STATE OF WYOMING

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY COUNCIL



CERTIFIED COPY

PUBLIC HEARING

8

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

Taken at: 117 South Fourth Street

Basin Wyoming

November 2, 2006 - 6:15 a.m.

MARK GORDON - Chairman

DENNIS BOAL - Council

JOHN MORRIS - DEO

BILL DiRIENZO - DEQ

JOEGIRARDIN- Paralegal

13

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 ATKINSON-BAKER, INC.

COURT REPORTERS

500 North Brand Boulevard, Third Floor 22 Glendale, California 91203

23 (800) 288-3376

REPORTED BY: David E. Hix, Notary Public 24

25 FILE NO.: A009783

Reported by David E. Hix, Professional Freelance Court 1 2 Reporter and Notary Public for the States of Idaho and 3 Montana, residing in Missoula, Montana. 4 5 APPEARANCES 6 7 NICOL THOMPSON KRAMER, ESQ., Attorney at Law, of the law firm of Williams, Porter, Day and Neville, P.C., 159 North Wolcott, Suite 400, Casper, Wyoming 82602, 8 appearing for and on behalf of Devon Energy. 9 ISAAC N. SUTPHIN, ESQ., Attorney at Law, of the law firm of Sundahl, Powers, Kapp & Martin, L.L.C., 1725 10 Carey Avenue, Cheyenne, Wyoming 82003-0328. 11 Appearing for and on behalf of Merritt. 12 SPEAKERS: 13 DOUG McMULLEN 14 JILL MORRISON NICOL KRAMER, ESQ. 15 STEVE JONES MARVIN BLAKESLY 16 KEITH HAMILTON LEE CAMPBELL 17 LORRAINE CORBERG ISAAC SUTPHIN, ESQ. 18 19 20 21 Certificate of Court Reporter 54 22 23 24 25

Thursday November 2, 2006

MR. GORDON: Thank you all for coming out this evening. A little over a year ago I guess the Governor's tour came through and Basin had this wonderful facility, and it seemed like a great place to hold this meeting tonight.

My name is Mark Gordon. I'm the chairman of the Environmental Quality Council. You can see we have a video system set up so that other Council members can participate. We have various forums on tonight:

Dennis Boal in Evanston, Rick Moore in Laramie, I think. John Morris is in Cheyenne. I think Bill

DiRienzo is there. Bill DiRienzo is with the

Department of Environmental Quality. Sarah Flitner,

John Brady and Wendy Hutchinson, who are also members of the Council are not available tonight, but will be listening to a recording of the meeting. Joe Girardin is here. He is the Council's paralegal and technical wiz.

making, I will state that it is about 6:15 on November 2, 2006. I'm in Basin, Wyoming, to hold a listening session for the Environmental Quality Council. My special thanks go to the technical people with TCT West a terrific company in Wyoming. Thank you very much for

your help and for all the work of getting the Council on line.

I also want to thank Mark Hillman who is around here somewhere, whose wife gave him permission to use this theater tonight. Mark is the guy making sure the lights work and the heat is on and all of that sort of thing.

We will keep a recording of the meeting in our permanent files in Cheyenne. If anyone wants a copy, I will at the end of this meeting give you a phone number and we can send you one.

For the past several months -- just kind of the reason why I wanted to come here -- for the past several months people in the Basin have contacted a few Council members. Friends of mine have asked questions and stated some concerns they have about how produced water is being used in the Basin and what its future might be.

This past summer John Cora and his staff came to Worland, I think, to hold a meeting on a new agricultural protection policy, which has gone through the advisory board meeting, and they're trying to get in front of the Environmental Quality Council.

There has also been concerns expressed from time to time about a petition for rule making that is

pending before the Council. I looked at the Casper paper today and couldn't help but notice that there was an article about it. Funny enough, I picked up a book that says How To Make People Think You Are Normal. The reason why I wanted to come here tonight was because I really want to hear from you all, what your concerns are that are pertinent to the Council, and I wanted to have a chance to listen to you in a very informal, general session. So thank you for coming, again, tonight.

2.0

The Council has not yet moved forward on the rule making for the petition, but we have heard -- have heard comment in places like Cheyenne and Casper.

Consequently, this seemed like a good time for me to come to the Basin to hear your comments on produced water discharges and management.

The Council wants to make sure we understand your concerns. And for sort of the purposes of conducting this meeting, which I, again, would hope would be as informal as possible, I would like to -- I'm going to go to the speaker's podium and get the list of sign ups. If anyone has come in late and they want to sign up, now is the time to do it, and then we'll go through that. At the end of that, I will ask if any further questions are in front of us.

And I guess the last thing, you'll notice, on the left we have a fellow named David Hix, who is here doing a hearing -- he's a court reporter. He's here for an attorney not associated with the Environmental Qaulity Council. I guess you should probably speak to him if you have any thoughts or concerns on this.

So without further ado, thank you again, and let me see who we have. Also, if I can keep the folks from Powell late because Buffalo plays them tomorrow.

All right. First, I have Deb Thomas.

MS. THOMAS: I have no comments.

MR. GORDON: No comments, okay. Doug McMullen.

MR. McMULLEN: My name is Doug McMullen. I live in Deaver. We've been -- we purchased 300 acres in October of '05. In November of '05 -- we have two oil wells on our place; there was a rupture. At that time we called the DEQ, and they sent a representative from Lander.

We had the water tested, because we had so much oil running down our drains. We never received any test results other than a verbal that the polluted water was 1,200 times the legal limit. It was disgusting.

They couldn't verify it because DEQ never got

back to us with their lab result because they couldn't get their act together, I guess. They just never got back to us. That was a big concern right there, was dealing with Lander at that distance to get someone one up there and the follow up.

There was no -- they did not address the actual spill in the fields, as far as the soil. And three years later I still got probably four acres covered with oil where the weeds won't even grow. It's still there, and no one can make them clean it up.

And then September of this year same thing, had another oil spill. We did not notify the DEQ, because we didn't have satisfactory results from the first time. They couldn't get their lab results to confirm what they were saying. So there, again, we've got contaminated fields again, and it's still there.

They now dump the water from the well into our irrigation ditches, and I can't get stock to drink out of them. It's a milky color, it stinks and they won't touch it. As far as I know these original tests would have clarified whether that was potable water or whether the stock would drink it or whatever, but it was never clarified and it was never forced -- and we've had no feedback from anybody, so we are kind of alone out there.

