
| 3 | you. | | | |
| 4 | Any other questions for witnesses or | | | |
| 5 | other components? | | | |
| 6 | I had a couple of more general | | | |
| 7 | questions for the applicant that I think, Mr. | | | |
| 8 | Feldewert, you're probably going to be in a position | | | |
| 9 | to address. | | | |
| 10 | So I see what I'm holding here and | | | |
| 11 | looking at is the current version of R-111-P, which is | | | |
| 12 | on the Division website, that Mr. Feldewert passed | | | |
| 13 | out. As I read Exhibit 4, which is what the applicant | | | |
| 14 | is proposing to issue, it basically provides | | | |
| 15 | replacement language starting at page four, where it | | | |
| 16 | says "It is therefore ordered that," all the way | | | |
| 17 | through sort of the end, through the exhibits, | | | |
| 18 | including the new exhibits. | | | |
| 19 | So what isn't there is the findings | | | |
| 20 | that the Commission would make here. And in reading | | | |
| 21 | it over, you know, some of these are stale, at least | | | |
| 22 | in the Chair's view, and then I'm not sure there's any | | | |
| 23 | relevance mentioning R-111-A or R-111-B when we're at | | | |
| 24 | R-111-P. | | | |
| 25 | MR. FELDEWERT: Right. | | | |

| 1 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: And so I wanted |
|-----|--|
| 2 | to float in sort of reading through this, you know, up |
| 3 | through Paragraph 1 is sort of boilerplate, and it's |
| 4 | there, as I'm flipping through R-111-P. Paragraphs, |
| 5 | basically, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 can all be struck, as they're |
| 6 | sort of dated information, at least in our at least |
| 7 | in my view, relative to, you know, the circumstances |
| 8 | that led to the amendment at the time. |
| 9 | I wanted to ask, in Exhibit 8, is it |
| L O | the applicant's view that what is currently "Exhibit |
| L1 | B" to R-111-P should be retained, or is that sort of |
| L2 | an artifact that can be dropped? It wasn't in your |
| L3 | set. |
| L4 | MR. FELDEWERT: Good question. In my |
| L5 | opinion, that is an artifact that can be dropped for |
| L6 | the R-111-Q. It would be part it's already part of |
| L7 | R-111-P, part of the history, but it doesn't need to |
| L8 | be |
| L9 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Okay. |
| 20 | MR. FELDEWERT: doesn't really have |
| 21 | anything to do with this proposal. |
| 22 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: So Paragraphs 8 |
| 23 | and 9 also seem irrelevant for findings; 10 through |
| 24 | 17, with some maybe scrivener changes for references, |
| 25 | retain relevance just in terms of setting context. |
| | |

1 They describe general authority. 2 And then 18 is more of a kind of 3 summary statement about we heard testimony and comments reflected here to justify the amendments; 19, 4 20, 21, again, and 22, seem to be, again, artifacts of 6 history, don't need to be retained. And 23 is just sort of a boilerplate language. That's sort of my 8 thinking on an approach to what the order looks like. 9 And what I'd like to float for discussion with my fellow commissioners, the R-111-P 10 11 is an unusual vehicle. It's sort of written like a 12 rule set, but it's a Commission order. You know, 13 probably if we were starting from a blank slate, they might even be special area rules. But be that as it 14 15 may, we are where we are. 16 I think it would be helpful for the 17 Commission and counsel and other pieces if we got native file versions of your Exhibit 4, because I 18 think all we have is a PDF. 19 20 MR. FELDEWERT: Right. 2.1 THE HEARING EXAMINER: I'd rather have 22 a Word version. And I would actually like to propose to my commissioners -- and I'll put it for discussion 23 2.4 before we move it -- but that I think there was sufficient evidence to adopt the applicant's proposal, 25

| 1 | which is Exhibit 4, with the amendment or some version |
|--|--|
| 2 | of the amendment that we just discussed. |
| 3 | I think Commission counsel and |
| 4 | Commission staff should go ahead and put together a |
| 5 | draft written order that can be circulated to the |
| 6 | parties in advance of the next meeting so that we can |
| 7 | come to a confirmation that everyone is comfortable |
| 8 | and happy with the updated language, and they get to |
| 9 | see both the findings from the Commission and the |
| LO | proposed provisions, which are, again, largely |
| L1 | consensus in applicant's Exhibit 4, and that we |
| L2 | actually take action on the order at the April |
| L3 | hearing, once we've seen it written out. |
| L4 | So I'm not even sure there's a need for |
| | |
| L5 | a motion there. That's just a proposal on the table. |
| L5 L6 | a motion there. That's just a proposal on the table. Thoughts, reactions, from my fellow Commissioners? |
| L6 | |
| L6 L7 | Thoughts, reactions, from my fellow Commissioners? |
| L6 L7 L8 | Thoughts, reactions, from my fellow Commissioners? MR. BLOOM: Mr. Chair, that certainly |
| L6 L7 L8 L9 | Thoughts, reactions, from my fellow Commissioners? MR. BLOOM: Mr. Chair, that certainly makes sense to me. Thank you. |
| | Thoughts, reactions, from my fellow Commissioners? MR. BLOOM: Mr. Chair, that certainly makes sense to me. Thank you. DR. AMPOMAH: Mr. Chair, I do agree |
| L6 L7 L8 L9 | Thoughts, reactions, from my fellow Commissioners? MR. BLOOM: Mr. Chair, that certainly makes sense to me. Thank you. DR. AMPOMAH: Mr. Chair, I do agree with that. Thank you. |
| L6 L7 L8 L9 | Thoughts, reactions, from my fellow Commissioners? MR. BLOOM: Mr. Chair, that certainly makes sense to me. Thank you. DR. AMPOMAH: Mr. Chair, I do agree with that. Thank you. THE HEARING EXAMINER: So I think since |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Thoughts, reactions, from my fellow Commissioners? MR. BLOOM: Mr. Chair, that certainly makes sense to me. Thank you. DR. AMPOMAH: Mr. Chair, I do agree with that. Thank you. THE HEARING EXAMINER: So I think since we're not going to be approve it till we have it |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Thoughts, reactions, from my fellow Commissioners? MR. BLOOM: Mr. Chair, that certainly makes sense to me. Thank you. DR. AMPOMAH: Mr. Chair, I do agree with that. Thank you. THE HEARING EXAMINER: So I think since we're not going to be approve it till we have it put together, I think the directions to the party then |

| 1 | it? |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. FELDEWERT: Where would you like me |
| 3 | to send it? |
| 4 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Send it to the |
| 5 | OCC hearings clerk's address. |
| 6 | MR. FELDEWERT: Okay. Yep. |
| 7 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: And then we will |
| 8 | circulate it at least two weeks in advance of the |
| 9 | April Commission hearing so folks can look at it as a |
| LO | totality, and then we'll plan to vote on it at that |
| L1 | hearing. |
| L2 | MR. FELDEWERT: Hopefully, we won't |
| L3 | need it, but will we have an opportunity to provide |
| L4 | comment? |
| L5 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: The intent here |
| L6 | is, I would intend to list it on the April docket as a |
| L7 | matter that's open for hearing and comment. The |
| L8 | purpose of providing it two weeks in advance is if |
| L9 | there are redline comments to put in, we can go |
| 20 | through it, and we can, you know, talk through any |
| 21 | changes at a public hearing. |
| 22 | But in looking at the old order, |
| 23 | reading the new one, other pieces, I'd rather get it |
| 24 | right than have to come back in and do, like, some |
| 25 | technical amendments. So |

| 1 | MR. FELDEWERT: Yep. Thank you. |
|----|--|
| 2 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Mr. Tremaine, |
| 3 | does that work? |
| 4 | MR. TREMAINE: Excellent proposal. |
| 5 | Thank you. |
| 6 | MR. BLOOM: Mr. Chair, since we'll be |
| 7 | coming back on this, perhaps our next meeting or |
| 8 | hearing would be a time when the proponents could |
| 9 | maybe take another crack at the anti-collision |
| 10 | explanation. I just when I see that the factor is |
| 11 | 1, I mean, I think we're in a collision state. |
| 12 | I can't get my head around that. I |
| 13 | don't know why that wouldn't be a factor of 3 or 10 or |
| 14 | something like that. But if you could perhaps walk us |
| 15 | through that one more time, I'd appreciate it. Thank |
| 16 | you. |
| 17 | THE HEARING EXAMINER: Okay. All |
| 18 | right. Seeing nothing else on that matter, we will |
| 19 | continue Case Number 23655 to the April 2024 meeting |
| 20 | of the Oil Conservation Commission. |
| 21 | And then, moving on to the next item of |
| 22 | the agenda, "Other Business, Potential Rescheduling of |
| 23 | the April 11th," that was due to a conflict on my |
| 24 | schedule. But actually, that conflict cleared up. So |
| 25 | we will keep the April 11, 2024, hearing as currently |
| | |

| 1 | scheduled. |
|----|--|
| 2 | And with that, announced our next |
| 3 | meeting date, and I will adjourn this meeting of the |
| 4 | Oil Conservation Commission. Thank you. |
| 5 | MR. FELDEWERT: Thank you for your |
| 6 | time. |
| 7 | (Whereupon, at 1:18 p.m., the |
| 8 | proceeding was concluded.) |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| | Page 131 |
| | 1 436 131 |

1 CERTIFICATE 2 I, JAMES COGSWELL, the officer before whom 3 the foregoing proceedings were taken, do hereby certify that any witness(es) in the foregoing 4 5 proceedings, prior to testifying, were duly sworn; that the proceedings were recorded by me and 6 thereafter reduced to typewriting by a qualified transcriptionist; that said digital audio recording of 8 9 said proceedings are a true and accurate record to the 10 best of my knowledge, skills, and ability; that I am 11 neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any 12 of the parties to the action in which this was taken; 13 and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of any counsel or attorney employed by the parties 14 15 hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the 16 outcome of this action. 17 18 JAMES COGSWELL Notary Public in and for the 19 20 State of New Mexico 2.1 22 23 2.4 2.5

1 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER 2 I, PENNIE M. HAHN, do hereby certify that 3 this transcript was prepared from the digital audio recording of the foregoing proceeding, that said 4 transcript is a true and accurate record of the 5 proceedings to the best of my knowledge, skills, and 6 7 ability; that I am neither counsel for, related to, 8 nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this was taken; and, further, that I am not a 9 relative or employee of any counsel or attorney 10 11 employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or 12 otherwise interested in the outcome of this action. 13 14 Denne Marie Haha PENNIE M. HAHN 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 2.5

| & | 126:4,11,16,17 | 1:18 131:7 | 24 120:11 |
|---------------------------|------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| & 2:4 3:5 4:13 | 127:10 | 2 | 122:23 123:1 |
| 18:1 | 115 6:20 | 2 7:6,7 58:22 | 24018 1:10 |
| 1 | 11:30 108:22 | 59:3 60:8,10 | 37:14,15 38:18 |
| | 11th 130:23 | 60:12,17,21,25 | 24019 1:10 |
| 1 2:5 4:14 7:4,6 | 12 8:5 42:22 | 61:1 63:9 | 24020 1:10 |
| 56:18 58:22,23 | 67:21,22 69:3 | 20 127:5 | 37:15,15 38:18 |
| 59:3,17 60:6 | 69:25 | 2000s 58:1 | 24022 1:10 |
| 61:2 63:9 | 1220 1:20 3:14 | 2000s 38.1 201 4:22 | 24023 1:11 |
| 65:13 69:25 | 4:5 | 201 4.22 2010 112:17 | 24024 1:11 |
| 87:8,9 88:20 | 14 9:8 109:16 | 2010 112.17 2012 57:19 | 24025 1:12 |
| 88:24 89:3 | 17 126:24 | 2012 37.19 2023 43:23 | 37:15 38:18 |
| 126:3 130:11 | 18 1:16 18:3 | 2023 43:23 2024 1:16 9:8 | 24026 1:11 |
| 1,000 91:11 | 19:3 24:22 | 10:22 109:17 | 24027 1:11 |
| 10 7:21 59:9 | 25:10 29:17 | 130:19,25 | 24123 38:5,20 |
| 67:10,11,15 | 31:7 37:5 | 205 4:25 | 24277 1:9 |
| 126:23 130:13 | 103:19 127:2 | | 16:23 28:7 |
| 100 4:14 88:7 | 180 59:9 84:11 | 21 127:5 | 31:16 38:9,14 |
| 1000 3:22 | 19 127:4 | 218 2:13 | 24278 1:9 |
| 105 6:14 | 19.15.16 11:24 | 22 127:5 | 16:23 28:7 |
| 107 6:15 | 19.15.2 11:24 | 23 56:18 127:6 | 31:16 38:9,14 |
| 10:10 55:5 | 19.15.31 11:24 | 231-9312 4:8 | 24th 13:18 |
| 11 8:3 10:22 | 19.15.32. 11:25 | 23580 11:20 | 2523 2:20 |
| 67:21,22 68:20 | 19.15.4.12a5 | 23614 1:12 | 3 |
| 130:25 | 68:5 | 38:2,17 | |
| 110 2:5 35:22 | 1950s 21:6 | 23615 1:12 | 3 7:7 58:22 |
| 111 6:19 7:4,10 | 1960s 21:8 | 23616 1:12 | 59:3 60:22,24 |
| 55:13,16,17 | 1965 21:11 | 23617 1:13 | 61:3,8,13,16,23 |
| 56:6,17 57:17 | 1984 21:18 | 38:2,17 | 63:9 71:1,10 |
| 57:21 58:1,14 | 22:2 27:22 | 2365 109:18 | 126:5 130:13 |
| 59:10 62:8,9 | 1988 56:10,19 | 23655 1:13 | 30 12:25 21:18 |
| 63:13,20 64:1 | 56:23 90:11 | 55:4,12 130:19 | 301 4:22 |
| 69:19 92:6 | 92:5 | 23755 1:9 | 30229 133:14 |
| 96:3 109:19 | 1989 20:16 | 16:23 38:17,19 | 32311 132:17 |
| 112:5 125:11 | 20.10 | 23775 31:24 | 325 3:6 |
| 125:23,23,24 | | 38:3 39:20 | |
| 123.23,23,21 | | | 1 |

[33 - actually]

| 33 60:24 | 60 30:15 | 90 6:10 | accomplish |
|-----------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 39 84:11 | 60s 35:22 | 90s 23:14 57:25 | 26:7 |
| 4 | 64/70 7:12,14 | 913-6425 4:25 | accumulate |
| 4 7:8 58:22,23 | 7:16,18 | 9316 56:11 | 88:5 |
| 58:25 59:3 | 6492301 1:23 | 62:9 | accurate 89:12 |
| 61:24,24 62:3 | 65 62:23 | 94 6:11 | 95:12 132:9 |
| 62:16,19 63:9 | 67/70 7:20,22 | 95 87:16 88:8 | 133:5 |
| 63:12,15 64:3 | 8:4,5 | 89:1 | accurately |
| 65:13 68:3 | 7 | 98 6:12,17 | 35:18 |
| 70:3 71:1,3,10 | 7 7:15 64:3 | 23:23 | achieve 80:1 |
| 125:13 126:5 | 65:18 75:16 | 982-4554 2:16 | 81:16 |
| 127:18 128:1 | 126:5 | 986-2678 3:9 | achieved 78:13 |
| 128:11,25 | 76 6:4 | 988-4421 2:8 | acknowledge |
| 40 26:2,15 | 77 6:5 | 4:17 | 120:1 |
| 27:21 | 8 | 988-7577 2:23 | act 47:22 |
| 45 62:1 | 8 7:17 64:3,6 | 9:01 1:17 | action 104:6,18 |
| 48 122:24 | 66:14 85:10 | a | 113:17,18 |
| 123:1 | 126:9,22 | a.m. 1:17 | 128:12 132:12 |
| 4th 3:22 | 80s 23:13 | ab 88:15,16 | 132:16 133:8 |
| 5 | 82 6:6 | ability 19:13 | 133:12 |
| 5 7:11 64:3,6 | 83 6:7 | 30:6 82:13 | action's 118:7 actions 29:14 |
| 64:12 110:22 | 848-1800 3:25 | 107:10,13 | 104:15 105:3 |
| 126:5 | 86 6:9 | 132:10 133:7 | 104.13 103.3 |
| 500 3:22 | 87102 3:23 | able 9:16 26:21 | active 23:11,25 |
| 505 2:8,16,23 | 87501 2:6,14 | 39:7 82:10 | 34:13 99:25 |
| 3:9,17,25 4:8 | 3:7 4:15,23 | 83:23 94:10 | 120:10 |
| 4:17 | 87504 2:21 | 99:1 113:9 | activity 99:2,5 |
| 537-4477 3:17 | 87505 1:21 | 124:12 | 107:16 |
| 58/70 7:5,6,7 | 3:15 4:6 | absence 69:15 | actual 30:15 |
| 7:10 | 88 57:12 | absent 15:21 | 54:21 80:19 |
| 6 | 9 | absolutely 92:4 | 102:11 104:18 |
| 6 7:13 64:3 | 9 7:19 67:10,11 | accepted 61:25 accommodate | actually 16:21 |
| 65:4 98:1 | 67:13 86:17 | 43:14 | 17:5 39:20 |
| 126:5 | 126:23 | 43.14 | 46:4 55:11,17 |

[actually - allegation]

| | | | 1 _ |
|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| 60:5 68:2 | 39:8,11 47:4 | 70:2 71:13 | afternoon |
| 76:23 77:2 | 52:24 54:17 | 73:21 127:25 | 109:16 |
| 84:5 86:23 | 57:21 61:19 | adopted 56:22 | agenda 10:3,4 |
| 99:14 100:5 | 68:23 69:1,2 | 59:1 62:18 | 10:8,19,20 |
| 124:7 127:22 | 71:2 98:21 | 88:9,9 | 15:23 39:19,19 |
| 128:12 130:24 | 101:12 109:22 | adoption 56:19 | 55:1,18 130:22 |
| ad 88:15,16 | 110:9 114:10 | 57:14 69:18 | ages 27:24 |
| adam 2:3 17:25 | 116:25 119:7 | 71:3 74:9 | ago 20:5,8 |
| add 16:13 26:1 | 121:24 122:3 | advance 43:23 | agrankin 2:7 |
| 27:13,16 52:17 | 125:9 129:5 | 44:23 49:18 | agree 13:12 |
| 54:25 59:13 | addressed | 52:20 128:6 | 14:3,16 31:2 |
| 100:3 123:4 | 18:17 33:9 | 129:8,18 | 33:10,11 47:3 |
| added 61:4,11 | 34:21 39:16 | advanced 79:8 | 48:1 63:18 |
| 61:14,16 63:1 | 46:12 70:25 | 90:16 | 100:2 119:24 |
| adding 95:2 | 101:11 122:18 | advantageous | 128:19 |
| addition 104:4 | 123:2 | 51:24 52:5 | agreed 30:6 |
| 120:23 | addresses | advent 58:2 | 32:18 |
| additional | 32:18 66:2,6,9 | 119:17 | agreement |
| 12:11 15:21 | 66:21 67:4,8 | advisor 65:20 | 29:16 46:17 |
| 23:25 44:11 | 67:16 68:25 | 66:16 | 54:14 57:10 |
| 45:3 46:21 | addressing | affect 106:4 | 72:15 |
| 51:10 60:18 | 18:8 | affected 68:13 | ahead 9:3 55:9 |
| 61:3 81:19 | adequately | 68:24 69:8 | 83:24 128:4 |
| 84:13 94:11,12 | 71:2 | affidavit 68:21 | aimed 99:9 |
| 94:15 96:22 | adjacent 21:9 | 69:4 85:19 | albuquerque |
| 102:17 104:16 | adjourn 131:3 | affidavits 8:5 | 3:23 |
| 105:9 107:1,15 | adjudicatory | affirmative | alert 99:7,9 |
| 108:6 120:5 | 68:3 | 55:11 | 101:2,3 102:8 |
| additionally | adjust 75:22 | affirmed 7:11 | 107:19 |
| 12:15 | 78:10 | 7:13,15,17 8:3 | alex 7:18 66:15 |
| additions 10:5 | administrative | 64:4,12,23 | alexey 6:8 |
| 10:24 | 47:20 48:4 | 65:4,18 66:14 | 84:19 85:2 |
| address 11:22 | admitted 70:1 | 75:16 76:4 | allegation |
| 26:21 33:6 | adopt 62:2,9 | 85:19 98:8 | 52:25 53:13 |
| 36:6,23 37:13 | 63:4,13,20 | 110:21 111:7 | |
| | | | |

