BEFORE THE IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF LANDS

```
In the Matter of the Application ) CC-2021-OGR-01-002
of Snake River Oil and Gas, LLC )
for Spacing Order Consisting of )
the E 1/2 of the SE 1/4 of Section) Docket No.
9 SW 1/4 of Section 10, N 1/2 of ) CC-2021-OGR-01-002
the N 1/2 of the NW 1/4 of Section)
15, and the N 1/2 of the NE 1/4 of)
the NE 1/4 of the Section 16, )
Township 8 North, Range 5 West, )
Boise Meridian, Payette County, )
Idaho
                                 )
Snake River Oil and Gas, LLC,
                                )
         Applicant.
                                 )
                                 )
```

HEARING TO DETERMINE "JUST AND REASONABLE" FACTORS

DATE/TIME: JUNE 21, 2021, at 1:00 p.m.

LOCATION: Fruitland City Hall, 200, S. Whitney Dr. Fruitland, Idaho

TRANSCRIBED BY:

JEFF LaMAR, C.S.R. No. 640

Notary Public

UII 8	and Gas		June 21, 2021
	Page 2		Page 4
1	MICK THOMAS HEARING OFFICER	1	(Beginning of audio file.)
2		2	
3			Sorry to interrupt.
4	APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:	4	
5	For Snake River Oil and Gas, LLC:	5	
6	SMITH & MALEK	6	F 1 111 11 1 1
7	BY MICHAEL R. CHRISTIAN	7	
8	101 South Capitol Boulevard, Suite 930		interrupt one more time. The audio is very, very low
9	Boise, Idaho 83702		coming from that device. I cannot hardly hear
10	mike@smithmalek.com		Mr. Christian. I apologize.
11	For the Idaho Department of Lands:	11	THE HEARING OFFICER: I got an idea.
12	OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL	12	
13	BY JOY VEGA	13	
14	Post Office Box 83720	14	
15	Boise, Idaho 83720-0010		something?
16	joy.vega@ag.idaho.gov	16	THE HEARING OFFICER: Chris, is it any better
17	For Non-Consenting Owners and CAIA:		now?
18	PIOTROWSKI DURAND, PLLC	18	CHRIS GOZZO: I can hear you just fine.
19	BY JAMES M. PIOTROWSKI	19	
20	1020 West Main Street, Suite 440	20	So the amazing, high quality speaker was
20	Boise, Idaho 83702		dying.
21 22	-	22	
	james@idunionlaw.com	23	
23	///	24	
24	///	25	
25	///		
	Page 3		Page 5
1	APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL (Continued):	-	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.
2		1	
3	For City of Fruitland:		taking appearances, initially I'm just asking everyone
4	MSBT LAW		to say who they represent, and then I'll call upon the
5	BY STEPHANIE JAYMES BONNEY		parties after that.
6	7699 West Riverside Drive	6	
7	Boise, Idaho 83714	7	
8	sjb@msbtlaw.com	-	garble was actually perfect.
9	-	9	
10		10	
11			Mr. Christian.
12		12	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you go ahead and just
13			identify the docket we're on again.
14		14	
15		15	
16		_	[unintelligible].
17		17	- •
			important. And I think they were hearing me okay. It
18			was just the speaker was
19		19 20	
20			myself?
21		21 22	
22		22	
23		23	
24			on we are now on the record for Docket No.
25		23	on we are now on the record for Docket no.

	Page 6		Page 8
1	CC-2021-OGR-01-002.	1	JOY VEGA: Good morning or afternoon,
2	We had some technical difficulties		Mr. Thomas.
3	regarding audio. That's been resolved. I had I'm	3	Joy Vega, deputy attorney general,
	in the process of asking folks to identify themselves.	4	appearing on behalf of the Idaho Department of Lands.
5	Mr. Christian, representative of Snake	5	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you very much for
6	River, has just identified himself.	6	your persistence.
7	I believe, Ms. Vega, will you please	7	Ms. Bonney, I see you're on the Zoom.
8	identify yourself and who you represent.	8	Would you please identify yourself and who you
9	I don't see Ms. Vega on Zoom.	9	represent.
10	CHRIS GOZZO: Mr. Hearing Officer, she's joined	10	STEPHANIE JAYMES BONNEY: Certainly, Mr. Thomas.
11	as an attendee, so she will not be able to speak in the	11	My name is Stephanie Jaymes Bonney, and I
12	webinar format. If she does need to be joined as a	12	represent the City of Fruitland.
13	panelist, I can promote her to a panelist so she's able	13	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you very much.
14	to communicate.	14	Are there any other uncommitted mineral
15	THE HEARING OFFICER: Please do so.	15	interest owners in the proposed unit that plan to
16	Mr. Piotrowski, can you please identify	16	participate today?
17	yourself and who you represent.	17	Would you please step up to the podium and
18	MR. PIOTROWSKI: Yes, sir, I certainly can.	18	state your name and if you represent yourself.
	James Piotrowski, Piotrowski Durand, PLLC, representing	19	SHARON SIMMONS: My name's Sharon Simmons. And
	Dale Verhaeghe, Linda Dernoncourt, Sharon Simmons, Alan		Piotrowski is representing me as part of that coalition
21	and Glenda Grace	21	of owners.
22	JOY VEGA: All right. Mr. Thomas, can you hear	22	THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay.
23	me? Or I'm sorry.	23	SHARON SIMMONS: And I'm on here on my own
24	MR. PIOTROWSKI: Should I continue?		behalf too.
25	THE HEARING OFFICER: Please, Mr. Piotrowski.	25	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you very much.
	Page 7		Page 9
1		1	
	We're all family here. Go ahead.	1	All right. Now that we have the
2	We're all family here. Go ahead. MR. PIOTROWSKI: Okay. Yes, we are at this	2	All right. Now that we have the appearances out of the way, I think everybody's online
2 3	We're all family here. Go ahead. MR. PIOTROWSKI: Okay. Yes, we are at this point.	2 3	All right. Now that we have the appearances out of the way, I think everybody's online and streaming well. I'd like to begin arguments.
2 3 4	We're all family here. Go ahead. MR. PIOTROWSKI: Okay. Yes, we are at this point. Edward and Cheryl Adair, William and Roxie	2 3 4	All right. Now that we have the appearances out of the way, I think everybody's online and streaming well. I'd like to begin arguments. Mr. Christian, I'd like to invite you to
2 3 4 5	We're all family here. Go ahead. MR. PIOTROWSKI: Okay. Yes, we are at this point. Edward and Cheryl Adair, William and Roxie Tolbert, Wendell and Norma Nierman, Cheryl and Richard	2 3 4 5	All right. Now that we have the appearances out of the way, I think everybody's online and streaming well. I'd like to begin arguments. Mr. Christian, I'd like to invite you to provide argument at this time.
2 3 4 5 6	We're all family here. Go ahead. MR. PIOTROWSKI: Okay. Yes, we are at this point. Edward and Cheryl Adair, William and Roxie Tolbert, Wendell and Norma Nierman, Cheryl and Richard Addison, Jimmie and Judy Hicks, Antonio and Danielle	2 3 4 5 6	All right. Now that we have the appearances out of the way, I think everybody's online and streaming well. I'd like to begin arguments. Mr. Christian, I'd like to invite you to provide argument at this time. MIKE CHRISTIAN: Thank you, Mr. Administrator.
2 3 4 5 6 7	We're all family here. Go ahead. MR. PIOTROWSKI: Okay. Yes, we are at this point. Edward and Cheryl Adair, William and Roxie Tolbert, Wendell and Norma Nierman, Cheryl and Richard Addison, Jimmie and Judy Hicks, Antonio and Danielle Anchustegui, Philip and Kathleen Hendrickson, Donna and	2 3 4 5 6 7	All right. Now that we have the appearances out of the way, I think everybody's online and streaming well. I'd like to begin arguments. Mr. Christian, I'd like to invite you to provide argument at this time. MIKE CHRISTIAN: Thank you, Mr. Administrator. I apologize for getting ahead of myself.
2 3 4 5 6 7	We're all family here. Go ahead. MR. PIOTROWSKI: Okay. Yes, we are at this point. Edward and Cheryl Adair, William and Roxie Tolbert, Wendell and Norma Nierman, Cheryl and Richard Addison, Jimmie and Judy Hicks, Antonio and Danielle Anchustegui, Philip and Kathleen Hendrickson, Donna and George Jackson, Karen Altman [phonetic], Bonnie McGee	2 3 4 5 6	All right. Now that we have the appearances out of the way, I think everybody's online and streaming well. I'd like to begin arguments. Mr. Christian, I'd like to invite you to provide argument at this time. MIKE CHRISTIAN: Thank you, Mr. Administrator. I apologize for getting ahead of myself. THE HEARING OFFICER: No, that's fine.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	We're all family here. Go ahead. MR. PIOTROWSKI: Okay. Yes, we are at this point. Edward and Cheryl Adair, William and Roxie Tolbert, Wendell and Norma Nierman, Cheryl and Richard Addison, Jimmie and Judy Hicks, Antonio and Danielle Anchustegui, Philip and Kathleen Hendrickson, Donna and George Jackson, Karen Altman [phonetic], Bonnie McGee [phonetic], Lorinda Schuman, Samuel Burtorovich, Tim	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	All right. Now that we have the appearances out of the way, I think everybody's online and streaming well. I'd like to begin arguments. Mr. Christian, I'd like to invite you to provide argument at this time. MIKE CHRISTIAN: Thank you, Mr. Administrator. I apologize for getting ahead of myself. THE HEARING OFFICER: No, that's fine. MIKE CHRISTIAN: As I've mentioned before, we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	We're all family here. Go ahead. MR. PIOTROWSKI: Okay. Yes, we are at this point. Edward and Cheryl Adair, William and Roxie Tolbert, Wendell and Norma Nierman, Cheryl and Richard Addison, Jimmie and Judy Hicks, Antonio and Danielle Anchustegui, Philip and Kathleen Hendrickson, Donna and George Jackson, Karen Altman [phonetic], Bonnie McGee [phonetic], Lorinda Schuman, Samuel Burtorovich, Tim and Kate Kilbourne, and Citizens Aligned for Integrity	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	All right. Now that we have the appearances out of the way, I think everybody's online and streaming well. I'd like to begin arguments. Mr. Christian, I'd like to invite you to provide argument at this time. MIKE CHRISTIAN: Thank you, Mr. Administrator. I apologize for getting ahead of myself. THE HEARING OFFICER: No, that's fine. MIKE CHRISTIAN: As I've mentioned before, we submitted briefing on behalf of the applicant. I don't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	We're all family here. Go ahead. MR. PIOTROWSKI: Okay. Yes, we are at this point. Edward and Cheryl Adair, William and Roxie Tolbert, Wendell and Norma Nierman, Cheryl and Richard Addison, Jimmie and Judy Hicks, Antonio and Danielle Anchustegui, Philip and Kathleen Hendrickson, Donna and George Jackson, Karen Altman [phonetic], Bonnie McGee [phonetic], Lorinda Schuman, Samuel Burtorovich, Tim and Kate Kilbourne, and Citizens Aligned for Integrity and Accountability.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	All right. Now that we have the appearances out of the way, I think everybody's online and streaming well. I'd like to begin arguments. Mr. Christian, I'd like to invite you to provide argument at this time. MIKE CHRISTIAN: Thank you, Mr. Administrator. I apologize for getting ahead of myself. THE HEARING OFFICER: No, that's fine. MIKE CHRISTIAN: As I've mentioned before, we submitted briefing on behalf of the applicant. I don't intend to repeat any of that here, other than to answer
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	We're all family here. Go ahead. MR. PIOTROWSKI: Okay. Yes, we are at this point. Edward and Cheryl Adair, William and Roxie Tolbert, Wendell and Norma Nierman, Cheryl and Richard Addison, Jimmie and Judy Hicks, Antonio and Danielle Anchustegui, Philip and Kathleen Hendrickson, Donna and George Jackson, Karen Altman [phonetic], Bonnie McGee [phonetic], Lorinda Schuman, Samuel Burtorovich, Tim and Kate Kilbourne, and Citizens Aligned for Integrity	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	All right. Now that we have the appearances out of the way, I think everybody's online and streaming well. I'd like to begin arguments. Mr. Christian, I'd like to invite you to provide argument at this time. MIKE CHRISTIAN: Thank you, Mr. Administrator. I apologize for getting ahead of myself. THE HEARING OFFICER: No, that's fine. MIKE CHRISTIAN: As I've mentioned before, we submitted briefing on behalf of the applicant. I don't intend to repeat any of that here, other than to answer
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	We're all family here. Go ahead. MR. PIOTROWSKI: Okay. Yes, we are at this point. Edward and Cheryl Adair, William and Roxie Tolbert, Wendell and Norma Nierman, Cheryl and Richard Addison, Jimmie and Judy Hicks, Antonio and Danielle Anchustegui, Philip and Kathleen Hendrickson, Donna and George Jackson, Karen Altman [phonetic], Bonnie McGee [phonetic], Lorinda Schuman, Samuel Burtorovich, Tim and Kate Kilbourne, and Citizens Aligned for Integrity and Accountability. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	All right. Now that we have the appearances out of the way, I think everybody's online and streaming well. I'd like to begin arguments. Mr. Christian, I'd like to invite you to provide argument at this time. MIKE CHRISTIAN: Thank you, Mr. Administrator. I apologize for getting ahead of myself. THE HEARING OFFICER: No, that's fine. MIKE CHRISTIAN: As I've mentioned before, we submitted briefing on behalf of the applicant. I don't intend to repeat any of that here, other than to answer any questions you may have. I have reviewed the order
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 We're all family here. Go ahead. MR. PIOTROWSKI: Okay. Yes, we are at this point. Edward and Cheryl Adair, William and Roxie Tolbert, Wendell and Norma Nierman, Cheryl and Richard Addison, Jimmie and Judy Hicks, Antonio and Danielle Anchustegui, Philip and Kathleen Hendrickson, Donna and George Jackson, Karen Altman [phonetic], Bonnie McGee [phonetic], Lorinda Schuman, Samuel Burtorovich, Tim and Kate Kilbourne, and Citizens Aligned for Integrity and Accountability. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski. Ms. Vega, I believe you are on the line now officially. Can you please identify yourself and who 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	All right. Now that we have the appearances out of the way, I think everybody's online and streaming well. I'd like to begin arguments. Mr. Christian, I'd like to invite you to provide argument at this time. MIKE CHRISTIAN: Thank you, Mr. Administrator. I apologize for getting ahead of myself. THE HEARING OFFICER: No, that's fine. MIKE CHRISTIAN: As I've mentioned before, we submitted briefing on behalf of the applicant. I don't intend to repeat any of that here, other than to answer any questions you may have. I have reviewed the order of factors to be used to reach just and reasonable terms in the other pending integration application
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 We're all family here. Go ahead. MR. PIOTROWSKI: Okay. Yes, we are at this point. Edward and Cheryl Adair, William and Roxie Tolbert, Wendell and Norma Nierman, Cheryl and Richard Addison, Jimmie and Judy Hicks, Antonio and Danielle Anchustegui, Philip and Kathleen Hendrickson, Donna and George Jackson, Karen Altman [phonetic], Bonnie McGee [phonetic], Lorinda Schuman, Samuel Burtorovich, Tim and Kate Kilbourne, and Citizens Aligned for Integrity and Accountability. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski. Ms. Vega, I believe you are on the line now 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	All right. Now that we have the appearances out of the way, I think everybody's online and streaming well. I'd like to begin arguments. Mr. Christian, I'd like to invite you to provide argument at this time. MIKE CHRISTIAN: Thank you, Mr. Administrator. I apologize for getting ahead of myself. THE HEARING OFFICER: No, that's fine. MIKE CHRISTIAN: As I've mentioned before, we submitted briefing on behalf of the applicant. I don't intend to repeat any of that here, other than to answer any questions you may have. I have reviewed the order of factors to be used to reach just and reasonable
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 We're all family here. Go ahead. MR. PIOTROWSKI: Okay. Yes, we are at this point. Edward and Cheryl Adair, William and Roxie Tolbert, Wendell and Norma Nierman, Cheryl and Richard Addison, Jimmie and Judy Hicks, Antonio and Danielle Anchustegui, Philip and Kathleen Hendrickson, Donna and George Jackson, Karen Altman [phonetic], Bonnie McGee [phonetic], Lorinda Schuman, Samuel Burtorovich, Tim and Kate Kilbourne, and Citizens Aligned for Integrity and Accountability. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski. Ms. Vega, I believe you are on the line now officially. Can you please identify yourself and who you represent. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	All right. Now that we have the appearances out of the way, I think everybody's online and streaming well. I'd like to begin arguments. Mr. Christian, I'd like to invite you to provide argument at this time. MIKE CHRISTIAN: Thank you, Mr. Administrator. I apologize for getting ahead of myself. THE HEARING OFFICER: No, that's fine. MIKE CHRISTIAN: As I've mentioned before, we submitted briefing on behalf of the applicant. I don't intend to repeat any of that here, other than to answer any questions you may have. I have reviewed the order of factors to be used to reach just and reasonable terms in the other pending integration application regarding the Barlow 111 unit, which is docket No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 We're all family here. Go ahead. MR. PIOTROWSKI: Okay. Yes, we are at this point. Edward and Cheryl Adair, William and Roxie Tolbert, Wendell and Norma Nierman, Cheryl and Richard Addison, Jimmie and Judy Hicks, Antonio and Danielle Anchustegui, Philip and Kathleen Hendrickson, Donna and George Jackson, Karen Altman [phonetic], Bonnie McGee [phonetic], Lorinda Schuman, Samuel Burtorovich, Tim and Kate Kilbourne, and Citizens Aligned for Integrity and Accountability. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski. Ms. Vega, I believe you are on the line now officially. Can you please identify yourself and who you represent. We'll get it later. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	All right. Now that we have the appearances out of the way, I think everybody's online and streaming well. I'd like to begin arguments. Mr. Christian, I'd like to invite you to provide argument at this time. MIKE CHRISTIAN: Thank you, Mr. Administrator. I apologize for getting ahead of myself. THE HEARING OFFICER: No, that's fine. MIKE CHRISTIAN: As I've mentioned before, we submitted briefing on behalf of the applicant. I don't intend to repeat any of that here, other than to answer any questions you may have. I have reviewed the order of factors to be used to reach just and reasonable terms in the other pending integration application regarding the Barlow 111 unit, which is docket No. CC-2021-OGR-01-001. And I think those factors are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 We're all family here. Go ahead. MR. PIOTROWSKI: Okay. Yes, we are at this point. Edward and Cheryl Adair, William and Roxie Tolbert, Wendell and Norma Nierman, Cheryl and Richard Addison, Jimmie and Judy Hicks, Antonio and Danielle Anchustegui, Philip and Kathleen Hendrickson, Donna and George Jackson, Karen Altman [phonetic], Bonnie McGee [phonetic], Lorinda Schuman, Samuel Burtorovich, Tim and Kate Kilbourne, and Citizens Aligned for Integrity and Accountability. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski. Ms. Vega, I believe you are on the line now officially. Can you please identify yourself and who you represent. We'll get it later. CHRIS GOZZO: Mr. Hearing Officer, she was 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	All right. Now that we have the appearances out of the way, I think everybody's online and streaming well. I'd like to begin arguments. Mr. Christian, I'd like to invite you to provide argument at this time. MIKE CHRISTIAN: Thank you, Mr. Administrator. I apologize for getting ahead of myself. THE HEARING OFFICER: No, that's fine. MIKE CHRISTIAN: As I've mentioned before, we submitted briefing on behalf of the applicant. I don't intend to repeat any of that here, other than to answer any questions you may have. I have reviewed the order of factors to be used to reach just and reasonable terms in the other pending integration application regarding the Barlow 111 unit, which is docket No. CC-2021-OGR-01-001. And I think those factors are appropriate for use in this matter. I don't know anything about this unit that would cause you to need
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	We're all family here. Go ahead. MR. PIOTROWSKI: Okay. Yes, we are at this point. Edward and Cheryl Adair, William and Roxie Tolbert, Wendell and Norma Nierman, Cheryl and Richard Addison, Jimmie and Judy Hicks, Antonio and Danielle Anchustegui, Philip and Kathleen Hendrickson, Donna and George Jackson, Karen Altman [phonetic], Bonnie McGee [phonetic], Lorinda Schuman, Samuel Burtorovich, Tim and Kate Kilbourne, and Citizens Aligned for Integrity and Accountability. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski. Ms. Vega, I believe you are on the line now officially. Can you please identify yourself and who you represent. We'll get it later. CHRIS GOZZO: Mr. Hearing Officer, she was promoted as a panelist, but then it looks like she disconnected and rejoined as an attendee. I'm promoting her again.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	All right. Now that we have the appearances out of the way, I think everybody's online and streaming well. I'd like to begin arguments. Mr. Christian, I'd like to invite you to provide argument at this time. MIKE CHRISTIAN: Thank you, Mr. Administrator. I apologize for getting ahead of myself. THE HEARING OFFICER: No, that's fine. MIKE CHRISTIAN: As I've mentioned before, we submitted briefing on behalf of the applicant. I don't intend to repeat any of that here, other than to answer any questions you may have. I have reviewed the order of factors to be used to reach just and reasonable terms in the other pending integration application regarding the Barlow 111 unit, which is docket No. CC-2021-OGR-01-001. And I think those factors are appropriate for use in this matter. I don't know anything about this unit that would cause you to need
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 We're all family here. Go ahead. MR. PIOTROWSKI: Okay. Yes, we are at this point. Edward and Cheryl Adair, William and Roxie Tolbert, Wendell and Norma Nierman, Cheryl and Richard Addison, Jimmie and Judy Hicks, Antonio and Danielle Anchustegui, Philip and Kathleen Hendrickson, Donna and George Jackson, Karen Altman [phonetic], Bonnie McGee [phonetic], Lorinda Schuman, Samuel Burtorovich, Tim and Kate Kilbourne, and Citizens Aligned for Integrity and Accountability. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski. Ms. Vega, I believe you are on the line now officially. Can you please identify yourself and who you represent. We'll get it later. CHRIS GOZZO: Mr. Hearing Officer, she was promoted as a panelist, but then it looks like she disconnected and rejoined as an attendee. I'm promoting her again. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you very much. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	All right. Now that we have the appearances out of the way, I think everybody's online and streaming well. I'd like to begin arguments. Mr. Christian, I'd like to invite you to provide argument at this time. MIKE CHRISTIAN: Thank you, Mr. Administrator. I apologize for getting ahead of myself. THE HEARING OFFICER: No, that's fine. MIKE CHRISTIAN: As I've mentioned before, we submitted briefing on behalf of the applicant. I don't intend to repeat any of that here, other than to answer any questions you may have. I have reviewed the order of factors to be used to reach just and reasonable terms in the other pending integration application regarding the Barlow 111 unit, which is docket No. CC-2021-OGR-01-001. And I think those factors are appropriate for use in this matter. I don't know anything about this unit that would cause you to need to depart from those factors. I'm happy to answer any questions you may have.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 We're all family here. Go ahead. MR. PIOTROWSKI: Okay. Yes, we are at this point. Edward and Cheryl Adair, William and Roxie Tolbert, Wendell and Norma Nierman, Cheryl and Richard Addison, Jimmie and Judy Hicks, Antonio and Danielle Anchustegui, Philip and Kathleen Hendrickson, Donna and George Jackson, Karen Altman [phonetic], Bonnie McGee [phonetic], Lorinda Schuman, Samuel Burtorovich, Tim and Kate Kilbourne, and Citizens Aligned for Integrity and Accountability. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski. Ms. Vega, I believe you are on the line now officially. Can you please identify yourself and who you represent. We'll get it later. CHRIS GOZZO: Mr. Hearing Officer, she was promoted as a panelist, but then it looks like she disconnected and rejoined as an attendee. I'm promoting her again. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you very much. Let's just wait a moment. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	All right. Now that we have the appearances out of the way, I think everybody's online and streaming well. I'd like to begin arguments. Mr. Christian, I'd like to invite you to provide argument at this time. MIKE CHRISTIAN: Thank you, Mr. Administrator. I apologize for getting ahead of myself. THE HEARING OFFICER: No, that's fine. MIKE CHRISTIAN: As I've mentioned before, we submitted briefing on behalf of the applicant. I don't intend to repeat any of that here, other than to answer any questions you may have. I have reviewed the order of factors to be used to reach just and reasonable terms in the other pending integration application regarding the Barlow 111 unit, which is docket No. CC-2021-OGR-01-001. And I think those factors are appropriate for use in this matter. I don't know anything about this unit that would cause you to need to depart from those factors. I'm happy to answer any questions you may have. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	We're all family here. Go ahead. MR. PIOTROWSKI: Okay. Yes, we are at this point. Edward and Cheryl Adair, William and Roxie Tolbert, Wendell and Norma Nierman, Cheryl and Richard Addison, Jimmie and Judy Hicks, Antonio and Danielle Anchustegui, Philip and Kathleen Hendrickson, Donna and George Jackson, Karen Altman [phonetic], Bonnie McGee [phonetic], Lorinda Schuman, Samuel Burtorovich, Tim and Kate Kilbourne, and Citizens Aligned for Integrity and Accountability. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski. Ms. Vega, I believe you are on the line now officially. Can you please identify yourself and who you represent. We'll get it later. CHRIS GOZZO: Mr. Hearing Officer, she was promoted as a panelist, but then it looks like she disconnected and rejoined as an attendee. I'm promoting her again. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you very much. Let's just wait a moment. CHRIS GOZZO: Okay. She has joined as a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	All right. Now that we have the appearances out of the way, I think everybody's online and streaming well. I'd like to begin arguments. Mr. Christian, I'd like to invite you to provide argument at this time. MIKE CHRISTIAN: Thank you, Mr. Administrator. I apologize for getting ahead of myself. THE HEARING OFFICER: No, that's fine. MIKE CHRISTIAN: As I've mentioned before, we submitted briefing on behalf of the applicant. I don't intend to repeat any of that here, other than to answer any questions you may have. I have reviewed the order of factors to be used to reach just and reasonable terms in the other pending integration application regarding the Barlow 111 unit, which is docket No. CC-2021-OGR-01-001. And I think those factors are appropriate for use in this matter. I don't know anything about this unit that would cause you to need to depart from those factors. I'm happy to answer any questions you may have. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. I do have some questions for you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 We're all family here. Go ahead. MR. PIOTROWSKI: Okay. Yes, we are at this point. Edward and Cheryl Adair, William and Roxie Tolbert, Wendell and Norma Nierman, Cheryl and Richard Addison, Jimmie and Judy Hicks, Antonio and Danielle Anchustegui, Philip and Kathleen Hendrickson, Donna and George Jackson, Karen Altman [phonetic], Bonnie McGee [phonetic], Lorinda Schuman, Samuel Burtorovich, Tim and Kate Kilbourne, and Citizens Aligned for Integrity and Accountability. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski. Ms. Vega, I believe you are on the line now officially. Can you please identify yourself and who you represent. We'll get it later. CHRIS GOZZO: Mr. Hearing Officer, she was promoted as a panelist, but then it looks like she disconnected and rejoined as an attendee. I'm promoting her again. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you very much. Let's just wait a moment. CHRIS GOZZO: Okay. She has joined as a panelist, but I show her mic as muted. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	All right. Now that we have the appearances out of the way, I think everybody's online and streaming well. I'd like to begin arguments. Mr. Christian, I'd like to invite you to provide argument at this time. MIKE CHRISTIAN: Thank you, Mr. Administrator. I apologize for getting ahead of myself. THE HEARING OFFICER: No, that's fine. MIKE CHRISTIAN: As I've mentioned before, we submitted briefing on behalf of the applicant. I don't intend to repeat any of that here, other than to answer any questions you may have. I have reviewed the order of factors to be used to reach just and reasonable terms in the other pending integration application regarding the Barlow 111 unit, which is docket No. CC-2021-OGR-01-001. And I think those factors are appropriate for use in this matter. I don't know anything about this unit that would cause you to need to depart from those factors. I'm happy to answer any questions you may have. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. I do have some questions for you. Should factors used to determine just and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	We're all family here. Go ahead. MR. PIOTROWSKI: Okay. Yes, we are at this point. Edward and Cheryl Adair, William and Roxie Tolbert, Wendell and Norma Nierman, Cheryl and Richard Addison, Jimmie and Judy Hicks, Antonio and Danielle Anchustegui, Philip and Kathleen Hendrickson, Donna and George Jackson, Karen Altman [phonetic], Bonnie McGee [phonetic], Lorinda Schuman, Samuel Burtorovich, Tim and Kate Kilbourne, and Citizens Aligned for Integrity and Accountability. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski. Ms. Vega, I believe you are on the line now officially. Can you please identify yourself and who you represent. We'll get it later. CHRIS GOZZO: Mr. Hearing Officer, she was promoted as a panelist, but then it looks like she disconnected and rejoined as an attendee. I'm promoting her again. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you very much. Let's just wait a moment. CHRIS GOZZO: Okay. She has joined as a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	All right. Now that we have the appearances out of the way, I think everybody's online and streaming well. I'd like to begin arguments. Mr. Christian, I'd like to invite you to provide argument at this time. MIKE CHRISTIAN: Thank you, Mr. Administrator. I apologize for getting ahead of myself. THE HEARING OFFICER: No, that's fine. MIKE CHRISTIAN: As I've mentioned before, we submitted briefing on behalf of the applicant. I don't intend to repeat any of that here, other than to answer any questions you may have. I have reviewed the order of factors to be used to reach just and reasonable terms in the other pending integration application regarding the Barlow 111 unit, which is docket No. CC-2021-OGR-01-001. And I think those factors are appropriate for use in this matter. I don't know anything about this unit that would cause you to need to depart from those factors. I'm happy to answer any questions you may have. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. I do have some questions for you.