And then I didn't realize until we got into this oil and gas situation that there were different -- DEQ takes care of air, water and soil. And all we ever addressed -- because of our knowledge this the area was so limited -- all we addressed was the water.

I have fences that are rotting. I now know to come and go to the DEQ about the soil condition, because they're deplorable; it's disgusting. We didn't get any feedback from DEQ, and we gave up because we didn't -- we just gave up because we never got any response from them.

And we'd like to hear from someone. We'd like someone to be concerned about it, and we'd like to have some follow-up. Just tell us what your test results are. If they're good or bad or indifferent, it would be nice to know whether that's poison going in for my stock. And if there is a spill and DEQ is concerned about soil quality, why do I have oil three years later in my fields? Why didn't someone come back and say, look, clean this up, and clean it up properly. Because all they're doing now is taking the contaminated soil, what they do clean up, and dumping it right next to their pits. It's still my surface, but it's there, and now it's four feet deep. Okay. Thank you.

MR. GORDON: Thank you. Thank you for your time. I also have Jeanie McMullen.

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{MS.}}$ McMULLEN: I think he said what needed to be said.

MR. GORDON: Okay. Thank you. Bernadette Barlow.

MS. BARLOW: No comments.

MR. GORDON: Okay. Jill Morrison.

MS. MORRISON: The only thing I wanted to do was make sure the Council had a copy of a letter we had sent around to all the folks who commented in the first hearing with their concerns about the applicability of this rule to oil field produced water. And we sent this letter out last week just explaining that the rule had been revised to apply only to coal bed methane discharges, not to the oil field produced water; that we've essentially heard the concerns.

And so I wanted to submit a copy of the letter we had sent, for the record. And we did receive an e-mail back -- a copy of an e-mail back from the Hot Springs County planner in response to our letter basically saying that they felt it had resolved their concerns. So if I could submit those for the record.

MR. GORDON: Jill, it's not really -- we're not technically holding a hearing for the record. I'm

glad that you advised us about that. I guess, you 2 know, with that in mind, I guess as we go forward with 3 this, we'll have language. That language will be 4 published, then there will be a period of time, and 5 then there's a formal comment and that letter can be 6 submitted at that time, if that makes sense. 7 MS. MORRISON: Okay. I wanted to make sure 8 that the Council was aware --9 MR. GORDON: Okav. 10 MS. MORRISON: -- and that we were trying to 11 address the concerns of folks in the Big Horn Basin. 12 MR. GORDON: Are there any questions from 13 anvone? Thank you, Jill. I have -- is it Nicol 14 Kramer? 15 MS. KRAMER: Yes. 16 MR. GORDON: Thank you, Nicol. 17 18 William, Porter, Day and Neville in Casper. I'm a

MS. KRAMER: My name is Nicol Kramer I'm with William, Porter, Day and Neville in Casper. I'm a lawyer. I represent Devon Energy Company, and I'm the attorney who asked the court reporter to be here. Our only concern is that we wanted to express a concern -- and other industry people wanted us to express a concern that this notice was called -- or this meeting was called with very little notice, and we wanted the opportunity to have better representation here so that

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

we can hear landowner concerns as well. Because we are 1 concerned about the petition. And in the future, we 2 would like to ask that you give us a little bit more 3 notice so that we can make sure to have better 4 attendance at the meetings. 5 6 MR. GORDON: Sure, duly noted. 7 MS. KRAMER: And the transcript is so that we'll all know what goes on. 8 9 MR. GORDON: Do you have any thoughts or are 10 you just listening as well? 11 MS. KRAMER: I'm here pretty much to listen. I think I have a client on the way who may also express 12 thoughts, but that's why I'm here. 13 14 MR. GORDON: Thanks. I'm sorry it wasn't --I didn't get to this sooner, but, Nicol, I share your 15 concerns. My whole point is it's nice to have the 16 17 conversation. 18 MS. KRAMER: It is. 19 MR. GORDON: Thanks. Kevin D. Jones. 20 MR. JONES: No comment. 21 MR. GORDON: Thank you, Kevin. Jeff Sviga. 22 MR. SVIGA: No comment. 23 MR. GORDON: Okay, thanks. Bob Georges. 24 MR. GEORGES: No comment. 25 MR. GORDON: No comment. Okay, thank you.

Steve Jones.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. JONES: Thank you. For the record, I do represent the Meeteetse Conservation Direct, which is local government, five elected, unpaid officials who are charged through statute for looking after the economic viability of the agricultural community through management of water, soil and other natural resources.

I would like to remind the Council of some of the statutory language in Title 35, Public Health and Safety 11-32 the Administrator's Authority to Recognize Standards Rules and Regulations or Permits. And getting into it a little bit, subsection (6), in recommending any standards, rules, regulations or permit, the administrator and the advisory board shall consider all of the facts and circumstances bearing upon the reasonableness of the pollution involved including the character and degree of injury to or interference with the health and well-being of the people, animals, wildlife, aquatic life and plant life affected; B, the social and economic value of the source of pollution; C, the priority of location in the area involved; D, the technical practicability and economic reasonableness of reducing or eliminating the source of the pollution; and E, the effect upon the

environment.

1.3

and the effects of this water. But it seems somewhat inconceivable that water from a coal bed methane well over here should be treated different than the water from an oil gas production facility. Water is water. The effects on the environment will be the same if the composition of the water is the same. The language in Appendix I, that would be --

MR. GORDON: Actually, I don't mean to take you off track. I'm not -- I just kind of wanted to sort of understand, generally, the practices and efforts that have gone on. We don't really have specific language published yet to comment on, so --

MR. JONES: I'll get there then.

MR. GORDON: Okay.

MR. JONES: Because the produced waters do not cause contamination where alteration of the physical, chemical and biological properties of any waters of the state including change in temperature, taste, color, turbidity or odor.

Well, that rules out even the ability to improve water quality, according to what's going on in this rule. It would make it required for realtime monitoring of the body of water that the produced water

is going into to make sure there's no change in existence. I think that's technically impossible.

MR. GORDON: I understand this. Let me just mention, again, that we don't have specific language in front of us. When that language is crafted, it will be published, and that language will then go to a hearing where your comments would be appropriate and part of the formal record.

MR. JONES: I'd like to go back to Title 35 11-302, the technical practicabilities and economic reasonableness, reducing or eliminating the source of pollution need to be considered. And we are as a conservation district, first and foremost, empowered to work to assist our ranchers and farmers and the rest of the agricultural community through the management of water and resources -- excuse me the water, soil and natural resources.