[allege - appropriately]

| allege 26:16 | 82:16 83:7,9 | 119:6 | applicants |
|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| allegedly 19:14 | 90:1,3,6,8 | answers 30:12 | 110:6 |
| allow 12:10 | 98:13,14,16 | anti 59:20 66:4 | application |
| 25:8 36:6 51:4 | 101:25 105:11 | 66:23 67:15 | 11:21 26:8 |
| 99:4 | 105:13 110:4 | 72:20 86:1 | 38:3 55:12 |
| allows 32:11 | 115:3,5,8 | 89:16 95:25 | 60:9,19 68:22 |
| 45:9 63:24 | 116:24 117:5 | 96:3 130:9 | 69:7 71:18 |
| alternative | 118:13 123:22 | anticipate | 109:18 |
| 12:23 13:2 | 128:19 | 30:18 108:20 | applications |
| amenable | ampomah's | anybody 116:5 | 18:6 22:3 28:4 |
| 42:20 123:19 | 103:24 | anyway 112:2 | 28:7 29:9 |
| amend 18:7 | analyses 36:13 | 123:7 | 31:16 37:16 |
| 31:16 38:8 | analysis 87:13 | apodaca 5:9 | 38:8,15 42:25 |
| 55:13 109:19 | analyze 113:14 | 9:6 109:4 | 44:10,11 53:8 |
| amended 26:6 | analyzed 114:1 | apologize 16:9 | apply 46:19 |
| amending | anchor 60:7 | appeal 18:5 | 92:15 93:14 |
| 11:24 | andres 19:6,10 | appearance | 124:8 |
| amendment | 19:14,25 20:14 | 12:2 16:11,14 | appreciate 25:7 |
| 80:2 120:6 | 21:1,4,7,9,13 | 16:19 17:10 | 46:4 76:15 |
| 126:8 128:1,2 | 21:17,19 22:7 | 28:23 55:24 | 130:15 |
| amendments | 22:12,15,19,22 | 60:14 70:11 | appreciated |
| 11:22 71:9,13 | 23:1,4,7,10,15 | appearances | 20:11 |
| 79:25 127:4 | 23:17,22 24:5 | 16:22 | appreciates |
| 129:25 | 27:3 28:1 | appearing 31:5 | 71:10 |
| amount 42:6 | 34:18 36:9 | appears 56:7 | approach 31:2 |
| amounts 51:25 | andrews 3:5 | applicable | 36:22 127:8 |
| ampomah 5:7 | anecdotal | 93:17 | approaching |
| 6:5,7,10,12,14 | 119:13 | applicant 56:4 | 42:20 |
| 6:17,20 9:21 | announced | 58:6 64:24 | appropriate |
| 9:22 10:10,13 | 131:2 | 70:25 71:5 | 24:25 31:9,22 |
| 10:14 11:4,5,7 | annulus 93:9 | 125:7,13 | 48:3 95:8 |
| 16:7 32:23 | 93:19,20 94:3 | applicant's | 100:3 108:4 |
| 52:15,18 72:24 | 94:7,12 | 97:25 110:22 | 114:8 120:8 |
| 72:25 73:12 | answer 101:14 | 126:10 127:25 | appropriately |
| 77:18,20,21,23 | 102:3 115:19 | 128:11 | 33:9 39:16 |
| | | | |

[approval - back]

| approval 10:3 | 127:14 | 122:21 | 52:7 |
|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 10:20 22:1 | areas 13:1 | assent 115:18 | authorities |
| 24:5 | 26:25 61:22 | assist 63:1 | 82:1 |
| approve 10:8 | 71:24 72:8 | 85:13 98:4 | authority 21:15 |
| 21:16 63:14 | 78:15 83:15,17 | 100:18 111:22 | 100:4,9,13,18 |
| 128:22 | 84:8 | assistance | 120:2 127:1 |
| approved | argue 24:15 | 110:23 | authorized |
| 10:14,17,19 | 28:4 43:1,2 | assisted 91:24 | 22:15,18 23:20 |
| 11:7,10,12 | argument | associated 67:6 | 26:25 |
| 21:8,19 22:8 | 24:18,22 25:4 | 87:25 88:3 | authorizing |
| 23:9,11 26:3 | 25:4 28:5 34:2 | 124:13 | 21:7 |
| 26:18 27:22 | 34:5,6 43:5 | assume 16:17 | availabilities |
| approximately | arguments | assuming 91:10 | 13:15 |
| 26:2 | 25:15 42:17 | astounded | availability |
| april 15:23 | 54:20 | 27:23 | 13:4 15:9 51:7 |
| 50:5,25 52:7 | argus 69:5 | attached 67:3 | available 15:1 |
| 53:21 128:12 | arose 107:18 | attachments | 66:12 70:20 |
| 129:9,16 | artesia 35:7 | 86:14 | 74:1,17 97:6 |
| 130:19,23,25 | articulated | attack 27:7 | 102:14,22 |
| aquifer 21:12 | 39:2 40:1 | 33:5 | 113:11 114:20 |
| 23:12 26:23 | articulates 35:3 | attacking 24:24 | 114:22,24 |
| 28:5 | artifact 126:12 | attempted | 119:18 |
| area 20:14 21:3 | 126:15 | 114:14 | avenue 2:13 |
| 21:7,20 23:15 | artifacts 127:5 | attempts | avenues 103:22 |
| 26:2,11 30:5 | artificial 40:17 | 105:19 | aware 30:21 |
| 35:7,10,23 | 41:3,12 | attend 46:11 | 32:4 43:22 |
| 40:19 54:11 | ascertained | attention 44:19 | 54:12 57:24 |
| 56:13,25 57:6 | 21:21 | attorney | 107:8 |
| 57:17,20 58:20 | aside 27:21 | 132:14 133:10 | b |
| 63:7 66:4 68:1 | asked 53:4 | audio 74:21 | b 7:1 8:1 57:8 |
| 68:6,11 69:21 | 90:10 | 97:10 102:25 | 62:21 93:7 |
| 83:15 90:12,13 | asking 71:12 | 132:8 133:3 | 125:23 126:11 |
| 99:3,6,9 | aspects 12:16 | august 14:6 | back 14:8 |
| 103:25 106:5 | 12:18 64:21 | 42:3 46:3 48:9 | 20:16 26:15 |
| 107:11 115:23 | 66:1,21,22 | 49:7 51:21 | 28:9 43:23 |

[back - building]

| 53:21 56:19,23 | 122:5,6,13 | bennett 3:20 | bog 36:17 |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| 57:4 60:7 | 123:6 | 16:8,9,18 | boilerplate |
| 63:22 82:10 | batch 80:17 | best 17:6 33:5 | 126:3 127:7 |
| 87:23 94:23 | battery 109:10 | 33:16 108:3 | bottom 56:20 |
| 108:19,23 | bearing 23:12 | 118:16 119:2 | boundaries |
| 119:24 121:18 | 23:18 | 132:10 133:6 | 35:2 |
| 123:16 129:24 | began 59:6 | bet 114:25 | boundary 35:8 |
| 130:7 | beginning | better 31:25 | 35:21 36:20,23 |
| background | 56:20 | 76:24 | 37:14,17 38:1 |
| 25:12 56:18 | begins 59:8 | beyond 47:12 | 41:2 |
| 57:13 65:8 | 62:1 | 120:20 122:4 | box 2:20 |
| 87:3 103:15 | begun 113:23 | bigger 53:9 | brandon 6:13 |
| backward 54:3 | behalf 2:2,10 | bit 13:22 18:21 | 103:9 |
| barely 113:23 | 3:2,11,19 4:2 | 25:12 49:15,24 | break 43:12 |
| barrels 35:23 | 4:10,19 17:13 | 72:12,17 78:6 | 49:15 55:3 |
| base 21:1 22:11 | 111:23 | 86:24 | 108:15 113:4 |
| based 15:11 | believe 13:8 | blank 127:13 | 123:22 |
| 31:15 32:9 | 17:14 31:18 | blend 80:18 | breaking 42:12 |
| 36:14 39:10 | 38:5 39:11 | blm 26:3,12 | 42:18 |
| 50:15 76:3 | 43:16 44:13,16 | 58:3,12 61:21 | brief 13:2 |
| 79:2 80:14 | 44:18,20,25 | 68:13,19 69:2 | 46:23 55:20 |
| 81:7,11 85:18 | 52:18 55:23 | 114:21 120:8 | 70:9 |
| 98:7 99:15 | 58:18 63:1 | 120:14 123:5 | briefing 31:6 |
| 105:15 111:3,6 | 64:15 65:8,21 | bloom 5:5 6:4,9 | 31:10 46:6,14 |
| 111:8 115:9 | 66:17 69:17 | 9:24,25 10:6,9 | 47:4 48:25 |
| 118:15 | 74:16 76:18 | 10:16,17,25 | briefly 59:2 |
| baseline 104:5 | 77:12 79:4 | 11:3,9,10 16:6 | 103:14 |
| 105:3 | 83:3,24 84:4 | 32:22 52:14,16 | bring 113:2 |
| basically 28:25 | 84:10 86:13 | 72:11 73:2 | 116:4 |
| 44:6 105:2 | 91:6,7,19 | 76:10,13 77:4 | broad 112:19 |
| 125:14 126:5 | 93:10 97:6 | 85:25 86:3,12 | brought 24:3 |
| basin 21:12,13 | 98:20 100:15 | 86:21 90:4 | 33:3 |
| basis 18:15 | 101:23 105:15 | 128:17 130:6 | buck 51:6 |
| 19:21 35:12 | 105:17,24 | blue 61:4 | building 1:19 |
| 40:16 51:25 | 107:22,25 | | 64:25,25 |
| | | | |

[bump - chair]

| 1 1 1 1 1 | 75 14 76 6 14 | 26 12 27 2 6 9 | 00.05.01.2.10 |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| bump 14:11 | 75:14 76:6,14 | 36:12 37:2,6,8 | 80:25 81:3,10 |
| bundle 31:25 | 77:8,10,11 | 37:12,13,25 | 81:15,16,18 |
| burden 46:20 | 82:19 83:20,24 | 38:13,16,17,19 | cemented 93:20 |
| 61:20 | 84:3,14,16 | 39:3,4,10,12,15 | cementing |
| bureau 103:20 | 85:7 | 39:23 40:5,9 | 59:21 |
| business | care 103:24 | 40:10 41:5,14 | center 34:16 |
| 130:22 | carlsbad 64:15 | 41:18,24 42:11 | centers 88:17 |
| button 9:15 | 69:5 110:8 | 42:18,21,22 | certain 26:25 |
| c | carried 113:23 | 43:2,3,7,8,9 | 44:22 53:5 |
| c 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1 | carry 25:11 | 44:3 50:13 | 70:11 119:9 |
| 9:1 66:3 | case 1:9 11:20 | 52:13 53:1,2 | certainly 99:20 |
| calculated | 12:2,4,18 18:5 | 53:23 54:5,7 | 128:17 |
| 87:14 | 25:3 30:22 | 54:25 | certainty 87:16 |
| call 9:20 10:11 | 37:4,19,21 | casing 59:21,22 | 88:7 89:2,13 |
| 11:6 64:20 | 38:2,5,5,6,9,13 | 59:23,24 66:5 | certificate |
| 74:16 77:16 | 38:14,16,20,21 | 66:24 67:4,9 | 132:1 133:1 |
| 84:19 108:10 | 39:7,19,21,25 | 77:12,14 78:7 | certified 68:9 |
| 110:7 | 40:1,8 45:8 | 78:10,11,13,14 | certify 132:4 |
| called 1:6 56:13 | 53:1 55:3,11 | 78:17,21,21 | 133:2 |
| 75:10 85:3 | 55:11 56:11 | 84:8 115:25 | cessation |
| 97:20 103:10 | 62:9 79:6 | 118:19 122:20 | 107:10,23 |
| 110:16 | 109:18 130:19 | 122:24 123:11 | cetera 102:9 |
| | cases 16:21,23 | 124:6,8,11,13 | 112:4 |
| calling 74:5 capacity 32:5 | 16:25 17:3,4,6 | 124:17 | chair 5:3 10:6 |
| | 17:10,23 18:3 | casings 77:25 | 10:25 12:8 |
| 54:6 | 18:12,21 19:3 | catch 100:6 | 14:2 16:6,7,8 |
| capital 83:1 capitan 21:12 | 19:5 24:22 | cause 21:22 | 16:15 17:3,24 |
| _ | 25:2,4,10 | 104:4 114:13 | 18:3,12 19:2 |
| 83:2,14,16,18 | 27:11,20 28:7 | 118:23 | 25:24 28:18 |
| 84:9 | 28:19,20,23 | caused 124:16 | 30:10 32:22,23 |
| caption 39:25 | 29:7,17,21 | cbl 81:2,20 | 33:2,10 35:14 |
| 55:15,18 | 31:7,11,23 | cd 88:15,16 | 36:5 37:6 |
| caraway 6:3 | 32:1 33:12 | ceasing 107:15 | 39:17 40:14 |
| 7:16 65:19 | 34:10,19,22 | cement 66:11 | 42:16 43:20 |
| 73:10 74:16,22 | 35:2,15 36:10 | 80:15,18,20,23 | 44:9,20 45:20 |
| 74:24 75:3,9 | , | , , , | , |

[chair - comments]

| | I | I | I |
|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 47:2,7 48:19 | chris 20:19 | cleared 130:24 | 87:20 89:17 |
| 51:15 52:16,18 | chunks 31:8 | clearly 29:11 | 95:23,25 96:3 |
| 52:22 56:5 | circulate 15:8 | 31:15 | 96:18 130:9,11 |
| 70:8 72:11,17 | 129:8 | clerical 63:14 | collisions 76:21 |
| 72:25 74:12 | circulated | clerk 5:9 15:7 | 89:25 96:11,16 |
| 82:16,21 83:6 | 10:22 128:5 | clerk's 129:5 | color 34:14 |
| 83:7 98:14 | circumstances | click 9:14 | column 22:17 |
| 101:25 102:5 | 44:25 126:7 | client 28:13 | 22:24 23:2 |
| 107:3 110:5 | civil 47:16,17 | close 51:2 | come 14:25 |
| 121:19 128:17 | 47:24 | 88:22 | 26:15 32:17 |
| 128:19 130:6 | claim 45:18 | closer 35:2 | 47:3 50:7 |
| chair's 124:20 | claims 19:17,21 | 39:13 | 53:21 54:1,14 |
| 125:22 | 29:6,12,18 | closing 25:4 | 58:17 78:3 |
| chairman | 33:11 35:6,18 | cogswell 1:22 | 84:19 91:25 |
| 24:14 27:18 | 36:23 43:7 | 132:2,18 | 108:19 110:9 |
| 34:1 | 53:11,15 | collaboration | 112:19 113:1 |
| chance 9:11 | clarification | 69:12 96:15 | 115:16 117:8 |
| 44:20,21 | 107:4 | 105:5 | 128:7 129:24 |
| change 62:11 | clarified | collaborative | comes 87:23 |
| 62:17 | 115:13 | 69:15 70:10 | 116:8 |
| changed 15:25 | clarify 42:7 | collapse 118:19 | comfortable |
| 61:5 | 60:4 63:11 | collateral 27:7 | 18:23 71:25 |
| changes 7:5 | 79:18 82:25 | collect 99:1 | 128:7 |
| 16:2 61:3 66:2 | 83:7,13 105:1 | collected 92:5 | coming 48:15 |
| 66:11 126:24 | clarifying | 105:4 114:19 | 69:2 79:8 |
| 129:21 | 82:24 93:5 | collecting | 119:4 120:15 |
| changing 57:7 | clarity 38:11 | 105:2 | 130:7 |
| check 16:16 | 40:10 | collection | comment |
| chemistry | clean 7:6,8 | 120:1 | 103:24 129:14 |
| 19:11 45:15 | 60:10 61:1 | collective | 129:17 |
| chief 103:21 | cleaning 63:15 | 100:12 | commentary |
| chino 1:19 | clear 37:11 | colliding 89:23 | 25:20 |
| choose 81:23 | 60:23 63:5 | collision 59:20 | comments 10:5 |
| 82:2 | 113:25 | 66:4,23 67:15 | 10:24 13:25 |
| | | 72:20 86:1 | 70:16,22 |
| | | | |

[comments - conclusions]

| 121:20 127:4 | commission's | companies | 54:4,18 56:16 |
|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| 129:19 | 10:2 15:13 | 68:16,16 95:19 | 77:14 120:21 |
| commercially | commissioner | company 3:3 | 123:12 125:5 |
| 69:22 | 5:3,5,7 9:21,23 | 4:11 60:15 | comprehensive |
| commission | 10:15 11:8 | 65:7 96:6 | 71:19 81:22 |
| 3:11,13 5:4,6,8 | 15:9 51:7 | company's | 119:19,20 |
| 9:9 11:13 | 52:14,14 73:2 | 95:24 | compressive |
| 13:14 14:13 | 76:10 77:20 | comparable | 80:25 |
| 15:8,17 16:24 | 85:25 123:21 | 91:14 | concept 89:18 |
| 18:4,6,18 20:5 | commissioners | competing 33:6 | conceptually |
| 22:2 23:10 | 9:10 10:23 | compiled 68:12 | 120:22 |
| 24:11 26:4,13 | 14:3 15:22 | complete 72:15 | concern 33:24 |
| 31:1,3 32:6 | 16:5 17:25 | 79:5 | 48:24 49:17 |
| 33:4 35:25 | 30:11 32:20 | completed | 74:5 79:22 |
| 38:6,13,14,16 | 49:23 50:19 | 12:15 20:24 | 81:15 83:17 |
| 38:20 40:10,23 | 52:11 71:17 | 90:24 101:23 | 90:15 100:25 |
| 42:4,7 43:14 | 72:7 73:9 | completion | 101:6,6 102:11 |
| 45:7,9 46:9,16 | 127:10,23 | 79:9,19,21 | 124:16 |
| 47:9,20 48:3,8 | 128:16 | 90:16 91:7,12 | concerned |
| 48:10 49:8 | committed 20:5 | 92:20 93:25 | 51:18 52:4 |
| 50:1,12,16,25 | 108:1 | completions | concerning |
| 51:5,12 52:6 | committee 4:11 | 21:16 65:6 | 33:16 38:15 |
| 53:16,24 54:4 | 55:13,25 58:7 | 79:2,7,8,10,22 | 76:10 97:5 |
| 55:19 57:11 | 58:10,13 59:15 | 79:23 80:3,7 | concerns 28:24 |
| 62:2 70:1,20 | 59:19 60:17 | 93:7 98:10 | 29:25 30:4,22 |
| 71:13 72:5 | 68:12,18 108:2 | complex 29:18 | 35:24 53:4 |
| 73:20 74:6 | 109:19 114:3 | complexity | 70:11,25 71:2 |
| 76:6 85:19 | 117:21 119:8 | 30:14 | 71:12 99:10 |
| 98:9 103:14 | common 28:3 | compliance | 120:19 121:21 |
| 109:17,23 | commonly 88:9 | 30:6 | 121:24 |
| 111:10 125:20 | communicate | comply 30:6 | concluded |
| 127:12,17 | 48:7 | components | 131:8 |
| 128:3,4,9 | communication | 16:1 17:7 | conclusion 78:3 |
| 129:9 130:20 | 19:9 36:2,9 | 31:20 32:6 | conclusions |
| 131:4 | 118:20 | 50:1,21 51:8 | 112:22 |
| | | | |