	Page 10		Page 12
	owners' lands, including whether a well bore or		statutory construction in Idaho and around the country,
	pipeline may physically cross the land of an		in fact, that in construing and applying a statute a
	uncommitted mineral interest owner?		decision-maker, whether that would be a court, an
4	MIKE CHRISTIAN: With respect to a pipeline,		administrative agency, or some other body, should not
	which is effectively a surface use, they may. And in		interpret and construe the statute in such a way that
	fact, in our proposed [unintelligible] lease for		any part of it becomes meaningless.
	certainly for tracks a certain size we or I'm sorry,	7	And if all that is required is bare minimum
	below a certain size we have included no no drill		legal compliance in order to ensure that the
9	activity language.		requirement for just and reasonable terms is met, then
10	In the case of this particular unit, it		just and reasonable terms becomes meaningless. Legal
	isn't particularly relevant because we have an existing		requirement or legal compliance, rather, is required
	well and pipeline that crosses either lease property or		by the statutes that impose particular terms and
13		13	conditions.
14	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you very much.	14	
15	If a well bore is already crossing an		that in addition to the requirement the duty of the
16	uncommitted owner's lands again, this is going to be		administrator and the agency to ensure compliance with
17	the same answer should that physical occupation be		the law, in addition to that, you were to ensure that
18	addressed, if at all, in this just and reasonable		the terms were just and reasonable. Thus "just and
19	factors order?		reasonable" necessarily means either nothing at all or
20	MIKE CHRISTIAN: Other than to say well, I		it means something in addition to bare minimum, strict,
	don't think so, given that it it's going to be at a	21	legal compliance.
22	depth, you know, a [unintelligible] in this well has a	22	5 5 7
23			that in addition to meeting all of the statutes, the
	and you can go research this subject, and I have		application for integration requires terms that are
25	some, but the presence of the well bore, in my view,	25	just and reasonable.
	Page 11		Page 13
1		1	
	wouldn't constitute any form of trespass because it's	1	The other point that the second point I
2	wouldn't constitute any form of trespass because it's at a point that the owner would never make use of	2	The other point that the second point I would make is that having read this morning's order
2	wouldn't constitute any form of trespass because it's at a point that the owner would never make use of subsurface. So I don't think it needs to be addressed.	2	The other point that the second point I would make is that having read this morning's order from the other case, there appears to be or there
2 3 4	wouldn't constitute any form of trespass because it's at a point that the owner would never make use of subsurface. So I don't think it needs to be addressed. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian.	2 3 4	The other point that the second point I would make is that having read this morning's order from the other case, there appears to be or there might be I'm not sure yet, there might be a failure
2 3 4 5	wouldn't constitute any form of trespass because it's at a point that the owner would never make use of subsurface. So I don't think it needs to be addressed. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. Those are all the questions I have for you right now.	2 3 4 5	The other point that the second point I would make is that having read this morning's order from the other case, there appears to be or there might be I'm not sure yet, there might be a failure to recognize a critical portion of the relevant
2 3 4 5 6	 wouldn't constitute any form of trespass because it's at a point that the owner would never make use of subsurface. So I don't think it needs to be addressed. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. Those are all the questions I have for you right now. MIKE CHRISTIAN: Thank you. 	2 3 4 5 6	The other point that the second point I would make is that having read this morning's order from the other case, there appears to be or there might be I'm not sure yet, there might be a failure to recognize a critical portion of the relevant statutes here.
2 3 4 5 6 7	 wouldn't constitute any form of trespass because it's at a point that the owner would never make use of subsurface. So I don't think it needs to be addressed. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. Those are all the questions I have for you right now. MIKE CHRISTIAN: Thank you. THE HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Piotrowski, I would 	2 3 4 5 6 7	The other point that the second point I would make is that having read this morning's order from the other case, there appears to be or there might be I'm not sure yet, there might be a failure to recognize a critical portion of the relevant statutes here. The presumption of Snake River Oil and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 wouldn't constitute any form of trespass because it's at a point that the owner would never make use of subsurface. So I don't think it needs to be addressed. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. Those are all the questions I have for you right now. MIKE CHRISTIAN: Thank you. THE HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Piotrowski, I would invite you to provide argument at this time. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	The other point that the second point I would make is that having read this morning's order from the other case, there appears to be or there might be I'm not sure yet, there might be a failure to recognize a critical portion of the relevant statutes here. The presumption of Snake River Oil and Gas and it sometimes appears the presumption, either
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 wouldn't constitute any form of trespass because it's at a point that the owner would never make use of subsurface. So I don't think it needs to be addressed. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. Those are all the questions I have for you right now. MIKE CHRISTIAN: Thank you. THE HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Piotrowski, I would invite you to provide argument at this time. MR. PIOTROWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Thomas. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	The other point that the second point I would make is that having read this morning's order from the other case, there appears to be or there might be I'm not sure yet, there might be a failure to recognize a critical portion of the relevant statutes here. The presumption of Snake River Oil and Gas and it sometimes appears the presumption, either the administrator or the Department or the Commission,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 wouldn't constitute any form of trespass because it's at a point that the owner would never make use of subsurface. So I don't think it needs to be addressed. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. Those are all the questions I have for you right now. MIKE CHRISTIAN: Thank you. THE HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Piotrowski, I would invite you to provide argument at this time. MR. PIOTROWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Thomas. I would rely primarily on the written 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	The other point that the second point I would make is that having read this morning's order from the other case, there appears to be or there might be I'm not sure yet, there might be a failure to recognize a critical portion of the relevant statutes here. The presumption of Snake River Oil and Gas and it sometimes appears the presumption, either the administrator or the Department or the Commission, is that in an integration situation those who have not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 wouldn't constitute any form of trespass because it's at a point that the owner would never make use of subsurface. So I don't think it needs to be addressed. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. Those are all the questions I have for you right now. MIKE CHRISTIAN: Thank you. THE HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Piotrowski, I would invite you to provide argument at this time. MR. PIOTROWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Thomas. I would rely primarily on the written briefing already provided. I think there are two 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	The other point that the second point I would make is that having read this morning's order from the other case, there appears to be or there might be I'm not sure yet, there might be a failure to recognize a critical portion of the relevant statutes here. The presumption of Snake River Oil and Gas and it sometimes appears the presumption, either the administrator or the Department or the Commission, is that in an integration situation those who have not previously consented to a lease of their mineral rights
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 wouldn't constitute any form of trespass because it's at a point that the owner would never make use of subsurface. So I don't think it needs to be addressed. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. Those are all the questions I have for you right now. MIKE CHRISTIAN: Thank you. THE HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Piotrowski, I would invite you to provide argument at this time. MR. PIOTROWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Thomas. I would rely primarily on the written briefing already provided. I think there are two points that are worth emphasizing at this stage. 	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	The other point that the second point I would make is that having read this morning's order from the other case, there appears to be or there might be I'm not sure yet, there might be a failure to recognize a critical portion of the relevant statutes here. The presumption of Snake River Oil and Gas and it sometimes appears the presumption, either the administrator or the Department or the Commission, is that in an integration situation those who have not previously consented to a lease of their mineral rights will be limited to receiving only a one-eighth royalty
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 12	 wouldn't constitute any form of trespass because it's at a point that the owner would never make use of subsurface. So I don't think it needs to be addressed. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. Those are all the questions I have for you right now. MIKE CHRISTIAN: Thank you. THE HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Piotrowski, I would invite you to provide argument at this time. MR. PIOTROWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Thomas. I would rely primarily on the written briefing already provided. I think there are two points that are worth emphasizing at this stage. First is to come to a recognition of the 	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	The other point that the second point I would make is that having read this morning's order from the other case, there appears to be or there might be I'm not sure yet, there might be a failure to recognize a critical portion of the relevant statutes here. The presumption of Snake River Oil and Gas and it sometimes appears the presumption, either the administrator or the Department or the Commission, is that in an integration situation those who have not previously consented to a lease of their mineral rights will be limited to receiving only a one-eighth royalty and a bonus payment that is no less than the highest
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 wouldn't constitute any form of trespass because it's at a point that the owner would never make use of subsurface. So I don't think it needs to be addressed. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. Those are all the questions I have for you right now. MIKE CHRISTIAN: Thank you. THE HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Piotrowski, I would invite you to provide argument at this time. MR. PIOTROWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Thomas. I would rely primarily on the written briefing already provided. I think there are two points that are worth emphasizing at this stage. First is to come to a recognition of the general nature of the requirement that terms of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	The other point that the second point I would make is that having read this morning's order from the other case, there appears to be or there might be I'm not sure yet, there might be a failure to recognize a critical portion of the relevant statutes here. The presumption of Snake River Oil and Gas and it sometimes appears the presumption, either the administrator or the Department or the Commission, is that in an integration situation those who have not previously consented to a lease of their mineral rights will be limited to receiving only a one-eighth royalty and a bonus payment that is no less than the highest bonus payment made prior to the application for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 12	 wouldn't constitute any form of trespass because it's at a point that the owner would never make use of subsurface. So I don't think it needs to be addressed. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. Those are all the questions I have for you right now. MIKE CHRISTIAN: Thank you. THE HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Piotrowski, I would invite you to provide argument at this time. MR. PIOTROWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Thomas. I would rely primarily on the written briefing already provided. I think there are two points that are worth emphasizing at this stage. First is to come to a recognition of the general nature of the requirement that terms of integration be just and reasonable for well, for 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	The other point that the second point I would make is that having read this morning's order from the other case, there appears to be or there might be I'm not sure yet, there might be a failure to recognize a critical portion of the relevant statutes here. The presumption of Snake River Oil and Gas and it sometimes appears the presumption, either the administrator or the Department or the Commission, is that in an integration situation those who have not previously consented to a lease of their mineral rights will be limited to receiving only a one-eighth royalty and a bonus payment that is no less than the highest bonus payment made prior to the application for integration.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 wouldn't constitute any form of trespass because it's at a point that the owner would never make use of subsurface. So I don't think it needs to be addressed. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. Those are all the questions I have for you right now. MIKE CHRISTIAN: Thank you. THE HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Piotrowski, I would invite you to provide argument at this time. MR. PIOTROWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Thomas. I would rely primarily on the written briefing already provided. I think there are two points that are worth emphasizing at this stage. First is to come to a recognition of the general nature of the requirement that terms of integration be just and reasonable for well, for everybody involved, but in particular for 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	The other point that the second point I would make is that having read this morning's order from the other case, there appears to be or there might be I'm not sure yet, there might be a failure to recognize a critical portion of the relevant statutes here. The presumption of Snake River Oil and Gas and it sometimes appears the presumption, either the administrator or the Department or the Commission, is that in an integration situation those who have not previously consented to a lease of their mineral rights will be limited to receiving only a one-eighth royalty and a bonus payment that is no less than the highest bonus payment made prior to the application for integration. That is not, quite frankly, the state of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 wouldn't constitute any form of trespass because it's at a point that the owner would never make use of subsurface. So I don't think it needs to be addressed. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. Those are all the questions I have for you right now. MIKE CHRISTIAN: Thank you. THE HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Piotrowski, I would invite you to provide argument at this time. MR. PIOTROWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Thomas. I would rely primarily on the written briefing already provided. I think there are two points that are worth emphasizing at this stage. First is to come to a recognition of the general nature of the requirement that terms of integration be just and reasonable for well, for everybody involved, but in particular for non-consenting owners. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	The other point that the second point I would make is that having read this morning's order from the other case, there appears to be or there might be I'm not sure yet, there might be a failure to recognize a critical portion of the relevant statutes here. The presumption of Snake River Oil and Gas and it sometimes appears the presumption, either the administrator or the Department or the Commission, is that in an integration situation those who have not previously consented to a lease of their mineral rights will be limited to receiving only a one-eighth royalty and a bonus payment that is no less than the highest bonus payment made prior to the application for integration. That is not, quite frankly, the state of the law. The law provides the statute provides that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 wouldn't constitute any form of trespass because it's at a point that the owner would never make use of subsurface. So I don't think it needs to be addressed. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. Those are all the questions I have for you right now. MIKE CHRISTIAN: Thank you. THE HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Piotrowski, I would invite you to provide argument at this time. MR. PIOTROWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Thomas. I would rely primarily on the written briefing already provided. I think there are two points that are worth emphasizing at this stage. First is to come to a recognition of the general nature of the requirement that terms of integration be just and reasonable for well, for everybody involved, but in particular for non-consenting owners. The argument came up in the briefs, and the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	The other point that the second point I would make is that having read this morning's order from the other case, there appears to be or there might be I'm not sure yet, there might be a failure to recognize a critical portion of the relevant statutes here. The presumption of Snake River Oil and Gas and it sometimes appears the presumption, either the administrator or the Department or the Commission, is that in an integration situation those who have not previously consented to a lease of their mineral rights will be limited to receiving only a one-eighth royalty and a bonus payment that is no less than the highest bonus payment made prior to the application for integration. That is not, quite frankly, the state of the law. The law provides the statute provides that after integration there will be four potential status
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 wouldn't constitute any form of trespass because it's at a point that the owner would never make use of subsurface. So I don't think it needs to be addressed. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. Those are all the questions I have for you right now. MIKE CHRISTIAN: Thank you. THE HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Piotrowski, I would invite you to provide argument at this time. MR. PIOTROWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Thomas. I would rely primarily on the written briefing already provided. I think there are two points that are worth emphasizing at this stage. First is to come to a recognition of the general nature of the requirement that terms of integration be just and reasonable for well, for everybody involved, but in particular for non-consenting owners. The argument came up in the briefs, and the Snake River Oil and Gas has fundamentally taken the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	The other point that the second point I would make is that having read this morning's order from the other case, there appears to be or there might be I'm not sure yet, there might be a failure to recognize a critical portion of the relevant statutes here. The presumption of Snake River Oil and Gas and it sometimes appears the presumption, either the administrator or the Department or the Commission, is that in an integration situation those who have not previously consented to a lease of their mineral rights will be limited to receiving only a one-eighth royalty and a bonus payment that is no less than the highest bonus payment made prior to the application for integration. That is not, quite frankly, the state of the law. The law provides the statute provides that after integration there will be four potential status that a mineral owner may be at: a working interest
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 wouldn't constitute any form of trespass because it's at a point that the owner would never make use of subsurface. So I don't think it needs to be addressed. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. Those are all the questions I have for you right now. MIKE CHRISTIAN: Thank you. THE HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Piotrowski, I would invite you to provide argument at this time. MR. PIOTROWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Thomas. I would rely primarily on the written briefing already provided. I think there are two points that are worth emphasizing at this stage. First is to come to a recognition of the general nature of the requirement that terms of integration be just and reasonable for well, for everybody involved, but in particular for non-consenting owners. The argument came up in the briefs, and the Snake River Oil and Gas has fundamentally taken the position that as long as they comply with existing 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	The other point that the second point I would make is that having read this morning's order from the other case, there appears to be or there might be I'm not sure yet, there might be a failure to recognize a critical portion of the relevant statutes here. The presumption of Snake River Oil and Gas and it sometimes appears the presumption, either the administrator or the Department or the Commission, is that in an integration situation those who have not previously consented to a lease of their mineral rights will be limited to receiving only a one-eighth royalty and a bonus payment that is no less than the highest bonus payment made prior to the application for integration. That is not, quite frankly, the state of the law. The law provides the statute provides that after integration there will be four potential status that a mineral owner may be at: a working interest owner; a non-consenting working interest owner; a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 wouldn't constitute any form of trespass because it's at a point that the owner would never make use of subsurface. So I don't think it needs to be addressed. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. Those are all the questions I have for you right now. MIKE CHRISTIAN: Thank you. THE HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Piotrowski, I would invite you to provide argument at this time. MR. PIOTROWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Thomas. I would rely primarily on the written briefing already provided. I think there are two points that are worth emphasizing at this stage. First is to come to a recognition of the general nature of the requirement that terms of integration be just and reasonable for well, for everybody involved, but in particular for non-consenting owners. The argument came up in the briefs, and the Snake River Oil and Gas has fundamentally taken the position that as long as they comply with existing statutory law that the terms they propose are 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	The other point that the second point I would make is that having read this morning's order from the other case, there appears to be or there might be I'm not sure yet, there might be a failure to recognize a critical portion of the relevant statutes here. The presumption of Snake River Oil and Gas and it sometimes appears the presumption, either the administrator or the Department or the Commission, is that in an integration situation those who have not previously consented to a lease of their mineral rights will be limited to receiving only a one-eighth royalty and a bonus payment that is no less than the highest bonus payment made prior to the application for integration. That is not, quite frankly, the state of the law. The law provides the statute provides that after integration there will be four potential status that a mineral owner may be at: a working interest owner; a non-consenting working interest owner; a lessee or lessor I forget which one that is, but,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 wouldn't constitute any form of trespass because it's at a point that the owner would never make use of subsurface. So I don't think it needs to be addressed. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. Those are all the questions I have for you right now. MIKE CHRISTIAN: Thank you. THE HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Piotrowski, I would invite you to provide argument at this time. MR. PIOTROWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Thomas. I would rely primarily on the written briefing already provided. I think there are two points that are worth emphasizing at this stage. First is to come to a recognition of the general nature of the requirement that terms of integration be just and reasonable for well, for everybody involved, but in particular for non-consenting owners. The argument came up in the briefs, and the Snake River Oil and Gas has fundamentally taken the position that as long as they comply with existing statutory law that the terms they propose are necessarily just and reasonable. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	The other point that the second point I would make is that having read this morning's order from the other case, there appears to be or there might be I'm not sure yet, there might be a failure to recognize a critical portion of the relevant statutes here. The presumption of Snake River Oil and Gas and it sometimes appears the presumption, either the administrator or the Department or the Commission, is that in an integration situation those who have not previously consented to a lease of their mineral rights will be limited to receiving only a one-eighth royalty and a bonus payment that is no less than the highest bonus payment made prior to the application for integration. That is not, quite frankly, the state of the law. The law provides the statute provides that after integration there will be four potential status that a mineral owner may be at: a working interest owner; a non-consenting working interest owner; a lessee or lessor I forget which one that is, but, you know, somebody with a lease; and somebody who is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 wouldn't constitute any form of trespass because it's at a point that the owner would never make use of subsurface. So I don't think it needs to be addressed. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. Those are all the questions I have for you right now. MIKE CHRISTIAN: Thank you. THE HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Piotrowski, I would invite you to provide argument at this time. MR. PIOTROWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Thomas. I would rely primarily on the written briefing already provided. I think there are two points that are worth emphasizing at this stage. First is to come to a recognition of the general nature of the requirement that terms of integration be just and reasonable for well, for everybody involved, but in particular for non-consenting owners. The argument came up in the briefs, and the Snake River Oil and Gas has fundamentally taken the position that as long as they comply with existing statutory law that the terms they propose are necessarily just and reasonable. That effectively is reading the phrase 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	The other point that the second point I would make is that having read this morning's order from the other case, there appears to be or there might be I'm not sure yet, there might be a failure to recognize a critical portion of the relevant statutes here. The presumption of Snake River Oil and Gas and it sometimes appears the presumption, either the administrator or the Department or the Commission, is that in an integration situation those who have not previously consented to a lease of their mineral rights will be limited to receiving only a one-eighth royalty and a bonus payment that is no less than the highest bonus payment made prior to the application for integration. That is not, quite frankly, the state of the law. The law provides the statute provides that after integration there will be four potential status that a mineral owner may be at: a working interest owner; a non-consenting working interest owner; a lessee or lessor I forget which one that is, but, you know, somebody with a lease; and somebody who is deemed leased.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 wouldn't constitute any form of trespass because it's at a point that the owner would never make use of subsurface. So I don't think it needs to be addressed. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. Those are all the questions I have for you right now. MIKE CHRISTIAN: Thank you. THE HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Piotrowski, I would invite you to provide argument at this time. MR. PIOTROWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Thomas. I would rely primarily on the written briefing already provided. I think there are two points that are worth emphasizing at this stage. First is to come to a recognition of the general nature of the requirement that terms of integration be just and reasonable for well, for everybody involved, but in particular for non-consenting owners. The argument came up in the briefs, and the Snake River Oil and Gas has fundamentally taken the position that as long as they comply with existing statutory law that the terms they propose are necessarily just and reasonable. That effectively is reading the phrase 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	The other point that the second point I would make is that having read this morning's order from the other case, there appears to be or there might be I'm not sure yet, there might be a failure to recognize a critical portion of the relevant statutes here. The presumption of Snake River Oil and Gas and it sometimes appears the presumption, either the administrator or the Department or the Commission, is that in an integration situation those who have not previously consented to a lease of their mineral rights will be limited to receiving only a one-eighth royalty and a bonus payment that is no less than the highest bonus payment made prior to the application for integration. That is not, quite frankly, the state of the law. The law provides the statute provides that after integration there will be four potential status that a mineral owner may be at: a working interest owner; a non-consenting working interest owner; a lessee or lessor I forget which one that is, but, you know, somebody with a lease; and somebody who is deemed leased.