And to trying to take a statewide policy, that this appears to be, that needs to be so site specific because of the interactions of soil and water, we do not feel that a statewide, one-size-fits-all approach is really practicable considering the economic requirement not only on the agricultural community, but also on the producers themselves.

We are concerned -- in the Big Horn Basin --

and the Meeteetse Conservation District lies on the south side of Park County -- we have really an incredibly good relationship with our oil and gas

4 producers and the agricultural community.

The DEQ visited on site the Pitch Fork Field and North Sunshine Field discharges, and it was pointed out that in that desert that was the only water around. It's been pointed out in other public forums that perhaps -- high sulfates, for example, might cause some kind of problem with -- I think it was in front of the Park County Commissioners --- bovine -- a bovine disease, what was it? -- Bovine polio.

Our agricultural producers are used to having things that go wrong with their cattle. And bovine polio is nowhere near the list here in the desert where things like good old Wyoming hollow belly and dehydration are important things.

Our high altitude producers routinely have problems with cattle brisket disease, which are pulmonary artery problems, but we handle that as an industry. We don't need a statewide policy dealing with water discharge to handle this nonproblem.

On that, I think I'd just like to close with saying the agricultural community needs the water. This policy does not, for example, appear to give us

options to utilize water in the future that may really provide benefit -- we may be able to get beneficial use out of, and we have no concerns about this statewide policy that may not fit us.

MR. GORDON: And I appreciate it. Actually,
I think, you know, oil and gas produced water and
agriculture have coexisted for a long time, and it's a
very important part of our agriculture. That's why I'm
so impressed that you're able to come here as a
conservation district and kind of talk a little bit
about the kinds of programs that you have done.

Could you -- I'm not even a little bit familiar with Meeteetse. But can you tell me a little bit more about the kinds of -- is it drinking water or are there irrigation things that are going on? Are there other kinds of programs that can be, you know, that are of value?

I guess to me, coming from the Powder River

Basin coming over to the Big Horn Basin, it looks to me

like there's been a very, very long and good

relationship in a lot of ways between the producers and

the agriculture people, and that water is very

important to those agricultural operations. I think

that's what you were saying.

MR. JONES: That is what I was saying. We

recognize that there are real problems over in the Powder River Basin with the interactions of bad water and bad soils and good water and bad soils and all things in between.

I think it would be fair to say that local situations need to be taken care of on a local basis not statewide. We have different soils than Powder River Basin. And the simplistic look at SAR and TDS that is, for example, in the Section 20, Chapter 1, which is similar to what's going on in this petition, the thing that's too complex and needs to be hammered out on a local basis.

The Department of Agriculture, for example, has a mediation process that's mainly used for federal problems. Perhaps that state program could be fine tuned to work with solving situations that are happening on a local basis between state entities and production companies and ranchers and farmers.

But getting back to your comment. The water we use is used for both agriculture and livestock.

Indirectly, I suppose it could be considered to be drinking water. We do have coal underlying part of our area. We are expecting that there will be coal bed methane production sometime in the future.

We also know that as the price of a commodity

changes, new wells in the old fields may come on line or may be shut in, plugged or abandoned or whatever. Things change, and we are concerned that minor changes in water chemistry might cost our partners, if you will -- the oil and gas industry -- incredible amounts of time, money and possibly even result in the water being just put in a pipeline and injected somewhere where we get no benefit from it.

We do not know what the future holds. We do know that it will change. We do know that in our desert, water is probably to us as valuable as the oil and gas and methane production. I think that's the note I'd like to leave you with.

The sage grouse benefit from it, the DEQ tour showed what the discharge waters provided to our community, and I think -- I felt very comfortable with the dialogue that occurred with John Cora and Bill DiRienzo and the rest of the group as we had that tour. I thought it was an excellent tour. I think a lot of common ground was found, and I think it started things. It really improved the situation on the rule making.

But this thing is --

MR. GORDON: Again, I want to thank you very much for the sort of general comments. I don't mean to

shut you off on those other things, but it's not the right time. I really don't have anything to comment specifically on; although, I do register what your concerns are.

 $$\operatorname{\mathtt{MR}}$.$ JONES: Our desert needs water. Thank you.

MR. GORDON: Thank you. I have Marvin Blakesly. I met you out in the lobby.

MR. BLAKESLY: First of all, Mark, I'd like to thank you for coming here to the Big Horn Basin and hearing the concerns the ranchers and the operators and the county government has here. We appreciate you coming here to listen to us.

I wish we had had a little more time, because there are a lot of people that are very concerned about the loss of water here in the Big Horn Basin. I think that was very evident at the meeting in Worland. There was well over 100 people there. There was a lot of concern expressed both with the ag protection policy and the petition. I think the message came out loud and clear that we need the produced water here in the Big Horn Basin. Agriculture and wildlife very heavily depend on the water.

I guess there's been some confusion as to exactly what is moving forward with the rule making. I

was at the hearing in Casper when the motion to dismiss was denied. I left that meeting and I was very unclear as to what was moving forward with rule making, whether it was the original petition, whether it was the amended petition, whether it was the status report. I think there was a lot of confusion as to just exactly what was moving forward.

I guess what I have noted in your public notice and with what Jill has said, that what is moving forward for rule making is the amended petition; is that correct, with the pending coal bed methane? Or, is everything still on the table, I guess is my question?

MR. GORDON: On November 13th in Buffalo, we're going to have a working session to precisely craft the language. There were a series of resolutions which were passed, which as you say are confusing. And so the point was to put it all in one place at one time.

It's important that under public meeting rules and so on and so forth that that be done in a Council meeting with a quarum and all of that. I would recommend that you come to that meeting.

We're not really taking testimony. It is to put the language specifically together. That language

will then be published with the Secretary of State, and that is the language we'll move forward for a hearing on. Does that make sense?

MR. BLAKESLY: It does. I would just further like to say that I'm a native of Thermopolis. I was born and raised in Thermopolis, so I had the pleasure to grow up here in the Basin and live around the oil fields and discharge water.

You know, I'm a very avid outdoorsman. I hunt along the discharge water, because that's where the wildlife is at. The wildlife is very dependent on the water here in the Basin, as is agriculture. And the irrigation that comes from the produced water here in the Big Horn Basin is also very important to the wildlife and sage grouse, particularly on the Cottonwood and the Gooseberry. It provides some very critical habitat for the sage grouse populations here in the Basin.

We're opposed to the petition. But I would like to say we are pleased with some of the language that has come forth in the amended petition and wanted to recognize that.