[concur - counsel]

| concur 49:6 | confusing | consists 56:16 | contradictory |
|---------------------|------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| 70:9 | 39:18 | 58:8 | 24:3 |
| concurrent | confusion 40:4 | consolidate | control 42:11 |
| 58:19 69:20 | connected | 25:11 | controversy |
| concurs 71:9 | 74:21 | constraints | 57:22,25 58:4 |
| conditions 80:9 | consensus 13:1 | 13:4 | converted 59:6 |
| 80:21 105:20 | 14:20,25 64:24 | cont'd 3:1 4:1 | cooperation |
| 105:22 120:9 | 64:25 72:3,13 | 5:1 8:1 | 58:5 |
| confer 15:18 | 73:3 112:12 | contact 28:12 | cooperative |
| 46:13 47:1 | 128:11 | 88:25 89:3,4 | 69:12 |
| conference | consequence | contains 57:9 | coordinate |
| 11:19 25:1 | 44:2 | 58:25 | 16:18 |
| 50:5 55:20 | consequences | contemplate | coordination |
| conferences | 20:10 | 51:12 | 105:5 120:13 |
| 46:9 | conservation | contemplated | core 29:17 43:6 |
| conferring 44:4 | 1:3,6 3:11,13 | 122:8 | correct 40:2 |
| confirm 15:9 | 4:2,4,10 5:3,5,8 | contemporary | 60:5 76:2 82:4 |
| 74:20,22 75:15 | 5:9 9:9 10:2 | 90:25 | 86:8 87:10 |
| 75:16 85:8 | 12:9,11 16:25 | content 98:6,20 | 90:13,14 95:20 |
| 97:10,11,25 | 17:17 29:4 | context 18:14 | 99:18 105:7 |
| 102:25 | 51:12 55:25 | 25:7 27:17 | 112:6,7 113:6 |
| confirmation | 103:17 109:17 | 33:15 126:25 | corrected 20:13 |
| 120:11 128:7 | 130:20 131:4 | continuation | corrections |
| confirmed | consider 11:21 | 113:22 114:12 | 60:18 |
| 23:17 | considerably | continue 13:11 | correlative |
| conflict 20:1 | 27:25 | 52:5 108:23 | 21:23 41:9 |
| 130:23,24 | consideration | 112:23 130:19 | 47:21 69:24 |
| conflicting | 39:12 | continues | 106:22 107:20 |
| 13:15 | considerations | 51:24 | costs 45:16 |
| conflicts 13:8,9 | 123:23 | continuing | counsel 55:18 |
| 13:21 14:5 | considered | 14:4 44:3 | 56:3 110:24 |
| conform 60:6 | 118:17 119:4 | continuous | 127:17 128:3 |
| 91:11,15 | considering 1:8 | 15:14 | 132:11,14 |
| conformance | consistent | contracts 12:14 | 133:7,10 |
| 91:20 | 27:15 | | |
| | | | |

[counterparts - delay]

| counterparts | current 30:6 | 117:7,15,15,16 | 122:3,4 |
|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| 78:5 | 37:16 60:7 | 118:1,2,9 | deals 90:23 |
| counties 55:14 | 69:5 80:6,9 | 119:25 120:3,7 | 91:16 |
| 56:14 57:6 | 103:14 107:16 | 120:15 122:9 | deana 3:20 |
| 109:20 | 112:5 125:11 | 122:12 123:5 | 16:8 |
| couple 63:20 | currently 29:8 | 123:23,25 | deana.bennett |
| 107:4 109:8,9 | 30:20 35:21 | 124:2 | 3:24 |
| 121:19 125:6 | 38:19 40:5 | date 1:16 15:1 | decades 20:5,8 |
| course 47:18,24 | 41:24 53:24 | 32:15 48:9,11 | 21:14 |
| court 55:19,21 | 56:23 57:15 | 49:7 50:2,2,25 | decide 25:2 |
| 74:20 75:4 | 91:4 93:22 | 52:6,11 54:2 | 31:6 99:17 |
| 84:20 97:14,16 | 94:9 103:16 | 54:17 90:2 | decided 12:3 |
| 103:4 110:10 | 105:17 126:10 | 131:3 | 46:17 78:9 |
| cover 37:2 | 130:25 | dated 126:6 | deciding 25:10 |
| 73:23 83:15 | cursor 34:8 | dates 13:2,5 | decision 24:23 |
| covered 52:19 | cut 42:5 | 14:22 16:1 | 27:5 31:9 36:1 |
| 73:22 77:11 | cutting 54:10 | 42:1 50:14,20 | 99:23 |
| 85:22 | d | 51:6 52:19 | decisions 24:10 |
| crack 130:9 | d 6:1 9:1 66:6 | 54:18 | 27:6 116:8,10 |
| created 21:14 | d2 66:24 | david 66:6 | declared 21:11 |
| 22:4 | d3 66:25 | davis 4:20 | dedication |
| creates 29:25 | d4 67:1 | 13:24 14:2 | 49:11 |
| creating 22:21 | d5 67:5 | day 12:15 | deep 59:23 |
| credentials | d6 67:9 | 21:15 32:11 | define 89:7 |
| 64:16 65:8,21 | daily 51:25 | days 12:25 | defined 22:4 |
| 66:16 111:6,9 | dan 6:18 7:12 | 14:11 30:15 | 35:7 |
| critical 101:22 | 64:13 110:7,15 | de 3:6 18:5 | definitely 91:7 |
| criticality | dana 2:11 | 38:5,21 | 100:22 114:24 |
| 78:14 | 17:12 28:9 | deadline 48:13 | 118:25 |
| cross 54:10 | daniel 3:12 | deadlines 50:10 | definition |
| 74:11 | data 99:1 105:2 | deal 19:19 | 21:13 |
| crowd 9:16 | 105:4 109:25 | 37:25 67:20 | deformation |
| culmination | 113:9,11,13,21 | 122:19 | 115:25 |
| 20:4 69:11 | 113:25 114:19 | dealing 40:9 | delay 53:11 |
| | 114:21 115:16 | 112:6 114:9 | |

[delaying - discussion]

| delaying 52:25 | desire 52:12 | device 100:20 | discerned 22:1 |
|---------------------|------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| 52:25 | 54:6 | 101:18 | discovered |
| demonstrates | desired 78:23 | devices 100:14 | 20:16,22 |
| 69:18 | detailed 55:18 | dhardy 2:15 | discovery |
| demonstration | 71:19 77:12 | diagram 73:4 | 30:19 31:5,10 |
| 45:18 | details 29:10 | diagrams 62:22 | 43:17,21,22,25 |
| department 1:2 | determinations | 62:24 67:6 | 44:5,8,13,14 |
| 57:19 | 24:3 42:23 | 93:7 | 45:3,21,25 |
| depending | determine | died 58:4 | 46:5,11,24 |
| 15:15 | 24:21 25:2 | 109:10 | 47:8,18,25 |
| depends 89:9 | 124:13 | different 31:8 | 48:5,21,22 |
| 93:16 95:9 | determined | 39:16 41:16 | 49:4 51:19 |
| depositions | 27:2 59:16 | 42:25 72:12 | 52:4 53:4,10 |
| 44:22,22 45:2 | 117:21 | 74:15 86:25 | discovery's |
| deputy 70:19 | determining | 103:21 | 48:1,24 |
| 103:16 | 113:17 | difficult 13:6 | discrete 31:21 |
| describe 127:1 | develop 29:2,19 | digital 132:8 | discuss 16:3 |
| description 7:2 | 30:16 58:14 | 133:3 | 27:2 59:2 74:1 |
| 8:2 39:20 57:5 | developed | diligently 43:21 | 100:17 111:4 |
| 62:4,6 | 59:20 64:21 | dimensional | 117:8 |
| design 7:21 | 66:1,20 67:10 | 87:15 | discussed 40:5 |
| 67:2,6 78:19 | 92:10 96:14 | direct 18:6 | 41:22 67:14 |
| 78:24 80:8,10 | 120:12 | directed 69:7 | 73:11 76:1,8 |
| 80:11,12 82:6 | development | direction 50:6 | 95:9 100:9 |
| 82:8 91:2,25 | 24:17 29:8 | 54:13 | 128:2 |
| 93:17 | 30:5 56:24 | directions | discusses 64:23 |
| designated | 58:19 61:22 | 128:23 | 64:24 65:12,14 |
| 18:9 20:15 | 64:11,18 65:11 | directly 74:11 | 66:7,11 |
| 23:14,22,24 | 65:24 69:20 | director 16:25 | discussion 15:5 |
| 68:6,11 | 85:21 106:5,12 | 32:5 54:6 | 15:21 17:6,19 |
| designation | 106:20 111:17 | 70:19 103:17 | 40:15 50:15 |
| 23:21 24:6 | 111:24 | disadvantage | 77:13 95:1 |
| designed 122:3 | developments | 52:1 | 99:15 112:1 |
| designs 80:7 | 29:11 | discern 35:18 | 119:24 127:10 |
| 81:22 82:12 | | 36:14 | 127:23 |
| | | | |

[discussions - early]

| discussions | distinguish | documents | 94:16 106:16 |
|-----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| 12:24 14:18,21 | 35:12 | 53:5,5 | 106:17 116:6 |
| 14:24 15:11 | district 103:21 | doing 19:7 | drinking 29:14 |
| 16:13 28:9 | divided 88:15 | 23:16 56:8 | drive 1:20 3:14 |
| 60:13 78:4 | diving 30:23 | 80:19 86:24 | 4:5 |
| 101:9 105:16 | division 1:3,7 | dr 5:7 6:5,7,10 | driver's 45:13 |
| 108:11,12 | 4:2,4,10 5:10 | 6:12,14,17,20 | dropped |
| dismiss 26:7 | 12:9,11 13:17 | 9:22 10:10,13 | 126:12,15 |
| 28:3,6 31:17 | 16:24 17:1,17 | 10:14 11:4,5,7 | drubin 3:16 |
| 31:19 | 20:25 21:6,8 | 16:7 32:23 | dude 20:18 |
| displacement | 21:15,21 23:14 | 52:18 72:24,25 | due 11:16 19:9 |
| 101:5,18,21 | 23:16 26:4 | 73:12 77:18,21 | 19:11 28:23 |
| disposable | 28:19,20,21,21 | 77:23 82:16 | 30:13 51:18 |
| 34:16 | 29:4,15 30:1 | 83:7,9 90:1,3,6 | 130:23 |
| disposal 19:6 | 32:5 37:19,21 | 90:8 98:13,14 | duly 16:16 25:6 |
| 19:10 21:7,8 | 38:17 40:9,23 | 98:16 101:25 | 52:9 53:18 |
| 21:19,21 23:12 | 41:18,24 43:24 | 103:24 105:11 | 75:10 85:3 |
| 23:15,15,20,24 | 44:14 51:17 | 105:13 110:4 | 97:20 103:10 |
| 24:6,7 26:24 | 54:6 56:1 | 115:3,5,8 | 110:16 132:5 |
| dispute 19:4,6 | 60:16 61:10,18 | 116:24 117:5 | duplicative |
| 19:25 20:3 | 61:20 68:6 | 118:13 128:19 | 47:12 |
| 30:20 46:18 | 70:13 84:7 | draft 128:5 | dylan 5:3 |
| disputes 29:22 | 103:17,19 | drafting 118:17 | e |
| 30:19 43:17,25 | 107:22 117:4,6 | draw 21:17 | e 2:1,1 3:1,1 4:1 |
| 46:11 48:21 | 122:13 123:5 | drawn 112:22 | 4:1 5:1,1 6:1 |
| 49:4 51:19 | 125:12 | drill 91:9 | 7:1 8:1 9:1,1 |
| 52:4 54:22 | division's 9:13 | drilled 20:22 | 66:7 |
| 58:1 | 23:21 56:7,9 | 20:23 90:24 | eager 19:21 |
| distance 87:20 | 59:5 68:4 | 91:3 93:18,18 | 45:8 |
| 87:22 88:17 | 81:18 83:4,17 | drilling 56:12 | earlier 21:6 |
| 89:5,8,17,20 | 122:19,21 | 58:2,3 61:21 | 49:2 90:10 |
| 95:2,4 | 123:2 | 61:21 65:9,22 | early 13:5 14:6 |
| distinct 43:3 | docket 129:16 | 66:3,8,18 | 20:5 21:6 |
| distinction | documented | 79:21 81:12 | 23:14 57:25 |
| 40:17 41:4,13 | 21:2,4 | 91:17,22,24 | 105:20 108:15 |

[easier - esquire]

| easier 36:21 | 107:24 | energy 1:2 56:1 | entered 12:1,18 |
|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| 63:22 112:19 | emnrd.nm.gov | enforce 116:14 | 16:18,22 17:10 |
| economic 45:17 | 4:7 | 116:14 | 28:22 55:24 |
| eddy 55:14 | empire 2:10 3:2 | enforced 117:3 | 60:14 70:10 |
| 56:14 57:6 | 17:13,20 19:4 | 117:6 | 97:25 |
| 109:20 | 24:8 25:9,20 | enforcing | entire 20:25 |
| editing 70:16 | 25:25 26:2 | 116:20 | entirely 41:19 |
| edits 60:4 71:1 | 34:17 37:13 | engage 28:22 | 96:2 |
| effect 26:15 | 44:10,13 45:13 | 31:1 47:25 | entirety 83:15 |
| 99:5 | 47:17 52:1 | 49:3 70:21 | enumerated |
| effective 49:3 | empire's 19:13 | engaged 30:20 | 38:24 |
| 99:14 | 27:9 30:5 35:8 | 70:13 | environment |
| effectively | 40:13 44:22 | engagement | 106:24 |
| 26:22 | 48:15 51:20 | 12:16 71:11 | environmental |
| efficient 41:14 | employed 65:5 | engaging 47:8 | 103:18,20 |
| 43:12 | 65:19 132:11 | engineer 21:11 | envision 114:21 |
| effort 69:15 | 132:14 133:8 | 21:16 64:14 | eog 3:19 16:11 |
| 100:12 | 133:11 | 65:7,20 66:16 | 16:12 |
| eight 38:1 57:7 | employee | engineering | epa 29:16 |
| either 14:9,11 | 132:13 133:10 | 36:15 65:23 | equation 76:19 |
| 17:10 29:23 | emsu 20:15 | 76:7 80:12 | 86:6,25 87:5 |
| 43:10,14 47:3 | 21:10 22:5 | 85:21 98:10,11 | 88:14 |
| 61:4 107:20,23 | 34:9 38:8 | 103:18,20 | ernest 2:18 |
| elements 50:23 | 42:18,21 43:8 | 111:11,11 | erroneous |
| ellipse 7:19 | 43:12 | ensure 44:17 | 26:16 |
| 87:14,23 88:1 | enacted 56:10 | 51:7 70:11 | erroneously |
| 88:6 89:1,10 | 90:11 | 72:5 91:8 | 23:9 24:4 |
| 89:14 95:10 | enactment | 95:21 106:13 | error 20:4,10 |
| ellipses 88:24 | 57:23 | ensures 76:20 | 20:12 24:24 |
| 88:25 89:3,9 | encourage | 87:19 | 63:12 |
| 89:19,21 | 50:23 52:6 | ensuring | errors 63:14 |
| email 15:6,8 | 53:20 63:4,19 | 106:22 | 87:25 88:3,5 |
| 68:14,25 69:2 | endeavoring | enter 16:10,14 | es 132:4 |
| emergency | 45:4 | 78:17 | esquire 2:3,11 |
| 102:9 107:9,14 | | | 2:18 3:4,12,20 |
| | | | |

[esquire - exhibits]

| establishment 110:18 117:19 106:10,18,25 8:3,5 : 58:3 118:12 107:5 108:6,17 58:25 et 102:9 112:4 examiner 9:2,7 108:21 109:2,6 60:6,8 eunice 18:7 9:23 10:1,7,11 109:12,15 60:21, 20:16 24:18 10:15,18 11:1 110:10,19,25 61:1,2 33:13 11:5,8,11 111:8 114:18 61:15, evaluating 13:24 14:14 115:3 119:22 62:3,7 36:18 15:4 17:12,16 121:6,9,13,17 62:18, evd 7:2 8:2 18:23 20:19 122:14 123:10 63:15 eve 44:1 49:5 25:5 27:14 123:18 124:22 64:12 | |
|--|---------------|
| 13:16 87:10 105:12 107:6 94:18 96:21 excused 88:20 111:14 115:7 97:1,13,23 97:2 1 established examine 97:9 98:3,7 102:1 108:8 55:16 examined 102:15,24 exhibit establishing 75:12 85:5 103:3,13,23 7:7,7,8 105:2 97:22 103:12 104:25 105:8 7:15,1 establishment 110:18 117:19 106:10,18,25 8:3,5 : 58:3 118:12 107:5 108:6,17 58:25 et 102:9 112:4 examiner 9:2,7 108:21 109:2,6 60:6,8 eunice 18:7 9:23 10:1,7,11 109:12,15 60:21, 20:16 24:18 10:15,18 11:1 110:10,19,25 61:1,2 33:13 11:5,8,11 111:8 114:18 61:15, evaluating 13:24 14:14 115:3 119:22 62:3,7 36:18 15:4 17:12,16 121:6,9,13,17 62:18, eve 44:1 49:5 25:5 27:14 123:18 124:22 64:12 | |
| 88:20 111:14 115:7 97:1,13,23 97:2 1 established examine 97:9 98:3,7 102:1 108:8 55:16 examined 102:15,24 exhibit establishing 75:12 85:5 103:3,13,23 7:7,7,8 105:2 97:22 103:12 104:25 105:8 7:15,1 establishment 110:18 117:19 106:10,18,25 8:3,5 3 58:3 118:12 107:5 108:6,17 58:25 et 102:9 112:4 examiner 9:2,7 108:21 109:2,6 60:6,8 eunice 18:7 9:23 10:1,7,11 109:12,15 60:21, 20:16 24:18 10:15,18 11:1 110:10,19,25 61:1,2 33:13 11:5,8,11 111:8 114:18 61:15, evaluating 13:24 14:14 115:3 119:22 62:3,7 36:18 15:4 17:12,16 121:6,9,13,17 62:18, eve 44:1 49:5 25:5 27:14 123:18 124:22 64:12 | |
| established examine 97:9 98:3,7 102:1 108:8 55:16 examined 102:15,24 exhibit establishing 75:12 85:5 103:3,13,23 7:7,7,8 105:2 97:22 103:12 104:25 105:8 7:15,1 establishment 110:18 117:19 106:10,18,25 8:3,5 3 58:3 118:12 107:5 108:6,17 58:25 et 102:9 112:4 examiner 9:2,7 108:21 109:2,6 60:6,8 eunice 18:7 9:23 10:1,7,11 109:12,15 60:21, 20:16 24:18 10:15,18 11:1 110:10,19,25 61:1,2 33:13 11:5,8,11 111:8 114:18 61:15, evaluating 13:24 14:14 115:3 119:22 62:3,7 36:18 15:4 17:12,16 121:6,9,13,17 62:18, eve 44:1 49:5 25:5 27:14 123:18 124:22 64:12 | |
| 55:16 examined 102:15,24 exhibit establishing 75:12 85:5 103:3,13,23 7:7,7,8 105:2 97:22 103:12 104:25 105:8 7:15,1 establishment 110:18 117:19 106:10,18,25 8:3,5 3 58:3 118:12 107:5 108:6,17 58:25 et 102:9 112:4 examiner 9:2,7 108:21 109:2,6 60:6,8 eunice 18:7 9:23 10:1,7,11 109:12,15 60:21, 20:16 24:18 10:15,18 11:1 110:10,19,25 61:1,2 33:13 11:5,8,11 111:8 114:18 61:15, evaluating 13:24 14:14 115:3 119:22 62:3,7 36:18 15:4 17:12,16 121:6,9,13,17 62:18, evd 7:2 8:2 18:23 20:19 122:14 123:10 63:15 eve 44:1 49:5 25:5 27:14 123:18 124:22 64:12 | |
| establishing 75:12 85:5 103:3,13,23 7:7,7,8 105:2 97:22 103:12 104:25 105:8 7:15,1 establishment 110:18 117:19 106:10,18,25 8:3,5 3 58:3 118:12 107:5 108:6,17 58:25 et 102:9 112:4 examiner 9:2,7 108:21 109:2,6 60:6,8 eunice 18:7 9:23 10:1,7,11 109:12,15 60:21, 20:16 24:18 10:15,18 11:1 110:10,19,25 61:1,2 33:13 11:5,8,11 11:8 114:18 61:15, evaluating 13:24 14:14 115:3 119:22 62:3,7 36:18 15:4 17:12,16 121:6,9,13,17 62:18, evd 7:2 8:2 18:23 20:19 122:14 123:10 63:15 eve 44:1 49:5 25:5 27:14 123:18 124:22 64:12 | |
| 105:2 97:22 103:12 104:25 105:8 7:15,1 establishment 110:18 117:19 106:10,18,25 8:3,5 : 58:3 118:12 107:5 108:6,17 58:25 et 102:9 112:4 examiner 9:2,7 108:21 109:2,6 60:6,8 eunice 18:7 9:23 10:1,7,11 109:12,15 60:21, 20:16 24:18 10:15,18 11:1 110:10,19,25 61:1,2 33:13 11:5,8,11 111:8 114:18 61:15, evaluating 13:24 14:14 115:3 119:22 62:3,7 36:18 15:4 17:12,16 121:6,9,13,17 62:18, evd 7:2 8:2 18:23 20:19 122:14 123:10 63:15 eve 44:1 49:5 25:5 27:14 123:18 124:22 64:12 | |
| establishment 110:18 117:19 106:10,18,25 8:3,5 3 58:3 118:12 107:5 108:6,17 58:25 et 102:9 112:4 examiner 9:2,7 108:21 109:2,6 60:6,8 eunice 18:7 9:23 10:1,7,11 109:12,15 60:21, 20:16 24:18 10:15,18 11:1 110:10,19,25 61:1,2 33:13 11:5,8,11 111:8 114:18 61:15, evaluating 13:24 14:14 115:3 119:22 62:3,7 36:18 15:4 17:12,16 121:6,9,13,17 62:18, evd 7:2 8:2 18:23 20:19 122:14 123:10 63:15 eve 44:1 49:5 25:5 27:14 123:18 124:22 64:12 | 7,19,21 |
| 58:3 118:12 107:5 108:6,17 58:25 et 102:9 112:4 examiner 9:2,7 108:21 109:2,6 60:6,8 eunice 18:7 9:23 10:1,7,11 109:12,15 60:21, 20:16 24:18 10:15,18 11:1 110:10,19,25 61:1,2 33:13 11:5,8,11 11:8 114:18 61:15, evaluating 13:24 14:14 115:3 119:22 62:3,7 36:18 15:4 17:12,16 121:6,9,13,17 62:18, evd 7:2 8:2 18:23 20:19 122:14 123:10 63:15 eve 44:1 49:5 25:5 27:14 123:18 124:22 64:12 | |
| et 102:9 112:4 examiner 9:2,7 108:21 109:2,6 60:6,8 eunice 18:7 9:23 10:1,7,11 109:12,15 60:21, 20:16 24:18 10:15,18 11:1 110:10,19,25 61:1,2 33:13 11:5,8,11 11:8 114:18 61:15, evaluating 13:24 14:14 115:3 119:22 62:3,7 36:18 15:4 17:12,16 121:6,9,13,17 62:18, evd 7:2 8:2 18:23 20:19 122:14 123:10 63:15 eve 44:1 49:5 25:5 27:14 123:18 124:22 64:12 | * |
| eunice 18:7 9:23 10:1,7,11 109:12,15 60:21, 20:16 24:18 10:15,18 11:1 110:10,19,25 61:1,2 33:13 11:5,8,11 111:8 114:18 61:15, evaluating 13:24 14:14 115:3 119:22 62:3,7 36:18 15:4 17:12,16 121:6,9,13,17 62:18, evd 7:2 8:2 18:23 20:19 122:14 123:10 63:15 eve 44:1 49:5 25:5 27:14 123:18 124:22 64:12 | 3,10,12,17 |
| 20:16 24:18 10:15,18 11:1 110:10,19,25 61:1,2 33:13 11:5,8,11 111:8 114:18 61:15, evaluating 13:24 14:14 115:3 119:22 62:3,7 36:18 15:4 17:12,16 121:6,9,13,17 62:18, evd 7:2 8:2 18:23 20:19 122:14 123:10 63:15 eve 44:1 49:5 25:5 27:14 123:18 124:22 64:12 | ,22,24,25 |
| 33:13 11:5,8,11 111:8 114:18 61:15, evaluating 13:24 14:14 115:3 119:22 62:3,7 36:18 15:4 17:12,16 121:6,9,13,17 62:18, evd 7:2 8:2 18:23 20:19 122:14 123:10 63:15 eve 44:1 49:5 25:5 27:14 123:18 124:22 64:12 | 2,3,7,12 |
| evaluating 13:24 14:14 115:3 119:22 62:3,7 36:18 15:4 17:12,16 121:6,9,13,17 62:18, evd 7:2 8:2 18:23 20:19 122:14 123:10 63:15 eve 44:1 49:5 25:5 27:14 123:18 124:22 64:12 | ,23,24,24 |
| 36:18 15:4 17:12,16 121:6,9,13,17 62:18, evd 7:2 8:2 18:23 20:19 122:14 123:10 63:15 eve 44:1 49:5 25:5 27:14 123:18 124:22 64:12 | ,9,15,16 |
| eve 44:1 49:5 25:5 27:14 123:18 124:22 64:12 | ,21 63:12 |
| | 64:6,6 |
| evening 10:23 28:15,21 31:13 125:1 126:1,19 66:14 | 65:4,18 |
| | 67:11,11 |
| event 96:18 32:24 33:23 126:22 127:21 67:13. | ,15,21,22 |
| 120:9 122:25 34:3 37:1,7,18 128:21 129:4,7 67:22 | 68:20 |
| everybody's 37:23 38:10 129:15 130:2 69:3,4 | 70:2 |
| 108:3 118:6 39:5 40:6 130:17 71:3 7 | ' 5:15 |
| everything's 42:13 43:15 example 61:12 77:2 8 | 35:10 |
| 15:24 47:6 48:17 66:23 81:14 86:17 | 93:7 |
| evidence 26:17 49:21 52:8,21 82:8 87:21 97:25 | 110:22 |
| 27:8 69:17 52:23 53:18 excellent 130:4 125:13 | 3 126:9 |
| 80:14 81:7,11 55:8 62:14 except 120:9 126:10 | 0 127:18 |
| 119:10 127:25 63:10 70:4 exchange 30:21 128:1, | ,11,25 |
| evolution 63:21 71:6,15 72:24 53:22 exhibits | 41:24 |
| exactly 19:24 73:8,13 74:4 exchanged 42:5 5 | 88:22,23 |
| 115:5 117:5,16 74:14,19 75:1 48:23 59:3 6 | 53:8,9 |
| examination 75:13,19,24 exchanges 64:3,3 | 3,3 65:13 |
| 74:11 76:12 | ,20 69:25 |
| 77:22 82:22 82:17 83:20 70:5 7 | |