	anu Gas		June 21, 2021
	Page 14		Page 16
-	may anter into a lagge with the operator of the	-	MD DIOTDOWSKI, The Mr. Thomas I haliave
	may enter into a lease with the operator of the	1	
	integrated spacing unit under the terms and conditions		that it relates to the it certainly should be
	in the integration order. The owner shall receive no		accounted for in establishing working interest shares.
4	less than one-eighth royalty."		This is not, as Snake River Oil and Gas likes to claim,
5	That is directly contrary to deemed leased	5	a wildcat play.
	individuals who are, by statute, compelled to accept	6	This is an existing well. It's already
7	one-eighth royalty. Not no less than, not no more	7	known to produce hydrocarbons. They bought it. They
8	than, but precisely one-eighth royalty.	8	didn't drill it. They bought it at a discount in a
9	And so in this case in particular where	9	fire sale following a bankruptcy. All of those things
10	there are a large number of non-consenting orders,	10	should be considered in establishing the just and
	where there is a bit of a history on this particular	11	reasonable terms here.
	tract, it was appropriate, and one of the factors that	12	Obviously, Snake River Oil and Gas hopes to
	you, I believe, must consider, sir, is whether those		take this very inexpensive property they purchased and
	who choose to enter into a lease after the date of the		generate as much profit as possible. That is their
	integration order but before the expiration of the time		that is their reason for existence. But that should
	in which owners are given an opportunity to consider		also go into consideration as to what is reasonable in
	their response, the administrator must determine what		protecting the other interests of the people involved,
	royalty rate, not less than one-eighth, shall those		other mineral interest owners, the potentially other
	•••		· · ·
	people be entitled to enter into a lease for.		operators. As we know, no operator can be assumed that
20	The this was set out in the briefing as	20	
	a discussion of what royalty rates shall apply.		public, and specifically including the municipal
22	In the prior case with the order issued		interest involved here, since those are a factor in
	today, I believe the administrator took an improper		this case.
	position, which is to say that he had no power	24	
25	whatsoever to establish compensation terms, since those	25	factor that you should be considering in your
	Page 15		Page 17
1		1	
	were necessarily established at one-eighth royalty and		decision-making in this case.
2	were necessarily established at one-eighth royalty and a bonus payment no less than the largest amount paid to	2	decision-making in this case. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski,
2 3	were necessarily established at one-eighth royalty and a bonus payment no less than the largest amount paid to a leasing owner.	2	decision-making in this case. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski, I have one more question for you.
2 3 4	were necessarily established at one-eighth royalty and a bonus payment no less than the largest amount paid to a leasing owner. There is a third option for those who	2 3 4	decision-making in this case. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski, I have one more question for you. What role do you think an integration order
2 3 4 5	were necessarily established at one-eighth royalty and a bonus payment no less than the largest amount paid to a leasing owner. There is a third option for those who choose to enter into a lease during a particular time	2 3 4 5	decision-making in this case. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski, I have one more question for you. What role do you think an integration order plays in water resources? How do you believe a
2 3 4 5 6	were necessarily established at one-eighth royalty and a bonus payment no less than the largest amount paid to a leasing owner. There is a third option for those who choose to enter into a lease during a particular time frame. On terms, which are to be set by you in the	2 3 4 5 6	decision-making in this case. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski, I have one more question for you. What role do you think an integration order plays in water resources? How do you believe a proposed factor for an integration order would interact
2 3 4 5 6 7	were necessarily established at one-eighth royalty and a bonus payment no less than the largest amount paid to a leasing owner. There is a third option for those who choose to enter into a lease during a particular time frame. On terms, which are to be set by you in the first instance, obviously subject to appeal to the	2 3 4 5 6 7	decision-making in this case. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski, I have one more question for you. What role do you think an integration order plays in water resources? How do you believe a proposed factor for an integration order would interact with requirements that are already in the rule for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	were necessarily established at one-eighth royalty and a bonus payment no less than the largest amount paid to a leasing owner. There is a third option for those who choose to enter into a lease during a particular time frame. On terms, which are to be set by you in the first instance, obviously subject to appeal to the Commission, at no less than one-eighth consent. No	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	decision-making in this case. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski, I have one more question for you. What role do you think an integration order plays in water resources? How do you believe a proposed factor for an integration order would interact with requirements that are already in the rule for groundwater monitoring?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	were necessarily established at one-eighth royalty and a bonus payment no less than the largest amount paid to a leasing owner. There is a third option for those who choose to enter into a lease during a particular time frame. On terms, which are to be set by you in the first instance, obviously subject to appeal to the Commission, at no less than one-eighth consent. No less than, of course, necessarily beyond beyond any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	decision-making in this case. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski, I have one more question for you. What role do you think an integration order plays in water resources? How do you believe a proposed factor for an integration order would interact with requirements that are already in the rule for groundwater monitoring? MR. PIOTROWSKI: The existing protections for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	were necessarily established at one-eighth royalty and a bonus payment no less than the largest amount paid to a leasing owner. There is a third option for those who choose to enter into a lease during a particular time frame. On terms, which are to be set by you in the first instance, obviously subject to appeal to the Commission, at no less than one-eighth consent. No less than, of course, necessarily beyond beyond any reason implies it could be more than one.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	decision-making in this case. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski, I have one more question for you. What role do you think an integration order plays in water resources? How do you believe a proposed factor for an integration order would interact with requirements that are already in the rule for groundwater monitoring? MR. PIOTROWSKI: The existing protections for groundwater that exist as a result of other statutory
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	were necessarily established at one-eighth royalty and a bonus payment no less than the largest amount paid to a leasing owner. There is a third option for those who choose to enter into a lease during a particular time frame. On terms, which are to be set by you in the first instance, obviously subject to appeal to the Commission, at no less than one-eighth consent. No less than, of course, necessarily beyond beyond any reason implies it could be more than one. And I believe that's one of the factors you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	decision-making in this case. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski, I have one more question for you. What role do you think an integration order plays in water resources? How do you believe a proposed factor for an integration order would interact with requirements that are already in the rule for groundwater monitoring? MR. PIOTROWSKI: The existing protections for groundwater that exist as a result of other statutory schemes and as a result of the generalized law of water
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	were necessarily established at one-eighth royalty and a bonus payment no less than the largest amount paid to a leasing owner. There is a third option for those who choose to enter into a lease during a particular time frame. On terms, which are to be set by you in the first instance, obviously subject to appeal to the Commission, at no less than one-eighth consent. No less than, of course, necessarily beyond beyond any reason implies it could be more than one. And I believe that's one of the factors you should be considering at the hearing in this matter.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	decision-making in this case. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski, I have one more question for you. What role do you think an integration order plays in water resources? How do you believe a proposed factor for an integration order would interact with requirements that are already in the rule for groundwater monitoring? MR. PIOTROWSKI: The existing protections for groundwater that exist as a result of other statutory schemes and as a result of the generalized law of water use in Idaho exist independently.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	were necessarily established at one-eighth royalty and a bonus payment no less than the largest amount paid to a leasing owner. There is a third option for those who choose to enter into a lease during a particular time frame. On terms, which are to be set by you in the first instance, obviously subject to appeal to the Commission, at no less than one-eighth consent. No less than, of course, necessarily beyond beyond any reason implies it could be more than one. And I believe that's one of the factors you should be considering at the hearing in this matter. It's especially pertinent here, again, given the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	decision-making in this case. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski, I have one more question for you. What role do you think an integration order plays in water resources? How do you believe a proposed factor for an integration order would interact with requirements that are already in the rule for groundwater monitoring? MR. PIOTROWSKI: The existing protections for groundwater that exist as a result of other statutory schemes and as a result of the generalized law of water use in Idaho exist independently. And so what we are doing in this case is we
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	were necessarily established at one-eighth royalty and a bonus payment no less than the largest amount paid to a leasing owner. There is a third option for those who choose to enter into a lease during a particular time frame. On terms, which are to be set by you in the first instance, obviously subject to appeal to the Commission, at no less than one-eighth consent. No less than, of course, necessarily beyond beyond any reason implies it could be more than one. And I believe that's one of the factors you should be considering at the hearing in this matter. It's especially pertinent here, again, given the history of this particular tract and the integration of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	decision-making in this case. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski, I have one more question for you. What role do you think an integration order plays in water resources? How do you believe a proposed factor for an integration order would interact with requirements that are already in the rule for groundwater monitoring? MR. PIOTROWSKI: The existing protections for groundwater that exist as a result of other statutory schemes and as a result of the generalized law of water use in Idaho exist independently. And so what we are doing in this case is we are adding yet another factor to that mix. So for
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	were necessarily established at one-eighth royalty and a bonus payment no less than the largest amount paid to a leasing owner. There is a third option for those who choose to enter into a lease during a particular time frame. On terms, which are to be set by you in the first instance, obviously subject to appeal to the Commission, at no less than one-eighth consent. No less than, of course, necessarily beyond beyond any reason implies it could be more than one. And I believe that's one of the factors you should be considering at the hearing in this matter. It's especially pertinent here, again, given the history of this particular tract and the integration of this tract.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 decision-making in this case. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski, I have one more question for you. What role do you think an integration order plays in water resources? How do you believe a proposed factor for an integration order would interact with requirements that are already in the rule for groundwater monitoring? MR. PIOTROWSKI: The existing protections for groundwater that exist as a result of other statutory schemes and as a result of the generalized law of water use in Idaho exist independently. And so what we are doing in this case is we are adding yet another factor to that mix. So for instance, the work of the Department of Lands, the work
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	were necessarily established at one-eighth royalty and a bonus payment no less than the largest amount paid to a leasing owner. There is a third option for those who choose to enter into a lease during a particular time frame. On terms, which are to be set by you in the first instance, obviously subject to appeal to the Commission, at no less than one-eighth consent. No less than, of course, necessarily beyond beyond any reason implies it could be more than one. And I believe that's one of the factors you should be considering at the hearing in this matter. It's especially pertinent here, again, given the history of this particular tract and the integration of this tract. Beyond those two items, we would rely on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	decision-making in this case. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski, I have one more question for you. What role do you think an integration order plays in water resources? How do you believe a proposed factor for an integration order would interact with requirements that are already in the rule for groundwater monitoring? MR. PIOTROWSKI: The existing protections for groundwater that exist as a result of other statutory schemes and as a result of the generalized law of water use in Idaho exist independently. And so what we are doing in this case is we are adding yet another factor to that mix. So for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	were necessarily established at one-eighth royalty and a bonus payment no less than the largest amount paid to a leasing owner. There is a third option for those who choose to enter into a lease during a particular time frame. On terms, which are to be set by you in the first instance, obviously subject to appeal to the Commission, at no less than one-eighth consent. No less than, of course, necessarily beyond beyond any reason implies it could be more than one. And I believe that's one of the factors you should be considering at the hearing in this matter. It's especially pertinent here, again, given the history of this particular tract and the integration of this tract.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 decision-making in this case. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski, I have one more question for you. What role do you think an integration order plays in water resources? How do you believe a proposed factor for an integration order would interact with requirements that are already in the rule for groundwater monitoring? MR. PIOTROWSKI: The existing protections for groundwater that exist as a result of other statutory schemes and as a result of the generalized law of water use in Idaho exist independently. And so what we are doing in this case is we are adding yet another factor to that mix. So for instance, the work of the Department of Lands, the work
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	were necessarily established at one-eighth royalty and a bonus payment no less than the largest amount paid to a leasing owner. There is a third option for those who choose to enter into a lease during a particular time frame. On terms, which are to be set by you in the first instance, obviously subject to appeal to the Commission, at no less than one-eighth consent. No less than, of course, necessarily beyond beyond any reason implies it could be more than one. And I believe that's one of the factors you should be considering at the hearing in this matter. It's especially pertinent here, again, given the history of this particular tract and the integration of this tract. Beyond those two items, we would rely on our briefing in the matter. And of course, I'd be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 decision-making in this case. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski, I have one more question for you. What role do you think an integration order plays in water resources? How do you believe a proposed factor for an integration order would interact with requirements that are already in the rule for groundwater monitoring? MR. PIOTROWSKI: The existing protections for groundwater that exist as a result of other statutory schemes and as a result of the generalized law of water use in Idaho exist independently. And so what we are doing in this case is we are adding yet another factor to that mix. So for instance, the work of the Department of Lands, the work of the Department of Natural Resources, a number of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	were necessarily established at one-eighth royalty and a bonus payment no less than the largest amount paid to a leasing owner. There is a third option for those who choose to enter into a lease during a particular time frame. On terms, which are to be set by you in the first instance, obviously subject to appeal to the Commission, at no less than one-eighth consent. No less than, of course, necessarily beyond beyond any reason implies it could be more than one. And I believe that's one of the factors you should be considering at the hearing in this matter. It's especially pertinent here, again, given the history of this particular tract and the integration of this tract. Beyond those two items, we would rely on our briefing in the matter. And of course, I'd be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 decision-making in this case. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski, I have one more question for you. What role do you think an integration order plays in water resources? How do you believe a proposed factor for an integration order would interact with requirements that are already in the rule for groundwater monitoring? MR. PIOTROWSKI: The existing protections for groundwater that exist as a result of other statutory schemes and as a result of the generalized law of water use in Idaho exist independently. And so what we are doing in this case is we are adding yet another factor to that mix. So for instance, the work of the Department of Lands, the work of the Department of Natural Resources, a number of other agencies, as well as the work of irrigation
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	were necessarily established at one-eighth royalty and a bonus payment no less than the largest amount paid to a leasing owner. There is a third option for those who choose to enter into a lease during a particular time frame. On terms, which are to be set by you in the first instance, obviously subject to appeal to the Commission, at no less than one-eighth consent. No less than, of course, necessarily beyond beyond any reason implies it could be more than one. And I believe that's one of the factors you should be considering at the hearing in this matter. It's especially pertinent here, again, given the history of this particular tract and the integration of this tract. Beyond those two items, we would rely on our briefing in the matter. And of course, I'd be happy to stand for questions. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	decision-making in this case. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski, I have one more question for you. What role do you think an integration order plays in water resources? How do you believe a proposed factor for an integration order would interact with requirements that are already in the rule for groundwater monitoring? MR. PIOTROWSKI: The existing protections for groundwater that exist as a result of other statutory schemes and as a result of the generalized law of water use in Idaho exist independently. And so what we are doing in this case is we are adding yet another factor to that mix. So for instance, the work of the Department of Lands, the work of the Department of Natural Resources, a number of other agencies, as well as the work of irrigation districts, water companies, et cetera, are all designed to meet the needs of their particular industries and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	were necessarily established at one-eighth royalty and a bonus payment no less than the largest amount paid to a leasing owner. There is a third option for those who choose to enter into a lease during a particular time frame. On terms, which are to be set by you in the first instance, obviously subject to appeal to the Commission, at no less than one-eighth consent. No less than, of course, necessarily beyond beyond any reason implies it could be more than one. And I believe that's one of the factors you should be considering at the hearing in this matter. It's especially pertinent here, again, given the history of this particular tract and the integration of this tract. Beyond those two items, we would rely on our briefing in the matter. And of course, I'd be happy to stand for questions. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski. I appreciate your input today.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 decision-making in this case. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski, I have one more question for you. What role do you think an integration order plays in water resources? How do you believe a proposed factor for an integration order would interact with requirements that are already in the rule for groundwater monitoring? MR. PIOTROWSKI: The existing protections for groundwater that exist as a result of other statutory schemes and as a result of the generalized law of water use in Idaho exist independently. And so what we are doing in this case is we are adding yet another factor to that mix. So for instance, the work of the Department of Lands, the work of the Department of Natural Resources, a number of other agencies, as well as the work of irrigation districts, water companies, et cetera, are all designed to meet the needs of their particular industries and their particular programs.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	were necessarily established at one-eighth royalty and a bonus payment no less than the largest amount paid to a leasing owner. There is a third option for those who choose to enter into a lease during a particular time frame. On terms, which are to be set by you in the first instance, obviously subject to appeal to the Commission, at no less than one-eighth consent. No less than, of course, necessarily beyond beyond any reason implies it could be more than one. And I believe that's one of the factors you should be considering at the hearing in this matter. It's especially pertinent here, again, given the history of this particular tract and the integration of this tract. Beyond those two items, we would rely on our briefing in the matter. And of course, I'd be happy to stand for questions. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski. I appreciate your input today. I have a few questions, and actually a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	decision-making in this case. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski, I have one more question for you. What role do you think an integration order plays in water resources? How do you believe a proposed factor for an integration order would interact with requirements that are already in the rule for groundwater monitoring? MR. PIOTROWSKI: The existing protections for groundwater that exist as a result of other statutory schemes and as a result of the generalized law of water use in Idaho exist independently. And so what we are doing in this case is we are adding yet another factor to that mix. So for instance, the work of the Department of Lands, the work of the Department of Natural Resources, a number of other agencies, as well as the work of irrigation districts, water companies, et cetera, are all designed to meet the needs of their particular industries and their particular programs. None of them should be assumed to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	were necessarily established at one-eighth royalty and a bonus payment no less than the largest amount paid to a leasing owner. There is a third option for those who choose to enter into a lease during a particular time frame. On terms, which are to be set by you in the first instance, obviously subject to appeal to the Commission, at no less than one-eighth consent. No less than, of course, necessarily beyond beyond any reason implies it could be more than one. And I believe that's one of the factors you should be considering at the hearing in this matter. It's especially pertinent here, again, given the history of this particular tract and the integration of this tract. Beyond those two items, we would rely on our briefing in the matter. And of course, I'd be happy to stand for questions. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski. I appreciate your input today. I have a few questions, and actually a question I'll ask I forgot to ask Mr. Christian.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	decision-making in this case. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski, I have one more question for you. What role do you think an integration order plays in water resources? How do you believe a proposed factor for an integration order would interact with requirements that are already in the rule for groundwater monitoring? MR. PIOTROWSKI: The existing protections for groundwater that exist as a result of other statutory schemes and as a result of the generalized law of water use in Idaho exist independently. And so what we are doing in this case is we are adding yet another factor to that mix. So for instance, the work of the Department of Lands, the work of the Department of Natural Resources, a number of other agencies, as well as the work of irrigation districts, water companies, et cetera, are all designed to meet the needs of their particular industries and their particular programs. None of them should be assumed to be responsible for or to be taking appropriate measures to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	were necessarily established at one-eighth royalty and a bonus payment no less than the largest amount paid to a leasing owner. There is a third option for those who choose to enter into a lease during a particular time frame. On terms, which are to be set by you in the first instance, obviously subject to appeal to the Commission, at no less than one-eighth consent. No less than, of course, necessarily beyond beyond any reason implies it could be more than one. And I believe that's one of the factors you should be considering at the hearing in this matter. It's especially pertinent here, again, given the history of this particular tract and the integration of this tract. Beyond those two items, we would rely on our briefing in the matter. And of course, I'd be happy to stand for questions. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski. I appreciate your input today. I have a few questions, and actually a question I'll ask I forgot to ask Mr. Christian. I'll ask him during his rebuttal.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	decision-making in this case. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski, I have one more question for you. What role do you think an integration order plays in water resources? How do you believe a proposed factor for an integration order would interact with requirements that are already in the rule for groundwater monitoring? MR. PIOTROWSKI: The existing protections for groundwater that exist as a result of other statutory schemes and as a result of the generalized law of water use in Idaho exist independently. And so what we are doing in this case is we are adding yet another factor to that mix. So for instance, the work of the Department of Lands, the work of the Department of Natural Resources, a number of other agencies, as well as the work of irrigation districts, water companies, et cetera, are all designed to meet the needs of their particular industries and their particular programs. None of them should be assumed to be responsible for or to be taking appropriate measures to address the possibility of harms to groundwater arising
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	were necessarily established at one-eighth royalty and a bonus payment no less than the largest amount paid to a leasing owner. There is a third option for those who choose to enter into a lease during a particular time frame. On terms, which are to be set by you in the first instance, obviously subject to appeal to the Commission, at no less than one-eighth consent. No less than, of course, necessarily beyond beyond any reason implies it could be more than one. And I believe that's one of the factors you should be considering at the hearing in this matter. It's especially pertinent here, again, given the history of this particular tract and the integration of this tract. Beyond those two items, we would rely on our briefing in the matter. And of course, I'd be happy to stand for questions. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski. I appreciate your input today. I have a few questions, and actually a question I'll ask I forgot to ask Mr. Christian.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	decision-making in this case. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski, I have one more question for you. What role do you think an integration order plays in water resources? How do you believe a proposed factor for an integration order would interact with requirements that are already in the rule for groundwater monitoring? MR. PIOTROWSKI: The existing protections for groundwater that exist as a result of other statutory schemes and as a result of the generalized law of water use in Idaho exist independently. And so what we are doing in this case is we are adding yet another factor to that mix. So for instance, the work of the Department of Lands, the work of the Department of Natural Resources, a number of other agencies, as well as the work of irrigation districts, water companies, et cetera, are all designed to meet the needs of their particular industries and their particular programs. None of them should be assumed to be responsible for or to be taking appropriate measures to