We live in a very arid area here. We're in the midst of a ten-year drought. And I think it became even more apparent when the DEQ came here, for their

tours, just how important the produced water is here for the folks in the Big Horn Basin.

2.0

You know, I think had we had more time there would be a lot more people here, certainly, to express their opinions on this. I just want to point out the fact that if the water goes away from the Big Horn Basin, I don't see any winners for this.

wildlife and agriculture are the extreme stream big losers. It also hurts the industry. I just don't see any good thing to come of it. Agriculture and wildlife and industry have lived in a very good relationship here in the Big Horn Basin for 100 years almost in some cases.

I respect your comments, and I would tell you that's the first negatives comments that I've heard about produced water here in the Big Horn Basin. I appreciate your comments. If we ever hear comments, it's where is our water, and, geez, could we have more.

If for whatever reason the wells go down and the water is gone for a day or two, people are knocking at our door saying, where's the water? Where's the water? We really need it.

So I just hope that you'll take this away.

Please consider any negative impacts that would result in the loss of the water here in the Big Horn Basin.

Again, we appreciate you being here.

MR. GORDON: Thank you. I apologize for the short notice, again. What happened is, I didn't realize DEQ was having their thing. I got that notice actually from a cell phone call after it had happened. I wish I had been able to attend. Then Norma Lee Sanford, who probably you know --

MR. BLAKESLY: I do.

MR. GORDON: -- Norma Lee said, you've got to get up there and listen to those guys because it's a big issue.

MR. BLAKESLY: There was standing room only in Worland. People were very concerned both with the ag policy and the petition. You know, is it going to take away the water that we've got now, and how much -- you know, we certainly see an impact to the future opportunities to develop water, additional water sources here in Basin.

I mean here in the Big Horn Basin and the use of this produced water, it goes on all over Wyoming.

That was one of the original reasons that the beneficial use was carved out in the Clean Water Act in the first place, with Wyoming in particular in a desert environment, and the beneficial uses of that water went on for many, many decades, and we certainly want to see

that continue. 2 MR. GORDON: Thank you. 3 MR. BLAKESLY: Thank you. MR. GORDON: Thank you very much. I have 4 5 Keith Hamilton. 6 MR. HAMILTON: What I was going to talk about tonight is the same thing you guys have already heard. 7 I'm the Northwest District Director of the Wyoming Farm 8 Bureau. I represent the Big Horn Basin. The comments 9 that I have tonight have been submitted. It has to do 10 whether you guys actually have the authority to 11 12 regulate the quantity of water. So if you've already -- if this is an 13 inappropriate time to present these again, why then 14 15 maybe I should wait until we can deal with it in Buffalo. That's why I posed the question. You know, I 16 can read these. I can present them again. 17 18 MR. GORDON: Are those the same comments that 19 Ken Hamilton presented? 20 MR. HAMILTON: Right. MR. GORDON: I mean, duly noted. And in 21 response, I would say that that is absolutely part of 22 23 what we're wrestling with. They're very good points. 24 MR. HAMILTON: So what you've said just lately is that you will be putting this stuff together 25

and presenting it again in Buffalo or at the Buffalo meeting, so that we'll -- maybe we should wait until then and proceed after that. You're aware of what our concerns are as far as this at this point in time?

MR. GORDON: Right. And in response, I guess, you know, one of the things that is concerning to me, I think the Council has tried very hard to move in a very deliberate fashion here. And there have been —— we've had a lot of help and all of that's been good.

I guess I hope nobody thinks that the Council is anxious to jump any claims, because we certainly are not. Our authority is very prescribed. And so I appreciate those comments, and they're very, very valuable.

MR. HAMILTON: I work with Marvin a lot, the speaker before me, as it relates to sage grouse in this area. We both serve on the sage grouse committee.

We're very cognizant of the fact that if it wasn't for the methane water, our sage grouse -- particularly in the year 2006 as it related to the drought in the Big Horn Basin -- would be in desperate need.

We in agriculture are very supportive of what the oil business has done for us, in particular over in the western side of the Big Horn Basin. A lot of

irrigation takes place, and a lot of wildlife need that 1 water. A lot of livestock drink it, so we're just 2 again reiterating the fact that we don't want the same 3 rules that apply here to apply to the Powder River 4 Basin. With that, I thank you for the opportunity to 5 be here and even with short notice. 6 7 MR. GORDON: Thank you very, very much. 8 have Susie Naker. 9 MS. NAKER: That's okay, we'll save our comments for the hearing on the petition. 10 11 MR. GORDON: Okay, all right. 12 MS. NAKER: That's what I thought you were 13 doing tonight. 14 MR. GORDON: I wanted -- I really wanted to have the opportunity just to sort of get a sense of how 15 practices are being conducted in the Basin, so, thank 16 17 you. I have Barry Adolf. 18 MR. ADOLF: No comment. 19 MR. GORDON: How about Lee Campbell. 20 MR. CAMPBELL: Brief comments, Mr. Chairman. 21 MR. GORDON: Thank you. 22 MR. CAMPBELL: Hot Springs County submitted extensive comments back in early February on this 23 matter. And so we're in a position that we're one of 24 the parties that helped formulate this compromise that 25

we have today. And there's an old saying: Be careful what you ask for, because that's what you might get. So I'd like to read one sentence out of our letter from February.

"It is a recommendation of Hot Springs

County that coal bed methane surface water discharge standards be adopted specifically from the CBM industry which do not impact the other industries and counties in Wyoming." And so that's what we have today, a separation of Appendix H and Appendix I. And I guess you might as well say we were instrumental in getting that, so we support it.

I just wanted to talk to you about what it really represents. It's kind of like a first trial bloom or a first compromise that's brought to the Environmental Quality Council. I think the Powder River Basin Resource Council stepped way back from their initial position that they had in December. And ourselves and them were kind of the ones that brought this out.

Some of the questions you have to ask yourself is, okay, we have this first compromise brought forward by the people that participated early. Are there other suggestions that come out second or third that are better? I haven't heard a second or

third one myself, maybe you have.

I guess the only thing that we'll know is the test of time and go through the hearings and everything. We're kind of the ones that got us to where we're at today. We certainly support where we're at. And we'll just have to see if it stands up. We recognize you may have to modify and add some things into like Appendix I and stuff like that. We're pretty happy with where we're at today.

MR. GORDON: I want to remind you, I'm not talking about the petition specifically here. I did want to ask you a little bit about, with Hot Springs, how produced water is used. If you're a planner, do you have any direct experience with any of that?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, the irrigators use it extensively. Our economy is extremely fragile. You know, we've got more verification on use. On August 23rd, when John Cora and John Wagner and Bill DiRienzo came out, they -- I missed that tour. There were quite a few other people that went. They verified all of that.