[exhibits - filed]

| 86:8 125:17,18 | express 22:23 | 96:10,14 | 83:23 84:2,10 |
|------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| existence 27:21 | expressed | 130:10,13 | 85:14 86:6,9 |
| 80:3 91:4 | 27:19 | factors 36:15 | 86:16 94:20,22 |
| existing 43:16 | extend 23:1 | 89:20 95:5 | 97:7,8 98:5 |
| 79:2,7,9,12,23 | 51:19 | facts 43:4 | 108:9,14,18,25 |
| 80:2 90:10,12 | extended 49:4 | factual 30:14 | 109:6,9,13 |
| 90:18,19 91:10 | extending 43:5 | 54:22 | 110:5,6 111:2 |
| 91:19 92:16 | extensive 47:18 | fair 36:1 101:8 | 111:5,15 |
| 93:12 94:2,14 | 68:22 | fairly 35:18 | 116:24 117:12 |
| 121:22 | extensively | 73:23 | 119:5 120:24 |
| expect 12:14,25 | 41:19 | fairway 35:7 | 121:7,11,14,19 |
| 48:20 113:10 | extent 70:23 | familiar 9:13 | 122:15 125:8 |
| expectation | 119:9 121:10 | far 12:23 33:12 | 125:12,25 |
| 104:13 | extraction | 36:21 70:17 | 126:14,20 |
| expectations | 11:24 | 100:9 104:6 | 127:20 128:24 |
| 30:13 | extraordinary | 116:11 | 129:2,6,12 |
| expert 12:12,20 | 45:1 | fashion 106:6 | 130:1 131:5 |
| 64:16 65:9,22 | extremely 20:1 | fe 1:3,21 2:6,14 | fellow 15:22 |
| 66:17 76:7 | 49:13 | 2:21 3:7,15 4:6 | 16:5 32:20 |
| 85:20 98:10 | exxonmobil | 4:15,23 18:1 | 49:23 50:18 |
| 99:20 111:3,6 | 66:16 94:9 | february 11:14 | 71:17 72:7 |
| 111:10 114:6 | eye 112:13 | federal 57:20 | 127:10 128:16 |
| expertise | 113:1 | feedback 40:7 | felt 112:25 |
| 102:12 | \mathbf{f} | 70:22 | field 81:12 |
| experts 35:9 | f 62:23 66:10 | feel 101:17 | 85:20 98:10 |
| 44:17 58:15 | 67:17 | 115:13 117:10 | 99:21 120:3 |
| 69:14 95:14,18 | face 19:5 | feet 91:11 | figure 14:25 |
| 96:15 | fact 23:22 | feldewert 4:12 | figures 62:23 |
| explain 18:21 | 29:21,23 41:17 | 6:11,19 8:4 | 63:5 67:3,17 |
| 76:20 90:1 | 47:15 | 14:14,16 56:4 | file 127:18 |
| explanation | factor 7:20 | 56:5 62:15 | filed 22:3 26:7 |
| 130:10 | 67:14 76:18 | 63:17 70:9 | 28:3 41:17 |
| exploration | 77:2,3 87:8 | 73:14,18 74:17 | 44:10,10 53:7 |
| 56:24 | 88:15,20,24 | 74:18 75:21 | 59:8,9 60:8,21 |
| | 89:3 94:24 | 76:25 77:7 | 60:25 74:7 |

[filed - gather]

| 98:9 | flag 44:19 47:8 | formed 88:1 | 72:13 |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| filing 47:10,13 | 47:15 | forms 87:15 | fuge 5:3 |
| 60:12,19 74:16 | | forth 71:10 | fulfill 99:23 |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | fledged 29:2 | | |
| filings 58:22 | flesh 102:14 | 96:6 119:24 | full 50:7 53:17 |
| 62:19 72:8 | flexibility 82:5 | 123:16 | 54:15 |
| final 12:13 | flipping 126:4 | forward 19:22 | fully 29:2 30:16 |
| 61:24 | float 126:2 | 25:12,22 30:13 | 45:9 53:14 |
| finalizing 12:14 | 127:9 | 30:17 32:1 | further 48:22 |
| financially | flow 22:9 | 36:24 40:3,11 | 90:4 105:5 |
| 132:15 133:11 | fluid 66:7 | 43:8 45:7 | 108:5 113:23 |
| find 37:12 39:7 | focus 33:8 | 114:15 | 122:6 132:13 |
| 68:25 | 35:16 50:24 | found 26:13 | 133:9 |
| finding 36:8 | folks 109:8 | 68:2 71:19 | future 29:9 |
| findings 23:21 | 129:9 | 86:24 | 80:7 90:2 91:9 |
| 56:17 125:19 | follow 40:7 | foundation | 106:5 |
| 126:23 128:9 | 79:21 90:20 | 43:9 | g |
| fine 108:21 | 105:14 113:3 | four 37:13 53:2 | g 2:3 9:1 93:3 |
| firm 2:19 18:1 | followed 101:7 | 56:17,20 64:2 | 98:17 105:15 |
| first 9:10 10:3 | following 56:16 | 67:6 83:1,11 | 111:25 114:20 |
| 20:15 22:3 | follows 75:12 | 83:11,19 | 120:6,23 |
| 31:22 33:9 | 85:5 97:22 | 125:15 | gained 81:1 |
| 35:16 36:5 | 103:12 110:18 | fracturing | gas 11:23 47:22 |
| 73:19 75:10 | font 56:7 | 91:17 | 56:12,24 57:11 |
| 77:24 85:3 | force 108:2 | frame 46:3,14 | 58:10,16,19 |
| 97:20 98:19 | foregoing | 46:18 | 59:23 61:22 |
| 103:10 104:21 | 132:3,4 133:4 | francis 1:20 | 64:10,18 65:9 |
| 110:16 112:4 | forget 73:10 | 3:14 4:5 | 65:11,22,23 |
| 113:20,21 | format 59:7 | frankly 42:16 | 66:18 68:9,10 |
| 114:8,11,13 | 128:25 | 43:13 | 68:16 69:13,21 |
| 117:14 118:10 | formation 19:7 | free 16:3 | 69:23 72:15 |
| 120:24 121:20 | 22:25 23:3 | freewheeling | 90:13 106:16 |
| fit 80:7,10 | 29:7 34:18 | 48:2 | 106:20 112:11 |
| fits 122:15 | 40:19 58:5 | friday 32:12 | |
| five 58:13 | 108:1 118:23 | front 9:14 42:8 | 118:5 |
| 121:2,12 | | 46:24 62:13 | gather 113:9 122:9 |
| | | | 144.7 |

[gathered - group]

| gathered | 94:23 119:14 | 97:14 98:12 | goodstream |
|-----------------------|-----------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| 113:11 | 120:16 121:21 | 100:5,17,21 | 24:23 |
| general 30:22 | 123:18 128:4 | 101:2 103:4 | gotten 44:6 |
| 82:8 104:13 | 129:19 | 106:2,15 114:1 | 116:10 |
| 106:15,19,19 | goes 47:12 | 115:12 116:13 | govern 56:23 |
| 123:15 125:6 | goetz 70:19 | 116:14,20 | governed 56:12 |
| 127:1 | going 9:3 11:18 | 117:7,8 119:19 | 57:17 |
| generally 70:14 | 11:20 13:18,22 | 122:10,23,24 | governs 57:19 |
| 70:15 106:11 | 14:8 17:18 | 123:1,1 125:8 | gradually |
| 106:23 117:8 | 19:19 20:25 | 128:22 | 122:25 |
| generated | 22:6 24:14,16 | good 9:2,7 | grandfathered |
| 120:3 | 24:21 25:2,10 | 17:25 46:3 | 93:23 |
| geology 36:14 | 26:17 29:1 | 55:10 56:6 | granted 70:5 |
| give 15:16 | 30:13 31:7 | 60:20 68:15 | gravity 54:12 |
| 18:13 19:18 | 36:13,14,17,23 | 97:23 101:13 | grayburg 19:8 |
| 55:2 82:4 85:9 | 39:9 40:3 43:1 | 101:16 104:4 | 20:24 21:3 |
| 86:9 116:13 | 43:2,8,10 | 105:18 109:15 | 22:6,10,11,16 |
| 119:19 121:2 | 45:23 46:21 | 112:9 114:10 | 22:19,20,25 |
| 121:12,12 | 47:17 48:20 | 114:12,15 | 23:2,8 27:2 |
| given 18:11,24 | 49:12 50:2,12 | 115:20 116:16 | 28:2 36:9 |
| 20:1 78:14 | 50:19 55:2,14 | 121:1 126:14 | great 54:15 |
| 88:7 | 59:17 61:8,13 | goodnight 2:2 | 87:1 101:16 |
| giving 100:4 | 61:18 62:10 | 17:18 18:2,7 | 109:10 114:16 |
| 109:7 | 70:6 74:19 | 19:4 24:8,23 | 121:14 |
| gleaned 121:20 | 75:4 76:9 | 26:6 27:5 | greater 87:9 |
| go 9:3 14:8 | 78:13 79:24 | 31:18 34:15,20 | green 9:15 |
| 17:4 24:22 | 80:1,15,16,21 | 35:19 37:24 | 34:23 35:8 |
| 32:1,25 34:2 | 81:13 84:18 | 47:17 51:19,24 | greg 5:5 6:3 |
| 42:8 45:7 46:5 | 85:24 86:13,16 | 52:5 | 7:16 65:19 |
| 51:20 53:1,2 | 87:7,18 89:11 | goodnight's | 75:9 |
| 53:15 55:3,9 | 89:14,25 90:17 | 19:17 35:3 | ground 93:23 |
| 56:9 59:16 | 91:8,9,19 | 38:8,12 39:13 | group 58:13 |
| 61:7,12,15 | 92:15,25 93:9 | 41:7 47:11 | 64:20 66:1,20 |
| 62:5 83:24 | 93:14 94:7 | 53:8 | 95:3,16 96:10 |
| 86:11 88:5 | 95:24 96:7 | | 100:24 101:9 |

[group - helpful]

| | | | I |
|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| 111:20 | hardy 2:11 | 27:24 28:15,21 | 102:24 103:3 |
| grows 88:6 | 17:12,13 25:19 | 29:24 30:23 | 103:13,23 |
| guadalupe 2:5 | 25:24 27:19 | 31:11,13 32:10 | 104:25 105:8 |
| 4:14,22 | 28:9,11 40:12 | 32:15,24 33:23 | 106:10,18,25 |
| guardians 4:19 | 40:14 42:14 | 34:3 37:1,7,18 | 107:5 108:6,17 |
| 4:21 11:21 | 46:2 47:6,7 | 37:23 38:10,13 | 108:21,23 |
| guess 71:16 | 48:18 | 38:22 39:5 | 109:2,6,12,15 |
| 87:18 92:21 | hart 2:4 4:13 | 40:6 42:2,6,9 | 109:17 110:10 |
| 116:3 | 18:1 | 42:13 43:5,11 | 110:19,25 |
| guidelines 58:3 | head 72:21 | 43:15,18,24,25 | 111:8 114:18 |
| gulf 22:3 23:4 | 130:12 | 44:1,21,23 | 115:3 119:22 |
| guys 116:3,15 | heading 54:23 | 45:1 46:7 47:6 | 121:6,9,13,17 |
| gyro 89:12 | 62:11,17 | 48:4,9,11,17,21 | 122:14 123:10 |
| h | hear 9:16 27:12 | 49:2,4,5,21 | 123:18 124:22 |
| h 4:12 7:1 8:1,4 | 36:6 38:12 | 50:2,10,14,17 | 125:1 126:1,19 |
| 66:11 | 41:5,14 72:6 | 50:25 51:7,20 | 126:22 127:21 |
| hahn 133:2,15 | 73:16 74:23,25 | 51:21,23 52:2 | 128:13,21 |
| half 121:23 | 75:1 76:15 | 52:6,8,11,21,23 | 129:4,7,9,11,15 |
| hall 1:18 | 77:5 78:1 | 53:2,3,18,25 | 129:17,21 |
| hammer 12:25 | 97:10,11,12,13 | 54:2,17,19,21 | 130:2,8,17,25 |
| 13:15 14:12 | 102:25 103:1,3 | 55:4,8,11,21 | hearings 29:24 |
| hand 16:16 | heard 49:9 | 62:14 63:10 | 30:15 32:16 |
| 75:7 84:23 | 51:17 127:3 | 69:7 70:4,18 | 38:25 48:25 |
| 97:17 103:7 | hearing 1:5,15 | 71:6,15 72:24 | 49:11,15,19 |
| 110:13 | 9:2,7,13,23 | 73:8,13,24 | 51:8 54:18 |
| handed 56:6 | 10:1,7,11,15,18 | 74:4,14,19 | 72:12 129:5 |
| handle 17:6 | 11:1,5,8,11,15 | 75:1,13,19,24 | help 18:25 31:6 |
| handling 42:4 | 11:17 12:10 | 76:3 77:6,9,19 | 33:7,15 40:2 |
| happen 24:8 | 13:5,13,24 | 82:17 83:20 | 75:20 83:23 |
| happens 101:3 | 14:11,14 15:1 | 84:12,15,18 | helped 75:22 |
| 122:2 | 15:4,4,6,10 | 85:6,12,17 | 85:15 98:5 |
| happy 40:2 | 17:8,15,16 | 90:6,21 94:18 | helpful 15:20 |
| 76:22 128:8 | 18:23 19:20,22 | 96:21 97:1,9 | 18:11,15 25:8 |
| hard 48:13 | 20:19 22:24 | 97:13,23 98:3 | 25:13,16 33:22 |
| 11a1 u TO.13 | 25:5 27:14,23 | 98:7 102:1,15 | 48:10 127:16 |
| | | | |