On			5unt 21, 2021
	Page 18		Page 20
1	and preventing them is uniquely the job of the	1	time. I took my retirement money, bought a lot,
	Department of Lands and the Commission and the		including the minerals, hired a contractor, and had a
	administrator for oil and gas conservation. In other		house built for retirement.
	words, these the unique threats posed by oil and gas	4	
	development must be addressed, in my opinion, by the		gets contaminated? What is going to happen if the
	agency that is put in charge of regulating those		water treatment plant gets contaminated? What's going
	particular processes.		to happen if my house starts sinking into the ground
8	We should not be relying on agencies that		and the walls start cracking?
-	exist for entirely different purposes pursuing statutes	9	I'm too old to start all over and walk away
	that exist for entirely different purposes to address	-	from a house that I spent my entire life working for.
	the critical need of protecting water resources in		And please don't tell me that I can sue Snake River. I
	Idaho.		know what will happen.
13	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Piotrowski.	13	
	That's all those are all the questions I have for		They'll pick up their stuff. They'll leave. And the
	you right now.		taxpayers of Idaho will have to clean up their mess.
16	I would ask if there are other uncommitted		Don't tell me it can't happen. I lived in California
	mineral interest owners in the room who would like to		for 60 years. I know what happens when things go bad
	provide argument, again, if you're represented by		and how bad they can get.
	Mr. Piotrowski, that's fine.	19	
20	Please come up. State your name.		citizens of Idaho, our natural resources, which
21	LINDA DERNONCOURT: Linda Dernoncourt. Linda		includes our rivers, our water, and our air. Please
	Dernoncourt.		listen to what the taxpayers in the state are saying to
23	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.		you, rather than to an out-of-state corporation.
24	LINDA DERNONCOURT: First let me say that I am	24	•
	not against oil and gas.	25	
	Page 19		Page 21
1	-	-	
1	Am I supposed to go ahead and do my		Ms. Dernoncourt.
2	Am I supposed to go ahead and do my THE HEARING OFFICER: Go ahead.	2	Ms. Dernoncourt. Next I'd like to invite Ms. Vega to provide
2 3	Am I supposed to go ahead and do my THE HEARING OFFICER: Go ahead. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Go ahead.	2 3	Ms. Dernoncourt. Next I'd like to invite Ms. Vega to provide argument on behalf of the Idaho Department of Lands.
2 3 4	Am I supposed to go ahead and do my THE HEARING OFFICER: Go ahead. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Go ahead. THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes.	2 3 4	Ms. Dernoncourt. Next I'd like to invite Ms. Vega to provide argument on behalf of the Idaho Department of Lands. JOY VEGA: Thank you, Mr. Thomas.
2 3 4 5	Am I supposed to go ahead and do my THE HEARING OFFICER: Go ahead. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Go ahead. THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Thank you, because I have a	2 3 4 5	Ms. Dernoncourt. Next I'd like to invite Ms. Vega to provide argument on behalf of the Idaho Department of Lands. JOY VEGA: Thank you, Mr. Thomas. Joy Vega, deputy attorney general.
2 3 4 5 6	Am I supposed to go ahead and do my THE HEARING OFFICER: Go ahead. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Go ahead. THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Thank you, because I have a doctor's appointment I have to get to.	2 3 4 5 6	Ms. Dernoncourt. Next I'd like to invite Ms. Vega to provide argument on behalf of the Idaho Department of Lands. JOY VEGA: Thank you, Mr. Thomas. Joy Vega, deputy attorney general. The Department of Lands did file an opening
2 3 4 5 6 7	Am I supposed to go ahead and do my THE HEARING OFFICER: Go ahead. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Go ahead. THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Thank you, because I have a doctor's appointment I have to get to. THE HEARING OFFICER: Oh, that's fine.	2 3 4 5 6 7	Ms. Dernoncourt. Next I'd like to invite Ms. Vega to provide argument on behalf of the Idaho Department of Lands. JOY VEGA: Thank you, Mr. Thomas. Joy Vega, deputy attorney general. The Department of Lands did file an opening brief in this matter. The intent of that brief, as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Am I supposed to go ahead and do my THE HEARING OFFICER: Go ahead. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Go ahead. THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Thank you, because I have a doctor's appointment I have to get to. THE HEARING OFFICER: Oh, that's fine. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Okay. I'm not against oil	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Ms. Dernoncourt. Next I'd like to invite Ms. Vega to provide argument on behalf of the Idaho Department of Lands. JOY VEGA: Thank you, Mr. Thomas. Joy Vega, deputy attorney general. The Department of Lands did file an opening brief in this matter. The intent of that brief, as stated, was to provide easy reference for you to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Am I supposed to go ahead and do my THE HEARING OFFICER: Go ahead. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Go ahead. THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Thank you, because I have a doctor's appointment I have to get to. THE HEARING OFFICER: Oh, that's fine. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Okay. I'm not against oil and gas. I drive a car. I heat my home with gas. But	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Ms. Dernoncourt. Next I'd like to invite Ms. Vega to provide argument on behalf of the Idaho Department of Lands. JOY VEGA: Thank you, Mr. Thomas. Joy Vega, deputy attorney general. The Department of Lands did file an opening brief in this matter. The intent of that brief, as stated, was to provide easy reference for you to applicable Idaho code sections and administrative rules
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Am I supposed to go ahead and do my THE HEARING OFFICER: Go ahead. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Go ahead. THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Thank you, because I have a doctor's appointment I have to get to. THE HEARING OFFICER: Oh, that's fine. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Okay. I'm not against oil and gas. I drive a car. I heat my home with gas. But I do believe it should be done responsibly and safely.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Ms. Dernoncourt. Next I'd like to invite Ms. Vega to provide argument on behalf of the Idaho Department of Lands. JOY VEGA: Thank you, Mr. Thomas. Joy Vega, deputy attorney general. The Department of Lands did file an opening brief in this matter. The intent of that brief, as stated, was to provide easy reference for you to applicable Idaho code sections and administrative rules and other contract-based considerations that may be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Am I supposed to go ahead and do my THE HEARING OFFICER: Go ahead. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Go ahead. THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Thank you, because I have a doctor's appointment I have to get to. THE HEARING OFFICER: Oh, that's fine. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Okay. I'm not against oil and gas. I drive a car. I heat my home with gas. But I do believe it should be done responsibly and safely. I am worried about lines under the water treatment	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	Ms. Dernoncourt. Next I'd like to invite Ms. Vega to provide argument on behalf of the Idaho Department of Lands. JOY VEGA: Thank you, Mr. Thomas. Joy Vega, deputy attorney general. The Department of Lands did file an opening brief in this matter. The intent of that brief, as stated, was to provide easy reference for you to applicable Idaho code sections and administrative rules and other contract-based considerations that may be necessary or relevant to you in determining what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Am I supposed to go ahead and do my THE HEARING OFFICER: Go ahead. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Go ahead. THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Thank you, because I have a doctor's appointment I have to get to. THE HEARING OFFICER: Oh, that's fine. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Okay. I'm not against oil and gas. I drive a car. I heat my home with gas. But I do believe it should be done responsibly and safely. I am worried about lines under the water treatment plant, lines under our rivers.	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	Ms. Dernoncourt. Next I'd like to invite Ms. Vega to provide argument on behalf of the Idaho Department of Lands. JOY VEGA: Thank you, Mr. Thomas. Joy Vega, deputy attorney general. The Department of Lands did file an opening brief in this matter. The intent of that brief, as stated, was to provide easy reference for you to applicable Idaho code sections and administrative rules and other contract-based considerations that may be necessary or relevant to you in determining what factors are just and reasonable in this particular
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Am I supposed to go ahead and do my THE HEARING OFFICER: Go ahead. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Go ahead. THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Thank you, because I have a doctor's appointment I have to get to. THE HEARING OFFICER: Oh, that's fine. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Okay. I'm not against oil and gas. I drive a car. I heat my home with gas. But I do believe it should be done responsibly and safely. I am worried about lines under the water treatment plant, lines under our rivers. What happens when something happens to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Ms. Dernoncourt. Next I'd like to invite Ms. Vega to provide argument on behalf of the Idaho Department of Lands. JOY VEGA: Thank you, Mr. Thomas. Joy Vega, deputy attorney general. The Department of Lands did file an opening brief in this matter. The intent of that brief, as stated, was to provide easy reference for you to applicable Idaho code sections and administrative rules and other contract-based considerations that may be necessary or relevant to you in determining what factors are just and reasonable in this particular matter.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Am I supposed to go ahead and do my THE HEARING OFFICER: Go ahead. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Go ahead. THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Thank you, because I have a doctor's appointment I have to get to. THE HEARING OFFICER: Oh, that's fine. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Okay. I'm not against oil and gas. I drive a car. I heat my home with gas. But I do believe it should be done responsibly and safely. I am worried about lines under the water treatment plant, lines under our rivers. What happens when something happens to those things? I attended the meeting on May 20th for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Ms. Dernoncourt. Next I'd like to invite Ms. Vega to provide argument on behalf of the Idaho Department of Lands. JOY VEGA: Thank you, Mr. Thomas. Joy Vega, deputy attorney general. The Department of Lands did file an opening brief in this matter. The intent of that brief, as stated, was to provide easy reference for you to applicable Idaho code sections and administrative rules and other contract-based considerations that may be necessary or relevant to you in determining what factors are just and reasonable in this particular matter. I don't have any specific argument. And I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Am I supposed to go ahead and do my THE HEARING OFFICER: Go ahead. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Go ahead. THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Thank you, because I have a doctor's appointment I have to get to. THE HEARING OFFICER: Oh, that's fine. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Okay. I'm not against oil and gas. I drive a car. I heat my home with gas. But I do believe it should be done responsibly and safely. I am worried about lines under the water treatment plant, lines under our rivers. What happens when something happens to those things? I attended the meeting on May 20th for the Barlow one. Snake River spoke. They referenced	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Ms. Dernoncourt. Next I'd like to invite Ms. Vega to provide argument on behalf of the Idaho Department of Lands. JOY VEGA: Thank you, Mr. Thomas. Joy Vega, deputy attorney general. The Department of Lands did file an opening brief in this matter. The intent of that brief, as stated, was to provide easy reference for you to applicable Idaho code sections and administrative rules and other contract-based considerations that may be necessary or relevant to you in determining what factors are just and reasonable in this particular matter. I don't have any specific argument. And I certainly don't want to restate what was presented in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Am I supposed to go ahead and do my THE HEARING OFFICER: Go ahead. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Go ahead. THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Thank you, because I have a doctor's appointment I have to get to. THE HEARING OFFICER: Oh, that's fine. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Okay. I'm not against oil and gas. I drive a car. I heat my home with gas. But I do believe it should be done responsibly and safely. I am worried about lines under the water treatment plant, lines under our rivers. What happens when something happens to those things? I attended the meeting on May 20th for the Barlow one. Snake River spoke. They referenced case law and regulations in other states.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Ms. Dernoncourt. Next I'd like to invite Ms. Vega to provide argument on behalf of the Idaho Department of Lands. JOY VEGA: Thank you, Mr. Thomas. Joy Vega, deputy attorney general. The Department of Lands did file an opening brief in this matter. The intent of that brief, as stated, was to provide easy reference for you to applicable Idaho code sections and administrative rules and other contract-based considerations that may be necessary or relevant to you in determining what factors are just and reasonable in this particular matter. I don't have any specific argument. And I certainly don't want to restate what was presented in writing.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Am I supposed to go ahead and do my THE HEARING OFFICER: Go ahead. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Go ahead. THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Thank you, because I have a doctor's appointment I have to get to. THE HEARING OFFICER: Oh, that's fine. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Okay. I'm not against oil and gas. I drive a car. I heat my home with gas. But I do believe it should be done responsibly and safely. I am worried about lines under the water treatment plant, lines under our rivers. What happens when something happens to those things? I attended the meeting on May 20th for the Barlow one. Snake River spoke. They referenced case law and regulations in other states. My feelings are if I wanted to be regulated	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Ms. Dernoncourt. Next I'd like to invite Ms. Vega to provide argument on behalf of the Idaho Department of Lands. JOY VEGA: Thank you, Mr. Thomas. Joy Vega, deputy attorney general. The Department of Lands did file an opening brief in this matter. The intent of that brief, as stated, was to provide easy reference for you to applicable Idaho code sections and administrative rules and other contract-based considerations that may be necessary or relevant to you in determining what factors are just and reasonable in this particular matter. I don't have any specific argument. And I certainly don't want to restate what was presented in writing. So unless you have any specific questions,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Am I supposed to go ahead and do my THE HEARING OFFICER: Go ahead. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Go ahead. THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Thank you, because I have a doctor's appointment I have to get to. THE HEARING OFFICER: Oh, that's fine. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Okay. I'm not against oil and gas. I drive a car. I heat my home with gas. But I do believe it should be done responsibly and safely. I am worried about lines under the water treatment plant, lines under our rivers. What happens when something happens to those things? I attended the meeting on May 20th for the Barlow one. Snake River spoke. They referenced case law and regulations in other states. My feelings are if I wanted to be regulated by those case laws and those regulations, I would have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Ms. Dernoncourt. Next I'd like to invite Ms. Vega to provide argument on behalf of the Idaho Department of Lands. JOY VEGA: Thank you, Mr. Thomas. Joy Vega, deputy attorney general. The Department of Lands did file an opening brief in this matter. The intent of that brief, as stated, was to provide easy reference for you to applicable Idaho code sections and administrative rules and other contract-based considerations that may be necessary or relevant to you in determining what factors are just and reasonable in this particular matter. I don't have any specific argument. And I certainly don't want to restate what was presented in writing. So unless you have any specific questions, the Department would just rest on that opening brief.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Am I supposed to go ahead and do my THE HEARING OFFICER: Go ahead. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Go ahead. THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Thank you, because I have a doctor's appointment I have to get to. THE HEARING OFFICER: Oh, that's fine. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Okay. I'm not against oil and gas. I drive a car. I heat my home with gas. But I do believe it should be done responsibly and safely. I am worried about lines under the water treatment plant, lines under our rivers. What happens when something happens to those things? I attended the meeting on May 20th for the Barlow one. Snake River spoke. They referenced case law and regulations in other states. My feelings are if I wanted to be regulated by those case laws and those regulations, I would have moved to those states. I moved to Idaho under your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Ms. Dernoncourt. Next I'd like to invite Ms. Vega to provide argument on behalf of the Idaho Department of Lands. JOY VEGA: Thank you, Mr. Thomas. Joy Vega, deputy attorney general. The Department of Lands did file an opening brief in this matter. The intent of that brief, as stated, was to provide easy reference for you to applicable Idaho code sections and administrative rules and other contract-based considerations that may be necessary or relevant to you in determining what factors are just and reasonable in this particular matter. I don't have any specific argument. And I certainly don't want to restate what was presented in writing. So unless you have any specific questions, the Department would just rest on that opening brief. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Ms. Vega. I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Am I supposed to go ahead and do my THE HEARING OFFICER: Go ahead. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Go ahead. THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Thank you, because I have a doctor's appointment I have to get to. THE HEARING OFFICER: Oh, that's fine. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Okay. I'm not against oil and gas. I drive a car. I heat my home with gas. But I do believe it should be done responsibly and safely. I am worried about lines under the water treatment plant, lines under our rivers. What happens when something happens to those things? I attended the meeting on May 20th for the Barlow one. Snake River spoke. They referenced case law and regulations in other states. My feelings are if I wanted to be regulated by those case laws and those regulations, I would have moved to those states. I moved to Idaho under your regulations and your case law.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Ms. Dernoncourt. Next I'd like to invite Ms. Vega to provide argument on behalf of the Idaho Department of Lands. JOY VEGA: Thank you, Mr. Thomas. Joy Vega, deputy attorney general. The Department of Lands did file an opening brief in this matter. The intent of that brief, as stated, was to provide easy reference for you to applicable Idaho code sections and administrative rules and other contract-based considerations that may be necessary or relevant to you in determining what factors are just and reasonable in this particular matter. I don't have any specific argument. And I certainly don't want to restate what was presented in writing. So unless you have any specific questions, the Department would just rest on that opening brief. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Ms. Vega. I don't have any questions of the Department.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Am I supposed to go ahead and do my THE HEARING OFFICER: Go ahead. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Go ahead. THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Thank you, because I have a doctor's appointment I have to get to. THE HEARING OFFICER: Oh, that's fine. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Okay. I'm not against oil and gas. I drive a car. I heat my home with gas. But I do believe it should be done responsibly and safely. I am worried about lines under the water treatment plant, lines under our rivers. What happens when something happens to those things? I attended the meeting on May 20th for the Barlow one. Snake River spoke. They referenced case law and regulations in other states. My feelings are if I wanted to be regulated by those case laws and those regulations, I would have moved to those states. I moved to Idaho under your regulations and your case law. Mr. Brown was here, and he was complaining	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Ms. Dernoncourt. Next I'd like to invite Ms. Vega to provide argument on behalf of the Idaho Department of Lands. JOY VEGA: Thank you, Mr. Thomas. Joy Vega, deputy attorney general. The Department of Lands did file an opening brief in this matter. The intent of that brief, as stated, was to provide easy reference for you to applicable Idaho code sections and administrative rules and other contract-based considerations that may be necessary or relevant to you in determining what factors are just and reasonable in this particular matter. I don't have any specific argument. And I certainly don't want to restate what was presented in writing. So unless you have any specific questions, the Department would just rest on that opening brief. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Ms. Vega. I don't have any questions of the Department. Ms. Bonney, do you have any arguments to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Am I supposed to go ahead and do my THE HEARING OFFICER: Go ahead. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Go ahead. THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Thank you, because I have a doctor's appointment I have to get to. THE HEARING OFFICER: Oh, that's fine. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Okay. I'm not against oil and gas. I drive a car. I heat my home with gas. But I do believe it should be done responsibly and safely. I am worried about lines under the water treatment plant, lines under our rivers. What happens when something happens to those things? I attended the meeting on May 20th for the Barlow one. Snake River spoke. They referenced case law and regulations in other states. My feelings are if I wanted to be regulated by those case laws and those regulations, I would have moved to those states. I moved to Idaho under your regulations and your case law. Mr. Brown was here, and he was complaining that it was taking way too long to get through this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Ms. Dernoncourt. Next I'd like to invite Ms. Vega to provide argument on behalf of the Idaho Department of Lands. JOY VEGA: Thank you, Mr. Thomas. Joy Vega, deputy attorney general. The Department of Lands did file an opening brief in this matter. The intent of that brief, as stated, was to provide easy reference for you to applicable Idaho code sections and administrative rules and other contract-based considerations that may be necessary or relevant to you in determining what factors are just and reasonable in this particular matter. I don't have any specific argument. And I certainly don't want to restate what was presented in writing. So unless you have any specific questions, the Department would just rest on that opening brief. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Ms. Vega. I don't have any questions of the Department. Ms. Bonney, do you have any arguments to offer today?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Am I supposed to go ahead and do my THE HEARING OFFICER: Go ahead. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Go ahead. THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Thank you, because I have a doctor's appointment I have to get to. THE HEARING OFFICER: Oh, that's fine. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Okay. I'm not against oil and gas. I drive a car. I heat my home with gas. But I do believe it should be done responsibly and safely. I am worried about lines under the water treatment plant, lines under our rivers. What happens when something happens to those things? I attended the meeting on May 20th for the Barlow one. Snake River spoke. They referenced case law and regulations in other states. My feelings are if I wanted to be regulated by those case laws and those regulations, I would have moved to those states. I moved to Idaho under your regulations and your case law. Mr. Brown was here, and he was complaining that it was taking way too long to get through this process. It was over a year.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Ms. Dernoncourt. Next I'd like to invite Ms. Vega to provide argument on behalf of the Idaho Department of Lands. JOY VEGA: Thank you, Mr. Thomas. Joy Vega, deputy attorney general. The Department of Lands did file an opening brief in this matter. The intent of that brief, as stated, was to provide easy reference for you to applicable Idaho code sections and administrative rules and other contract-based considerations that may be necessary or relevant to you in determining what factors are just and reasonable in this particular matter. I don't have any specific argument. And I certainly don't want to restate what was presented in writing. So unless you have any specific questions, the Department would just rest on that opening brief. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Ms. Vega. I don't have any questions of the Department. Ms. Bonney, do you have any arguments to offer today? STEPHANIE JAYMES BONNEY: I don't, Mr. Thomas.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Am I supposed to go ahead and do my THE HEARING OFFICER: Go ahead. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Go ahead. THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Thank you, because I have a doctor's appointment I have to get to. THE HEARING OFFICER: Oh, that's fine. LINDA DERNONCOURT: Okay. I'm not against oil and gas. I drive a car. I heat my home with gas. But I do believe it should be done responsibly and safely. I am worried about lines under the water treatment plant, lines under our rivers. What happens when something happens to those things? I attended the meeting on May 20th for the Barlow one. Snake River spoke. They referenced case law and regulations in other states. My feelings are if I wanted to be regulated by those case laws and those regulations, I would have moved to those states. I moved to Idaho under your regulations and your case law. Mr. Brown was here, and he was complaining that it was taking way too long to get through this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Ms. Dernoncourt. Next I'd like to invite Ms. Vega to provide argument on behalf of the Idaho Department of Lands. JOY VEGA: Thank you, Mr. Thomas. Joy Vega, deputy attorney general. The Department of Lands did file an opening brief in this matter. The intent of that brief, as stated, was to provide easy reference for you to applicable Idaho code sections and administrative rules and other contract-based considerations that may be necessary or relevant to you in determining what factors are just and reasonable in this particular matter. I don't have any specific argument. And I certainly don't want to restate what was presented in writing. So unless you have any specific questions, the Department would just rest on that opening brief. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Ms. Vega. I don't have any questions of the Department. Ms. Bonney, do you have any arguments to offer today? STEPHANIE JAYMES BONNEY: I don't, Mr. Thomas. Thank you.