Actually it was a pretty good experience.

They verified that the grouse were migrating in there.

They verified the usage of the water. I heard there

was one comment that the water had been entirely used.

In this drought situation, we've just been totally dependent on it. We would have had bankruptcies with our ranchers. And our grouse certainly would not be in the position they are today.

Our grouse have actually increased their population during a six out of seven year drought. You just say, how can grouse increase during a severe drought? It's that prime habitat that's been provided down there.

It isn't just the grouse. It's had the same benefit to the other wildlife and ranchers too. I'm on the sage grouse working group. I was just totally impressed. I'm sure Mr. Cora and Mr. Wagner and Mr. DiRienzo can comment on that. It was almost like a verification trip of everything that we suspected was going on.

MR. GORDON: Sure. I guess that was really -- that trip was really in response to the Ag Protection Policy and concerns about that.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, it was a two-day trip and then they had the Worland Hearing after they did the field work. They did a lot of work in the Basin here they looked at a lot of land. They talked to ranchers, looked at properties and everything, a full, busy two days.

MR. GORDON: Good. Lee, I'm envious. I wish we had had a chance. Thank you. I have Lorraine Corberg.

MS. CORBERG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am Lorraine Corberg. I am the Executive Director for the Thermoplis/Hot Springs County Economic Development Company. I'm also a State Representative representing House District 28, which is all of Hot Springs County and South Big Horn County.

And I guess I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to be here this evening. I, again, share the concerns that you've already heard about the short time frame. And I really -- in listening to the comments being made tonight -- I have more questions, I guess, than I do comments about really what you're expecting from us tonight. That's becoming clearer as this proceeds, but I really don't think that the notice was quite clear about what you expected from us tonight and what we could expect from you in return.

One of my questions -- and I'd like you to perhaps when we're done with our comments is just to give this group an overview. Many of us here are not up to speed on the petition and where that's at. I understand there's more than one petition. And so I'd like -- I guess I would just like a clarification for

all of us here when you talk about the November meeting what petition we're talking about. So, if you could give us a little history when we're done, I know we would all appreciate that. Just kind of educate us.

You did leave the door open when you brought up the Ag Use Protection Policy, which, of course, is kind of for a lot of us over here in the Basin, it started the whole process for us. So I guess one of the things I would like to share with you is a lot of us believe that as you start to deal with the petition — the Powder River Basin Resource Petition — that that may very well affect the Ag Use Protection Policy.

So I'm going to reiterate our request to you that you not take any further action on Section 20 until you're done, if you're going to start with the Powder River, because it just seems like kind of almost a waste of time if you move forward with both and then you end up having to go back and -- go back through the entire basically rule making process to fix the Ag Use Protection Policy.

Now, it's a very comprehensive policy, and I felt a lot of our comments were not acted on by the Advisory Board. Quite, truthfully, I was even a little bit more dismayed to find out that several meetings prior to our final meeting with the Wastewater and

Advisory Board that they had actually recommended going forward with Chapter 1 without the Ag Use Protection Policy. For some reason their recommendation was overlooked and the policy continued to move forward.

I would just, once again, make a request to you that that policy stay on the table if you're going to, in fact, move forward on the Powder River Basin.

I'd also like to -- obviously, as you've become well aware, water is huge to ag and to the agriculture industry over here in the Big Horn Basin. We work very well with the mineral industry. And I'll probably have to disagree with our state planner because I find it very hard to believe that you're going to be able to go through the rule making process and apply different standards to conventional discharge versus coal bed methane.

And I'm also concerned that if you do adopt standards for coal bed methane -- if coal bed methane actually starts to be developed in the Basin, then we're going to be right in the same boat as people in the Powder River Basin, and we're not going to be able to make use of that water.

So these are some of my concerns. I have also one other major concern, which Keith Hamilton brought up. Obviously, I'm going to follow very close

your statutory authority on whether or not you can actually do what you are doing.

I also sit on the select water and I'm very concerned about this as you move through this process. Thank you for being here to day. We all do appreciate it.

MR. GORDON: I'll be glad to.

MS. CORBERG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. GORDON: Delloyd Corberg.

MR. CORBERG: I'm DeLloyd Corberg I hate to follow my wife, because she always ups me. I'm a little confused, a little bit, on what you want to hear from us. I'm with the Hot Springs Conservation District. I'm the chairman of that group. And the Agriculture Protection Act is the one thing that my primary concern is protection in keeping it intact, if we can.

The conversation district -- and you're asking the other people from down there in Thermopolis what are you doing? We just finished writing a watershed plan for Owl Creek. We are in the process of phase 1 that's going on right now for Grass Creek and Cottonwood Creek, and we're looking at forming -- of the possibility of forming -- we just had a meeting on it just the other night -- this week of forming a

watershed improve district.

And in that process then we, of course, we will identify projects and things that we can do to improve the streams and the water and all of those things. All of that kind of ties in right now. But you're asking what are you doing before we're getting it all done. We are still in the process and so that is going on right now.

It's been brought up about the -- in fact, I used to have a ranch on Owl Creek and was always envious of the guys over on Cottonwood Creek because they had water and I didn't. The discharge water from the Hamilton Dome Oil Field particularly has been extremely beneficial to those folks over there and the wildlife.

That's something from the conservation district side that's a part of -- the other conservation district guy, from the teaching point of that, part of our responsibility is to conserve our natural resources, but at the same time working with a multiple use concept. We're not just one entity or industry, so that they all can benefit from those and at the same time protecting the customs and cultural and socioeconomic base of our community. So all of those things come into play, and then, obviously,

water.

I also in my other occupation of real estate appraiser, I look at land values. And if you look at sage brush and barron land at 1, 2, \$300 an acre. You put water on it so that it can produce something and you're at 2, 3, \$4,000 an acre. So the quality of our communities is in our water, and we want to see that continue.