[helps - inclusion]

| halma 76.20 | la alla sa alla a sa4 a | 00.10.01.12 | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| helps 76:20 | hollandhart.c | 90:19 91:13 | improve 58:18 |
| hereto 132:15 | 2:7 4:16 | 106:17 120:20 | 92:1 |
| 133:11 | hope 62:10 | 122:24 | improvement |
| hesitation | 63:25 | impacted 24:10 | 90:20 |
| 124:3 | hopeful 45:24 | 120:13 | inaccurate |
| high 29:6 30:2 | hopefully 63:25 | impacting | 89:10 |
| 91:15 | 129:12 | 40:25 | inactive 30:7 |
| highlight 49:10 | horizontal 58:2 | impair 21:22 | inappropriate |
| highlighted | hour 122:23,24 | impairing | 27:7 |
| 29:3 61:9,17 | hours 120:11 | 19:11,13 41:8 | incentive 118:6 |
| 84:6 | 123:1 | impairment | inception |
| highly 19:18 | hovering 34:8 | 47:21 | 111:18 |
| hinkle 2:12 | humble 73:19 | implement | inclination |
| hinklelawfir | hydraulic | 90:17 93:1 | 50:4 |
| 2:15 | 91:17 | 100:13 | inclined 51:3 |
| historic 20:4,7 | hydrocarbon | implicate 29:7 | include 22:22 |
| 20:9 24:2,2 | 23:12 26:14,23 | 33:12 | 23:4,10 35:19 |
| historical 18:14 | i | implicated | 38:17 39:20 |
| 24:16,17 27:17 | _ | 29:11 | included 20:25 |
| 63:21 | i5 61:17 | implications | 21:12 22:5 |
| historically | idea 41:22 | 29:14 30:4 | 23:6 24:4 27:3 |
| 23:6 | ideally 50:7 | 54:10 78:8 | 32:16 33:20 |
| history 18:20 | identification | imply 39:22 | 35:25 37:9 |
| 20:3 23:22 | 58:24 64:7 | importance | 57:13 62:3,12 |
| 24:5 25:8,16 | 67:12,23 | 29:4 | 62:20 68:19,23 |
| 26:18 30:21 | identified 53:3 | important | 68:25 84:7 |
| 126:17 127:6 | identify 105:22 | 18:16,22 20:1 | 95:18 |
| hmm 88:13,18 | ignore 60:11 | 33:4 46:15 | includes 38:2,4 |
| 90:22 92:23 | immediately | 67:24 69:10 | 38:7 63:15 |
| | 21:9 35:1 | | |
| 94:25 | immobilized | impose 100:19 | 67:5 |
| hobbs 69:6 | 19:15 | imposing 106:1 | including 28:5 |
| hold 26:10 | impact 30:5 | impressed | 33:20 43:3 |
| holding 125:10 | 36:19 64:17 | 121:1 | 63:16 125:18 |
| holland 2:4 | 65:10,23 66:18 | improper 24:19 | inclusion 28:1 |
| 4:13 18:1 | 79:7,11,13 | 39:11 | 70:24 |
| | | | |

[inclusive - issue]

| inclusive 68:24 | information | 100:23 | interior 57:19 |
|-----------------|------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| | 30:22 32:4 | | |
| incorporate | | inquiry 48:2 | interject 77:1 |
| 93:19 128:25 | 43:17 44:18 | ins 102:8 | intermediate |
| incorporated | 45:12,15 51:10 | insar 112:18 | 59:23 67:4 |
| 92:4,11,12 | 53:22 54:23 | 119:17 | 84:8 |
| incorrect 40:1 | 57:13 71:4 | inside 35:1,13 | interplay 59:2 |
| increase 38:3 | 102:4 104:20 | 40:18,25 | 63:9 |
| increased | 110:3 112:10 | installed 78:21 | interval 18:9 |
| 44:12 | 112:21 126:6 | instance 33:9 | 22:20 23:5 |
| independently | informed 28:11 | instrument | 26:13 |
| 116:4 | 28:11,14 | 119:12 | intervals 22:10 |
| indicate 124:5 | initial 25:20 | integrities | intrepid 65:6 |
| individual | 40:15 51:13 | 106:23 | introduced |
| 104:19 106:5 | 54:17 62:19 | integrity 63:3 | 110:22 |
| individualized | 70:16 | 64:20 78:15,19 | introduces |
| 36:13,18 39:9 | initially 32:7 | 78:22 79:13 | 94:11 |
| industries | 36:22 59:4,10 | 80:12,24 81:3 | introducing |
| 58:16 | inject 34:17,25 | 81:10 82:6,7 | 94:15 |
| industry 4:10 | 51:25 | 82:14 91:8 | invalid 22:23 |
| 12:22 14:15 | injected 19:10 | 92:1 95:15 | involved 27:23 |
| 55:12,25 57:10 | 19:12 35:23 | 96:10 111:20 | 32:1 36:4 |
| 57:11 58:6,9 | injecting 34:22 | 120:10,17,20 | 39:23 57:25 |
| 58:10,16,17 | 35:16,21 40:24 | 122:20 123:2 | 64:10 106:3,8 |
| 60:16 64:9,10 | 40:24 | 123:12 124:8 | 111:16,23 |
| 68:17 69:13,13 | injection 19:25 | 124:11,14,17 | 112:1 114:7 |
| 69:14 78:5 | 21:24,24 22:18 | intend 44:14 | 117:10 |
| 88:9 91:25 | 29:10 34:13 | 70:18 114:10 | involves 47:21 |
| 92:7 95:7,19 | 36:16,20 37:14 | 129:16 | involving 16:21 |
| 107:25 108:2 | 37:25 38:4 | intent 82:4 | irish 20:17 |
| 109:19 111:23 | 39:14 41:7,8 | 129:15 | irrelevant |
| 112:9 114:2 | 53:8 54:10 | interest 26:10 | 126:23 |
| 117:21 118:5,5 | injections | 68:12 108:3 | islands 61:21 |
| 118:5,18 | 118:20 | interested | issue 30:3 31:3 |
| influence 36:15 | input 70:14 | 53:14 113:2 | 34:9,19 35:6 |
| 36:16 | 81:18 83:4 | 132:15 133:12 | 41:7 107:9,10 |
| | I . | I . | 1 |

[issue - kpla]

| | I | I | |
|---------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| 107:14,20,23 | jit 7:3 58:22,23 | k | 92:2,6,20 |
| 116:4 124:11 | 64:6 65:13 | k 4:3 | 93:12,25 94:8 |
| 125:14 | 67:11 86:17 | keep 52:1 98:22 | 95:2 98:23 |
| issued 22:2 | jitc 63:13 64:21 | 112:13 113:1 | 99:8,13 100:6 |
| 57:18 | 64:23 66:20 | 130:25 | 100:16,17 |
| issues 18:17 | 70:14 71:11 | key 50:22 66:22 | 101:9,13,17 |
| 19:18 29:3,18 | 75:15 113:2,9 | keyed 27:15 | 102:7,8 114:23 |
| 30:24 31:21 | 113:12,13 | keying 54:19 | 115:11,24 |
| 32:19 33:6,11 | 114:20 115:10 | kicking 52:1 | 116:9,17,21,22 |
| 33:16 36:6,18 | 115:15,22 | kind 13:2,14 | 117:9,12,13,16 |
| 39:9 41:6,16 | 116:13,15 | 18:13 24:12 | 117:17,18 |
| 41:18 42:7 | 117:7,23 118:4 | 25:16 28:6 | 118:3,11,14,19 |
| 43:6 44:12 | 120:13 122:9 | 45:20 49:25 | 118:24 119:4,6 |
| 45:10,21 46:11 | 123:6 | 50:11 65:12 | 119:11,11,13 |
| 46:17,19 47:5 | jitc's 71:18 | 118:23 119:12 | 119:24 120:17 |
| 53:17,23 54:19 | job 1:23 103:15 | 119:12 123:6 | 120:19,21,25 |
| 67:21 98:21 | joins 71:12 | 124:21 127:2 | 121:2 122:11 |
| 104:1,10 110:9 | joint 4:10 | kinds 106:7 | 122:16 123:4 |
| 113:1 114:9 | 55:12,24 58:6 | kissing 88:21 | 123:24 124:15 |
| 116:6 118:24 | 60:16 68:12,17 | know 13:19 | 125:21 126:2,7 |
| 121:4 122:20 | 91:25 108:1 | 14:12,16,17,18 | 127:12 129:20 |
| it'll 69:22 | 109:18 114:2 | 15:14,17 31:17 | 130:13 |
| item 10:3,20 | 117:20 | 32:1,4 36:1 | knowing 77:1 |
| 55:1 130:21 | joke 53:6 | 40:17 48:11,13 | 99:24 |
| items 11:19 | july 13:5,9,20 | 57:16 62:16 | knowledge |
| 112:12 | 14:6 | 69:10 72:7,13 | 132:10 133:6 |
| iterative 70:10 | jump 120:19 | 72:16 73:23 | known 23:12 |
| j | juncture 15:19 | 74:15 77:24 | 23:17 56:13,25 |
| j 56:21 | june 13:5,18 | 78:2,11,16 | 57:5,20 58:20 |
| james 1:22 | 14:6 45:24 | 79:2,7,11,13,23 | 63:7 69:21 |
| 132:2,18 | justify 45:1,3 | 81:9,21 85:15 | knows 11:13 |
| january 10:22 | 127:4 | 85:16 86:5 | kpla 56:14 |
| jesse 4:3 12:8 | | 87:3 88:14 | 57:16 83:15 |
| jessek.tremaine | | 89:22 90:23 | 99:25 |
| 4:7 | | 91:1,13,16 | |
| 1.7 | | 71.1,13,10 | |

[kudos - lot]

| kudos 72:13 | learning 91:22 | limits 61:20 | 92:7 108:20 |
|--------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | learnings 92:5 | line 59:14 61:6 | 122:5,5,16 |
| | 92:13 | 123:21 | 123:8 |
| 1 2:18 | leasing 56:13 | lines 120:7 | longer 51:23 |
| lab 81:9 | 56:25 57:6,20 | list 37:10,11,12 | 122:10 |
| labeled 68:5 | 58:20 63:7 | 38:24 68:13,14 | longstanding |
| laboratory | 69:21 | 68:22 129:16 | 26:5,18 27:5 |
| 80:20 | led 112:2 126:8 | listed 111:9 | look 17:7 25:21 |
| lack 26:9 31:25 | left 45:6 61:9 | listening | 29:5 32:20 |
| land 26:3,12 | 99:22 109:14 | 119:23 120:6 | 36:10 50:20 |
| 68:20 | 109:23 | listing 57:4 | 54:2 56:15 |
| lands 57:20 | legal 46:14,19 | lithuania 53:6 | 59:8 62:3 |
| language 61:4 | 47:4 57:5 62:4 | litigation 47:16 | 80:24 101:19 |
| 61:5,8,10,16,18 | 62:5 | 47:17,24 | 104:9,23 113:4 |
| 81:17 86:10,12 | legally 22:23 | little 13:6,22 | 114:14 115:24 |
| 88:10 98:6 | lengthy 57:5 | 14:19 16:10 | 115:25 116:25 |
| 112:4,24 | lessees 68:9,10 | 18:21 25:12 | 117:13,17,23 |
| 118:17 119:4 | level 29:6 30:2 | 39:18,18,23 | 118:18 129:9 |
| 122:18 125:15 | levels 104:6 | 40:3 49:15,24 | looked 81:21 |
| 127:7 128:8 | lidar 112:18 | 51:4 72:11,17 | 106:7 112:21 |
| large 51:25 | 119:17 | 78:6 86:24 | 119:8 |
| 89:11 | light 43:25 44:1 | 112:18 | looking 15:7,16 |
| largely 58:4 | lights 9:15 | llc 2:2 18:2 | 17:5 25:17 |
| 60:11 128:10 | likely 43:11 | llp 2:4,12 4:13 | 27:20 29:13,23 |
| larger 106:6 | 44:21 48:22 | local 69:5 | 32:7 60:17 |
| lastly 30:2 | 124:8 | located 22:17 | 93:6,8 98:17 |
| 38:20 | likewise 65:21 | 87:17 88:8 | 98:18 105:14 |
| late 14:5 27:6 | 71:9 | 89:2,14 | 108:2 123:7 |
| law 2:19 5:9 | limit 36:22 73:6 | location 1:18 | 125:11 129:22 |
| 18:1 | limited 22:24 | 39:10 | looks 127:8 |
| lay 18:15 44:24 | 47:23 48:4 | locations 61:21 | lot 13:19 19:22 |
| 46:18 | 68:1 70:16 | locked 19:14 | 41:15 45:6 |
| lea 55:13 56:14 | 72:22 | long 29:24 | 46:23,24 49:18 |
| 57:6 109:20 | limiting 24:17 | 55:15,16 70:10 | 53:9,15 60:13 |
| leading 66:19 | | 70:13 82:13 | 89:13 92:8 |
| | | | |

[lot - mfeldewert]

| 118:19 119:1 112:19 113:25 29:17 55:24 78 lots 103:21 115:14 117:24 108:23 129:17 meet lower 21:3 22:5 118:6,7 122:12 130:18 10 | t 11:14 :23 |
|---|--------------------|
| lots 103:21 115:14 117:24 108:23 129:17 meet lower 21:3 22:5 118:6,7 122:12 130:18 10 | :23 |
| lower 21:3 22:5 118:6,7 122:12 130:18 10 | |
| | ting 9:8 |
| 22·10 11 25 123·20 125·20 matters 48·2 15 | :4,21,21 |
| 22.10,11,25 123.20 Hatters 10.2 | :23 47:2 |
| 23:2 makes 41:5 75:25 76:8 51 | :1 128:6 |
| lunch 108:15 42:12 128:18 85:22 130 | 0:7,19 131:3 |
| 109:21 making 12:3 mean 20:7 39:1 13 | 1:3 |
| m 19:18 24:18 42:21 73:19 meet | tings 14:19 |
| m 3:20 4:20 42:23 73:22 87:6 88:19,20 meet | ts 117:24 |
| 133:2,15 106:23 88:21 89:4 mem | 1ber 64:19 |
| made 60:9,18 manage 33:16 92:4 93:19 65 | :25 66:19 |
| 83:4 118:4 manageable 94:6 116:25 11 | 1:19 |
| 119:18 33:8 117:12,14 mem | nbers |
| magnitude management 120:25 121:9 11: | 5:22 |
| 101:4 19 20 111:11 122:5 130:11 mem | 106:15 |
| mail 68:9 manager 70:20 means 21:20 men | tion 48:5 |
| mailing 69:1 managing 78:7 88:24 51: | :16 |
| main 51:7 78:9 15:16 71:21 89:3 91:21 men | tioned 47:9 |
| maintain 63:21 mandatory 94:11 95:21 men | tioning |
| 78:22 80:12 114:1 117:2,24 116:5 117:2 12: | 5:23 |
| 82:7 manner 70:24 measure 80:16 meri | its 17:8 |
| maintaining map 33:19,25 116:7 119:14 19 | :19 25:16 |
| 82:5 34:6,7 35:3 measured 42 | :17 54:21 |
| maintenance 41:1 119:16 met | 58:13 |
| 112:25 march 1:16 9:8 measurement meth | hods 67:2,7 |
| make 33:4 36:1 109:16 115:25 92 | |
| 37:11 39:24 marked 7:4 measurements mew | bourne |
| 40:2 41:4.20 58:23 64:7 88:4 115:25 65: | |
| 45:2.10 46:6 67:12,22 measures 59:20 mexi | ico 1:1,3 |
| 46:10 48:6.9 material 53:15 66:5,24 72:20 9:9 | 9 28:2 55:14 |
| 53:11 63:5.22 materials 71:18 86:1 68: | :20 109:20 |
| 70:18 78:16.22 73:2 measuring 94:4 132 | 2:20 |
| 80:11 82:6 mathematical 99:14 112:16 mfel | dewert |
| 94:15 99:22 76:19 | 16 |
| | |

[michael - move]

| michael 4:12 | mining 64:14 | moment 24:9 | monument |
|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 8:4 110:6 | 64:17,17 65:10 | 37:10 | 24:18 33:13 |
| microphone | 78:5 102:11 | monitor 61:20 | 34:7 |
| 9:18 | 114:7 | 80:23 82:10 | monument's |
| mics 9:14 | minor 107:19 | 94:2,10 | 18:8 |
| middle 49:20 | minute 55:2 | monitored 94:7 | morehouse |
| midstream 2:2 | 86:10 | 94:13 99:10 | 6:18 7:12 |
| 17:18 18:2,7 | minutes 10:21 | 113:5 117:1,25 | 64:13,19,22 |
| mile 99:25 | 10:24 11:12 | monitoring | 110:7,11,15,19 |
| 121:22,23 | 18:13,20 109:8 | 60:2 65:14 | 111:16 114:6 |
| miles 20:22 | 109:9 121:3,12 | 73:5 92:14,17 | 114:18 117:14 |
| 123:8 | missed 16:15 | 92:22,25 93:1 | 119:7 123:13 |
| millennia 19:15 | 56:1 | 93:4,10,13,14 | 125:2 |
| million 35:23 | mm 88:13,18 | 94:1,12 97:5 | morgan 6:16 |
| mind 98:23 | 90:22 92:23 | 98:19,24 99:15 | 7:14 65:5 |
| 121:4 | 94:25 | 99:20,24 | 73:11 97:4,6,9 |
| mindful 50:18 | model 80:20 | 101:22,22 | 97:11,19,24 |
| 72:4 | modeling 45:16 | 102:11 104:3 | 102:19 105:16 |
| mine 64:14 | 81:9 | 104:11,17 | morning 9:2,8 |
| 85:16 98:6 | modification | 106:2 108:13 | 17:25 55:10 |
| 99:25 111:11 | 79:1 81:17 | 109:24 112:6 | 56:6 97:23 |
| 123:8 | modifications | 113:8 119:25 | mosaics 64:14 |
| mineral 68:10 | 7:9 58:14,17 | monitoring's | motion 10:8 |
| minerals 1:2 | 58:21 59:1,7 | 93:21 | 11:2,16 26:7 |
| 26:10 | 59:10 60:6,25 | monitors 104:3 | 28:3,6 31:17 |
| miners 82:9 | 61:2,25 64:11 | montand.com | 31:19 47:10,13 |
| mines 104:9,14 | 65:1 67:18 | 3:8 | 48:22 50:10 |
| 104:23 121:23 | 69:11,16,19 | montezuma | 51:8 54:3,18 |
| 122:7 | 83:4 111:17 | 2:13 | 128:15 |
| minimize 96:17 | modified 62:20 | montgomery | motions 31:6 |
| minimum 50:9 | modify 57:2 | 3:5 | move 10:9 11:3 |
| 54:1,16 78:12 | 85:15 | month 46:25 | 16:20 17:20 |
| 78:23 87:20,22 | modrall 3:21 | 49:12 | 25:11 30:14,16 |
| 89:5,8 95:2,4 | modrall.com | monthly 46:9 | 40:11 44:21 |
| 96:1,5,8 | 3:24 | | 50:13 52:13 |
| | | | |

[move - number]

| 54.05.60.7 | 40 17 44 10 05 | 41 1 | 1 100 4 |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 54:25 63:7 | 43:17 44:18,25 | nevertheless | nmocd 100:4 |
| 86:17 127:24 | 45:10,17,25 | 20:12 | 100:19 105:25 |
| moved 92:7 | 46:17 50:12,17 | new 1:1,3 9:9 | nomenclature |
| movement | 50:19 52:19 | 9:11 14:13 | 27:1 |
| 14:17 | 62:11,16 71:24 | 28:2 44:9 | non 23:12 |
| moving 55:10 | 72:4,5 80:7 | 55:14 59:20,25 | north 2:5 4:14 |
| 72:9 114:15 | 87:2 100:11,12 | 60:2 62:2,17 | 4:22 |
| 130:21 | 104:16 110:25 | 65:14 66:4,5,9 | northwest 3:22 |
| multiple 81:25 | 111:2 112:23 | 66:23 67:14 | nos 1:9 |
| n | 116:17 117:17 | 68:20 70:2 | notary 132:19 |
| n 2:1 3:1 4:1 | 117:18 118:8 | 77:25 78:6,10 | note 29:20 |
| 5:1 6:1 9:1 | 123:4 126:17 | 78:11,21 79:8 | 51:22 52:3 |
| name 69:8 | 127:6 128:14 | 79:12,19,20,20 | 68:23 76:5 |
| narrow 33:7 | 129:13 | 79:21,22 82:1 | noted 16:17 |
| native 127:18 | needed 48:1 | 90:15,20,23 | 25:6 45:5 52:9 |
| 128:25 | 60:18 61:19 | 91:6,7,11,14,18 | 53:18 56:11 |
| natural 1:2 | 73:22 105:3 | 91:25 92:8,9,9 | notice 27:22 |
| natural 1.2 nature 42:24 | needle 124:21 | 92:13,15,24 | 67:21 68:2,8 |
| 85:8 122:16 | needs 29:15 | 93:17,25 94:15 | 68:13,19,21 |
| 123:1 | 73:20 99:25 | 96:2,4 98:23 | 69:6,7 105:20 |
| near 50:12 | 100:8 101:7,23 | 99:8 101:11 | noticed 60:17 |
| 64:14 | 113:23 115:13 | 109:20 112:18 | 62:6 |
| nearly 21:18 | 115:17 117:18 | 117:22 118:14 | notices 68:14 |
| necessarily | 117:19 118:10 | 125:18 129:23 | notification |
| 39:2,7 81:5,6 | 118:12 | 132:20 | 59:25 66:9 |
| 83:11 88:23 | negative 99:5 | news 69:6 | 124:18 |
| 101:10 106:1 | negatively | newspapers | noting 74:10 |
| necessary 41:4 | 106:16 | 69:5 | november |
| 41:12 46:22 | negotiations | night 62:6 | 51:17 53:3 |
| | 44:4 | nine 98:18 | novo 18:5 38:5 |
| 60:4 112:25 | neither 132:11 | nm 1:21 2:6,14 | 38:21 |
| need 12:25 | 133:7 | 2:21 3:7,15,23 | number 11:19 |
| 13:22 14:23 | nest 50:20 | 4:6,15,23 | 11:20 16:24 |
| 18:17 29:5 | never 21:5 | nmag.gov 3:16 | 28:24 29:3 |
| 30:19 35:18 | | | 37:25 38:6,14 |
| 36:3 40:10 | | | <u> </u> |