	D		
	Page 22		Page 24
1	At this point I would invite Mr. Christian	1	offered you kind of a false equivalence in that you
2	representing Snake River to come up and offer rebuttal.		have the Department has its own set of rules which
	And if you don't mind, before you did that, the first		govern operations from, you know, drilling to cementing
	question that I promised you that I didn't ask the		and casing, to well treatments, to production, you
	first time.		know, to reclamation, to plugging and abandoning. And
6	MIKE CHRISTIAN: Certainly.		all of those things it can do to to be protective of
7	THE HEARING OFFICER: There is as discussed,		the environment and of the safety of those near the
	there's a well already drilled in the unit.		well.
9	Should a factor address that?	9	That does not mean that other agencies like
10	MIKE CHRISTIAN: I mean I don't I didn't mean		DQ or the Department of Water Resources do not also
	to be flippant, but I don't want to answer your		have their own sets of rules that may or may not apply
	question with a question, which is, in what way? If		to this setting, which they can administer. So I don't
	you mean in terms of what compensation should be		quibble with the idea that there are multiple
	provided to uncommitted mineral interest owners, I	14	jurisdictions at play where oil and gas operations are
15	think the answer is no for a couple of reasons.	15	concerned.
16	One is it's contrary to what, I think,	16	So and I don't think it's appropriate
17	Mr. Piotrowski suggested. It's the lightly tested	17	for the Department to, in an integration order, attempt
18	well. We don't know, as we stand here today, how it's	18	to define and administer rules of other agencies that
19	going to produce in the long term.	19	deal with the subject.
20	Secondly, if the suggestion is that because	20	And then last comment I would make is, on
21	we got this great well and we know it now, that	21	the subject of, you know, what is compliance with
	uncommitted mineral interest owners should be provided	22	the law enough. And I think the suggestion was just
	with a better deal, that to me suggests that holding		and reasonable has to mean something, and it must mean,
	out would be encouraged, which I think is antithetical		then, that you imply other terms.
	to the to the intent of the statute. You know, the	25	And and I think the answer to that is,
	Page 23		Page 25
1		1	
	idea is to encourage production and to regulate in a		as you did in your order in the other matter, go back
2	idea is to encourage production and to regulate in a way that allows operators to responsibly get to	2	as you did in your order in the other matter, go back to the 1963 [unintelligible] statute which had the
2 3	idea is to encourage production and to regulate in a way that allows operators to responsibly get to production. And encouraging holding out would	2 3	as you did in your order in the other matter, go back to the 1963 [unintelligible] statute which had the words "just and reasonable" in it to begin with. And
2 3 4	idea is to encourage production and to regulate in a way that allows operators to responsibly get to production. And encouraging holding out would reestablish the fact. So for those reasons, I think	2 3 4	as you did in your order in the other matter, go back to the 1963 [unintelligible] statute which had the words "just and reasonable" in it to begin with. And what it clearly referred to was, you know, alternative
2 3 4 5	idea is to encourage production and to regulate in a way that allows operators to responsibly get to production. And encouraging holding out would reestablish the fact. So for those reasons, I think the answer is no.	2 3 4 5	as you did in your order in the other matter, go back to the 1963 [unintelligible] statute which had the words "just and reasonable" in it to begin with. And what it clearly referred to was, you know, alternative economic terms, and which is kind of the point I've
2 3 4 5 6	idea is to encourage production and to regulate in a way that allows operators to responsibly get to production. And encouraging holding out would reestablish the fact. So for those reasons, I think the answer is no. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian.	2 3 4 5 6	as you did in your order in the other matter, go back to the 1963 [unintelligible] statute which had the words "just and reasonable" in it to begin with. And what it clearly referred to was, you know, alternative economic terms, and which is kind of the point I've been making through briefing in the last few matters.
2 3 4 5 6 7	idea is to encourage production and to regulate in a way that allows operators to responsibly get to production. And encouraging holding out would reestablish the fact. So for those reasons, I think the answer is no. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. I'll go ahead and let you start with your rebuttal,	2 3 4 5 6 7	as you did in your order in the other matter, go back to the 1963 [unintelligible] statute which had the words "just and reasonable" in it to begin with. And what it clearly referred to was, you know, alternative economic terms, and which is kind of the point I've been making through briefing in the last few matters. And since that time the statute has been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	idea is to encourage production and to regulate in a way that allows operators to responsibly get to production. And encouraging holding out would reestablish the fact. So for those reasons, I think the answer is no. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. I'll go ahead and let you start with your rebuttal, please.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	as you did in your order in the other matter, go back to the 1963 [unintelligible] statute which had the words "just and reasonable" in it to begin with. And what it clearly referred to was, you know, alternative economic terms, and which is kind of the point I've been making through briefing in the last few matters. And since that time the statute has been to the extent it's been changed, it's been narrowed.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	idea is to encourage production and to regulate in a way that allows operators to responsibly get to production. And encouraging holding out would reestablish the fact. So for those reasons, I think the answer is no. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. I'll go ahead and let you start with your rebuttal, please. MIKE CHRISTIAN: I have only excuse me a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	as you did in your order in the other matter, go back to the 1963 [unintelligible] statute which had the words "just and reasonable" in it to begin with. And what it clearly referred to was, you know, alternative economic terms, and which is kind of the point I've been making through briefing in the last few matters. And since that time the statute has been to the extent it's been changed, it's been narrowed. The alternatives have been more defined, whereas before
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	idea is to encourage production and to regulate in a way that allows operators to responsibly get to production. And encouraging holding out would reestablish the fact. So for those reasons, I think the answer is no. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. I'll go ahead and let you start with your rebuttal, please. MIKE CHRISTIAN: I have only excuse me a couple of things to say. One is Mr. Piotrowski's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	as you did in your order in the other matter, go back to the 1963 [unintelligible] statute which had the words "just and reasonable" in it to begin with. And what it clearly referred to was, you know, alternative economic terms, and which is kind of the point I've been making through briefing in the last few matters. And since that time the statute has been to the extent it's been changed, it's been narrowed. The alternatives have been more defined, whereas before [unintelligible], you know, we have to offer a number
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	idea is to encourage production and to regulate in a way that allows operators to responsibly get to production. And encouraging holding out would reestablish the fact. So for those reasons, I think the answer is no. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. I'll go ahead and let you start with your rebuttal, please. MIKE CHRISTIAN: I have only excuse me a couple of things to say. One is Mr. Piotrowski's correct, the statute says royalties no less than	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10	as you did in your order in the other matter, go back to the 1963 [unintelligible] statute which had the words "just and reasonable" in it to begin with. And what it clearly referred to was, you know, alternative economic terms, and which is kind of the point I've been making through briefing in the last few matters. And since that time the statute has been to the extent it's been changed, it's been narrowed. The alternatives have been more defined, whereas before [unintelligible], you know, we have to offer a number of just and reasonable alternatives. And the basis and
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	idea is to encourage production and to regulate in a way that allows operators to responsibly get to production. And encouraging holding out would reestablish the fact. So for those reasons, I think the answer is no. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. I'll go ahead and let you start with your rebuttal, please. MIKE CHRISTIAN: I have only excuse me a couple of things to say. One is Mr. Piotrowski's correct, the statute says royalties no less than [unintelligible] in one circumstance. And but I	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	as you did in your order in the other matter, go back to the 1963 [unintelligible] statute which had the words "just and reasonable" in it to begin with. And what it clearly referred to was, you know, alternative economic terms, and which is kind of the point I've been making through briefing in the last few matters. And since that time the statute has been to the extent it's been changed, it's been narrowed. The alternatives have been more defined, whereas before [unintelligible], you know, we have to offer a number of just and reasonable alternatives. And the basis and compensation, you know, have to fall within that term.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	idea is to encourage production and to regulate in a way that allows operators to responsibly get to production. And encouraging holding out would reestablish the fact. So for those reasons, I think the answer is no. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. I'll go ahead and let you start with your rebuttal, please. MIKE CHRISTIAN: I have only excuse me a couple of things to say. One is Mr. Piotrowski's correct, the statute says royalties no less than [unintelligible] in one circumstance. And but I think that, for example, one of the factors that you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	as you did in your order in the other matter, go back to the 1963 [unintelligible] statute which had the words "just and reasonable" in it to begin with. And what it clearly referred to was, you know, alternative economic terms, and which is kind of the point I've been making through briefing in the last few matters. And since that time the statute has been to the extent it's been changed, it's been narrowed. The alternatives have been more defined, whereas before [unintelligible], you know, we have to offer a number of just and reasonable alternatives. And the basis and compensation, you know, have to fall within that term. Now we have defined alternatives. The
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 idea is to encourage production and to regulate in a way that allows operators to responsibly get to production. And encouraging holding out would reestablish the fact. So for those reasons, I think the answer is no. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. I'll go ahead and let you start with your rebuttal, please. MIKE CHRISTIAN: I have only excuse me a couple of things to say. One is Mr. Piotrowski's correct, the statute says royalties no less than [unintelligible] in one circumstance. And but I think that, for example, one of the factors that you that you indicated you're going to use in the Fallon 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	as you did in your order in the other matter, go back to the 1963 [unintelligible] statute which had the words "just and reasonable" in it to begin with. And what it clearly referred to was, you know, alternative economic terms, and which is kind of the point I've been making through briefing in the last few matters. And since that time the statute has been to the extent it's been changed, it's been narrowed. The alternatives have been more defined, whereas before [unintelligible], you know, we have to offer a number of just and reasonable alternatives. And the basis and compensation, you know, have to fall within that term. Now we have defined alternatives. The words "just and reasonable" haven't been taken out of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 idea is to encourage production and to regulate in a way that allows operators to responsibly get to production. And encouraging holding out would reestablish the fact. So for those reasons, I think the answer is no. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. I'll go ahead and let you start with your rebuttal, please. MIKE CHRISTIAN: I have only excuse me a couple of things to say. One is Mr. Piotrowski's correct, the statute says royalties no less than [unintelligible] in one circumstance. And but I think that, for example, one of the factors that you that you indicated you're going to use in the Fallon 111 unit, which is, you know, how does this compare to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	as you did in your order in the other matter, go back to the 1963 [unintelligible] statute which had the words "just and reasonable" in it to begin with. And what it clearly referred to was, you know, alternative economic terms, and which is kind of the point I've been making through briefing in the last few matters. And since that time the statute has been to the extent it's been changed, it's been narrowed. The alternatives have been more defined, whereas before [unintelligible], you know, we have to offer a number of just and reasonable alternatives. And the basis and compensation, you know, have to fall within that term. Now we have defined alternatives. The words "just and reasonable" haven't been taken out of the statute. They were there already. There's no
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	idea is to encourage production and to regulate in a way that allows operators to responsibly get to production. And encouraging holding out would reestablish the fact. So for those reasons, I think the answer is no. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. I'll go ahead and let you start with your rebuttal, please. MIKE CHRISTIAN: I have only excuse me a couple of things to say. One is Mr. Piotrowski's correct, the statute says royalties no less than [unintelligible] in one circumstance. And but I think that, for example, one of the factors that you that you indicated you're going to use in the Fallon 111 unit, which is, you know, how does this compare to voluntary agreements within and around the unit, cover	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	as you did in your order in the other matter, go back to the 1963 [unintelligible] statute which had the words "just and reasonable" in it to begin with. And what it clearly referred to was, you know, alternative economic terms, and which is kind of the point I've been making through briefing in the last few matters. And since that time the statute has been to the extent it's been changed, it's been narrowed. The alternatives have been more defined, whereas before [unintelligible], you know, we have to offer a number of just and reasonable alternatives. And the basis and compensation, you know, have to fall within that term. Now we have defined alternatives. The words "just and reasonable" haven't been taken out of the statute. They were there already. There's no indication that they need anything different than they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 idea is to encourage production and to regulate in a way that allows operators to responsibly get to production. And encouraging holding out would reestablish the fact. So for those reasons, I think the answer is no. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. I'll go ahead and let you start with your rebuttal, please. MIKE CHRISTIAN: I have only excuse me a couple of things to say. One is Mr. Piotrowski's correct, the statute says royalties no less than [unintelligible] in one circumstance. And but I think that, for example, one of the factors that you that you indicated you're going to use in the Fallon 111 unit, which is, you know, how does this compare to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	as you did in your order in the other matter, go back to the 1963 [unintelligible] statute which had the words "just and reasonable" in it to begin with. And what it clearly referred to was, you know, alternative economic terms, and which is kind of the point I've been making through briefing in the last few matters. And since that time the statute has been to the extent it's been changed, it's been narrowed. The alternatives have been more defined, whereas before [unintelligible], you know, we have to offer a number of just and reasonable alternatives. And the basis and compensation, you know, have to fall within that term. Now we have defined alternatives. The words "just and reasonable" haven't been taken out of the statute. They were there already. There's no indication that they need anything different than they did back in 1963. It's just that the statute has been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	idea is to encourage production and to regulate in a way that allows operators to responsibly get to production. And encouraging holding out would reestablish the fact. So for those reasons, I think the answer is no. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. I'll go ahead and let you start with your rebuttal, please. MIKE CHRISTIAN: I have only excuse me a couple of things to say. One is Mr. Piotrowski's correct, the statute says royalties no less than [unintelligible] in one circumstance. And but I think that, for example, one of the factors that you that you indicated you're going to use in the Fallon 111 unit, which is, you know, how does this compare to voluntary agreements within and around the unit, cover	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	as you did in your order in the other matter, go back to the 1963 [unintelligible] statute which had the words "just and reasonable" in it to begin with. And what it clearly referred to was, you know, alternative economic terms, and which is kind of the point I've been making through briefing in the last few matters. And since that time the statute has been to the extent it's been changed, it's been narrowed. The alternatives have been more defined, whereas before [unintelligible], you know, we have to offer a number of just and reasonable alternatives. And the basis and compensation, you know, have to fall within that term. Now we have defined alternatives. The words "just and reasonable" haven't been taken out of the statute. They were there already. There's no indication that they need anything different than they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	idea is to encourage production and to regulate in a way that allows operators to responsibly get to production. And encouraging holding out would reestablish the fact. So for those reasons, I think the answer is no. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. I'll go ahead and let you start with your rebuttal, please. MIKE CHRISTIAN: I have only excuse me a couple of things to say. One is Mr. Piotrowski's correct, the statute says royalties no less than [unintelligible] in one circumstance. And but I think that, for example, one of the factors that you that you indicated you're going to use in the Fallon 111 unit, which is, you know, how does this compare to voluntary agreements within and around the unit, cover that situation.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	as you did in your order in the other matter, go back to the 1963 [unintelligible] statute which had the words "just and reasonable" in it to begin with. And what it clearly referred to was, you know, alternative economic terms, and which is kind of the point I've been making through briefing in the last few matters. And since that time the statute has been to the extent it's been changed, it's been narrowed. The alternatives have been more defined, whereas before [unintelligible], you know, we have to offer a number of just and reasonable alternatives. And the basis and compensation, you know, have to fall within that term. Now we have defined alternatives. The words "just and reasonable" haven't been taken out of the statute. They were there already. There's no indication that they need anything different than they did back in 1963. It's just that the statute has been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 idea is to encourage production and to regulate in a way that allows operators to responsibly get to production. And encouraging holding out would reestablish the fact. So for those reasons, I think the answer is no. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. I'll go ahead and let you start with your rebuttal, please. MIKE CHRISTIAN: I have only excuse me a couple of things to say. One is Mr. Piotrowski's correct, the statute says royalties no less than [unintelligible] in one circumstance. And but I think that, for example, one of the factors that you that you indicated you're going to use in the Fallon 111 unit, which is, you know, how does this compare to voluntary agreements within and around the unit, cover that situation. We can examine whether anybody else in the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	as you did in your order in the other matter, go back to the 1963 [unintelligible] statute which had the words "just and reasonable" in it to begin with. And what it clearly referred to was, you know, alternative economic terms, and which is kind of the point I've been making through briefing in the last few matters. And since that time the statute has been to the extent it's been changed, it's been narrowed. The alternatives have been more defined, whereas before [unintelligible], you know, we have to offer a number of just and reasonable alternatives. And the basis and compensation, you know, have to fall within that term. Now we have defined alternatives. The words "just and reasonable" haven't been taken out of the statute. They were there already. There's no indication that they need anything different than they did back in 1963. It's just that the statute has been taken from you know, from here to here, which to my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 idea is to encourage production and to regulate in a way that allows operators to responsibly get to production. And encouraging holding out would reestablish the fact. So for those reasons, I think the answer is no. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. I'll go ahead and let you start with your rebuttal, please. MIKE CHRISTIAN: I have only excuse me a couple of things to say. One is Mr. Piotrowski's correct, the statute says royalties no less than [unintelligible] in one circumstance. And but I think that, for example, one of the factors that you that you indicated you're going to use in the Fallon 111 unit, which is, you know, how does this compare to voluntary agreements within and around the unit, cover that situation. We can examine whether anybody else in the unit is getting more than an eighth on a voluntary 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	as you did in your order in the other matter, go back to the 1963 [unintelligible] statute which had the words "just and reasonable" in it to begin with. And what it clearly referred to was, you know, alternative economic terms, and which is kind of the point I've been making through briefing in the last few matters. And since that time the statute has been to the extent it's been changed, it's been narrowed. The alternatives have been more defined, whereas before [unintelligible], you know, we have to offer a number of just and reasonable alternatives. And the basis and compensation, you know, have to fall within that term. Now we have defined alternatives. The words "just and reasonable" haven't been taken out of the statute. They were there already. There's no indication that they need anything different than they did back in 1963. It's just that the statute has been taken from you know, from here to here, which to my mind means you're still dealing with the same issue,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 idea is to encourage production and to regulate in a way that allows operators to responsibly get to production. And encouraging holding out would reestablish the fact. So for those reasons, I think the answer is no. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. I'll go ahead and let you start with your rebuttal, please. MIKE CHRISTIAN: I have only excuse me a couple of things to say. One is Mr. Piotrowski's correct, the statute says royalties no less than [unintelligible] in one circumstance. And but I think that, for example, one of the factors that you that you indicated you're going to use in the Fallon 111 unit, which is, you know, how does this compare to voluntary agreements within and around the unit, cover that situation. We can examine whether anybody else in the unit is getting more than an eighth on a voluntary basis. And I think the answer in this case actually is 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	as you did in your order in the other matter, go back to the 1963 [unintelligible] statute which had the words "just and reasonable" in it to begin with. And what it clearly referred to was, you know, alternative economic terms, and which is kind of the point I've been making through briefing in the last few matters. And since that time the statute has been to the extent it's been changed, it's been narrowed. The alternatives have been more defined, whereas before [unintelligible], you know, we have to offer a number of just and reasonable alternatives. And the basis and compensation, you know, have to fall within that term. Now we have defined alternatives. The words "just and reasonable" haven't been taken out of the statute. They were there already. There's no indication that they need anything different than they did back in 1963. It's just that the statute has been taken from you know, from here to here, which to my mind means you're still dealing with the same issue, what's economically fair to uncommitted mineral
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	idea is to encourage production and to regulate in a way that allows operators to responsibly get to production. And encouraging holding out would reestablish the fact. So for those reasons, I think the answer is no. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. I'll go ahead and let you start with your rebuttal, please. MIKE CHRISTIAN: I have only excuse me a couple of things to say. One is Mr. Piotrowski's correct, the statute says royalties no less than [unintelligible] in one circumstance. And but I think that, for example, one of the factors that you that you indicated you're going to use in the Fallon 111 unit, which is, you know, how does this compare to voluntary agreements within and around the unit, cover that situation. We can examine whether anybody else in the unit is getting more than an eighth on a voluntary basis. And I think the answer in this case actually is no, across 100 or whatever owners. But I think you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	as you did in your order in the other matter, go back to the 1963 [unintelligible] statute which had the words "just and reasonable" in it to begin with. And what it clearly referred to was, you know, alternative economic terms, and which is kind of the point I've been making through briefing in the last few matters. And since that time the statute has been to the extent it's been changed, it's been narrowed. The alternatives have been more defined, whereas before [unintelligible], you know, we have to offer a number of just and reasonable alternatives. And the basis and compensation, you know, have to fall within that term. Now we have defined alternatives. The words "just and reasonable" haven't been taken out of the statute. They were there already. There's no indication that they need anything different than they did back in 1963. It's just that the statute has been taken from you know, from here to here, which to my mind means you're still dealing with the same issue, what's economically fair to uncommitted mineral interest owners in the context of compensation for minerals as compared to those who lease their minerals.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	idea is to encourage production and to regulate in a way that allows operators to responsibly get to production. And encouraging holding out would reestablish the fact. So for those reasons, I think the answer is no. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. I'll go ahead and let you start with your rebuttal, please. MIKE CHRISTIAN: I have only excuse me a couple of things to say. One is Mr. Piotrowski's correct, the statute says royalties no less than [unintelligible] in one circumstance. And but I think that, for example, one of the factors that you that you indicated you're going to use in the Fallon 111 unit, which is, you know, how does this compare to voluntary agreements within and around the unit, cover that situation. We can examine whether anybody else in the unit is getting more than an eighth on a voluntary basis. And I think the answer in this case actually is no, across 100 or whatever owners. But I think you can you can draft a factor that deals with that situation.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	as you did in your order in the other matter, go back to the 1963 [unintelligible] statute which had the words "just and reasonable" in it to begin with. And what it clearly referred to was, you know, alternative economic terms, and which is kind of the point I've been making through briefing in the last few matters. And since that time the statute has been to the extent it's been changed, it's been narrowed. The alternatives have been more defined, whereas before [unintelligible], you know, we have to offer a number of just and reasonable alternatives. And the basis and compensation, you know, have to fall within that term. Now we have defined alternatives. The words "just and reasonable" haven't been taken out of the statute. They were there already. There's no indication that they need anything different than they did back in 1963. It's just that the statute has been taken from you know, from here to here, which to my mind means you're still dealing with the same issue, what's economically fair to uncommitted mineral interest owners in the context of compensation for minerals as compared to those who lease their minerals. It doesn't mean that just and reasonable
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	idea is to encourage production and to regulate in a way that allows operators to responsibly get to production. And encouraging holding out would reestablish the fact. So for those reasons, I think the answer is no. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian. I'll go ahead and let you start with your rebuttal, please. MIKE CHRISTIAN: I have only excuse me a couple of things to say. One is Mr. Piotrowski's correct, the statute says royalties no less than [unintelligible] in one circumstance. And but I think that, for example, one of the factors that you that you indicated you're going to use in the Fallon 111 unit, which is, you know, how does this compare to voluntary agreements within and around the unit, cover that situation. We can examine whether anybody else in the unit is getting more than an eighth on a voluntary basis. And I think the answer in this case actually is no, across 100 or whatever owners. But I think you can you can draft a factor that deals with that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	as you did in your order in the other matter, go back to the 1963 [unintelligible] statute which had the words "just and reasonable" in it to begin with. And what it clearly referred to was, you know, alternative economic terms, and which is kind of the point I've been making through briefing in the last few matters. And since that time the statute has been to the extent it's been changed, it's been narrowed. The alternatives have been more defined, whereas before [unintelligible], you know, we have to offer a number of just and reasonable alternatives. And the basis and compensation, you know, have to fall within that term. Now we have defined alternatives. The words "just and reasonable" haven't been taken out of the statute. They were there already. There's no indication that they need anything different than they did back in 1963. It's just that the statute has been taken from you know, from here to here, which to my mind means you're still dealing with the same issue, what's economically fair to uncommitted mineral interest owners in the context of compensation for minerals as compared to those who lease their minerals.