I think part of what -- I don't fully know what all your petition is, but I know it's going to affect the ag policy. We, no matter what you do and what plan doesn't fit all but in that process, somewhere there needs to be some flexibility so that you don't try to make one size fit all. It's kind of like, if you've got a problem, and it needs a Band-Aid then put a Band-Aid on it. Don't use the mummy approach and wrap the whole body, which it looks like is trying to be done to the state.

whatever you do, consider that flexibility that needs to be there for different areas and different things. Any discharge water, whether it be what's going on right now, conventionally, in the -- from the oil fields, or whether it's coal bed methane or whether it's coming down the road in the future, I think

somewhere in that whole process there needs to be a 1 place for agriculture, particularly, be able -- should 2 be given the opportunity to use that water, to put it 3 to beneficial use and they should have that choice. 4 If the contaminant or whatever is above the 5 standard that we're looking that, that certainly should 6 7 be in place as it is now so that they can take that responsibility and use that beneficially. And, 8 certainly, along with that should be the notice of 9 water -- some of the severe side effects of this water 10 so they know fully well what they're getting themselves 11 into. I think that needs to be disclosed as well. 12 Whether it's produced in the future, that still needs 13 to be there, not just shut it off and they can still 14 15 use it. 16 MR. GORDON: Thank you. That is terrific. Those are exactly what I was hoping to hear. 17 18 MR. CORBERG: Thank you very much. Thanks for listening and having this meeting. 19 20 MR. GORDON: Thank you. That's the last person I have. Is there anyone else? 21 22 MR. SUTPHIN: I came in late, may I? 23 MR. GORDON: You bet. And I guess because 24 everybody else had a name --

MR. SUTPHIN: Isaac Sutphin, S-u-t-p-h-i-n.

25

I'm with the law firm of the Sundahl, Powers, Kapp & Martin in Cheyenne, Wyoming. We represent Merritt Energy. I apologize for being late. I didn't get out of Cheyenne as early as I wanted to.

But Merritt Energy is the operator of the Hamilton Dome. We are in the somewhat unique position of having a significant traditional oil and gas production facility. But we also have some discharges in the Powder River Basin and have an interest in the coal bed methane side of things as well.

I, like most people, here was somewhat confused about the nature of the meeting. That's fine, we understand that, and we still appreciate the opportunity to be here.

Mostly, what I wanted to reiterate today is the tremendous impact that produced water from Hamilton Dome has on agriculture, wildlife and, basically, on life in general in Hot Springs County. And Merrit has undertaken some significant economic analyses about their water. They're happy with the partnership that they have with the area ranchers. This was extremely evident on the tour that has been mentioned tonight when DEQ came and gave our facilities a visit.

But the fact remains that if any of these proposed rules, which seem to purport to impose some

more stringent standards on the water quality, if these are adopted, Merritt is going to be put in a very difficult position of considering whether to attempt to treat the water, possibly reinject the water. And the answer is, based on the analyses that have been done and comments that have actually been submitted to this effect, it's not economically viable. Plain and simple, those wells are going to be shut in and the water isn't going to be there anymore.

We have serious concerns with the various petitions that have been put forth by the Powder River Basin Resource Council. I understand you're not here tonight to discussion those petitions. But I did want to mentions Merritt's concerns.

Merritt is very concerned that any attempt to separate traditional oil and gas produced water from coal bed methane could not be a legally enforceable distinction for a number of reasons that don't need to be explained in detail at this forum.

Basically, what we're faced with at this point, the DEQ as it exists at the moment and the powers that is has are very clear. The definition of pollution is broad, but the DEQ has the ability through exceptions to dictate when and where and under what circumstances water can be discharged in this state.

It's a system that has worked well. It's protected the environment. It's resulted in a net environmental gain as evidenced by the discharges at Hamilton Dome and along the Cottonwood Creek. And we have serious concerns about the proposed changes.

I suppose it's it's not possible to make the request -- I mean, you don't seem to be giving any indication tonight what sort of petition, what sort of language will be set forth in the rule making. I take it you can't do that for us.

MR. GORDON: I can't do that tonight because that's the whole point of November 13th, the day of November 13th.

MR. SUTPHIN: We do appreciate you being here. We'll certainly be making efforts to be in attendance at the meeting in Buffalo. And thank you for you time, your concern.

MR. GORDON: Thank you. Thank you. To honor Lorraine's -- is there anyone else that has any other comments to make?

MR. BLAKESLY: Can we talk twice?

MR. GORDON: Sure, what the heck.

MR. BLAKESLY: I guess one of the things you wanted to hear tonight is how this water is used in the Big Horn Basin for the ag and ranchers. It's used

extensively for irrigation, particularly in the Cottonwood drainage. Many other drainages use it for irrigation. We grow some wonderful alfalfa crops, totally with 100 percent produced water.

Extremely important to wildlife. The McCulloch Peaks wild horse herd uses the water produced from the Oregon Basin Field and discharged down Dry Creek. That is for 30 or 40 miles across the north end of the Big Horn Basin that is for most of the year the only water source present out there. Whole ecosystems have evolved around these produced water discharges.

I can say that the petition, as originally proposed, would cause Marathon to lose 100 percent of the discharges that we have today and probably, I'm guessing, well over 80 to 90 percent of the conventional oil discharges across Wyoming would go away as the original petition was presented.

Marathon's water, in itself, provides hundreds of acres of wetlands. Loc Katrine (ph) in the Oregon Basin is very dependent up the produced water from Oregon Basin Field. It provides an additional 3 to 500 acres of additional wetlands, and the BLM has verified that this, in itself, produces, you know, another 500 to 1,000 water foul and shore birds.

That produced water is the only water keeping

Loc Katrina alive today in the drought that we've got. So there are hundreds of miles of riparian zones and habitat. The water foul use it. The deer and antelope -- it was very evident on the tours that we did when DEQ was here. We didn't see a living creature outside of a half mile to a mile from where the produced water was used in irrigatation down the Cottonwood drainage.

And as we went down the Cottonwood drainage where the water was, there was deer, antelope and sage grouse and just a myriad of wildlife out there as well as productive ranches there. And it was very evident of folks that have water rights and the ones that didn't as you went down the drainage.

The folks that have water rights on the Cottonwood -- the discharge from Hamilton Dome, down the Cottonwood Field they have wonderful alfalfa fields and cattle and horses in their pastures. And those ranches that didn't were dust and desolate. It was a very good example of what you have and what you don't have with and without the water.

Just to reiterate how that water is used in the Big Horn Basin, in may ways with the wild horses, the wildlife, the agriculture all utilize the water very significantly.

MR. GORDON: Thank you. That's exactly what

1 | I wanted to hear.

MR. JONES: In light of wanting to have some dialog on how the water is used, I'd like to have a second shot too.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ GORDON: You bet, knock yourself out, that would be great.

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{MR}}.$ JONES: Now that we know what we're here for.

MR. GORDON: Let me take just a second. The reason why I wanted to do this is because of the dialog. I grew up in KC. You know, there were all those times when people had black and white solutions to things. Usually, it was in the coffee shops that problems got solved, because not everything is all one way or the other. So that was the reason why I wanted to have this kind of a meeting.