[number - open]

| 55:17 60:10,12 60:21,22,24,25 | 54:14 120:1,24 occ 129:5 occidental 65:20 occur 47:19 | offered 64:5 office 26:3,12 68:20 officer 132:2 | 39:5 53:6 56:2 62:11,14,17 64:1 65:3,17 |
|----------------------------------|---|--|---|
| 55:17 60:10,12 60:21,22,24,25 | occidental 65:20 | 68:20 | , , |
| 60:21,22,24,25 | 65:20 | | 64:1 65:3,17 |
| | | officer 132.2 | |
| 61:1,3,7,13,15 | occur 47:19 | 0111001 132.2 | 67:21 68:1 |
| | | officially 23:14 | 76:15 77:6,19 |
| 65:4 88:9 | occurred 91:23 | offsetting 33:19 | 81:6 85:17 |
| 109:18 117:13 | 92:3 | oh 82:20 83:1 | 86:4,16 87:18 |
| 130:19 | occurring | 93:24 114:5 | 88:10 89:22 |
| numbers 37:4 | 47:18 49:5 | oil 1:3,6 3:11 | 90:3 93:11 |
| 37:20,22 38:2 | 119:14 | 3:13 4:2,4,10 | 95:1 96:19 |
| 38:9 | occurs 102:9 | 5:3,5,7,9 9:9 | 103:2,23 105:8 |
| 0 | 122:6 | 10:2 11:23 | 107:5 111:8,19 |
| o 9:1 | ocd 12:21 13:4 | 12:8,11 16:25 | 111:22 112:3,3 |
| object 24:15 | 17:20 27:12 | 17:17 19:13 | 112:14 113:4,8 |
| 116:19 | 28:17 29:13 | 21:1 22:3,17 | 113:16,24 |
| objection 69:16 | 30:15,19 42:20 | 22:24 23:2 | 114:5,16 |
| 74:9,13 76:5 | 48:20 49:20 | 26:25 29:4 | 116:23 117:1 |
| 85:23 | 70:10 71:2 | 35:9 47:22 | 118:7 121:7,11 |
| objectives 80:1 | 72:16 88:11 | 51:11 55:25 | 121:14,23 |
| obligations | 89:24 102:2,6 | 56:12,24 57:10 | 122:14 123:10 |
| 106:11,20 | 102:7,13 | 58:9,16,19 | 125:1 126:19 |
| observation | 103:22,25 | 59:23 61:22 | 129:6 130:17 |
| 100:11 | 104:3,15,23 | 64:9,18 65:7,9 | old 26:2 91:22 |
| observe 99:1 | 106:3,7 107:8 | 65:11,22,23 | 92:25 129:22 |
| 100:10 | 107:9,13 | 66:17 68:9,10 | once 13:14 41:5 |
| observed 100:1 | 114:22 120:2,2 | 68:16 69:13,20 | 41:14 93:18 |
| obtain 12:12 | 120:8,14 | 69:23 72:15 | 128:13 |
| 118:1 | 123:19 124:12 | 90:13 103:17 | ones 79:12,12 |
| obtained | ocd's 29:1 30:4 | 106:13,15,20 | 94:2 |
| 113:25 | 48:23 49:10 | 109:17 112:11 | online 17:11 |
| obtaining | 70:19,21,25 | 118:5 130:20 | 74:17 97:7 |
| 112:9 | 71:2,11 102:6 | 131:4 | 102:21 |
| obviously | 106:11,19 | okay 20:23 | oop 20:20 |
| 14:20 16:3 | 120:19 124:8 | 21:25 24:4 | open 17:18 |
| 38:11 40:8 | | 28:15 34:6 | 30:19,24 40:7 |

[open - page]

| 50.00.71.17 | 00.00.114.0 | | 1 064 |
|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 53:22 71:17 | 98:22 114:8 | original 24:24 | owned 26:1 |
| 92:20 93:8,19 | 126:15 | 25:4 124:20 | owners 68:11 |
| 99:16 110:1 | opinions 75:25 | originally | p |
| 111:12 123:11 | opportunity | 43:23 51:16 | p 2:1,1 3:1,1 |
| 124:1 129:17 | 31:18 78:17 | ought 28:8 | 4:1,1 5:1,1 7:4 |
| opening 25:3 | 107:21 129:13 | outcome | 7:10 9:1 55:13 |
| 28:16 70:7 | oppose 100:10 | 132:16 133:12 | 55:16 56:6,17 |
| operated 34:15 | option 81:24 | outline 13:2 | 57:17,21 58:1 |
| 34:16,23,24 | 82:3 83:11,12 | 34:8 | 58:14 59:10 |
| operates 34:20 | 83:12 | outlook.com | 62:8,9 69:19 |
| operating 92:9 | options 7:22 | 2:22 | 92:6 96:3 |
| 96:6 | 15:17 81:23 | outside 35:1,13 | 109:19 112:5 |
| operation | orange 34:11 | 36:10,12 40:18 | 125:11,24 |
| 22:15 | 34:14,20 | 40:24 41:2 | 126:4,11,17 |
| operational | order 7:9 11:17 | 83:16 | 127:10 |
| 107:16 | 13:13 14:13 | outstanding | p.a. 2:19 3:5 |
| operations | 15:25 22:8,13 | 54:23 | p.m. 131:7 |
| 19:11 22:9,18 | 22:14,17 24:24 | overall 79:24 | p.m. 131.7 p.o. 2:20 |
| 23:1,8 54:11 | 30:7 31:3 32:8 | 113:2 | p.o. 2.20 package 38:13 |
| 64:17 91:2,18 | 32:18 35:15,17 | overarching | 38:21 |
| 106:24 | 47:1 50:7,9,25 | 49:17 | packaging |
| operator 45:14 | 54:15 55:13,16 | overlap 15:15 | 40:13 |
| 82:2 99:16,22 | 55:17 56:12,15 | 41:19 | padilla 2:18,19 |
| 100:21 105:23 | 57:4,8,12,17,18 | overlaps 24:7 | 17:14 24:14 |
| 115:23 124:5 | 58:11,12 59:5 | overly 68:24 | |
| operators | 62:9,21 74:15 | overlying 19:8 | 25:5,18,23 |
| 35:21 60:1 | 83:22 107:23 | overseeing | 26:1,21 27:12 27:16,18 34:1 |
| 61:22 66:10 | 107:24 109:19 | 103:17 | · |
| 67:2,7 68:10 | 127:8,12 128:5 | oversight | padillalawnm |
| 81:23 82:5 | 128:12 129:22 | 100:20 103:25 | 2:22 |
| 99:9 104:8,13 | ordered 125:16 | 105:25 106:1 | page 6:2 56:20 |
| 107:11,15 | orders 18:8 | overview 7:21 | 57:9 59:8,9 |
| 120:13 | 22:2 27:1 38:8 | owl 34:24 | 60:24 61:12,15 |
| opinion 73:19 | 68:5 102:9 | own 38:11 | 62:1,23 84:11 |
| 80:6 96:9,13 | 107:10,14 | 50:18 95:21,25 | 84:11 86:19 |
| , - | , | , , , | 98:18 125:15 |

[pages - planning]

| pages 56:16 | 44:6 46:13,22 | pennie 133:2 | persuasion |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| 57:7 | 47:1,8,25 48:7 | 133:15 | 46:20 |
| paragraph | 48:11 49:14,24 | penrose 21:3 | pertains 53:23 |
| 61:16 126:3 | 50:6,14,23 | 22:5,11,25 | petition 12:17 |
| paragraphs | 51:2,4 53:20 | 23:3 | 12:19,23 14:4 |
| 56:18,21 57:1 | 54:13,14 55:23 | people 115:22 | 49:9 |
| 57:2 126:4,22 | 56:2,3 60:13 | peralta 3:6 | petitioners |
| part 21:1 40:15 | 68:13,24 69:8 | percent 87:16 | 12:22 13:8 |
| 63:5 67:3 81:3 | 71:18,23 72:14 | 88:7,8 89:2 | 14:5 |
| 86:15 100:23 | 76:5 100:23 | perfect 84:12 | petroleum 2:10 |
| 113:8 121:24 | 105:6 110:2 | 88:2 | 3:2 17:14 |
| 122:17 126:16 | 113:3 120:4,22 | perfluoroalkyl | 65:20 76:7 |
| 126:16,17 | 128:6 132:12 | 11:22,23 | 85:21 |
| participants | 132:14 133:8 | period 31:11 | petrophysics |
| 71:11 | 133:11 | 49:12 58:4 | 45:16 |
| participate | party 15:14 | 81:1 120:18 | pfas 11:15 49:9 |
| 70:18 | 69:1 128:23 | periods 91:24 | philip 70:19 |
| participated | paseo 3:6 | permian 2:2 | picture 33:14 |
| 68:17 | passed 125:12 | 18:2 | picture's 33:14 |
| particular | passing 90:21 | permission | piece 101:10 |
| 14:21 57:3 | past 92:3 | 18:19 | pieces 17:4 |
| 58:10 69:1 | 114:14 | permitted | 19:1 50:3,11 |
| parties 12:1,3 | pathway | 18:13 29:8 | 72:1 73:6 |
| 12:18 13:7,11 | 120:14 | perpetuated | 85:21 109:25 |
| 13:19,21 14:10 | patterns 29:21 | 20:6 | 127:17 129:23 |
| 14:15 15:6,24 | 29:23 | person 16:9 | pitch 36:24 |
| 16:3,17,22,22 | pause 25:14 | personal 96:13 | place 92:6 |
| 17:5,9 18:25 | 43:24 | personally 51:3 | 98:25 100:11 |
| 30:25 31:2,23 | pdf 59:9 60:24 | perspective | placed 65:15 |
| 32:4,7,14,17 | 62:1,24 84:11 | 17:21 18:25 | places 119:15 |
| 33:1,24 35:19 | 127:19 | 25:9 29:2 | plan 52:20 72:2 |
| 35:25 36:3 | pecos 1:18 | 31:23 32:14 | 129:10 |
| 38:12 40:22 | pending 24:1 | 40:13,21 52:10 | planning 52:12 |
| 41:17,21 43:1 | 29:9 34:13 | persuaded | 81:8 123:7 |
| 43:2,16,22 | 48:22 | 54:20 | |
| | | | |

[play - presented]

| play 115:12,15 | portion 30:7 | potential 12:23 | predecessors |
|------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| 115:17 | pose 73:16 | 14:4 29:13 | 45:15 |
| played 104:19 | 76:10 97:4 | 30:18 35:9 | preface 28:25 |
| players 24:9 | posed 73:14 | 64:17 65:10,23 | preferably |
| please 75:6 | 109:22 | 66:18 78:18 | 120:21 |
| 84:19,22 97:16 | position 27:9 | 80:6 82:10 | preference |
| 103:6 110:11 | 27:19 30:16 | 98:21 99:2,10 | 15:13 |
| 110:12 | 39:2 43:13 | 124:17 130:22 | preliminarily |
| plenary 120:2 | 46:6 102:3 | potentially | 32:13 73:9 |
| plugging 66:12 | 124:12 125:8 | 13:17 14:10 | preliminary |
| 109:11 | positions 75:25 | 29:24 35:10 | 31:14,14 32:9 |
| plus 88:15 | possible 14:12 | 36:19 42:3 | premature 15:2 |
| podust 6:8 7:18 | 83:17 93:21 | 46:3 50:17 | prep 106:14 |
| 66:15 67:18 | 104:24 | 53:25 102:6 | preparation |
| 76:23 77:3,5 | posting 85:8 | 105:21 106:5 | 49:18 98:4 |
| 77:13,17 84:19 | postponing | powell 6:13 | prepare 110:20 |
| 84:21 85:2,6 | 12:10 | 70:19 102:7,13 | prepared 75:17 |
| 86:4 94:23 | potash 56:13 | 102:21,22,24 | 85:10 98:1 |
| 96:23 97:2 | 56:25 57:5,10 | 103:1,9,13 | 133:3 |
| point 15:3 17:2 | 57:20 58:9,16 | 104:25 105:10 | presence 43:4 |
| 19:20,24 25:6 | 58:20 59:25 | 106:10,18 | present 5:2 |
| 30:10 33:3 | 63:7 64:8,14 | 107:2,4,8 | 9:22,25 14:13 |
| 36:7 39:17 | 64:16,18 65:6 | 108:8 | 15:24 31:20 |
| 44:7 67:24 | 65:10,10,24 | powerpoint | 53:16 65:16 |
| 91:5 96:1 | 66:4,10,18 | 86:14 | 71:24 80:21 |
| 101:8 118:3 | 68:1,6,9,11,14 | practical 29:16 | 83:18 94:3 |
| 122:22 123:11 | 68:16 69:13,21 | 49:3 | presentation |
| pool 18:9 20:15 | 69:21,23 72:15 | practices 58:18 | 14:1 24:15 |
| 20:16,21,25 | 82:9 90:19 | 90:25 91:2 | 31:15 32:3 |
| 21:1 22:4,22 | 95:19 99:3,9 | 118:16 119:3 | 33:24 |
| 23:6,9,15,20,23 | 104:14 106:12 | pre 13:13 44:21 | presentations |
| 24:7 27:1 41:7 | 106:17 107:20 | 45:1 50:10 | 32:10 |
| pools 26:20,22 | 111:23 112:8 | precedence | presented |
| 26:23 28:2 | 112:11 114:7 | 119:1 | 58:21 69:18 |
| | 118:5 120:20 | | 71:5 74:15 |
| | | | |

[presented - provide]

| 107:21 | procedure | 54:11 59:24 | 127:22 |
|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| pressure 82:10 | 18:16 28:14 | 60:15 61:14 | proposed 7:5,8 |
| presume 81:2 | 33:17 47:5 | 65:7 67:9 | 11:22 23:4 |
| 81:25 90:11 | proceed 28:14 | 77:13 94:5,7 | 24:1 28:12 |
| pretty 27:19 | 31:7 36:10 | 98:11 106:16 | 32:17 34:14 |
| 68:15 | 46:6,21 55:22 | productions | 41:8 49:6 |
| prevent 69:22 | 71:22 72:18 | 118:21,21 | 50:20 59:1,11 |
| 76:20 79:14 | 74:2 | productive | 59:13 60:6 |
| 95:22 96:16 | proceeding | 12:24 60:20 | 61:11,25 62:21 |
| preventative | 33:21 47:13,16 | program 70:20 | 62:25 64:11,22 |
| 99:7 | 47:19,20 48:3 | 79:24 | 65:1 66:2,21 |
| previous 12:10 | 73:15 74:10 | programs | 67:18 69:11,16 |
| 92:2 | 131:8 133:4 | 103:18 | 69:19 70:12 |
| previously | proceedings | promote 69:19 | 71:9,14 78:20 |
| 11:15 13:14 | 70:17 71:22 | promptly | 79:1 83:22 |
| 65:6 117:23 | 132:3,5,6,9 | 107:14,23 | 92:15 93:13 |
| 119:10 | 133:6 | proof 46:20 | 111:17,25 |
| primacy 29:15 | process 13:7 | proper 28:14 | 122:17 124:4 |
| primary 12:9 | 31:4 36:17 | properly 46:18 | 128:10 |
| principal 35:12 | 48:4 70:10,14 | proponents | proposing |
| prior 15:11 | 70:24 78:2 | 130:8 | 13:17 17:2 |
| 43:18 63:23 | 81:4 106:4 | proportion | 91:12 125:14 |
| 80:18 97:24 | 113:17,21 | 20:9 | prospective |
| 109:21 132:5 | processes 82:2 | proposal 36:5 | 26:14 |
| probably 15:12 | 82:6 | 38:12,23 54:2 | prospects |
| 31:10 44:16 | proclamations | 63:12 70:17 | 32:16 |
| 62:10 73:6 | 42:24 | 82:25 119:23 | protect 69:24 |
| 79:10 100:8 | produced | 124:2,20 | 96:11 |
| 116:25 125:8 | 23:16 | 126:21 127:25 | protecting |
| 127:13 | producing | 128:15 130:4 | 106:21 |
| problem 35:4 | 90:12 91:5 | propose 16:4 | protection |
| problems 91:23 | 94:10 99:6 | 27:11 32:7 | 59:22 66:25 |
| 92:2 | production 3:2 | 35:14 41:21 | protests 89:24 |
| procedural | 4:11 21:2,4 | 46:14 47:2 | provide 13:6 |
| 14:13 25:3 | 26:14 30:4,9 | 48:8 63:16 | 17:21 25:9 |
| | | | |

[provide - rankin]

| 43:9 51:5 | pulled 120:25 | 72:20 73:14 | quick 9:19 |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------|------------------------|
| 56:18 76:22 | purported 19:9 | 77:1,24 79:1 | 10:11 24:12 |
| 78:18 87:2 | purpose 1:7 | 79:16 82:24 | quickly 46:12 |
| 101:2 105:19 | 112:15 117:20 | 83:5 90:9,15 | 122:2 |
| 122:12 128:24 | 120:16 121:24 | 93:16 98:19 | quite 43:7 51:3 |
| 129:13 | 129:18 | 101:13 108:10 | 72:21 118:14 |
| provided 40:4 | purposely | 110:2 114:6 | quorum 10:2 |
| 51:11 67:2 | 73:21 | 115:4,6 118:16 | r |
| 68:22 69:9 | purposes 52:12 | 119:2,5,23 | r 2:1 3:1,12 4:1 |
| 71:4 85:10 | 76:7 85:22 | 123:17 124:1 | 5:1 7:4,10 9:1 |
| 110:3 123:5 | 93:10 | 124:23 126:14 | 55:13,16,17 |
| provides 67:7 | put 13:1 15:22 | questions 10:4 | 56:6,17 57:17 |
| 120:14 125:14 | 33:15 45:8,17 | 15:21 16:5 | 57:21 58:1,14 |
| providing 31:4 | 50:20 59:24 | 17:22 30:12 | 59:10 62:8,9 |
| 129:18 | 70:5 72:4 | 31:15 32:19 | 63:13,20,25 |
| provision 98:23 | 91:19 94:4 | 52:15 63:8 | 69:19 92:6 |
| 99:1,8 101:11 | 100:11 116:16 | 65:2,16 66:13 | |
| 101:17 105:1 | 119:3 127:23 | 67:19 70:21 | 96:3 109:19 |
| 105:15,17,19 | 128:4,23 | 71:24 72:9,22 | 112:5 125:11 |
| 112:15 114:1 | 129:19 | 73:4,6,10,16 | 125:23,23,24 |
| 114:10 115:10 | puts 124:12 | 74:2,6,11 | 126:4,11,16,17 |
| 115:11 116:19 | putting 18:14 | 76:10 77:8,10 | 127:10 |
| 117:3 119:25 | 42:17 | 77:11,16 82:18 | radii 88:16 |
| 121:22 | q | 84:13 85:25 | radius 36:16 |
| provisions | | 90:4 94:19 | raise 45:21 |
| 65:15 66:23 | qualified 132:7 | 96:22 97:4 | 75:6 84:22 |
| 67:15 68:3 | qualify 64:16 | 98:13 102:3,17 | 97:16 103:6 |
| 109:25 112:5 | 65:8,21 66:17 | 103:24 105:9 | 110:12 |
| 122:19 128:10 | quantify 80:15 | 107:1,4 108:5 | raised 33:12 |
| public 129:21 | 81:3 | 108:7 109:22 | 36:7 |
| 132:19 | quarter 121:22 | 109:24 110:4 | ranging 103:19 |
| publication 8:5 | quarterly | 111:3,13 112:3 | rankin 2:3 |
| 69:4 | 120:8 | 120:17 123:13 | 17:18,20,24,25 |
| pull 11:17 | quash 48:22 | 123:21 124:24 | 19:2 20:21 |
| _ | question 37:3 | 125:4,7 | 24:16 25:7,15 |
| | 43:15 71:17 | <u> </u> | 26:24 28:9 |