-			
	Page 26		Page 28
1	And that's all I have.	1	years [unintelligible]. So and I'm concerned over
2	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Christian.		my investment that there's nothing behind this to back
3	MIKE CHRISTIAN: Thank you.		us as landowners if they contaminate our water.
4	THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Folks, the	4	
5	arguments have been made.	5	
6	And, Chris, I'm going to lean on you a	6	that.
7	little bit.	7	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.
8	I would invite anyone who signed up to	8	Mr. Gozzo, is there anyone online who
9	provide public comments to do so at this time.	9	signed up to provide public comment?
10	First, is there anyone in the room who	10	CHRIS GOZZO: For this webinar meeting,
11	signed up to provide public comments who would like to	11	Mr. Hearing Officer, we've got only one other
12	do so?	12	individual who's an attendee. And that is Richard
13	Okay. You're welcome to come up if you'd	13	Brown. And the rest are all panelists.
14	like to say something.	14	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Chris. Let's
15	SHARON SIMMONS: Can I get in the line already	15	go ahead and do what you can to help Mr. Brown provide
16	to ask to speak?	16	comment.
17	THE HEARING OFFICER: There's not a line in	17	CHRIS GOZZO: Okay. I'll go ahead and promote
18	front of you, so go ahead and walk up. It's okay.	18	him to panelist.
19	SHARON SIMMONS: Okay. Great. I'm glad to see	19	Mr. Brown is now a panelist.
20	your humor isn't all [unintelligible].	20	8
21	Okay. My name's Sharon Simmons. I am an		And I just wanted to comment in regard to there was
	uncommitted mineral owner. And I am very concerned		comments about, one, about us being all out-of-staters
	over what is what has already happened, what has		and if something went wrong that we're all going to run
	already been allowed. And to say it's just and		for the hills.
25	reasonable for a hundred dollars an acre, you could	25	And I do appreciate both of the both of
	Page 27		Page 29
	Page 27		Page 29
	have your water contaminated for life.		the the testimony from the two parties regarding
2	have your water contaminated for life. And if that happened, Texan cowboys, they	2	the the testimony from the two parties regarding care of their water. And one of our employees is
2 3	have your water contaminated for life. And if that happened, Texan cowboys, they would be out of here in a heartbeat with a bankruptcy,	2 3	the the testimony from the two parties regarding care of their water. And one of our employees is there, Wade is in the room. He is an Idaho resident.
2 3 4	have your water contaminated for life. And if that happened, Texan cowboys, they would be out of here in a heartbeat with a bankruptcy, leaving the Idaho property owners with their hands, you	2 3 4	the the testimony from the two parties regarding care of their water. And one of our employees is there, Wade is in the room. He is an Idaho resident. I personally am now an Idaho resident. And I am the
2 3 4 5	have your water contaminated for life. And if that happened, Texan cowboys, they would be out of here in a heartbeat with a bankruptcy, leaving the Idaho property owners with their hands, you know, like I'm absolutely positive my place would be	2 3 4 5	the the testimony from the two parties regarding care of their water. And one of our employees is there, Wade is in the room. He is an Idaho resident. I personally am now an Idaho resident. And I am the owner and manager of Snake River Oil and Gas. I live
2 3 4 5 6	have your water contaminated for life. And if that happened, Texan cowboys, they would be out of here in a heartbeat with a bankruptcy, leaving the Idaho property owners with their hands, you know, like I'm absolutely positive my place would be worth very little if the water was contaminated.	2 3 4 5 6	the the testimony from the two parties regarding care of their water. And one of our employees is there, Wade is in the room. He is an Idaho resident. I personally am now an Idaho resident. And I am the owner and manager of Snake River Oil and Gas. I live in the state of Idaho, and plan on remaining in the
2 3 4 5 6 7	have your water contaminated for life. And if that happened, Texan cowboys, they would be out of here in a heartbeat with a bankruptcy, leaving the Idaho property owners with their hands, you know, like I'm absolutely positive my place would be worth very little if the water was contaminated. There's history. You guys want to go back	2 3 4 5 6 7	the the testimony from the two parties regarding care of their water. And one of our employees is there, Wade is in the room. He is an Idaho resident. I personally am now an Idaho resident. And I am the owner and manager of Snake River Oil and Gas. I live in the state of Idaho, and plan on remaining in the state of Idaho. And we're trying to be as transparent
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	have your water contaminated for life. And if that happened, Texan cowboys, they would be out of here in a heartbeat with a bankruptcy, leaving the Idaho property owners with their hands, you know, like I'm absolutely positive my place would be worth very little if the water was contaminated. There's history. You guys want to go back to history where this state, that state, this state.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the the testimony from the two parties regarding care of their water. And one of our employees is there, Wade is in the room. He is an Idaho resident. I personally am now an Idaho resident. And I am the owner and manager of Snake River Oil and Gas. I live in the state of Idaho, and plan on remaining in the state of Idaho. And we're trying to be as transparent as possible.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	have your water contaminated for life. And if that happened, Texan cowboys, they would be out of here in a heartbeat with a bankruptcy, leaving the Idaho property owners with their hands, you know, like I'm absolutely positive my place would be worth very little if the water was contaminated. There's history. You guys want to go back to history where this state, that state, this state. Well, in Pennsylvania they did drilling there,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the the testimony from the two parties regarding care of their water. And one of our employees is there, Wade is in the room. He is an Idaho resident. I personally am now an Idaho resident. And I am the owner and manager of Snake River Oil and Gas. I live in the state of Idaho, and plan on remaining in the state of Idaho. And we're trying to be as transparent as possible. I'd be glad to sit down with anybody who
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	have your water contaminated for life. And if that happened, Texan cowboys, they would be out of here in a heartbeat with a bankruptcy, leaving the Idaho property owners with their hands, you know, like I'm absolutely positive my place would be worth very little if the water was contaminated. There's history. You guys want to go back to history where this state, that state, this state. Well, in Pennsylvania they did drilling there, contaminated the water. Those people cannot use their	2 3 6 7 8 9	the the testimony from the two parties regarding care of their water. And one of our employees is there, Wade is in the room. He is an Idaho resident. I personally am now an Idaho resident. And I am the owner and manager of Snake River Oil and Gas. I live in the state of Idaho, and plan on remaining in the state of Idaho. And we're trying to be as transparent as possible. I'd be glad to sit down with anybody who wants to talk about we've presented extensively in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	have your water contaminated for life. And if that happened, Texan cowboys, they would be out of here in a heartbeat with a bankruptcy, leaving the Idaho property owners with their hands, you know, like I'm absolutely positive my place would be worth very little if the water was contaminated. There's history. You guys want to go back to history where this state, that state, this state. Well, in Pennsylvania they did drilling there, contaminated the water. Those people cannot use their water. So they have to truck it in. And that's	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	the the testimony from the two parties regarding care of their water. And one of our employees is there, Wade is in the room. He is an Idaho resident. I personally am now an Idaho resident. And I am the owner and manager of Snake River Oil and Gas. I live in the state of Idaho, and plan on remaining in the state of Idaho. And we're trying to be as transparent as possible. I'd be glad to sit down with anybody who wants to talk about we've presented extensively in front of the City of Fruitland in regard to our care of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	have your water contaminated for life. And if that happened, Texan cowboys, they would be out of here in a heartbeat with a bankruptcy, leaving the Idaho property owners with their hands, you know, like I'm absolutely positive my place would be worth very little if the water was contaminated. There's history. You guys want to go back to history where this state, that state, this state. Well, in Pennsylvania they did drilling there, contaminated the water. Those people cannot use their water. So they have to truck it in. And that's that's not good.	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	the the testimony from the two parties regarding care of their water. And one of our employees is there, Wade is in the room. He is an Idaho resident. I personally am now an Idaho resident. And I am the owner and manager of Snake River Oil and Gas. I live in the state of Idaho, and plan on remaining in the state of Idaho. And we're trying to be as transparent as possible. I'd be glad to sit down with anybody who wants to talk about we've presented extensively in front of the City of Fruitland in regard to our care of the water. We will not be under the water treatment
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 12	have your water contaminated for life. And if that happened, Texan cowboys, they would be out of here in a heartbeat with a bankruptcy, leaving the Idaho property owners with their hands, you know, like I'm absolutely positive my place would be worth very little if the water was contaminated. There's history. You guys want to go back to history where this state, that state, this state. Well, in Pennsylvania they did drilling there, contaminated the water. Those people cannot use their water. So they have to truck it in. And that's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the the testimony from the two parties regarding care of their water. And one of our employees is there, Wade is in the room. He is an Idaho resident. I personally am now an Idaho resident. And I am the owner and manager of Snake River Oil and Gas. I live in the state of Idaho, and plan on remaining in the state of Idaho. And we're trying to be as transparent as possible. I'd be glad to sit down with anybody who wants to talk about we've presented extensively in front of the City of Fruitland in regard to our care of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	have your water contaminated for life. And if that happened, Texan cowboys, they would be out of here in a heartbeat with a bankruptcy, leaving the Idaho property owners with their hands, you know, like I'm absolutely positive my place would be worth very little if the water was contaminated. There's history. You guys want to go back to history where this state, that state, this state. Well, in Pennsylvania they did drilling there, contaminated the water. Those people cannot use their water. So they have to truck it in. And that's that's not good. I'd really just like you to think about,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the the testimony from the two parties regarding care of their water. And one of our employees is there, Wade is in the room. He is an Idaho resident. I personally am now an Idaho resident. And I am the owner and manager of Snake River Oil and Gas. I live in the state of Idaho, and plan on remaining in the state of Idaho. And we're trying to be as transparent as possible. I'd be glad to sit down with anybody who wants to talk about we've presented extensively in front of the City of Fruitland in regard to our care of the water. We will not be under the water treatment facility. We're the well site is west of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	have your water contaminated for life. And if that happened, Texan cowboys, they would be out of here in a heartbeat with a bankruptcy, leaving the Idaho property owners with their hands, you know, like I'm absolutely positive my place would be worth very little if the water was contaminated. There's history. You guys want to go back to history where this state, that state, this state. Well, in Pennsylvania they did drilling there, contaminated the water. Those people cannot use their water. So they have to truck it in. And that's that's not good. I'd really just like you to think about, okay, now we're they're discussing what's reasonable	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the the testimony from the two parties regarding care of their water. And one of our employees is there, Wade is in the room. He is an Idaho resident. I personally am now an Idaho resident. And I am the owner and manager of Snake River Oil and Gas. I live in the state of Idaho, and plan on remaining in the state of Idaho. And we're trying to be as transparent as possible. I'd be glad to sit down with anybody who wants to talk about we've presented extensively in front of the City of Fruitland in regard to our care of the water. We will not be under the water treatment facility. We're the well site is west of the river excuse me, I said the well site is east of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	have your water contaminated for life. And if that happened, Texan cowboys, they would be out of here in a heartbeat with a bankruptcy, leaving the Idaho property owners with their hands, you know, like I'm absolutely positive my place would be worth very little if the water was contaminated. There's history. You guys want to go back to history where this state, that state, this state. Well, in Pennsylvania they did drilling there, contaminated the water. Those people cannot use their water. So they have to truck it in. And that's that's not good. I'd really just like you to think about, okay, now we're they're discussing what's reasonable for a payoff if it comes to be? Well, great, what's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the the testimony from the two parties regarding care of their water. And one of our employees is there, Wade is in the room. He is an Idaho resident. I personally am now an Idaho resident. And I am the owner and manager of Snake River Oil and Gas. I live in the state of Idaho, and plan on remaining in the state of Idaho. And we're trying to be as transparent as possible. I'd be glad to sit down with anybody who wants to talk about we've presented extensively in front of the City of Fruitland in regard to our care of the water. We will not be under the water treatment facility. We're the well site is west of the river excuse me, I said the well site is east of the river. All product will be moving eastbound from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	have your water contaminated for life. And if that happened, Texan cowboys, they would be out of here in a heartbeat with a bankruptcy, leaving the Idaho property owners with their hands, you know, like I'm absolutely positive my place would be worth very little if the water was contaminated. There's history. You guys want to go back to history where this state, that state, this state. Well, in Pennsylvania they did drilling there, contaminated the water. Those people cannot use their water. So they have to truck it in. And that's that's not good. I'd really just like you to think about, okay, now we're they're discussing what's reasonable for a payoff if it comes to be? Well, great, what's reasonable if our water is destroyed?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the the testimony from the two parties regarding care of their water. And one of our employees is there, Wade is in the room. He is an Idaho resident. I personally am now an Idaho resident. And I am the owner and manager of Snake River Oil and Gas. I live in the state of Idaho, and plan on remaining in the state of Idaho. And we're trying to be as transparent as possible. I'd be glad to sit down with anybody who wants to talk about we've presented extensively in front of the City of Fruitland in regard to our care of the water. We will not be under the water treatment facility. We're the well site is west of the river excuse me, I said the well site is east of the river. All product will be moving eastbound from the location, so we do not plan and we have all kinds
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 have your water contaminated for life. And if that happened, Texan cowboys, they would be out of here in a heartbeat with a bankruptcy, leaving the Idaho property owners with their hands, you know, like I'm absolutely positive my place would be worth very little if the water was contaminated. There's history. You guys want to go back to history where this state, that state, this state. Well, in Pennsylvania they did drilling there, contaminated the water. Those people cannot use their water. So they have to truck it in. And that's that's not good. I'd really just like you to think about, okay, now we're they're discussing what's reasonable for a payoff if it comes to be? Well, great, what's reasonable if our water is destroyed? As an owner of property and I'm much like the other lady that spoke, it's everything I have. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the the testimony from the two parties regarding care of their water. And one of our employees is there, Wade is in the room. He is an Idaho resident. I personally am now an Idaho resident. And I am the owner and manager of Snake River Oil and Gas. I live in the state of Idaho, and plan on remaining in the state of Idaho. And we're trying to be as transparent as possible. I'd be glad to sit down with anybody who wants to talk about we've presented extensively in front of the City of Fruitland in regard to our care of the water. We will not be under the water treatment facility. We're the well site is west of the river excuse me, I said the well site is east of the river. All product will be moving eastbound from the location, so we do not plan and we have all kinds of protections in place to avoid any product getting
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 have your water contaminated for life. And if that happened, Texan cowboys, they would be out of here in a heartbeat with a bankruptcy, leaving the Idaho property owners with their hands, you know, like I'm absolutely positive my place would be worth very little if the water was contaminated. There's history. You guys want to go back to history where this state, that state, this state. Well, in Pennsylvania they did drilling there, contaminated the water. Those people cannot use their water. So they have to truck it in. And that's that's not good. I'd really just like you to think about, okay, now we're they're discussing what's reasonable for a payoff if it comes to be? Well, great, what's reasonable if our water is destroyed? As an owner of property and I'm much like the other lady that spoke, it's everything I have. And if it goes down the tube, you know, I won't live long enough to argue it out, because the system is 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the the testimony from the two parties regarding care of their water. And one of our employees is there, Wade is in the room. He is an Idaho resident. I personally am now an Idaho resident. And I am the owner and manager of Snake River Oil and Gas. I live in the state of Idaho, and plan on remaining in the state of Idaho. And we're trying to be as transparent as possible. I'd be glad to sit down with anybody who wants to talk about we've presented extensively in front of the City of Fruitland in regard to our care of the water. We will not be under the water treatment facility. We're the well site is west of the river excuse me, I said the well site is east of the river. All product will be moving eastbound from the location, so we do not plan and we have all kinds of protections in place to avoid any product getting into any in any way infringing on this water supply or or the river itself. We've got berms. We've got multiple and they're redundant safeguards in place
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	have your water contaminated for life. And if that happened, Texan cowboys, they would be out of here in a heartbeat with a bankruptcy, leaving the Idaho property owners with their hands, you know, like I'm absolutely positive my place would be worth very little if the water was contaminated. There's history. You guys want to go back to history where this state, that state, this state. Well, in Pennsylvania they did drilling there, contaminated the water. Those people cannot use their water. So they have to truck it in. And that's that's not good. I'd really just like you to think about, okay, now we're they're discussing what's reasonable for a payoff if it comes to be? Well, great, what's reasonable if our water is destroyed? As an owner of property and I'm much like the other lady that spoke, it's everything I have. And if it goes down the tube, you know, I won't live long enough to argue it out, because the system is almost encouraged I think it's a little, good ole	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the the testimony from the two parties regarding care of their water. And one of our employees is there, Wade is in the room. He is an Idaho resident. I personally am now an Idaho resident. And I am the owner and manager of Snake River Oil and Gas. I live in the state of Idaho, and plan on remaining in the state of Idaho. And we're trying to be as transparent as possible. I'd be glad to sit down with anybody who wants to talk about we've presented extensively in front of the City of Fruitland in regard to our care of the water. We will not be under the water treatment facility. We're the well site is west of the river excuse me, I said the well site is east of the river. All product will be moving eastbound from the location, so we do not plan and we have all kinds of protections in place to avoid any product getting into any in any way infringing on this water supply or or the river itself. We've got berms. We've got multiple and they're redundant safeguards in place that are required by multiple agencies.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	have your water contaminated for life. And if that happened, Texan cowboys, they would be out of here in a heartbeat with a bankruptcy, leaving the Idaho property owners with their hands, you know, like I'm absolutely positive my place would be worth very little if the water was contaminated. There's history. You guys want to go back to history where this state, that state, this state. Well, in Pennsylvania they did drilling there, contaminated the water. Those people cannot use their water. So they have to truck it in. And that's that's not good. I'd really just like you to think about, okay, now we're they're discussing what's reasonable for a payoff if it comes to be? Well, great, what's reasonable if our water is destroyed? As an owner of property and I'm much like the other lady that spoke, it's everything I have. And if it goes down the tube, you know, I won't live long enough to argue it out, because the system is almost encouraged I think it's a little, good ole boy system with the attorneys that let's drag it out.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the the testimony from the two parties regarding care of their water. And one of our employees is there, Wade is in the room. He is an Idaho resident. I personally am now an Idaho resident. And I am the owner and manager of Snake River Oil and Gas. I live in the state of Idaho, and plan on remaining in the state of Idaho. And we're trying to be as transparent as possible. I'd be glad to sit down with anybody who wants to talk about we've presented extensively in front of the City of Fruitland in regard to our care of the water. We will not be under the water treatment facility. We're the well site is west of the river excuse me, I said the well site is east of the river. All product will be moving eastbound from the location, so we do not plan and we have all kinds of protections in place to avoid any product getting into any in any way infringing on this water supply or or the river itself. We've got berms. We've got multiple and they're redundant safeguards in place that are required by multiple agencies. And I would comment as to other states,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	have your water contaminated for life. And if that happened, Texan cowboys, they would be out of here in a heartbeat with a bankruptcy, leaving the Idaho property owners with their hands, you know, like I'm absolutely positive my place would be worth very little if the water was contaminated. There's history. You guys want to go back to history where this state, that state, this state. Well, in Pennsylvania they did drilling there, contaminated the water. Those people cannot use their water. So they have to truck it in. And that's that's not good. I'd really just like you to think about, okay, now we're they're discussing what's reasonable for a payoff if it comes to be? Well, great, what's reasonable if our water is destroyed? As an owner of property and I'm much like the other lady that spoke, it's everything I have. And if it goes down the tube, you know, I won't live long enough to argue it out, because the system is almost encouraged I think it's a little, good ole boy system with the attorneys that let's drag it out. Let's drag it out. We don't make enough money if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the the testimony from the two parties regarding care of their water. And one of our employees is there, Wade is in the room. He is an Idaho resident. I personally am now an Idaho resident. And I am the owner and manager of Snake River Oil and Gas. I live in the state of Idaho, and plan on remaining in the state of Idaho. And we're trying to be as transparent as possible. I'd be glad to sit down with anybody who wants to talk about we've presented extensively in front of the City of Fruitland in regard to our care of the water. We will not be under the water treatment facility. We're the well site is west of the river excuse me, I said the well site is east of the river. All product will be moving eastbound from the location, so we do not plan and we have all kinds of protections in place to avoid any product getting into any in any way infringing on this water supply or or the river itself. We've got berms. We've got multiple and they're redundant safeguards in place that are required by multiple agencies. And I would comment as to other states, Idaho we operate in multiple other states. Idaho's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	have your water contaminated for life. And if that happened, Texan cowboys, they would be out of here in a heartbeat with a bankruptcy, leaving the Idaho property owners with their hands, you know, like I'm absolutely positive my place would be worth very little if the water was contaminated. There's history. You guys want to go back to history where this state, that state, this state. Well, in Pennsylvania they did drilling there, contaminated the water. Those people cannot use their water. So they have to truck it in. And that's that's not good. I'd really just like you to think about, okay, now we're they're discussing what's reasonable for a payoff if it comes to be? Well, great, what's reasonable if our water is destroyed? As an owner of property and I'm much like the other lady that spoke, it's everything I have. And if it goes down the tube, you know, I won't live long enough to argue it out, because the system is almost encouraged I think it's a little, good ole boy system with the attorneys that let's drag it out.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the the testimony from the two parties regarding care of their water. And one of our employees is there, Wade is in the room. He is an Idaho resident. I personally am now an Idaho resident. And I am the owner and manager of Snake River Oil and Gas. I live in the state of Idaho, and plan on remaining in the state of Idaho. And we're trying to be as transparent as possible. I'd be glad to sit down with anybody who wants to talk about we've presented extensively in front of the City of Fruitland in regard to our care of the water. We will not be under the water treatment facility. We're the well site is west of the river excuse me, I said the well site is east of the river. All product will be moving eastbound from the location, so we do not plan and we have all kinds of protections in place to avoid any product getting into any in any way infringing on this water supply or or the river itself. We've got berms. We've got multiple and they're redundant safeguards in place that are required by multiple agencies. And I would comment as to other states,

	Page 30
1	of me, but I'd be glad to sit down with anybody and go
	over those things. And I am here, and I'll be glad
	Wade is there, and he'd be glad to give his number or
	my number if somebody would like to visit with us
	outside of outside of this setting.
	ũ là chí
6	Thank you.
7	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Brown.
8	I'd also like to thank everyone for
9	participating today. I will take this matter under
10	
11	days calendar days of this hearing, which I believe
12	is July 21st.
13	This adjourns our hearing. Thank you very
14	much.
15	Mr. Gozzo, you can stop recording.
16	(End of audio file.)
17	-000-
	-000-
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
2	
2 3	I, JEFF LAMAR, CSR No. 640, Certified Shorthand
2 3 4	I, JEFF LAMAR, CSR No. 640, Certified Shorthand Reporter, certify:
2 3 4 5	I, JEFF LAMAR, CSR No. 640, Certified Shorthand Reporter, certify: That the audio recording of the proceedings were
2 3 4	I, JEFF LAMAR, CSR No. 640, Certified Shorthand Reporter, certify:
2 3 4 5	I, JEFF LAMAR, CSR No. 640, Certified Shorthand Reporter, certify: That the audio recording of the proceedings were
2 3 4 5 6	I, JEFF LAMAR, CSR No. 640, Certified Shorthand Reporter, certify: That the audio recording of the proceedings were transcribed by me or under my direction.
2 3 4 5 6 7	I, JEFF LAMAR, CSR No. 640, Certified Shorthand Reporter, certify: That the audio recording of the proceedings were transcribed by me or under my direction. That the foregoing is a true and correct
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I, JEFF LaMAR, CSR No. 640, Certified Shorthand Reporter, certify: That the audio recording of the proceedings were transcribed by me or under my direction. That the foregoing is a true and correct transcription of all testimony given, to the best of my ability.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I, JEFF LAMAR, CSR No. 640, Certified Shorthand Reporter, certify: That the audio recording of the proceedings were transcribed by me or under my direction. That the foregoing is a true and correct transcription of all testimony given, to the best of my ability. I further certify that I am not a relative or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I, JEFF LaMAR, CSR No. 640, Certified Shorthand Reporter, certify: That the audio recording of the proceedings were transcribed by me or under my direction. That the foregoing is a true and correct transcription of all testimony given, to the best of my ability. I further certify that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or party, nor am I financially
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<pre>I, JEFF LaMAR, CSR No. 640, Certified Shorthand Reporter, certify: That the audio recording of the proceedings were transcribed by me or under my direction. That the foregoing is a true and correct transcription of all testimony given, to the best of my ability. I further certify that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or party, nor am I financially interested in the action.</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I, JEFF LaMAR, CSR No. 640, Certified Shorthand Reporter, certify: That the audio recording of the proceedings were transcribed by me or under my direction. That the foregoing is a true and correct transcription of all testimony given, to the best of my ability. I further certify that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or party, nor am I financially interested in the action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I set my hand and seal this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<pre>I, JEFF LaMAR, CSR No. 640, Certified Shorthand Reporter, certify: That the audio recording of the proceedings were transcribed by me or under my direction. That the foregoing is a true and correct transcription of all testimony given, to the best of my ability. I further certify that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or party, nor am I financially interested in the action.</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I, JEFF LaMAR, CSR No. 640, Certified Shorthand Reporter, certify: That the audio recording of the proceedings were transcribed by me or under my direction. That the foregoing is a true and correct transcription of all testimony given, to the best of my ability. I further certify that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or party, nor am I financially interested in the action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I set my hand and seal this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I, JEFF LaMAR, CSR No. 640, Certified Shorthand Reporter, certify: That the audio recording of the proceedings were transcribed by me or under my direction. That the foregoing is a true and correct transcription of all testimony given, to the best of my ability. I further certify that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or party, nor am I financially interested in the action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I set my hand and seal this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	I, JEFF LaMAR, CSR No. 640, Certified Shorthand Reporter, certify: That the audio recording of the proceedings were transcribed by me or under my direction. That the foregoing is a true and correct transcription of all testimony given, to the best of my ability. I further certify that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or party, nor am I financially interested in the action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I set my hand and seal this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I, JEFF LaMAR, CSR No. 640, Certified Shorthand Reporter, certify: That the audio recording of the proceedings were transcribed by me or under my direction. That the foregoing is a true and correct transcription of all testimony given, to the best of my ability. I further certify that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or party, nor am I financially interested in the action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I set my hand and seal this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I, JEFF LaMAR, CSR No. 640, Certified Shorthand Reporter, certify: That the audio recording of the proceedings were transcribed by me or under my direction. That the foregoing is a true and correct transcription of all testimony given, to the best of my ability. I further certify that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or party, nor am I financially interested in the action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I set my hand and seal this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	I, JEFF LaMAR, CSR No. 640, Certified Shorthand Reporter, certify: That the audio recording of the proceedings were transcribed by me or under my direction. That the foregoing is a true and correct transcription of all testimony given, to the best of my ability. I further certify that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or party, nor am I financially interested in the action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I set my hand and seal this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I, JEFF LAMAR, CSR No. 640, Certified Shorthand Reporter, certify: That the audio recording of the proceedings were transcribed by me or under my direction. That the foregoing is a true and correct transcription of all testimony given, to the best of my ability. I further certify that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or party, nor am I financially interested in the action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I set my hand and seal this 6th day of July, 2021.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I, JEFF LAMAR, CSR No. 640, Certified Shorthand Reporter, certify: That the audio recording of the proceedings were transcribed by me or under my direction. That the foregoing is a true and correct transcription of all testimony given, to the best of my ability. I further certify that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or party, nor am I financially interested in the action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I set my hand and seal this 6th day of July, 2021. JEFF LAMAR, CSR NO. 640
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I, JEFF LAMAR, CSR No. 640, Certified Shorthand Reporter, certify: That the audio recording of the proceedings were transcribed by me or under my direction. That the foregoing is a true and correct transcription of all testimony given, to the best of my ability. I further certify that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or party, nor am I financially interested in the action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I set my hand and seal this 6th day of July, 2021. JEFF LaMAR, CSR NO. 640 Notary Public
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I, JEFF LAMAR, CSR No. 640, Certified Shorthand Reporter, certify: That the audio recording of the proceedings were transcribed by me or under my direction. That the foregoing is a true and correct transcription of all testimony given, to the best of my ability. I further certify that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or party, nor am I financially interested in the action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I set my hand and seal this 6th day of July, 2021. JEFF LAMAR, CSR NO. 640 Notary Public Post Office Box 2636
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I, JEFF LAMAR, CSR No. 640, Certified Shorthand Reporter, certify: That the audio recording of the proceedings were transcribed by me or under my direction. That the foregoing is a true and correct transcription of all testimony given, to the best of my ability. I further certify that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or party, nor am I financially interested in the action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I set my hand and seal this 6th day of July, 2021. JEFF LaMAR, CSR NO. 640 Notary Public
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I, JEFF LAMAR, CSR No. 640, Certified Shorthand Reporter, certify: That the audio recording of the proceedings were transcribed by me or under my direction. That the foregoing is a true and correct transcription of all testimony given, to the best of my ability. I further certify that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or party, nor am I financially interested in the action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I set my hand and seal this 6th day of July, 2021. JEFF LAMAR, CSR NO. 640 Notary Public Post Office Box 2636