MR. JONES: This is great that we can get our second shots and really talk about the situation.

There's been an incredible display of riveted -- the attention of these people behind you. It's been quite a show. We appreciate that they're on overtime or something. I have to recover, myself, from that.

We do use the water for countless uses.

Coming up Highway 120 from Thermopolis, Cottonwood

Creek was the only drainage that had significant water

this summer, and that was because of the discharge from Hamilton Dome. Owl Creek was dry. Grass Creek was dry. Gooseberry Creek was dry. The Greybull River had some storage, so it flowed. Those are the drainages that I have personal knowledge of.

There's an awful lot of agricultural operation in the drainages in those watersheds. They rely on every bit of water that they can get. We recycle the water. The water from the irrigation goes into the gravels and becomes our economic water. The water from Hamilton Dome has an approximately 2,500 part TDS. That will not pass your proposed, as written, rule if it were coal bed methane water.

That is water that has incredible economic effect on folks in that watershed. Marvin Blakesly, by virtue of his being affiliated with an oil company, maybe he doesn't have some credibility when he talks about the problems of wildlife.

I have a ranch in Hot Springs County on Owl Creek. I have as senior water rights as I can get and I had no water this year. Fortunately, we irrigated well last year, and the ground water held up and our domestic wells were fine.

We don't see a lot of problems with flooding our fields with our irrigation water and everything,

potable water. Most places where the TDS is higher, the hardness is higher, we have the technology to put RO and have wonderful drinking water and still water a patch of grass that we can call a lawn and kind of kick our feet around in.

And in my position, if I could raise an 80 percent crop instead of a 100 percent, based the salt sensitivity, I would be tickled to death by having 80 percent instead of the desert field. We rely on the water. We see water coming in the future. I think most of the agriculture was really hoping there's going to be some coal bed methane development in the area.

First of all, we can use the natural gas.

That's good. But the water to us is probably more important than that natural gas. We have towns that would love to have good quality water. And not all coal bed methane water is really bad.

We want to encourage and stipulate the development of our resources within proper bounds. We don't want to put a blanket rule out that is going to restrict our economic development.

While you're saying you're not taking testimony on the petition, it's obvious that this discussion we're having is important to you in evaluating the petition, so we have to kind of direct

-- I feel I need to direct my comments to you in light of what might come to be in the future. And I want to come back to agriculture, wildlife.

1.3

And everybody in the community recycles the water, uses the water. It turns over several times in our water sheds just the same way an economic dollar turns over several times in our community. You can't separate the two even.

good, and if you look at the water quality in Big
Spring, it could never pass your CBM rules, but it sure
provides a heck of a lot of benefit to our community.
And it's all natural. What's the distinction, natural
coming out of a pipe in an oil field? It's not how it
comes to be. It's how we can develop the uses for it
and keep the damage down.

And we ask you not to try to make the Powder River Basin Rule when there are real problems that are different than elsewhere in the state fit our area if it can't. I'm going to have to say that based on what I've seen in your draft documents, you can't. I'd like to leave that with you.

MR. GORDON: Okay. All right. Well, anyone else? I'll try to honor Lorraine's comments. Let me start out with back before the turn of the century,

coal bed methane started out and there was an issue that showed up about whether the state engineer would recognize the production of water for coal bed methane as a beneficial use. That was term that was used in Wyoming statutes, and I think it was Jeff Facet at the time who decided that was a beneficial use.

2.2

Environmental Quality Act, there was a slightly different issue. I liken it to productive use. It did really have the same standing as beneficial use. And so our issue -- and some of you that have been using produced water for a long time might remember that there were statements that would be signed as to how will you put this water to beneficial use.

When Chapter 2 was revised -- excuse me

Chapter -- Chapter 2 was revised, there were a number of different rules packages that were rolled in as appendices. One of those was this Appendix H. At the time, language was considered that basically blessed that water for the Environmental Quality Act.

So really you didn't have a statute -- there was nothing to do with the state engineer. It really had to do with -- the land owners no longer had the opportunity to sign that statement. And so that issue seems to be one of the things that's confused people

around the state for a long time.

When we use the term "beneficial for water," are we talking about the state statute or are we talking about this productive use standard in the Environmental Quality Act? And I think it's been so helpful to have the Attorney General and others really carefully consider how you sparse the distinction.

Because it is clear that each agency has its responsibility. We have absolutely no authority to jump anyone's claim. We can only deal with the Environmental Quality Act.

Now, as a citizen of Wyoming, and you know this, it's difficult to have a problem. There are places in the state that have problems, other places that don't. Some places where it's a great boom. We all know that there are cases where things can be better.

As a citizen with a problem, if you go to one agency and they say, it's not our jurisdiction, so then you go to another agency and they say, that's not our jurisdiction, and you go to another agency and they say it's not our jurisdiction, that citizen gets pretty frustrated.

That's what is so great about having a task force, which is meeting in Douglas tonight, because

they can look at the statutory issues that really the legislature needs to deal with that particular kind of difficulty. Our role and one reason why I wanted to talk about this, is because coal bed methane, with its abundance of water in the Powder River Basin, has brought into some reference some areas that have had problems, and they have not been dealt with very successfully since 2000, since 1999, probably since 1998.

I served on an advisory board way back when, and there's been advisory board after advisory board. And it always comes down to this one difficult thing: Who's got jurisdiction. So it's great what that task force is doing.

What I wanted to do, since the Powder River had those issues, and we've heard about terrific cases and poor cases. And then when John Cora said, you know, we're going to have a meeting up there. I was unable to get up here for that meeting. I had very short notice.

Then Norma Lee and other people in the Basin

-- I think think Sarah Flitner, one of my colleagues,
also got some calls and people started say, look,
you've got to understand what's going on in the Basin,
so that was the reason why I wanted to have this

meeting.

I didn't -- I wanted to have more in the sense of a conversation, largely because we need to understand the scope of these issues as they pertain to the Basin. They do influence how we proceed. So the problem we have is that we took two votes. Let me kind of go through that time line a little bit.

In February, I believe it was, the
Environmental Quality Council decided to proceed on the
citizen's petition that was presented by the Powder
River Basin Resource Council, largely, because there
was a quantity of water that was unregulated, and the
perception was maybe there was something that should be
done about that. Whether we had jurisdiction or not
was not really being considered at that point. That is
why the governor requested of the Attorney General Pat
Frank that he issue an opinion, which he did.