[rankin - regulations]

| | I | I | I |
|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| 32:25 33:2 | 95:8,9 98:21 | recommended | reef 83:1,2,14 |
| 34:4 37:1,5,8 | 101:15,15 | 78:1 99:13 | 83:16,18 84:9 |
| 37:21,24 39:1 | 118:11,14 | reconvene 52:7 | referenced 35:4 |
| 39:6 40:15 | 123:3,22 | 55:3,5 108:22 | 57:11,12 62:24 |
| 41:22 43:19,20 | 126:20 | record 10:1,18 | 62:25 86:7 |
| 47:10 51:18 | reason 12:9 | 11:11 16:11,14 | references |
| 52:21,22,23,24 | 26:8,9 61:9 | 37:19 39:25 | 39:19 126:24 |
| 53:19 | 78:9 95:9 | 51:23 52:3 | referral 16:24 |
| rankin's 41:1 | reasonably | 55:7 63:11 | referred 18:4 |
| rate 38:3 | 35:15 | 68:11 70:1,5 | 38:19 54:5,7,9 |
| rather 107:15 | reasoned 27:4 | 72:6 73:20 | referring 92:18 |
| 127:21 129:23 | reasoning | 74:8 75:14,15 | 93:4 |
| reach 14:20 | 100:22 | 76:6 83:21 | refers 105:20 |
| 16:17 46:16 | reasons 63:20 | 85:7,18 109:1 | reflect 10:2,19 |
| reached 44:5 | 63:21 | 121:16 132:9 | 11:12 82:12 |
| reaches 36:20 | rebuttal 41:25 | 133:5 | reflected 70:2 |
| react 105:23 | recall 61:1 | recorded 132:6 | 71:1 83:22 |
| reactions 31:14 | recent 44:12 | recording 9:5 | 127:4 |
| 120:22 128:16 | 47:11 | 109:3,4 132:8 | reflecting |
| read 55:14 | recently 28:22 | 133:4 | 68:21 |
| 93:10 105:1 | 124:4 | records 68:15 | reflects 75:25 |
| 121:10 125:13 | recognize 76:6 | 72:1 | 98:1 |
| reading 27:24 | 85:20 98:9 | recover 19:13 | regarding |
| 63:2 125:20 | 111:2,6,10 | recoverable | 29:15 47:11 |
| 126:2 129:23 | recognized | 69:23 | 68:6 70:21 |
| ready 53:1,2 | 26:23 27:1 | recovery 35:11 | 104:19 |
| 74:2 109:7 | 40:16 58:11 | red 34:7,15 | regards 73:4 |
| real 24:12 | recognizes | 59:14 61:4 | 100:17 116:12 |
| 48:24 88:21 | 21:15 | redline 7:7 59:7 | 118:22 |
| 112:22 | recommend | 60:9 129:19 | regular 49:16 |
| really 30:3 | 31:5 | redlines 59:18 | regulation |
| 40:16,22 41:6 | recommendat | 60:21 | 90:16,23 |
| 41:11,13 42:11 | 30:25 31:12 | reduced 132:7 | regulations |
| 42:12 81:22 | 46:4,8,25 | reduction | 56:22 88:11 |
| 88:7 91:3 95:7 | | 78:18 | |
| | | | |

[regulator - restate]

| regulator | removed 59:16 | 114:22,25 | reserves 64:18 |
|---------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| 115:12,14,16 | 61:5 | 120:2 | 65:10 |
| 117:10 123:24 | repeated 20:6 | requested | reservoir 65:20 |
| regulators | rephrase 79:17 | 61:18 | 65:22 |
| 116:14 | 90:9 | requests 48:23 | residual 19:13 |
| regulatory | replacement | 82:9 | 35:9 |
| 103:25 | 125:15 | require 12:19 | resolution |
| reiterating | report 12:4 | 29:1 83:1 | 31:22,24 |
| 49:1 | 104:15,22 | 105:5 107:14 | resolutions |
| related 12:18 | reported 1:22 | required 30:8 | 54:3 |
| 124:6,10 | 99:11 114:21 | 42:6 63:6,6 | resolve 30:19 |
| 132:11 133:7 | 120:7,10 | 68:8 81:20 | 54:7 |
| relation 118:24 | 122:21 | 84:8 89:5 | resolved 43:18 |
| relative 49:15 | reporter 74:20 | 92:25 114:19 | 48:24 54:22 |
| 126:7 132:13 | 75:4,6 84:20 | 117:23 122:20 | resolves 50:10 |
| 133:10 | 84:22 97:15,16 | requirement | 124:3 |
| relevance | 103:4,6 110:11 | 83:19,21 99:23 | resources 1:2 |
| 125:23 126:25 | 110:12 | 113:6 117:25 | 40:22 41:11 |
| reliance 23:20 | reporting | requirements | 45:11 69:23 |
| 71:4 | 120:18 123:20 | 59:21,25 60:3 | respect 26:20 |
| relies 124:4 | represent 19:5 | 63:3 66:3,5,10 | 51:18 106:12 |
| relying 74:7 | representation | 66:25 67:1,5 | 106:20 |
| remain 21:23 | 72:1 124:5 | 68:2 78:23 | respond 31:19 |
| 21:24 29:10 | representatives | 80:5,8,10 91:1 | 53:12 102:8 |
| 30:24 | 58:8,9 | 96:1,4,5,7 | 104:1 107:22 |
| remaining 30:8 | represented | requires 98:24 | responded |
| 39:3 67:20 | 26:24 | 119:25 | 70:15 110:1 |
| remarks 28:17 | representing | rescheduling | response 79:3 |
| 70:7 | 18:2 | 130:22 | 102:7 105:4 |
| remedial | represents | research 86:24 | 110:4 118:15 |
| 120:12 | 34:14 76:19 | researched | 123:9,16 |
| remember | 89:1 | 114:24 | responsible |
| 118:4 | request 44:8 | reserve 15:12 | 58:19 69:20 |
| remind 9:12 | 49:1 69:25 | 15:13 50:17 | restate 11:14 |
| | 70:4 84:7 | | |
| | | | |

[resulted - schedule]

| | I | 1 | 1 |
|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| resulted 58:5 | 88:21 93:4 | 62:25 63:2,5 | safer 94:16 |
| 60:20 65:1 | 95:11,16,17,23 | 64:22 65:15 | salt 24:5,6 |
| resulting 41:9 | 97:17 101:1,2 | 67:3,7 68:3 | 59:22 66:8,25 |
| resume 55:9 | 103:6 109:12 | 71:13 88:8 | 77:13 81:14 |
| 109:7 | 109:15 110:12 | 92:15 105:17 | san 19:6,9,14 |
| resumed 109:3 | 117:22 118:7 | 112:25 113:5 | 19:25 20:14 |
| resuming | 121:8,17 | 116:5,12 117:1 | 21:1,4,7,9,13 |
| 109:16 | 122:24 125:25 | 117:3 121:20 | 21:17,19 22:6 |
| retain 126:25 | 127:20 129:24 | 122:17,21 | 22:12,14,19,22 |
| retained | 130:18 | 123:2 127:12 | 23:1,4,7,10,14 |
| 126:11 127:6 | rights 21:23 | rulemaking | 23:17,22 24:5 |
| return 55:20,21 | 41:9 47:21 | 11:16 16:12 | 27:2 28:1 |
| 109:8 | 69:24 106:22 | 49:9 | 34:17 36:9 |
| returned 30:8 | 107:21 | rules 51:11 | santa 1:3,21 |
| 81:19 | rise 19:18 20:1 | 56:22 57:14 | 2:6,14,21 3:7 |
| returns 81:16 | risk 96:17 | 62:2 63:23 | 3:15 4:6,15,23 |
| review 18:14 | robust 17:5 | 64:5 66:2,21 | 18:1 |
| 115:15 | 32:17 50:24 | 67:25,25 68:4 | satisfied 44:7 |
| reviewed 72:21 | 72:5 | 70:2 73:21 | saving 92:21 |
| reviewing 73:1 | role 115:11,14 | 90:11 92:17 | saw 88:14 |
| revised 13:13 | 115:17 | 95:22,25 | saying 39:6 |
| 14:4 | roll 9:19 10:11 | 111:25 122:19 | 94:13,14 100:4 |
| revisions | 11:6 | 124:8 127:14 | 100:18 116:18 |
| 105:21 | room 9:11 | run 41:21 | says 50:2 62:8 |
| revoke 37:16 | 17:11,15 67:19 | 80:18 81:2 | 113:5 117:1 |
| 53:8 | root 53:10 | running 80:18 | 125:16 |
| reworded 80:5 | round 44:17 | S | scale 20:9 |
| rice 34:24 | roz 35:11 36:8 | s 2:1,11 3:1 4:1 | 44:11 53:9 |
| right 9:7,15 | 53:5 | 5:1 7:1 8:1 9:1 | 122:10 |
| 13:3,16 41:2 | rubin 3:12 | safe 58:18 | scenarios 124:9 |
| 50:4 55:8 64:1 | 55:19 | 69:20 | schedule 13:12 |
| 75:6,13 76:14 | rule 48:5 56:19 | safeguard 7:22 | 15:2,18 24:21 |
| 76:17 81:11 | 58:25 59:13 | 90:18,18 | 24:21 25:22 |
| 84:22 86:20 | 60:3,5,7 61:11 | safeguards | 27:11 33:17 |
| 87:10,12,13 | 61:25 62:10,17 | 94:15 | 47:4 48:7 |
| | 1 | 1 | I |

[schedule - shaheen]

| 40.14.51.12 | gastian 66.270 | goon 20.10 | 05.5 06.10 14 |
|---------------------|------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 49:14 51:13 | section 66:3,7,8 | seen 29:10 89:23 92:24 | 95:5 96:10,14 series 29:23 |
| 130:24 | 66:10,11 92:18 | | |
| scheduled | 92:21 93:3 | 104:12,22 | 56:17,21 62:22 |
| 11:15 43:24 | 96:2 98:17 | 128:13 | 88:4 |
| 131:1 | 124:19 | seismic 104:10 | serious 53:4,13 |
| schedules | see 14:9,19 | self 7:11,13,15 | serve 23:7 |
| 50:11,19 | 17:17 25:25 | 7:17 8:3 64:4 | 43:22 44:14 |
| scheduling | 32:21 41:1 | 64:12,23 65:4 | served 43:22 |
| 11:17 13:13 | 42:17 43:4,10 | 65:18 66:14 | 44:12 |
| 15:25 17:7,22 | 46:5 56:8,21 | 75:16 76:4 | services 12:14 |
| 18:25 28:12 | 57:3 59:9,17 | 85:19 98:8 | 12:20 |
| 29:25 31:3 | 61:8,13 62:7,8 | 110:21 111:7 | servicing 66:15 |
| 32:8,18 40:11 | 62:13,18 67:9 | send 50:14 | set 9:11 11:19 |
| 40:13 47:1 | 67:17 75:2 | 115:1 129:3,4 | 27:20 31:11,21 |
| 49:25 50:7,9 | 83:10 86:11,12 | sense 20:9 41:5 | 32:9 46:9 |
| 50:24 52:12,15 | 89:25 93:8 | 41:20 42:12 | 48:10 50:5,12 |
| 54:15 55:20 | 97:14 99:12 | 48:6,9 113:16 | 50:24 51:8,16 |
| scope 18:12 | 100:22 101:3,5 | 122:12 123:20 | 52:6 55:4,11 |
| 33:5,7 35:4 | 103:4 104:15 | 128:18 | 64:2 71:10 |
| 44:11 47:12 | 106:6 119:18 | senses 20:8 | 78:11 95:2,4 |
| 70:23 | 121:3 125:10 | sent 68:8 | 95:25 96:6 |
| screen 16:16 | 128:9 130:10 | sentence 123:4 | 115:1 118:9 |
| 33:18 84:3 | seeing 13:4 | separate 38:25 | 126:13 127:12 |
| 111:24 | 56:3 82:19 | 39:4 40:17,23 | setback 121:23 |
| scrivener | 84:15 85:24 | 41:11 42:22 | 122:2 |
| 126:24 | 102:19 104:10 | 49:11 87:21 | sets 50:8 91:1 |
| seat 45:13 | 104:14 130:18 | 120:18 | 95:25 |
| second 10:10 | seek 26:8 57:2 | separated | setting 25:16 |
| 11:4 22:8 84:7 | seeking 18:7 | 31:24 88:12 | 52:10 104:5,5 |
| 85:9 116:13 | seeks 26:6 27:5 | separately 32:2 | 126:25 |
| 122:17 124:19 | seem 14:23 | separation 7:20 | several 28:19 |
| secondly 121:2 | 49:2 126:23 | 67:13 76:18 | shaded 59:12 |
| secretarial | 127:5 | 77:2,3 87:8,15 | 59:14 |
| 57:18 58:11,12 | seems 39:22 | 88:15,19,23 | shaheen 3:4 |
| | 122:18 | 89:3,20 94:24 | 17:14 25:19,25 |
| | | | |

[shaheen - sperling]

| 27:16 51:14,15 | sidebar 108:11 | skills 132:10 | 51:2 72:3 73:9 |
|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| 52:9 70:7 71:7 | signature | 133:6 | 73:15 115:9 |
| 71:8 74:5,13 | 132:17 133:14 | slate 16:21 | 118:15 |
| 96:24,25 | significant | 127:13 | source 22:14 |
| shanor 2:12 | 54:11 59:17 | slide 86:14,20 | 23:7 68:15 |
| shape 87:16 | 64:25 104:22 | slightly 86:24 | south 3:14 4:5 |
| share 31:13 | 107:9,19 | slot 32:11 | 18:8 20:22 |
| 33:18 62:12 | 124:16 | small 89:15 | 24:18 33:13 |
| shared 117:7 | significantly | solely 35:16 | southeast 28:2 |
| sharing 43:17 | 42:5 92:8 | somewhat | speak 9:16 14:8 |
| 121:4 | 98:20 | 30:11 31:1,4 | 25:25 74:23 |
| sharon 3:4 | signifies 59:15 | 62:20 | 94:8 100:12 |
| sheehan 27:13 | signs 99:4 | soon 55:21 | 102:6,7 |
| sheila 5:9 9:5 | similar 16:21 | sorry 16:15 | speaker 20:17 |
| 109:2 | 16:22 18:24 | 20:20 22:10 | 20:20 55:6 |
| short 23:8 | 25:9 43:8 | 37:10,15 82:21 | speaking 9:17 |
| 73:23 101:17 | 104:10 124:19 | 83:2 | 46:2 |
| shorter 124:17 | similarly 39:13 | sort 25:11 | special 11:15 |
| shot 37:10 | simple 76:19 | 27:17 32:5,15 | 15:9 18:9 22:4 |
| show 24:12 | 124:15 | 32:17,19 38:19 | 22:21 23:9 |
| 33:14,21 34:6 | simply 23:5 | 38:21 45:6 | 32:15,16 68:5 |
| 115:21 | 49:1 | 48:1 50:20,22 | 127:14 |
| showing 7:5 | single 29:24 | 51:4,12,13 | specialist |
| shown 61:2,4,5 | sir 63:17 74:18 | 52:11 54:22 | 103:20 |
| shows 33:19 | sit 49:22 | 71:16,25 72:2 | specific 53:22 |
| 34:7 60:24 | site 81:12 | 72:6 77:14 | 70:16 73:22 |
| 88:11 | sits 56:14 | 120:5,18,20,23 | 87:5,24 100:10 |
| shut 102:8 | situated 39:13 | 125:17 126:2,3 | 100:13 |
| 109:13 | 107:22 | 126:6,11 127:7 | specifically |
| sic 24:23 68:12 | situation 87:8 | 127:7,11 | 12:17 66:7 |
| 109:18 | 107:18 | sorts 50:8 | 67:16 68:4 |
| sick 16:10 | six 39:3,10,12 | sound 80:11 | 70:15 118:21 |
| side 82:11 | 43:3 58:14 | sounding 32:3 | specified 80:24 |
| 120:2 | size 89:9 95:10 | sounds 15:20 | sperling 3:21 |
| | | 31:15,21 50:16 | |
| | | | |

[spiel - subpoena]

| spiel 63:18 | 118:1 | stayed 44:3 | 66:24 67:5,9 |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| split 31:8 | started 9:4 | stayed 44.3 step 55:19 | 81:15 83:1,16 |
| spoke 14:7 97:3 | 12:16 21:6 | 104:21 113:20 | 83:19 84:8 |
| spoke 14.7 97.3 squarely | 104:9 | 113:22 114:9 | |
| 102:12 | | 113.22 114.9 | stringent 59:20 67:8 81:24 |
| | starting 21:5 125:15 127:13 | 117:14 | strings 77:12 |
| squares 34:12 34:13 | | | 77:14 83:10 |
| | starts 60:23 | steps 12:5 | |
| sshaheen 3:8 | 104:4,5 | 72:10 101:7,21 | strong 43:13 |
| st 1:20 3:14 4:5 | state 1:1 21:11 | 107:15 114:12 | struck 126:5 |
| stacking 29:22 | 21:16 26:3,12 | 115:16 117:9,9 | structure 12:17 |
| staff 40:2 49:10 | 68:20 103:14 | 120:12 | 12:19,23 |
| 49:13,16,20 | 130:11 132:20 | stopped 101:1 | 123:20 124:4 |
| 128:4 | statement 7:11 | straightforward | structured 31:2 |
| stage 24:9 | 7:13,15,17 8:3 | 36:22 124:15 | studies 119:1 |
| stages 12:13 | 57:9 64:13,23 | strata 3:2 4:11 | study 69:12 |
| stakeholder | 65:5,12,19 | 56:1 60:15 | 122:5,16 |
| 12:16 14:18,24 | 66:15 75:16,17 | 71:8 74:13 | studying 118:2 |
| stakeholders | 76:4 77:25 | 96:25 | stuff 112:22 |
| 12:22 | 85:9,13,16,22 | strata's 71:12 | style 91:12 |
| stale 125:21 | 98:1,4,8 100:3 | strategies 93:1 | 93:25 |
| stand 38:25 | 110:21 111:7 | 93:13,14 | subject 31:17 |
| 39:4 110:9 | 115:18 127:3 | strategy 101:22 | 35:10 38:24 |
| standard 91:15 | statements | stream 66:25 | submissions |
| 91:16 92:13 | 64:4 74:7 | streamline 39:8 | 42:1 |
| 95:8 | 76:11 85:18 | street 2:5 3:22 | submit 13:12 |
| standards | 98:8 | 4:14,22 | 41:23,25 |
| 46:19 67:8 | statewide 67:25 | strength 80:25 | submitted |
| 78:12 96:8 | statistical | stricken 61:11 | 110:21 |
| standing 26:9 | 87:13 89:18 | strict 94:1 | suboptimal |
| start 11:18,20 | status 11:19 | strike 61:6 | 79:10 |
| 12:2,7 17:19 | 12:4 25:1 46:9 | strikeout 59:7 | subpart 66:6 |
| 29:22 32:25 | 50:5 | 59:14 | 111:25 |
| 43:19 54:19 | statutory 22:8 | strikeouts 60:9 | subpoena |
| 71:16 80:19 | stay 34:4 48:12 | string 59:22,22 | 30:21 47:11 |
| 87:1 112:9 | | 59:23,24 66:5 | |
| | | | |