			June 21, 202
	- 17:17;18:8;24:9,18;29:21	27:20	12:4
r	agency (3)	argument (6)	Bonney (6)
[- 12:4,16;18:6	9:5;11:8,18;18:18;21:3,14	8:7,10,11;21:21,23,25
	agreements (1)	arguments (3)	Bonnie (1)
[phonetic] (2)	23:16	9:3;21:21;26:5	7:8
7:8,9			
[unintelligible] (10)	ahead (10)	arising (1)	bonus (3)
4:6;5:16;10:6,22;23:12;25:2,	5:12;7:1;9:7;19:1,2,3;23:7;	17:23	13:13,14;15:2
10;26:20;27:24;28:1	26:18;28:15,17	around (2)	bore (4)
	- air (1)	12:1;23:16	10:1,15,23,25
Α	20:21	assumed (2)	both (2)
	- Alan (1)	16:19;17:21	28:25,25
abandoning (1)	6:20	attempt (1)	bought (3)
24:5	Aligned (1)	24:17	16:7,8;20:1
	7:10	attended (1)	boy (1)
able (2)	allowed (1)	19:14	27:22
6:11,13	26:24	attendee (3)	break (1)
absolutely (1)			5:2
27:5	allows (1)	6:11;7:19;28:12	
accept (1)	23:2	attorney (2)	brief (3)
14:6	almost (1)	8:3;21:5	21:7,7,18
Accountability (1)	27:21	attorneys (1)	briefing (5)
7:11	alternative (1)	27:22	9:10;11:11;14:20;15:17;25:6
accounted (2)	25:4	audio (4)	briefs (1)
15:25;16:3	alternatives (3)	4:1,8;6:3;30:16	11:18
	25:9,11,13	avoid (1)	Brown (7)
Accounting (1)	Altman (1)	29:17	19:21,24;28:13,15,19,20;
17:25	7:8	away (1)	30:7
acre (1)		20:9	built (1)
26:25	amazing (1)	20:9	
across (1)	4:20	р	20:3
23:21	amount (1)	B	Burtorovich (1)
activity (1)	15:2		7:9
10:9	Anchustegui (1)	back (4)	
actually (3)	7:7	25:1,17;27:7;28:2	С
5:8;15:21;23:20	antithetical (1)	bad (2)	
Adair (1)	22:24	20:17,18	calendar (1)
	Antonio (1)	bankruptcy (3)	30:11
7:4	7:6	16:9;20:13;27:3	California (1)
adding (1)	apologize (2)	bare (2)	20:16
	apologize (2)	$\operatorname{Dale}(2)$	
17:14	4.10.0.7	12.7.20	
Addison (1)	4:10;9:7	12:7,20 Barlam (2)	call (1)
Addison (1) 7:6	appeal (1)	Barlow (2)	call (1) 5:4
Addison (1) 7:6	appeal (1) 15:7	Barlow (2) 9:15;19:15	call (1) 5:4 came (1)
Addison (1) 7:6 addition (4)	appeal (1) 15:7 appearances (2)	Barlow (2) 9:15;19:15 basis (2)	call (1) 5:4 came (1) 11:18
Addison (1) 7:6 addition (4) 12:15,17,20,23	appeal (1) 15:7 appearances (2) 5:3;9:2	Barlow (2) 9:15;19:15 basis (2) 23:20;25:11	call (1) 5:4 came (1)
Addison (1) 7:6 addition (4) 12:15,17,20,23 address (4)	appeal (1) 15:7 appearances (2)	Barlow (2) 9:15;19:15 basis (2)	call (1) 5:4 came (1) 11:18
Addison (1) 7:6 addition (4) 12:15,17,20,23 address (4) 17:23;18:10;22:9;25:25	appeal (1) 15:7 appearances (2) 5:3;9:2	Barlow (2) 9:15;19:15 basis (2) 23:20;25:11	call (1) 5:4 came (1) 11:18 can (20)
Addison (1) 7:6 addition (4) 12:15,17,20,23 address (4) 17:23;18:10;22:9;25:25 addressed (3)	appeal (1) 15:7 appearances (2) 5:3;9:2 appearing (1) 8:4	Barlow (2) 9:15;19:15 basis (2) 23:20;25:11 becomes (2) 12:6,10	call (1) 5:4 came (1) 11:18 can (20) 4:13,18;5:12;6:13,16,18,22; 7:14;10:24;16:19;20:11,18;
Addison (1) 7:6 addition (4) 12:15,17,20,23 address (4) 17:23;18:10;22:9;25:25 addressed (3) 10:18;11:3;18:5	appeal (1) 15:7 appearances (2) 5:3;9:2 appearing (1) 8:4 appears (2)	Barlow (2) 9:15;19:15 basis (2) 23:20;25:11 becomes (2) 12:6,10 begin (2)	call (1) 5:4 came (1) 11:18 can (20) 4:13,18;5:12;6:13,16,18,22; 7:14;10:24;16:19;20:11,18; 23:18,22,22;24:6,12;26:15;
Addison (1) 7:6 addition (4) 12:15,17,20,23 address (4) 17:23;18:10;22:9;25:25 addressed (3) 10:18;11:3;18:5 adjourns (1)	appeal (1) 15:7 appearances (2) 5:3;9:2 appearing (1) 8:4 appears (2) 13:3,8	Barlow (2) 9:15;19:15 basis (2) 23:20;25:11 becomes (2) 12:6,10 begin (2) 9:3;25:3	call (1) 5:4 came (1) 11:18 can (20) 4:13,18;5:12;6:13,16,18,22; 7:14;10:24;16:19;20:11,18; 23:18,22,22;24:6,12;26:15; 28:15;30:15
Addison (1) 7:6 addition (4) 12:15,17,20,23 address (4) 17:23;18:10;22:9;25:25 addressed (3) 10:18;11:3;18:5 adjourns (1) 30:13	appeal (1) 15:7 appearances (2) 5:3;9:2 appearing (1) 8:4 appears (2) 13:3,8 applicable (1)	Barlow (2) 9:15;19:15 basis (2) 23:20;25:11 becomes (2) 12:6,10 begin (2) 9:3;25:3 Beginning (1)	call (1) 5:4 came (1) 11:18 can (20) 4:13,18;5:12;6:13,16,18,22; 7:14;10:24;16:19;20:11,18; 23:18,22,22;24:6,12;26:15; 28:15;30:15 car (1)
Addison (1) 7:6 addition (4) 12:15,17,20,23 address (4) 17:23;18:10;22:9;25:25 addressed (3) 10:18;11:3;18:5 adjourns (1) 30:13 administer (2)	appeal (1) 15:7 appearances (2) 5:3;9:2 appearing (1) 8:4 appears (2) 13:3,8 applicable (1) 21:9	Barlow (2) 9:15;19:15 basis (2) 23:20;25:11 becomes (2) 12:6,10 begin (2) 9:3;25:3 Beginning (1) 4:1	call (1) 5:4 came (1) 11:18 can (20) 4:13,18;5:12;6:13,16,18,22; 7:14;10:24;16:19;20:11,18; 23:18,22,22;24:6,12;26:15; 28:15;30:15 car (1) 19:9
Addison (1) 7:6 addition (4) 12:15,17,20,23 address (4) 17:23;18:10;22:9;25:25 addressed (3) 10:18;11:3;18:5 adjourns (1) 30:13 administer (2) 24:12,18	appeal (1) 15:7 appearances (2) 5:3;9:2 appearing (1) 8:4 appears (2) 13:3,8 applicable (1) 21:9 applicant (1)	Barlow (2) 9:15;19:15 basis (2) 23:20;25:11 becomes (2) 12:6,10 begin (2) 9:3;25:3 Beginning (1) 4:1 behalf (4)	call (1) 5:4 came (1) 11:18 can (20) 4:13,18;5:12;6:13,16,18,22; 7:14;10:24;16:19;20:11,18; 23:18,22,22;24:6,12;26:15; 28:15;30:15 car (1) 19:9 care (2)
Addison (1) 7:6 addition (4) 12:15,17,20,23 address (4) 17:23;18:10;22:9;25:25 addressed (3) 10:18;11:3;18:5 adjourns (1) 30:13 administer (2) 24:12,18	appeal (1) 15:7 appearances (2) 5:3;9:2 appearing (1) 8:4 appears (2) 13:3,8 applicable (1) 21:9 applicant (1) 9:10	Barlow (2) 9:15;19:15 basis (2) 23:20;25:11 becomes (2) 12:6,10 begin (2) 9:3;25:3 Beginning (1) 4:1 behalf (4) 8:4,24;9:10;21:3	call (1) 5:4 came (1) 11:18 can (20) 4:13,18;5:12;6:13,16,18,22; 7:14;10:24;16:19;20:11,18; 23:18,22,22;24:6,12;26:15; 28:15;30:15 car (1) 19:9 care (2) 29:2,11
Addison (1) 7:6 addition (4) 12:15,17,20,23 address (4) 17:23;18:10;22:9;25:25 addressed (3) 10:18;11:3;18:5 adjourns (1) 30:13 administer (2) 24:12,18	appeal (1) 15:7 appearances (2) 5:3;9:2 appearing (1) 8:4 appears (2) 13:3,8 applicable (1) 21:9 applicant (1) 9:10 application (3)	Barlow (2) 9:15;19:15 basis (2) 23:20;25:11 becomes (2) 12:6,10 begin (2) 9:3;25:3 Beginning (1) 4:1 behalf (4) 8:4,24;9:10;21:3 behind (1)	call (1) 5:4 came (1) 11:18 can (20) 4:13,18;5:12;6:13,16,18,22; 7:14;10:24;16:19;20:11,18; 23:18,22,22;24:6,12;26:15; 28:15;30:15 car (1) 19:9 care (2) 29:2,11 case (11)
Addison (1) 7:6 addition (4) 12:15,17,20,23 address (4) 17:23;18:10;22:9;25:25 addressed (3) 10:18;11:3;18:5 adjourns (1) 30:13 administer (2) 24:12,18 administrative (2) 12:4;21:9	appeal (1) 15:7 appearances (2) 5:3;9:2 appearing (1) 8:4 appears (2) 13:3,8 applicable (1) 21:9 applicant (1) 9:10	Barlow (2) 9:15;19:15 basis (2) 23:20;25:11 becomes (2) 12:6,10 begin (2) 9:3;25:3 Beginning (1) 4:1 behalf (4) 8:4,24;9:10;21:3 behind (1) 28:2	call (1) 5:4 came (1) 11:18 can (20) 4:13,18;5:12;6:13,16,18,22; 7:14;10:24;16:19;20:11,18; 23:18,22,22;24:6,12;26:15; 28:15;30:15 car (1) 19:9 care (2) 29:2,11 case (11) 10:10;13:3;14:9,22;16:23;
Addison (1) 7:6 addition (4) 12:15,17,20,23 address (4) 17:23;18:10;22:9;25:25 addressed (3) 10:18;11:3;18:5 adjourns (1) 30:13 administer (2) 24:12,18 administrative (2) 12:4;21:9 Administrator (7)	appeal (1) 15:7 appearances (2) 5:3;9:2 appearing (1) 8:4 appears (2) 13:3,8 applicable (1) 21:9 applicant (1) 9:10 application (3)	Barlow (2) 9:15;19:15 basis (2) 23:20;25:11 becomes (2) 12:6,10 begin (2) 9:3;25:3 Beginning (1) 4:1 behalf (4) 8:4,24;9:10;21:3 behind (1)	call (1) 5:4 came (1) 11:18 can (20) 4:13,18;5:12;6:13,16,18,22; 7:14;10:24;16:19;20:11,18; 23:18,22,22;24:6,12;26:15; 28:15;30:15 car (1) 19:9 care (2) 29:2,11 case (11)
Addison (1) 7:6 addition (4) 12:15,17,20,23 address (4) 17:23;18:10;22:9;25:25 addressed (3) 10:18;11:3;18:5 adjourns (1) 30:13 administer (2) 24:12,18 administrative (2) 12:4;21:9 Administrator (7) 4:5;9:6;12:16;13:9;14:17,23;	appeal (1) 15:7 appearances (2) 5:3;9:2 appearing (1) 8:4 appears (2) 13:3,8 applicable (1) 21:9 applicant (1) 9:10 application (3) 9:14;12:24;13:14	Barlow (2) 9:15;19:15 basis (2) 23:20;25:11 becomes (2) 12:6,10 begin (2) 9:3;25:3 Beginning (1) 4:1 behalf (4) 8:4,24;9:10;21:3 behind (1) 28:2	call (1) 5:4 came (1) 11:18 can (20) 4:13,18;5:12;6:13,16,18,22; 7:14;10:24;16:19;20:11,18; 23:18,22,22;24:6,12;26:15; 28:15;30:15 car (1) 19:9 care (2) 29:2,11 case (11) 10:10;13:3;14:9,22;16:23;
Addison (1) 7:6 addition (4) 12:15,17,20,23 address (4) 17:23;18:10;22:9;25:25 addressed (3) 10:18;11:3;18:5 adjourns (1) 30:13 administer (2) 24:12,18 administrative (2) 12:4;21:9 Administrator (7) 4:5;9:6;12:16;13:9;14:17,23; 18:3	appeal (1) 15:7 appearances (2) 5:3;9:2 appearing (1) 8:4 appears (2) 13:3,8 applicable (1) 21:9 applicant (1) 9:10 application (3) 9:14;12:24;13:14 apply (2) 14:21;24:11	Barlow (2) 9:15;19:15 basis (2) 23:20;25:11 becomes (2) 12:6,10 begin (2) 9:3;25:3 Beginning (1) 4:1 behalf (4) 8:4,24;9:10;21:3 behind (1) 28:2 below (1) 10:8	call (1) 5:4 came (1) 11:18 can (20) 4:13,18;5:12;6:13,16,18,22; 7:14;10:24;16:19;20:11,18; 23:18,22,22;24:6,12;26:15; 28:15;30:15 car (1) 19:9 care (2) 29:2,11 case (11) 10:10;13:3;14:9,22;16:23; 17:1,13;19:16,18,20;23:20 casing (1)
Addison (1) 7:6 addition (4) 12:15,17,20,23 address (4) 17:23;18:10;22:9;25:25 addressed (3) 10:18;11:3;18:5 adjourns (1) 30:13 administer (2) 24:12,18 administrative (2) 12:4;21:9 Administrator (7) 4:5;9:6;12:16;13:9;14:17,23; 18:3 advisement (1)	appeal (1) 15:7 appearances (2) 5:3;9:2 appearing (1) 8:4 appears (2) 13:3,8 applicable (1) 21:9 applicant (1) 9:10 application (3) 9:14;12:24;13:14 apply (2) 14:21;24:11 applying (1)	Barlow (2) 9:15;19:15 basis (2) 23:20;25:11 becomes (2) 12:6,10 begin (2) 9:3;25:3 Beginning (1) 4:1 behalf (4) 8:4,24;9:10;21:3 behind (1) 28:2 below (1) 10:8 berms (1)	call (1) 5:4 came (1) 11:18 can (20) 4:13,18;5:12;6:13,16,18,22; 7:14;10:24;16:19;20:11,18; 23:18,22,22;24:6,12;26:15; 28:15;30:15 car (1) 19:9 care (2) 29:2,11 case (11) 10:10;13:3;14:9,22;16:23; 17:1,13;19:16,18,20;23:20 casing (1) 24:4
Addison (1) 7:6 addition (4) 12:15,17,20,23 address (4) 17:23;18:10;22:9;25:25 addressed (3) 10:18;11:3;18:5 adjourns (1) 30:13 administer (2) 24:12,18 administrative (2) 12:4;21:9 Administrator (7) 4:5;9:6;12:16;13:9;14:17,23; 18:3 advisement (1) 30:10	appeal (1) 15:7 appearances (2) 5:3;9:2 appearing (1) 8:4 appears (2) 13:3,8 applicable (1) 21:9 applicant (1) 9:10 application (3) 9:14;12:24;13:14 apply (2) 14:21;24:11 applying (1) 12:2	Barlow (2) 9:15;19:15 basis (2) 23:20;25:11 becomes (2) 12:6,10 begin (2) 9:3;25:3 Beginning (1) 4:1 behalf (4) 8:4,24;9:10;21:3 behind (1) 28:2 below (1) 10:8 berms (1) 29:19	call (1) 5:4 came (1) 11:18 can (20) 4:13,18;5:12;6:13,16,18,22; 7:14;10:24;16:19;20:11,18; 23:18,22,22;24:6,12;26:15; 28:15;30:15 car (1) 19:9 care (2) 29:2,11 case (11) 10:10;13:3;14:9,22;16:23; 17:1,13;19:16,18,20;23:20 casing (1) 24:4 cause (1)
Addison (1) 7:6 addition (4) 12:15,17,20,23 address (4) 17:23;18:10;22:9;25:25 addressed (3) 10:18;11:3;18:5 adjourns (1) 30:13 administer (2) 24:12,18 administrative (2) 12:4;21:9 Administrator (7) 4:5;9:6;12:16;13:9;14:17,23; 18:3 advisement (1) 30:10 afternoon (2)	appeal (1) 15:7 appearances (2) 5:3;9:2 appearing (1) 8:4 appears (2) 13:3,8 applicable (1) 21:9 applicant (1) 9:10 application (3) 9:14;12:24;13:14 apply (2) 14:21;24:11 applying (1) 12:2 appointment (1)	Barlow (2) 9:15;19:15 basis (2) 23:20;25:11 becomes (2) 12:6,10 begin (2) 9:3;25:3 Beginning (1) 4:1 behalf (4) 8:4,24;9:10;21:3 behind (1) 28:2 below (1) 10:8 berms (1) 29:19 better (3)	call (1) 5:4 came (1) 11:18 can (20) 4:13,18;5:12;6:13,16,18,22; 7:14;10:24;16:19;20:11,18; 23:18,22,22;24:6,12;26:15; 28:15;30:15 car (1) 19:9 care (2) 29:2,11 case (11) 10:10;13:3;14:9,22;16:23; 17:1,13;19:16,18,20;23:20 casing (1) 24:4 cause (1) 9:18
Addison (1) 7:6 addition (4) 12:15,17,20,23 address (4) 17:23;18:10;22:9;25:25 addressed (3) 10:18;11:3;18:5 adjourns (1) 30:13 administer (2) 24:12,18 administrative (2) 12:4;21:9 Administrator (7) 4:5;9:6;12:16;13:9;14:17,23; 18:3 advisement (1) 30:10 afternoon (2) 8:1;28:20	appeal (1) 15:7 appearances (2) 5:3;9:2 appearing (1) 8:4 appears (2) 13:3,8 applicable (1) 21:9 applicant (1) 9:10 application (3) 9:14;12:24;13:14 apply (2) 14:21;24:11 applying (1) 12:2 appointment (1) 19:6	Barlow (2) 9:15;19:15 basis (2) 23:20;25:11 becomes (2) 12:6,10 begin (2) 9:3;25:3 Beginning (1) 4:1 behalf (4) 8:4,24;9:10;21:3 behind (1) 28:2 below (1) 10:8 berms (1) 29:19 better (3) 4:12,16;22:23	call (1) 5:4 came (1) 11:18 can (20) 4:13,18;5:12;6:13,16,18,22; 7:14;10:24;16:19;20:11,18; 23:18,22,22;24:6,12;26:15; 28:15;30:15 car (1) 19:9 care (2) 29:2,11 case (11) 10:10;13:3;14:9,22;16:23; 17:1,13;19:16,18,20;23:20 casing (1) 24:4 cause (1) 9:18 CC-2021-OGR-01-001 (1)
Addison (1) 7:6 addition (4) 12:15,17,20,23 address (4) 17:23;18:10;22:9;25:25 addressed (3) 10:18;11:3;18:5 adjourns (1) 30:13 administer (2) 24:12,18 administrative (2) 12:4;21:9 Administrator (7) 4:5;9:6;12:16;13:9;14:17,23; 18:3 advisement (1) 30:10 afternoon (2) 8:1;28:20	appeal (1) 15:7 appearances (2) 5:3;9:2 appearing (1) 8:4 appears (2) 13:3,8 applicable (1) 21:9 applicant (1) 9:10 application (3) 9:14;12:24;13:14 apply (2) 14:21;24:11 applying (1) 12:2 appointment (1) 19:6 appreciate (2)	Barlow (2) 9:15;19:15 basis (2) 23:20;25:11 becomes (2) 12:6,10 begin (2) 9:3;25:3 Beginning (1) 4:1 behalf (4) 8:4,24;9:10;21:3 behind (1) 28:2 below (1) 10:8 berms (1) 29:19 better (3) 4:12,16;22:23 beyond (3)	call (1) 5:4 came (1) 11:18 can (20) 4:13,18;5:12;6:13,16,18,22; 7:14;10:24;16:19;20:11,18; 23:18,22,22;24:6,12;26:15; 28:15;30:15 car (1) 19:9 care (2) 29:2,11 case (11) 10:10;13:3;14:9,22;16:23; 17:1,13;19:16,18,20;23:20 casing (1) 24:4 cause (1) 9:18 CC-2021-OGR-01-001 (1) 9:16
Addison (1) 7:6 addition (4) 12:15,17,20,23 address (4) 17:23;18:10;22:9;25:25 addressed (3) 10:18;11:3;18:5 adjourns (1) 30:13 administret (2) 24:12,18 administrative (2) 12:4;21:9 Administrator (7) 4:5;9:6;12:16;13:9;14:17,23; 18:3 advisement (1) 30:10 afternoon (2)	appeal (1) 15:7 appearances (2) 5:3;9:2 appearing (1) 8:4 appears (2) 13:3,8 applicable (1) 21:9 applicant (1) 9:10 application (3) 9:14;12:24;13:14 apply (2) 14:21;24:11 applying (1) 12:2 appointment (1) 19:6 appreciate (2) 15:20;28:25	Barlow (2) 9:15;19:15 basis (2) 23:20;25:11 becomes (2) 12:6,10 begin (2) 9:3;25:3 Beginning (1) 4:1 behalf (4) 8:4,24;9:10;21:3 behind (1) 28:2 below (1) 10:8 berms (1) 29:19 better (3) 4:12,16;22:23 beyond (3) 15:9,9,16	call (1) 5:4 came (1) 11:18 can (20) 4:13,18;5:12;6:13,16,18,22; 7:14;10:24;16:19;20:11,18; 23:18,22,22;24:6,12;26:15; 28:15;30:15 car (1) 19:9 care (2) 29:2,11 case (11) 10:10;13:3;14:9,22;16:23; 17:1,13;19:16,18,20;23:20 casing (1) 24:4 cause (1) 9:18 CC-2021-OGR-01-001 (1) 9:16 CC-2021-OGR-01-002 (1)
Addison (1) 7:6 addition (4) 12:15,17,20,23 address (4) 17:23;18:10;22:9;25:25 addressed (3) 10:18;11:3;18:5 adjourns (1) 30:13 administrative (2) 24:12,18 administrator (7) 4:5;9:6;12:16;13:9;14:17,23; 18:3 advisement (1) 30:10 afternoon (2) 8:1;28:20 again (5) 5:13;7:20;10:16;15:13;18:18	appeal (1) 15:7 appearances (2) 5:3;9:2 appearing (1) 8:4 appears (2) 13:3,8 applicable (1) 21:9 applicant (1) 9:10 application (3) 9:14;12:24;13:14 apply (2) 14:21;24:11 applying (1) 12:2 appointment (1) 19:6 appropriate (2) 15:20;28:25 appropriate (4)	Barlow (2) 9:15;19:15 basis (2) 23:20;25:11 becomes (2) 12:6,10 begin (2) 9:3;25:3 Beginning (1) 4:1 behalf (4) 8:4,24;9:10;21:3 behind (1) 28:2 below (1) 10:8 berms (1) 29:19 better (3) 4:12,16;22:23 beyond (3) 15:9,9,16 bit (2)	call (1) 5:4 came (1) 11:18 can (20) 4:13,18;5:12;6:13,16,18,22; 7:14;10:24;16:19;20:11,18; 23:18,22,22;24:6,12;26:15; 28:15;30:15 car (1) 19:9 care (2) 29:2,11 case (11) 10:10;13:3;14:9,22;16:23; 17:1,13;19:16,18,20;23:20 casing (1) 24:4 cause (1) 9:18 CC-2021-OGR-01-001 (1) 9:16 CC-2021-OGR-01-002 (1) 6:1
Addison (1) 7:6 addition (4) 12:15,17,20,23 address (4) 17:23;18:10;22:9;25:25 addressed (3) 10:18;11:3;18:5 adjourns (1) 30:13 administret (2) 24:12,18 administrative (2) 12:4;21:9 Administrator (7) 4:5;9:6;12:16;13:9;14:17,23; 18:3 advisement (1) 30:10 afternoon (2) 8:1;28:20 again (5)	appeal (1) 15:7 appearances (2) 5:3;9:2 appearing (1) 8:4 appears (2) 13:3,8 applicable (1) 21:9 applicant (1) 9:10 application (3) 9:14;12:24;13:14 apply (2) 14:21;24:11 applying (1) 12:2 appointment (1) 19:6 appreciate (2) 15:20;28:25	Barlow (2) 9:15;19:15 basis (2) 23:20;25:11 becomes (2) 12:6,10 begin (2) 9:3;25:3 Beginning (1) 4:1 behalf (4) 8:4,24;9:10;21:3 behind (1) 28:2 below (1) 10:8 berms (1) 29:19 better (3) 4:12,16;22:23 beyond (3) 15:9,9,16	call (1) 5:4 came (1) 11:18 can (20) 4:13,18;5:12;6:13,16,18,22; 7:14;10:24;16:19;20:11,18; 23:18,22,22;24:6,12;26:15; 28:15;30:15 car (1) 19:9 care (2) 29:2,11 case (11) 10:10;13:3;14:9,22;16:23; 17:1,13;19:16,18,20;23:20 casing (1) 24:4 cause (1) 9:18 CC-2021-OGR-01-001 (1) 9:16 CC-2021-OGR-01-002 (1)

Min-U-Script®

centered (1) 4:22 certain (2) 10:7,8 Certainly (8) 5:14,17;6:18;8:10;10:7;16:2; 21:15:22:6 cetera (1) 17:18 changed (1) 25:8 charge (1) 18:6 Cheryl (2) 7:4,5 choose (2) 14:14;15:5 **CHRIS** (15) 4:2,7,12,13,16,18,23,25;6:10; 7:17,23;26:6;28:10,14,17 **CHRISTIAN (25)** 4:5,10,14;5:6,9,11,20,23;6:5; 9:4,6,9,22;10:4,20;11:4,6; 15:22;22:1,6,10;23:6,9;26:2,3 circumstance (1) 23:12 Citizens (2) 7:10:20:20 City (2) 8:12:29:11 claim (1) 16:4 clean (1) 20:15 Clearly (2) 12:14;25:4 coalition (1) 8:20 **Code** (2) 13:24:21:9 coming (1) 4:9 comment (5) 24:20;28:9,16,21;29:22 comments (3) 26:9,11;28:22 **Commission** (3) 13:9;15:8;18:2 communicate (1) 6:14 companies (1) 17:18 compare (1) 23:15 compared (1) 25:22 compelled (1) 14:6 compensation (4) 14:25;22:13;25:12,21 complaining (1) 19:21 compliance (5)

12:8,11,16,21;24:21 comply (1) 11:20 concerned (3) 24:15:26:22:28:1 conditions (2) 12:13:14:2 consent (1) 15:8 consented (1) 13:11 conservation (1) 18:3 consider (3) 9:25;14:13,16 consideration (1) 16:16 considerations (1) 21:10 considered (1) 16:10 considering (2) 15:12;16:25 constitute (1) 11:1 construction (1) 12:1 construe (1) 12:5 construing (1) 12:2 contaminate (1) 28:3contaminated (5) 20:5,6:27:1,6,10 context (1) 25:21 continue (1) 6:24 contract-based (1) 21:10 contractor (1) 20:2 contrary (2) 14:5;22:16 corporation (1) 20:23 country (1) 12:1couple (2) 22:15:23:10 course (2) 15:9,17 court (1) 12:3 cover (1) 23:16 cowboys (1) 27:2 cracking (1) 20:8 critical (2) 13:5;18:11

cross (1) 10:2 crosses (1) 10:12 crossing (1) 10:15 currently (1) 29:25 D Dale (1) 6:20 Danielle (1) 7:6 date (1) 14:14days (2) 30:11,11 deal (2) 22:23;24:19 dealing (1) 25:19 deals (2) 23:22,24 decision (1) 30:10 decision-maker (1) 12:3 decision-making (1) 17:1deemed (2) 13:23:14:5 deep (1) 10:23 define (1) 24:18 defined (2) 25:9,13 depart (1) 9:19 **Department** (12) 8:4;13:9;17:15,16;18:2;21:3, 6,18,20;24:2,10,17 depth (1) 10:22 deputy (2) 8:3:21:5 **Dernoncourt** (9) 6:20;18:21,21,22,24;19:3,5, 8:21:1 designed (1) 17:18 destroyed (1) 27:16 determine (2) 9:24;14:17 determining (1) 21:11 development (2) 17:24;18:5 device (1)

Hearing June 21, 2021

different (3) 18:9.10:25:16 difficulties (1) 6:2 directly (1) 14:5 disconnected (1) 7:19 discount (1) 16:8 discussed (1) 22:7 discussing (1) 27:14 discussion (1) 14:21 districts (1) 17:18 docket (3) 5:13,25;9:15 doctor's (1) 19:6 dollars (1) 26:25 done (1) 19:10 Donna (1) 7:7 down (3) 27:19:29:9:30:1 **DO**(1) 24:10 draft (1) 23:22 drag (3) 27:22,23,24 drill (2) 10:8:16:8 drilled (1) 22:8 drilling (2) 24:3:27:9 drive (1) 19:9 **Durand** (1) 6:19 during (2) 15:5,23 duty (1) 12:15 dying (1) 4:21E east (1) 29:14 eastbound (1) 29:15 easy (1) 21:8 economic (1) 25:5