[subsequent - taxing]

| subsequent | suggesting 17:3 | 125:22 128:14 | take 14:19 |
|------------------|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 38:25 120:5 | suggestion | surface 59:21 | 18:20 29:15,19 |
| subset 38:16 | 13:10 123:3 | 66:24 77:12 | 44:22 45:23 |
| subsidence | suggestions | 81:16,19 | 46:25 49:19 |
| 60:2 65:14 | 17:21 72:4 | surrounding | 51:23 89:24 |
| 73:5,11 92:19 | suite 4:22 | 17:23 108:12 | 104:6 107:15 |
| 93:3 97:5 | sum 70:23 | survey 87:14 | 108:3,15 |
| 98:18,21,24 | summarizes | 88:4 89:12 | 113:13 123:11 |
| 99:2,5,7,10,15 | 66:4 | 95:12 119:11 | 128:12 130:9 |
| 99:19,24 101:3 | summary 127:3 | surveying 87:4 | taken 28:23 |
| 101:4 102:10 | summer 49:2 | 87:12,24 88:2 | 104:16 105:3 |
| 102:12 104:1,2 | 49:20 | surveys 119:12 | 113:17,18 |
| 104:11,21 | sun 69:6 | suspect 15:11 | 118:8,8 132:3 |
| 107:19 108:13 | supersede 96:8 | swd 21:20 29:7 | 132:12 133:9 |
| 109:24 112:6 | 101:20 | 33:19 | talk 27:10 87:4 |
| 112:16,20 | supervisor | swds 21:18 | 89:16,17,19 |
| 115:21 117:1 | 103:21 | 23:19 24:1 | 91:3 93:24 |
| 118:13,23 | supplement | 29:8 34:12,14 | 121:3 129:20 |
| 119:10,13,21 | 110:3 | 34:22 37:16 | talked 58:11 |
| 121:25 122:6 | support 64:5 | 39:12 | 77:25 78:6 |
| 122:23 124:6 | 71:3 92:1 94:1 | swear 74:20 | 80:14 81:7 |
| 124:10,16 | supported | 75:5 84:21 | talking 12:21 |
| substances | 26:17 | 97:15 103:5 | 24:13 29:17 |
| 11:23 | suppose 43:16 | 110:11 | 42:2,19,21 |
| substandard | sure 39:24 40:2 | sweeping 19:15 | 86:20 87:11 |
| 78:17 | 45:2,11 46:6 | sworn 75:10 | 93:3 108:11 |
| substantial | 46:10 73:22 | 85:3 97:20 | 122:11 123:8 |
| 30:23 32:9,10 | 76:22 78:4,16 | 103:10 110:16 | 124:7 |
| substantive | 78:22 79:15 | 132:5 | talks 14:4 |
| 16:13 | 80:4,11,17 | system 63:24 | 67:13,15 |
| sufficient 95:22 | 81:14 82:7 | t | target 23:2 |
| 127:25 | 83:14 86:5 | t 3:4 7:1 8:1 | targeted 21:24 |
| suggest 12:22 | 104:2 106:15 | table 128:15 | task 108:2 |
| 15:5 108:14 | 106:23 108:17 | tackle 35:15 | taxing 49:13 |
| | 115:14 118:6,7 | | |
| | | | |

[tdavis - think]

| tdavis 4:24 | tentatively 49:6 | 40:14 42:13 | think 9:3 11:13 |
|-----------------|---------------------|-------------------|------------------------|
| team 30:16 | term 31:25 | 43:20 47:7 | 12:7,24 13:5 |
| 42:19 91:25 | 50:13 82:13 | 48:18,19 49:21 | 13:18,21 15:12 |
| 119:3 | 122:5,5,10,16 | 51:15 52:7,8 | 15:22 17:19 |
| technical 4:11 | 123:8 | 52:17,20 55:1 | 18:11,14,16,17 |
| 19:18 29:18 | terms 28:10 | 55:5,6 56:5 | 18:21 20:2 |
| 30:16 42:19,24 | 71:19,21 79:13 | 63:10 71:6,8 | 25:8,14,15,22 |
| 43:6 55:13,25 | 119:2 126:25 | 71:15 72:23 | 26:16 27:4,7 |
| 58:6,12 60:16 | tertiary 35:11 | 73:6 75:2,3 | 27:14,18 28:8 |
| 64:21 66:1,20 | test 80:19,20 | 76:14,17 77:21 | 29:1,22 30:13 |
| 66:22 68:12,17 | testament | 78:25 82:15 | 31:9 32:6,8,14 |
| 109:19 114:2 | 69:14 | 83:6 84:17 | 33:4,7,15 35:3 |
| 117:21 129:25 | tested 99:13 | 85:17 86:4 | 35:17 36:24 |
| technically | testified 75:12 | 87:1 90:5 | 37:9 39:7,15 |
| 45:6 | 85:5 97:22 | 94:17 96:19,19 | 40:3,6,15,21 |
| technique 79:9 | 103:12 110:7 | 96:21 97:1 | 41:1,3,4,10,12 |
| 100:19 | 110:18 113:24 | 98:14 101:25 | 41:12,13,15,19 |
| techniques | 117:14 | 102:15 105:24 | 41:20 42:4,10 |
| 79:19 90:17 | testify 76:24 | 106:9,25 108:5 | 42:11,19,22 |
| 92:14 106:2 | testifying 132:5 | 108:24,25 | 43:7,11 44:5,5 |
| technologies | testimony | 114:16 121:14 | 44:6,7 45:5,20 |
| 92:9 | 22:23 23:5 | 125:2 128:18 | 45:21,22,23 |
| technology | 41:18,23 42:4 | 128:20 130:1,5 | 46:13,15,23 |
| 100:7 | 71:4,20 74:10 | 130:15 131:4,5 | 47:11,23 48:1 |
| tell 15:18 34:5 | 75:23 76:8,23 | thanks 72:25 | 48:6,8,9,15 |
| 75:11 83:21 | 77:11,15 86:15 | 82:16 95:18 | 49:5,24 50:11 |
| 85:4 87:6 | 109:22 115:9 | thickness 78:12 | 52:10 54:4,12 |
| 97:21 103:11 | 117:7 127:3 | thing 28:6 | 54:12 67:24 |
| 106:11 110:17 | text 56:8 59:13 | 39:17 49:8 | 69:10,14 74:16 |
| 116:15 | 59:14,15 60:5 | 62:18 115:20 | 75:21 76:23 |
| temporary | 61:4,13 67:16 | things 19:8 | 77:4 80:4,5 |
| 107:10,23 | thank 14:2 | 45:16 46:5 | 84:6 86:6,18 |
| ten 44:9 53:7 | 16:14,15 17:24 | 48:14 51:5 | 97:3 100:8 |
| 55:2 57:9 | 19:2 25:23 | 71:20,23 81:19 | 101:15 102:5 |
| 61:15 | 28:18 33:2 | 106:7 | 104:4,8,21 |

[think - try]

| 105.10 106.2 7 | thresholds | 76.15 06.5 | transarintianist |
|----------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| 105:19 106:3,7 | 117:17 | 76:15 86:5 | transcriptionist 132:8 |
| 108:3,21 | | 91:3,12 | |
| 109:23 110:1 | thursday 1:16 | today's 10:4 | tremaine 4:3 |
| 112:23 113:24 | 32:12 | together 13:1 | 6:6,15 12:6,7,8 |
| 120:5,14 | tie 63:22 | 17:4 25:11 | 14:3,7 17:17 |
| 123:21,22 | tight 13:19 | 39:8 45:17,22 | 28:16,18 33:3 |
| 124:1,7,14,20 | till 128:22 | 50:8 59:25 | 33:11 35:4 |
| 125:7 127:16 | time 1:17 9:10 | 119:3 128:4,23 | 41:22 42:15,16 |
| 127:19,24 | 12:11 13:6,22 | took 59:4,6 | 45:5 48:17,19 |
| 128:3,21,23 | 14:19,24 18:24 | 60:9 62:7 | 49:22 70:6,8 |
| 130:11 | 20:6,11,24 | tool 89:10,12 | 74:4,9 82:20 |
| thinking 25:21 | 23:10,13 24:19 | 99:17 100:5 | 82:21,23 83:5 |
| 46:2 127:8 | 24:25 25:9 | 101:22 | 102:1,5,16,21 |
| third 22:13,17 | 28:22 29:1,19 | tools 87:24,25 | 102:22 107:3,7 |
| thought 112:9 | 39:16 42:6,18 | 88:2 99:13,20 | 123:14,15,19 |
| 112:13 | 44:9 45:11,24 | 100:10,11,13 | 124:24 130:2,4 |
| thoughts 52:15 | 46:3,14 49:12 | top 62:8 | tremaine's |
| 53:22 71:23 | 49:20 50:17 | topics 66:13 | 13:25 46:4 |
| 72:8 73:14 | 51:4,20 52:17 | 74:1 | trend 34:7 |
| 128:16 | 53:3,7 56:11 | total 37:5 | trends 106:6 |
| thousand 33:15 | 76:15 79:5 | totality 129:10 | triangle 34:15 |
| thread 124:21 | 80:15,24 81:1 | touch 88:24 | triangles 34:11 |
| threaten 120:9 | 86:4 92:7 | toward 48:12 | 34:12 |
| threatened | 101:14 118:15 | towards 14:17 | true 132:9 |
| 107:20 | 122:23,25 | 45:19 57:4 | 133:5 |
| threatening | 126:8 130:8,15 | 62:4 113:20 | truly 98:25 |
| 106:24 | 131:6 | track 46:10 | truth 75:11,11 |
| three 15:17 | timing 31:9 | 48:12 | 75:12 85:4,4,5 |
| 22:2 35:20 | timothy 4:20 | tracking 40:8 | 97:21,21,22 |
| 49:19 55:23 | today 12:2 | trailing 30:3 | 103:11,11,12 |
| 83:10,12,16 | 16:10 24:11 | transcriber | 110:17,17,18 |
| 87:15 | 40:5 44:19 | 133:1 | try 12:25 14:24 |
| threshold | 55:4 57:2,21 | transcript | 48:7 49:14 |
| 117:19 118:10 | 64:13 65:2 | 27:24 133:3,5 | 86:10 90:9 |
| | 70:18 72:18 | | |
| | | | |

[trying - version]

| trying 25:3 | 88:1,6 89:18 | unit 18:8,10 | updates 70:12 |
|--|---|---|--|
| 27:20 28:10 | 89:19,21 95:10 | 19:7,9 20:23 | usc 70:20 |
| 79:14,24 122:4 | unclear 39:24 | 21:14 22:5,22 | use 9:11 11:23 |
| tubing 94:5,6 | 40:4 | 22:23 23:9 | 81:13 82:3 |
| turn 9:17 13:10 | under 47:22 | 24:4,7,18 26:1 | 88:2 99:17 |
| 15:5 25:19 | 51:11 56:11 | 26:5,19 27:22 | 100:21 105:21 |
| 27:15 32:24 | 58:1 68:3 80:9 | 33:13,19 34:9 | used 61:22 66:8 |
| 40:12 49:22 | 80:20 114:20 | 34:9,22,23 | 66:12 68:14 |
| 56:4 70:6 76:9 | underground | 35:1,1,2,13,13 | 78:1,6 87:24 |
| 85:24 98:12 | 21:12 | 35:17,21 36:6 | 102:4 110:1 |
| two 13:20 | underlined | 36:11,12,20,23 | 112:4 113:10 |
| 15:17 18:5 | 59:12 61:5 | 37:3,4,9,14,17 | using 22:19 |
| 19:7 20:22 | understand | 38:1,15 40:18 | 51:19 112:18 |
| 21:14 24:9 | 20:2 24:20 | 40:18,24,25,25 | usually 119:11 |
| 28:4,7 31:16 | 33:5,5,22 | 45:14 | utilized 58:15 |
| 31:23 32:11 | 52:10 61:19 | unitized 18:8 | 67:14 100:6 |
| 44:10 49:11,11 | 63:2 79:15 | 22:9,20 23:5 | 106:2 114:2 |
| 49:19 50:22 | 80:25 82:13 | 26:13 | V |
| 64:8,9 67:1 | 87:19 89:22 | universally | vacate 11:16 |
| 69:5 89:1 | 91:13,21 93:16 | 119:16 | value 52:10 |
| 123:22 129:8 | 116:9 | unleased 68:10 | variation 29:20 |
| 129:18 | understanding | unopposed | various 29:21 |
| type 114:9 | 33:7 42:25 | 11:16 | 29:22 42:25 |
| types 48:2 | 99:19,21 | unpack 17:22 | 58:1 60:4 |
| typewriting | 102:10 | 49:25 | |
| | | | 99:19 105:6 |
| 132:7 | understood | unsafe 94:14 | 99:19 105:6 112:17 |
| typical 31:4 | understood 20:11 34:3 | unsafe 94:14 unseen 20:10 | |
| typical 31:4 32:11 | understood 20:11 34:3 101:24 | unsafe 94:14 unseen 20:10 unsupported | 112:17 vehicle 127:11 |
| typical 31:4 | understood 20:11 34:3 101:24 undo 27:6 | unsafe 94:14 unseen 20:10 unsupported 27:8 | 112:17 |
| typical 31:4 32:11 | understood 20:11 34:3 101:24 undo 27:6 undue 69:22 | unsafe 94:14 unseen 20:10 unsupported 27:8 unusual 127:11 | 112:17 vehicle 127:11 verbiage 75:22 78:10 84:6 |
| typical 31:4 32:11 typically 104:3 | understood 20:11 34:3 101:24 undo 27:6 undue 69:22 unidentified | unsafe 94:14 unseen 20:10 unsupported 27:8 unusual 127:11 update 60:4 | 112:17 vehicle 127:11 verbiage 75:22 |
| typical 31:4 32:11 typically 104:3 u | understood 20:11 34:3 101:24 undo 27:6 undue 69:22 unidentified 20:17,20 55:6 | unsafe 94:14 unseen 20:10 unsupported 27:8 unusual 127:11 update 60:4 72:3 92:12 | 112:17 vehicle 127:11 verbiage 75:22 78:10 84:6 verging 25:15 |
| typical 31:4 32:11 typically 104:3 u ultimate 54:17 | understood 20:11 34:3 101:24 undo 27:6 undue 69:22 unidentified 20:17,20 55:6 unilaterally | unsafe 94:14 unseen 20:10 unsupported 27:8 unusual 127:11 update 60:4 72:3 92:12 updated 15:25 | 112:17 vehicle 127:11 verbiage 75:22 78:10 84:6 verging 25:15 version 7:4,6,7 |
| typical 31:4 32:11 typically 104:3 u ultimate 54:17 unanimously | understood 20:11 34:3 101:24 undo 27:6 undue 69:22 unidentified 20:17,20 55:6 | unsafe 94:14 unseen 20:10 unsupported 27:8 unusual 127:11 update 60:4 72:3 92:12 | 112:17 vehicle 127:11 verbiage 75:22 78:10 84:6 verging 25:15 version 7:4,6,7 7:8 60:10 61:1 |
| typical 31:4 32:11 typically 104:3 u ultimate 54:17 unanimously 10:19 11:12 | understood 20:11 34:3 101:24 undo 27:6 undue 69:22 unidentified 20:17,20 55:6 unilaterally | unsafe 94:14 unseen 20:10 unsupported 27:8 unusual 127:11 update 60:4 72:3 92:12 updated 15:25 | 112:17 vehicle 127:11 verbiage 75:22 78:10 84:6 verging 25:15 version 7:4,6,7 7:8 60:10 61:1 125:11 127:22 |

[versions - wells]

| versions 127:18 | 48:5 49:3 | watering 19:8 | welcome 31:22 |
|------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| versus 71:25 | 51:16 53:11,12 | 35:24 36:3 | 32:13 |
| 78:6 | 53:16 54:16,21 | | wellbore 62:22 |
| vet 45:10 100:5 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | way 15:15 17:6 39:8,25 42:5 | |
| | 60:23 72:6 | · | 63:2 64:20 |
| vetting 53:14 | 73:15 79:20 | 43:10 47:12 | 67:1,6 73:4 |
| 53:17 | 82:3 87:19 | 79:5 80:4 | 78:18 80:22 |
| viable 45:18 | 91:13 93:12 | 110:8 112:14 | 81:21 87:3,4 |
| video 65:16 | 94:23 99:17 | 114:15 115:1 | 87:12,13,17 |
| 66:12 | 101:15 105:14 | 116:16 125:16 | 88:8,16 89:2 |
| videoconfere | 111:3 115:24 | ways 112:17,18 | 91:10 93:7 |
| 1:15 2:11 3:20 | 117:23 121:2 | 117:13 | 95:15,22 96:9 |
| view 19:20 20:4 | 122:9 | we've 9:10 | 96:16 106:22 |
| 22:21 37:2 | wanted 33:3 | 11:18 26:7 | 111:19 116:1,8 |
| 125:22 126:7 | 37:11 78:15 | 28:22 29:3 | 120:17,20 |
| 126:10 | 110:2 114:25 | 44:7 58:21 | wellbores 87:9 |
| viewed 104:12 | 120:21 126:1,9 | 62:3,12 80:5 | 87:21 88:12,17 |
| 105:22 | wanting 97:4 | 104:10,22 | 88:20 89:1,4,6 |
| viewpoints | warning 99:4 | 110:20 113:22 | 89:8,23 90:12 |
| 46:16 | 105:20 | 114:13,23 | 90:20 91:14 |
| vote 10:12 11:6 | waste 21:22 | 128:13 | 92:24 93:13 |
| 129:10 | 40:22 41:9,10 | webex 17:13 | wells 21:16,20 |
| \mathbf{W} | 47:21 69:22 | 102:23 | 22:1 23:23 |
| wait 45:2 46:5 | 107:21 | website 56:7,9 | 24:6 30:7,8 |
| waiting 80:14 | watch 104:6 | 59:5 125:12 | 33:19,20,20 |
| walk 18:20 | 112:23 | weed 28:10 | 34:12,13,15,17 |
| 20:3 76:17 | water 19:10,12 | week 13:17 | 34:20,23 35:3 |
| 86:23,25 | 19:15 21:17 | 14:11 15:12,14 | 35:13,16,20 |
| 130:14 | 22:9,14,19,19 | 44:13 49:11 | 36:10,12,16,19 |
| wall 78:12 | 23:7,16,18 | 50:17 59:9 | 37:3,3,8 38:4 |
| want 15:12 | 24:5,6 29:14 | weekend 15:14 | 39:10 40:17,18 |
| 16:10,14 17:22 | 51:25 | weeks 13:20 | 40:23,24 41:8 |
| 20:2 28:4 34:2 | waterflood | 15:7 49:19 | 53:8 56:12 |
| 34:6 39:17,24 | 19:11 22:9,14 | 129:8,18 | 59:23 66:12 |
| 44:19 45:2,7,8 | 22:15,18 23:1 | weigh 48:20 | 79:5,9 87:9 |
| 45:20 47:8,15 | 23:8 | | 89:17 90:24,25 |

[wells - zone]

| 91:2,4,8,18,19 | 85:14 86:13,15 | 41:25 44:4 | 121:6,11,13 |
|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| 91:22 92:16,25 | 86:18 94:19 | 49:16,24 51:6 | yearly 122:11 |
| 93:18,22 94:8 | 97:3,20 98:2,5 | 54:3 66:19 | 122:13 123:6 |
| 94:9,10,12,14 | 102:18 103:10 | 75:19 104:8,9 | 123:20 |
| 94:15 95:6,6 | 103:16 104:2 | 104:24 130:3 | years 26:2,15 |
| 99:6,24 104:19 | 105:7 106:13 | worked 15:24 | 27:21 57:22 |
| 106:4 120:10 | 106:21 108:7 | working 43:21 | 58:14 64:15 |
| wendell 1:19 | 109:21 110:16 | 45:19,22 48:12 | 69:11 103:19 |
| went 65:13 | 110:23 111:10 | 49:14 64:20 | 112:17 114:8 |
| 78:2 | 114:23 119:9 | 65:25 95:15 | yellow 34:24 |
| whichever | 124:23,25 | 96:10 101:9 | 59:12 61:9,13 |
| 99:17 | 132:4 | 111:20 116:19 | 61:17 |
| whilst 81:12 | witnesses 6:2 | works 15:18 | yep 37:7,23 |
| who've 12:1 | 12:12 14:9 | 42:3 108:16 | 86:18 129:6 |
| wide 29:7 | 15:1 44:23 | worth 33:14 | 130:1 |
| wildearth 4:19 | 64:4,8,9 71:5 | write 99:12 | yesterday |
| 4:21 11:21 | 71:25 73:17,25 | written 41:23 | 10:23 28:3,10 |
| wildearthgua | 74:6 97:24 | 41:25 71:20 | 46:2 47:10 |
| 4:24 | 102:2,6 108:10 | 74:7,10 75:23 | Z |
| william 5:7 | 110:20 125:4 | 76:11 98:8 | zone 19:16 |
| 6:16 7:14 65:5 | wonder 120:4 | 112:14 127:11 | 21:22,24 22:16 |
| 97:19 | wonderful 59:5 | 128:5,13 | 23:11,18 34:25 |
| willing 51:20 | 72:16 | X | 35:9,22 |
| 114:25 | word 20:8 59:6 | x 6:1 7:1 8:1 | 33.7,22 |
| window 124:18 | 61:14 89:24 | 50:2 | |
| wish 102:13 | 127:22 128:25 | | |
| wishes 70:21 | wording 85:15 | y | |
| witness 7:12,14 | 100:16 | y 50:2 | |
| 7:16,18 13:9 | words 33:15 | yeah 39:1 | |
| 14:5 64:10,16 | 122:1 | 76:25 78:25 | |
| 65:9,22 66:17 | wordsmithing | 79:6 81:6 87:6 | |
| 75:10,18,21 | 60:20 | 90:9 99:12 | |
| 76:2,24 82:18 | work 13:7,12 | 100:8,15 101:8 | |
| 82:25 84:1,4 | 13:19,22 14:9 | 112:11 113:10 | |
| 84:17 85:3,11 | 14:10 19:22 | 113:22 116:18 | |
| | | | |