Min-U-Script®

4:9

Oli anu Gas			Julie 21, 2021
accomentically (1)	17.10 12.18.0 10	form (1)	
economically (1)	17:10,12;18:9,10	form (1)	
25:20	existence (3)	11:1	H
Edward (1)	15:24;16:15,24	format (1)	
7:4	existing (4)	6:12	hands (1)
effectively (2)	10:11;11:20;16:6;17:9	four (1)	27:4
10:5;11:23	expiration (1)	13:18	
eighth (1)	14:15	frame (1)	happen (5)
			20:4,5,7,12,16
23:19	exploration (1)	15:6	happened (2)
either (3)	17:24	frankly (1)	26:23;27:2
10:12;12:19;13:8	extensively (1)	13:16	happens (3)
else (1)	29:10	front (2)	19:13,13;20:17
23:18	extent (1)	26:18;29:11	
emphasizing (1)	25:8	Fruitland (2)	happy (2)
	23.8		9:20;15:18
11:12	E.	8:12;29:11	hardly (1)
employees (1)	F	fundamentally (1)	4:9
29:2		11:19	harms (2)
encourage (1)	facility (1)		17:23,25
23:1	29:13	G	
encouraged (2)	fact (3)		hear (4)
			4:9,13,18;6:22
22:24;27:21	10:6;12:2;23:4	garble (1)	HEARING (54)
encouraging (1)	factor (6)	5:8	4:4,7,11,16,19,24,25;5:1,7,
23:3	16:22,25;17:6,14;22:9;23:22	Gas (13)	10,14,17,18,22,24;6:10,15,25;
End (1)	factors (10)	11:19;13:8;16:4,12;17:24;	7:12,17,21,25;8:5,13,22,25;9:8,
30:16	9:13,16,19,24;10:19;14:12;	18:3,4,25;19:9,9;24:14;29:5,24	
enough (4)	15:11,25;21:12;23:13	general (4)	22;10:14;11:4,7;15:12,19;17:2;
			18:13,23;19:2,4,7;20:25;21:19,
10:23;24:22;27:20,23	failure (1)	8:3;11:14;16:20;21:5	25;22:7;23:6;26:2,4,17;28:4,7,
ensure (4)	13:4	generalized (1)	11,14;30:7,11,13
12:8,16,17,22	fair (1)	17:11	heartbeat (1)
enter (4)	25:20	generate (1)	27:3
14:1,14,19;15:5	fall (1)	16:14	
entire (2)	25:12	George (1)	heat (1)
20:10;25:24			19:9
	Fallon (2)	7:8	help (1)
entirely (3)	15:24;23:14	gets (2)	28:15
11:24;18:9,10	false (1)	20:5,6	Hendrickson (1)
entitled (1)	24:1	given (3)	7:7
14:19	family (1)	10:21;14:16;15:13	Hicks (1)
environment (1)	7:1	glad (5)	
24:7	Fantastic (1)	26:19;29:9;30:1,2,3	7:6
			high (1)
equivalence (1)	5:9	Glenda (1)	4:20
24:1	feelings (1)	6:21	highest (1)
especially (1)	19:17	goes (1)	13:13
15:13	few (2)	27:19	hills (1)
establish (1)	15:21;25:6	good (5)	
14:25	file (4)	5:2;8:1;27:12,21;28:20	28:24
established (1)	4:1;20:13;21:6;30:16		himself (1)
. ,		govern (1)	6:6
15:1	fine (7)	24:3	hired (1)
establishing (2)	4:13,18,25;5:7;9:8;18:19;	GOZZO (12)	20:2
16:3,10	19:7	4:2,7,13,18,25;6:10;7:17,23;	history (4)
et (1)	fire (1)	28:8,10,17;30:15	14:11;15:14;27:7,8
17:18	16:9	Grace (1)	
everybody (1)	First (6)	6:21	holding (2)
			22:23;23:3
11:16	11:13;15:7;18:24;22:3,5;	great (3)	home (1)
everybody's (1)	26:10	22:21;26:19;27:15	19:9
9:2	flippant (1)	ground (1)	hopes (1)
everyone (2)	22:11	20:7	16:12
5:3;30:8	folks (2)	groundwater (4)	
examine (1)	6:4;26:4	17:8,10,23;20:4	house (3)
23:18			20:3,7,10
	following (1)	guarantee (1)	humor (1)
example (1)	16:9	28:5	26:20
23:13	forget (1)	guys (1)	hundred (1)
excuse (2)	13:21	27:7	26:25
23:9;29:14	forgot (1)		hydrocarbons (1)
exist (4)	15:22		
			16:7

Oli allu Gas			June 21, 2021
	- 12:14;21:7;22:25	kind (2)	limited (1)
	interact (1)	24:1;25:5	13:12
Ι			
	- 17:6	kinds (1)	Linda (8)
Idaho (16)	interest (11)	29:16	6:20;18:21,21,21,24;19:3,5,8
8:4;12:1;13:24;17:12;18:12;	8:15;10:3;13:19,20;16:3,18,	known (1)	line (3)
19:19;20:15,20;21:3,9;27:4;	22;18:17;22:14,22;25:21	16:7	7:13;26:15,17
29:3,4,6,7,23	interests (1)		lines (2)
	16:17	L	19:11,12
Idaho's (1)	interpret (1)		listen (1)
29:23	12:5	lady (1)	20:22
idea (3)			
4:11;23:1;24:13	interrupt (2)	27:18	little (3)
identified (1)	4:3,8	land (1)	26:7;27:6,21
6:6	into (7)	10:2	live (2)
identify (6)	14:1,14,19;15:5;16:16;20:7;	landowners (1)	27:19;29:5
5:13;6:4,8,16;7:14;8:8	29:18	28:3	lived (1)
implies (1)	investment (1)	Lands (7)	20:16
	28:2	8:4;10:1,16;17:15;18:2;21:3,	location (1)
15:10	invite (5)	6	29:16
imply (1)		-	
24:24	9:4;11:8;21:2;22:1;26:8	language (1)	long (5)
important (1)	involved (3)	10:9	11:20;19:22,25;22:19;27:20
5:18	11:16;16:17,22	large (1)	long-term (1)
impose (1)	irrigation (1)	14:10	11:25
12:12	17:17	largest (1)	looks (1)
improper (1)	issue (2)	15:2	7:18
14:23	25:19;30:10	last (2)	Lorinda (1)
	issued (1)	24:20:25:6	7:9
included (1)	14:22	,	lot (1)
10:8		later (1)	
includes (1)	items (1)	7:16	20:1
20:21	15:16	law (8)	low (1)
including (3)		11:21;12:17;13:17,17;17:11;	4:8
10:1;16:21;20:2	J	19:16,20;24:22	
independently (1)		laws (1)	Μ
17:12	Jackson (1)	19:18	
	7:8	lean (1)	making (1)
indicated (1)	James (1)	26:6	25:6
23:14			
indication (1)	6:19	lease (9)	manager (1)
25:16	JAYMES (3)	10:6,12;13:11,22;14:1,14,19;	29:5
individual (1)	8:10,11;21:23	15:5;25:22	matter (7)
28:12	Jimmie (1)	leased (2)	9:17;15:12,17;21:7,13;25:1;
individuals (1)	7:6	13:23;14:5	30:9
14:6	job (3)	leasing (1)	matters (1)
	12:22;18:1;20:19	15:3	25:6
industries (1)	joined (3)	leave (1)	may (10)
17:19			
inexpensive (1)	6:10,12;7:23	20:14	9:12,20;10:2,5;13:19;14:1;
16:13	JOY (5)	leaving (1)	19:14;21:10;24:11,11
infringing (1)	6:22;8:1,3;21:4,5	27:4	McGee (1)
29:18	Judy (1)	legal (4)	7:8
initially (1)	7:6	12:8,10,11,21	mean (7)
5:3	July (1)	legislature (1)	22:10,10,13;24:9,23,23;
	30:12	12:14	25:23
input (1)	jurisdictions (1)	less (8)	meaningless (2)
15:20	24:14	13:13;14:4,7,18;15:2,8,9;	12:6,10
instance (2)	24:14		,
15:7;17:15	17	23:11	means (4)
integrated (1)	K	lessee (1)	12:19,20;25:19,24
14:2		13:21	measures (1)
integration (12)	Karen (1)	lessor (1)	17:22
	7:8	13:21	meet (1)
9:14;11:15;12:24;13:10,15,	Kate (1)	life (2)	17:19
18;14:3,15;15:14;17:4,6;24:17			
Integrity (1)	7:10	20:10;27:1	meeting (3)
	TT (1) (4)		
7:10	Kathleen (1)	lightly (1)	12:23;19:14;28:10
7:10	7:7	22:17	mentioned (1)
7:10 intend (1)			
7:10	7:7	22:17	mentioned (1)

Min-U-Script®

20:15 met (1) 12:9 mic (1) 7:24 might (2) 13:4,4 **MIKE (14)** 4:5;5:6,9,20,23;9:6,9;10:4, 20;11:6;22:6,10;23:9;26:3 mind (3)4:14;22:3;25:19 mineral (10) 8:14;10:3;13:11,19;16:18; 18:17;22:14,22;25:20;26:22 minerals (3) 20:2;25:22,22 minimum (2) 12:7,20 mix (1) 17:14 moment (1) 7:22 money (2) 20:1;27:23 monitoring (1) 17:8 more (6) 4:8;14:7;15:10;17:3;23:19; 25:9morning (1) 8:1 morning's (1) 13:2most (1) 29:24 moved (2) 19:19.19 moving (1) 29:15 much (9) 7:21:8:5,13,25:10:14:16:14; 20:24;27:17;30:14 multiple (4) 24:13;29:20,21,23 municipal (1) 16:21 must (4) 14:13,17;18:5;24:23 muted (1) 7:24 myself (2) 5:21;9:7 N name (3) 8:11,18;18:20 name's (2) 8:19;26:21 narrowed (1) 25:8 Natural (2)

17:16:20:20 nature (1) 11:14 near (1) 24:7 necessarily (4) 11:22;12:19;15:1.9 necessary (1) 21:11 need (5) 5:20;6:12;9:18;18:11;25:16 needs (2) 11:3:17:19 Next (1) 21:2 Nierman (1) 7:5 non-consenting (3) 11:17;13:20;14:10 None (1) 17:21 nonfactor (1) 10:13 Norma (1) 7:5 number (5) 14:10;17:16;25:10;30:3,4 0 obviously (2) 15:7;16:12 occupation (1) 10:17 offer (3) 21:22;22:2;25:10 offered (1) 24:1**OFFICER (48)** 4:4.7.11.16.19:5:1.7.10.14. 17,22,24;6:10,15,25;7:12,17, 21.25:8:5.13.22.25:9:8.22: 10:14;11:4,7;15:19;17:2;18:13, 23;19:2,4,7;20:25;21:19,25; 22:7;23:6;26:2,4,17;28:4,7,11, 14;30:7 officially (1) 7:14 Oil (12) 11:19:13:7:16:4,12:17:24; 18:3,4,25;19:8;24:14;29:5,24 old (1) 20:9 ole (1) 27:21 one (15) 4:8;13:21;14:12;15:10,11; 17:3;19:15;22:16;23:10,12,13; 25:25;28:11,22;29:2 one-eighth (7) 13:12;14:4,7,8,18;15:1,8 online (2) 9:2:28:8

only (3) 13:12:23:9:28:11 **oOo-**(1) 30:17 opening (2) 21:6.18 operate (2) 29:23,25 operations (2) 24:3,14 operator (2) 14:1;16:19 operators (2) 16:19:23:2 opinion (1) 18:5 opportunity (1) 14:16 option (1) 15:4order (11) 9:12;10:19;12:8;13:2;14:3, 15,22;17:4,6;24:17;25:1 orders (1) 14:10 out (12) 9:2;11:24;14:20;22:24;23:3; 25:14;27:3,20,22,23,24;29:25 out-of-state (1) 20:23 out-of-staters (1) 28:22 outside (2) 30:5.5 over (6) 19:23;20:9;26:23;27:25; 28:1:30:2 own (3) 8:23;24:2,11 owner (11) 10:3;11:2;13:19,20,20,25; 14:3;15:3;26:22;27:17;29:5 owners (11) 8:15,21;11:17;14:16;16:18; 18:17;22:14,22;23:21;25:21; 27:4 owners' (1) 10:1 owner's (1) 10:16 Р paid (1) 15:2 panelist (6) 6:13,13;7:18,24;28:18,19 panelists (1) 28:13 part (2) 8:20;12:6 participate (1) 8.16

participating (1) 30:9 particular (11) 10:10;11:16;12:12;14:9,11; 15:5,14;17:19,20;18:7;21:12 particularly (1) 10:11 parties (2) 5:5;29:1 payment (3) 13:13,14;15:2 payoff (1) 27:15 pending (1) 9:14 Pennsylvania (2) 27:9,25 people (3) 14:19;16:17;27:10 perfect (1) 5:8 perpetuity (1) 16:20 persistence (1) 8:6 personally (1) 29:4 pertinent (1) 15:13 Philip (1) 7:7 phrase (1) 11:23physical (1) 10:17physically (1) 10:2 pick (1) 20:14Piotrowski (18) 6:16.18.19.19.24.25:7:2.12: 8:20;11:7.9;15:19;16:1;17:2.9; 18:13,19;22:17 Piotrowski's (2) 23:10,25 pipeline (3) 10:2,4,12 place (3) 27:5;29:17,20 plan (3) 8:15;29:6,16 plant (2) 19:12;20:6 play (2) 16:5;24:14 plays (1) 17:5 please (11) 6:7,15,16,25;7:14;8:8,17; 18:20;20:11,21;23:8 PLLC(1) 6:19 plugging (1)

24:5podium (1) 8:17 point (7) 7:3:10:23:11:2:13:1.1:22:1; 25:5 points (1) 11:12 portion (1) 13:5 posed (1) 18:4 position (2) 11:20;14:24 positive (1) 27:5 possibility (1) 17:23 possible (2) 16:14;29:8 potential (2) 13:18:25:24 potentially (1) 16:18 power (1) 14:24 precisely (1) 14:8 presence (2) 10:23,25 presented (2) 21:15:29:10 presumption (2) 13:7.8 preventing (1) 18:1 previously (1) 13:11 primarily (1) 11:10 prior (2) 13:14:14:22 process (2) 6:4;19:23 processes (1) 18:7 produce (2) 16:7;22:19 product (2) 29:15,17 production (3) 23:1,3;24:4 profit (1) 16:14programs (1) 17:20 promised (1) 22:4 promote (2) 6:13:28:17 promoted (1) 7:18 promoting (1)

7:20 4:23property (5) really (2) 10:12,13;16:13;27:4,17 propose (1) 11:21 proposed (3) 8:15;10:6;17:6 protect (1) 20:19 protecting (2) 16:17;18:11 protections (2) 17:9:29:17 protective (1) 24:6 provide (9) 14:3 9:5;11:8;18:18;21:2,8;26:9, 11;28:9,15 13:12 provided (3) 11:11;22:14,22 24:5 provides (3) 13:17.17.25 11:13 province (1) 29:25 13:5 public (4) 16:21;26:9,11;28:9 purchase (1) 10:13 30:15 purchased (1) 16:13 4:2 purposes (2) 18:9.10 29:20 pursuing (1) 18:9 23:4put (1) 21:8 18:6 0 19:15 quality (1) 25:4 4:20 quibble (1) 24:13 quick (1) 4:23 quite (1) 23:1 13:16 19:17 R 18:6 rate (1) 14:18 rates (1) 5:20 14:21 rather (2) 12:11;20:23 7:19 reach (1) 9:13 16:2 read (1) 13:2 reading (1) rely (2) 11:23 11:10:15:16 relying (1) real (1)

27:13;29:25 reason (2) 15:10:16:15 reasonable (22) 9:13,25;10:18;11:15,22,24; 12:9.10.18.19.25:16:11.16; 21:12;24:23;25:3,11,14,23; 26:25;27:14,16 reasons (2) 22:15:23:4 rebuttal (3) 15:23;22:2;23:7 receive (1) receiving (1) reclamation (1) recognition (1) recognize (1) record (2) 5:24,25 recording (1) recording's (1) redundant (1) reestablish (1) reference (1) referenced (1) referred (1) regard (2) 28:21:29:11 regarding (4) 5:2;6:3;9:15;29:1 regulate (1) regulated (1) regulating (1) regulations (4) 19:16,18,20;29:24 reidentify (1) rejoined (1) relates (1) relevant (3) 10:11:13:5:21:11

18:8 remain (1) 16:20remaining (1) 29:6 repeat (1) 9:11 represent (7) 5:4;6:8,17;7:15;8:9,12,18 representative (1) 6:5 represented (1) 18:18 representing (3) 6:19;8:20;22:2 required (3) 12:7,11;29:21 requirement (4) 11:14;12:9,11,15 requirements (1) 17:7 requires (1) 12:24 research (1) 10:24 resident (2) 29:3,4 resolved (1) 6:3 resources (5) 17:5,16;18:11;20:20;24:10 respect (2) 10:4:23:24 response (2) 14:17;19:24 responsible (1) 17:22 responsibly (2) 19:10:23:2 rest (2) 21:18;28:13 restate (1) 21:15 result (2) 17:10,11 retirement (2) 20:1,3 reviewed (1) 9:12 Richard (3) 7:5;28:12,20 right (5) 4:4;6:22;9:1;11:5;18:15 right-of-way (1) 10:13 rights (1) 13:11 risks (1) 17:25 **River** (12) 6:6;11:19;13:7;16:4,12; 19:15;20:11;22:2;29:5,14,15, 19

rivers (2) 19:12:20:21 role (1) 17:4room (3)18:17;26:10;29:3 Roxie (1) 7:4 royalties (1) 23:11 royalty (7) 13:12;14:4,7,8,18,21;15:1 rule (2) 11:25;17:7 rules (4) 21:9;24:2,11,18 run (1) 28:23 S safeguards (1) 29:20 safely (1) 19:10 safety (1) 24:7 sale (1) 16:9 same (2) 10:17:25:19 Samuel (1) 7:9saying (2) 4:14;20:22 schemes (1) 17:11 Schuman (1) 7:9 second (1) 13:1 Secondly (1) 22:20 Section (1) 13:24 sections (1) 21:9 set (3) 14:20;15:6;24:2 sets (1) 24:11 setting (2) 24:12:30:5 shall (3) 14:3,18,21 shares (1) 16:3 Sharon (8) 6:20;8:19,19,23;26:15,19,21; 28:5 show (1) 7:24 signed (3)

26:8,11:28:9 Simmons (8) 6:20;8:19,19,23;26:15,19,21; 28:5sinking (1) 20:7 sit (2) 29:9;30:1 site (2) 29:13,14 situation (3) 13:10:23:17,23 size (2) 10:7,8 Snake (9) 6:5;11:19;13:7;16:4,12; 19:15;20:11;22:2;29:5 somebody (3) 13:22,22;30:4 sometimes (1) 13:8 Sorry (5) 4:3,7;5:6;6:23;10:7 spacing (1) 14:2speak (2) 6:11;26:16 speaker (4) 4:20;5:12,15,19 specific (2) 21:14,17 specifically (1) 16:21 spent (1) 20:10 spoke (2) 19:15:27:18 stage (1) 11:12 stand (2) 15:18:22:18 start (3) 20:8,9;23:7 started (1) 4:2 starts (1) 20:7 state (9) 8:18;13:16;18:20;20:22; 27:8,8,8;29:6,7 stated (1) 21:8 states (4) 19:16,19;29:22,23 status (1) 13:18 statute (12) 11:24;12:2,5;13:17,25;14:6; 22:25;23:11;25:2,7,15,17 statutes (4) 12:12,23;13:6;18:9 statutory (3) 11:21;12:1;17:10

step (1) 8:17 **STEPHANIE (3)** 8:10.11:21:23 still (1) 25:19 stop (1) 30:15 streaming (1) 9:3 strict (1) 12:20 stringent (1) 29:24 stuff (1) 20:14 subject (4) 10:24;15:7;24:19,21 subjects (1) 25:25 submitted (1) 9:10 subsection (2) 13:24.25 subsurface (1) 11:3 sue (2) 20:11,13 suggest (1) 23:25 suggested (1) 22:17 suggestion (2) 22:20:24:22 suggests (1) 22:23 supply (1) 29:18 supposed (1) 19:1 sure (2) 5:15:13:4 surface (1) 10:5 system (2) 27:20,22 Т talk (1) 29:10 taxpayers (2) 20:15,22 technical (1) 6:2 term (2) 22:19:25:12 terms (16) 9:14,25;11:14,21;12:9,10,12, 18,24;14:2,25;15:6;16:11; 22:13;24:24;25:5

tested (1) 22:17 testimony (1) 29:1 Texan (1) 27:2 third (1) 15:4 Thomas (9) 6:22;8:2,10;11:9;12:22;16:1; 20:19;21:4,23 threats (1) 18:4 Thus (1) 12:18 Tim (1) 7:9 today (6) 8:16;14:23;15:20;21:22; 22:18;30:9 Tolbert (1) 7:5 took (2) 14:23;20:1 tracks (1) 10:7 tract (3) 14:12;15:14,15 transparent (1) 29:7 treatment (3) 19:11:20:6:29:12 treatments (1) 24:4trespass (1) $1\bar{1}:1$ truck (1) 27:11 trying (1) 29:7 tube (1) 27:19 two (3) 11:11;15:16;29:1 U uncommitted (9) 8:14;9:25;10:3,16;18:16; 22:14,22;25:20;26:22 under (6) 14:2;19:11,12,19;29:12;30:9 **UNIDENTIFIED (2)** 5:12,15 unique (1) 18:4 uniquely (1) 18:1

unit (10) 8:15;9:15,18;10:10;14:2; 15:25;22:8;23:15,16,19 **universe (1)** 25:24

test (1)

4:23

20:6:25:20:27:14 15	21st (1)
	30:12
	3
	3 (1)
	13:25
	30 (1)
	30:10
7:4	4
within (3)	
23:16;25:12;30:10	47-320 (1)
words (3)	13:24
18:4;25:3,14	
work (3)	6
17:15,15,17	
worked (1)	60 (1)
19:24	20:17
working (4)	63 (1)
13:19,20;16:3;20:10	19:25
worried (1)	
wrong (1)	
28:23	
- 28:23	
- 28:23 Y	
- 28:23 Y year (1)	
- 28:23 Y year (1) 19:23	
- 28:23 Y year (1) 19:23 years (2)	
- 28:23 Y year (1) 19:23	
- 28:23 Y year (1) 19:23 years (2)	
- 28:23 Year (1) 19:23 years (2) 20:17;28:1	
- 28:23 Year (1) 19:23 years (2) 20:17;28:1	
- 28:23 Y year (1) 19:23 years (2) 20:17;28:1 Z	
- 28:23 Y year (1) 19:23 years (2) 20:17;28:1 Z Zoom (2) 6:9;8:7	
- 28:23 Y year (1) 19:23 years (2) 20:17;28:1 Z Zoom (2)	
28:23 Y year (1) 19:23 years (2) 20:17;28:1 Z Zoom (2) 6:9;8:7 1	
28:23 Y year (1) 19:23 years (2) 20:17;28:1 Z Zoom (2) 6:9;8:7 1 100 (1)	
28:23 Y year (1) 19:23 years (2) 20:17;28:1 Z Zoom (2) 6:9;8:7 1 100 (1) 23:21	
28:23 Y year (1) 19:23 years (2) 20:17;28:1 Z Zoom (2) 6:9;8:7 1 100 (1) 23:21 110 (1)	
28:23 Y year (1) 19:23 years (2) 20:17;28:1 Z Zoom (2) 6:9;8:7 1 100 (1) 23:21 110 (1) 15:24	
28:23 Y year (1) 19:23 years (2) 20:17;28:1 Z Zoom (2) 6:9;8:7 1 100 (1) 23:21 110 (1) 15:24 111 (2)	
28:23 Y year (1) 19:23 years (2) 20:17;28:1 Z Zoom (2) 6:9;8:7 1 100 (1) 23:21 110 (1) 15:24 111 (2) 9:15;23:15	
28:23 Y year (1) 19:23 years (2) 20:17;28:1 Z Zoom (2) 6:9;8:7 1 100 (1) 23:21 110 (1) 15:24 111 (2) 9:15;23:15 16 (1)	
28:23 Y year (1) 19:23 years (2) 20:17;28:1 Z Zoom (2) 6:9;8:7 1 100 (1) 23:21 110 (1) 15:24 111 (2) 9:15;23:15 16 (1) 19:25	
28:23 Y year (1) 19:23 years (2) 20:17;28:1 Zoom (2) 6:9;8:7 1 100 (1) 23:21 110 (1) 15:24 111 (2) 9:15;23:15 16 (1) 19:25 1963 (2)	
28:23 Y year (1) 19:23 years (2) 20:17;28:1 Z Zoom (2) 6:9;8:7 1 100 (1) 23:21 110 (1) 15:24 111 (2) 9:15;23:15 16 (1) 19:25	
28:23 Y year (1) 19:23 years (2) 20:17;28:1 Z Zoom (2) 6:9;8:7 1 100 (1) 23:21 110 (1) 15:24 111 (2) 9:15;23:15 16 (1) 19:25 1963 (2) 25:2,17	
28:23 Y year (1) 19:23 years (2) 20:17;28:1 Zoom (2) 6:9;8:7 1 100 (1) 23:21 110 (1) 15:24 111 (2) 9:15;23:15 16 (1) 19:25 1963 (2)	
28:23 Y year (1) 19:23 years (2) 20:17;28:1 Z Zoom (2) 6:9;8:7 1 100 (1) 23:21 110 (1) 15:24 111 (2) 9:15;23:15 16 (1) 19:25 1963 (2) 25:2,17	
28:23 Y year (1) 19:23 years (2) 20:17;28:1 Z Zoom (2) 6:9;8:7 1 100 (1) 23:21 110 (1) 15:24 111 (2) 9:15;23:15 16 (1) 19:25 1963 (2) 25:2,17 2 20 (1)	
28:23 Y year (1) 19:23 years (2) 20:17;28:1 Z Zoom (2) 6:9;8:7 1 100 (1) 23:21 110 (1) 15:24 111 (2) 9:15;23:15 16 (1) 19:25 1963 (2) 25:2,17 2 20 (1) 27:25	
28:23 Y year (1) 19:23 years (2) 20:17;28:1 Z Zoom (2) 6:9;8:7 1 100 (1) 23:21 110 (1) 15:24 111 (2) 9:15;23:15 16 (1) 19:25 1963 (2) 25:2,17 2 20 (1)	
	<pre>within (3) 23:16;25:12;30:10 words (3) 18:4;25:3,14 work (3) 17:15,15,17 worked (1) 19:24 working (4) 13:19,20;16:3;20:10 worried (1) 19:11 worth (2) 11:12;27:6 writing (1) 21:16 written (2) 11:10;30:10</pre>