And that then occasioned an adjustment in the citizen's petition and also a motion for dismissal, which came in the spring. And we voted down the motion for dismissal. It was a little bit nongermane, but the intent was clear.

And it's because we believe that that petition still had some scope to go forward within the context of our jurisdiction. But because there was so

many different pieces of language, at first, I thought, well, let's publish something that we can go through all of our various minutes and try to come up with the proper fully-worded language. Because we knew what it did and the trail of all of the meetings and motions that passed the amendments and so on and so forth.

Then it became clear there could be a lot of confusion, as many of you have said tonight. So it seemed very important to have the November 13th meeting to sit down to make sure everybody understood what the language was, then proceed to publish it with the state -- secretary of state -- that then goes to the normal 45 day period. And then we'll have a hearing on that, and we'll judge whether that rule has legs at that point or not, as it's proposed. Does that kind of cover most --

And then the other part of that is the Ag

Protection Policy which hasn't come to us. Some of you

may know, and some of you may not, but the

Environmental Quality Council gets rules from the

Department of Environmental Quality.

The Environmental Quality Council is a separate agency, and we are charged with that rule making capacity. So as the Ag Protection Policy bubbles it's way through the Water and Waste Advisory

Board and through the Department of Environmental 1 Quality -- I'm hoping Bill is going to correct me if I 2 misstep here -- they will then present that to the 3 Environmental Quality Council with a suitable 4 notification, too, and that will then go to hearing in 5 6 front of the Environmental Quality Council.

So those -- they are very similar in what they try to discuss. But I guess from my perspective, nobody has been in the Basin. There have been some people from the Basin who have addressed the Council, but nobody has been in the Basin to say: How is it working up here? You obviously have a slightly different thing from what's going on over there. That's why we had this meeting tonight. Thank you.

MS. CORBERG: Thank you.

MR. GORDON: Thank you.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. KRAMER: So at the November 13th meeting are you going to choose which language to use or is it possible that you're going to come up with language not in those proposals?

MR. GORDON: We're going to make sure the language logically and consistently holds together, but it's not going to be different from what we've done. It's just if there's a "they" in some place where that article doesn't refer to the right saying, something

like that, that's what we're going to do, draft that
language. And it's not going to publication. It's
still very much open. Does that make sense?

MS. KRAMER: I think so. I was at the July hearing and heard some of the Council members say that they were really concerned about the language in the last version of the petition.

I'm just wondering if that's where you're starting from, or are you going to come up with something that you're trying to pinpoint the issue more or are you going to use the last petition?

MR. GORDON: I think we'll start from the last petition, but I think we're going to try to pinpoint it more precisely, make sure the language actually does what it says it's supposed to do.

MS. KRAMER: Thanks.

MR. GORDON: Thank you. Dog McMullen, I just took note of what you said. I'll try to pass that along. We're not formally related to the Department of Environmental Quality. We don't serve as a quality control or anything like that.

MR. McMULLEN: I had no issue with the water. I think the water coming out of the well is great. It needs to be put to use. All I'm saying, if there's an issue with it, you need the teeth to make

them clean it up. MR. GORDON: Okay. Thank you all. Thank you for your comments, and please stay involved in the process, and we will give you ample warning, (Thereupon, the public hearing concluded at 7:45 p.m.) . 9

CERTIFICATE

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

1.7

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

County of Missoula)

STATE OF MONTANA

I, David E. Hix, Freelance Court Reporter and Notary Public for the States of Idaho and Montana, residing in Missoula, Montana, do hereby certify:

SS.

That I was duly authorized to and did report the testimony and evidence in this cause;

That the foregoing pages of this deposition constitute a true and accurate transcription of my stenotype notes.

I further certify that I am not an attorney nor counsel of any of the parties; nor a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor financially interested in the action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal on this the 9th day of November, 2006.

airel Exlex

Freelance Court Reporter,

Notary Public, States of Idaho and Montana Residing in Missoula, Montana.

My Commission expires: January 8, 2008

A009783 PUBLIC HEARING **NOVEMBER 2, 2006**

A
abandoned 18:2
ability 13:22 38:23
able 16:2,9 23:6 32:14 32:21 36:2
about 3:21 4:16,25 5:3
8:7,13,18 9:12 10:1 11:2 13:2 16:3,11,14
19:15 22:16 24:6
26:19 27:13 28:11,12
29:19 30:12,15,18 31:1,2 33:4 34:9
37:12,19 39:5 42:18
43:18 46:2 47:3,4,24
48:4,16 49:14 52:6 above 36:5
absolutely 24:22 47:9
abundance 48:5
according 13:23 accurate 54:8
acre 35:4,6
acres 6:15 7:8 40:19,22 across 40:8,16
act 7:2 23:22 33:15 46:8
46:20 47:5,11
acted 31:22 action 31:14 54:11,11
actual 7:7
actually 13:10 16:5 23:5
24:11 28:22 29:5 32:1 32:19 33:2 38:6 52:15
add 28:7
additional 23:17 40:21
40:22 address 7:6 10:11
addressed 8:4,5 51:10
adjustment 49:18
administrator 12:15 Administrator's 12:11
ado 6:7
adolf 26:17,18 adopt 32:17
adopted 27:7 38:2
advised 10:1
advisory 4:22 12:15 31:23 32:1 48:10,11
48:11 50:25
affect 31:12 35:11
affected 12:21 affiliated 43:16
after 12:5 23:5 25:3
29:21 48:11 ag 19:19 23:14 29:18
31:6,12,19 32:2,9
35:11 39:25 50:17,24
again 5:9,19 6:7 7:15,16 14:4 18:24 23:1,3
24:14,17 25:1 26:3 30:11 32:5
agency 47:8,19,20,21 50:23
ago 3:3
agricultural 4:21 12:6
14:15,23 15:4,13,24 16:23 43:6
agriculture 16:7,8,22
17:13,20 19:22 21:12 22:8,10 25:23 32:10
33:15 36:2 37:17
41:23 44:11 45:3

air 8:3 alfalfa 40:3 41:16 alive 41:1 almost 22:13 29:14 31:16 alone 7:25 along 21:10 36:9 39:4 52:19 already 24:7,13 30:12 alteration 13:18 although 19:3 altitude 15:18 always 33:11 34:10 48:12 amended 20:5,10 21:21 amendments 50:6 amounts 18:5 ample 53:4 analyses 37:19 38:5 animals 12:20 another 7:12 40:24 47:20.21 answer 38:5 antelope 41:3.9 anxious 25:12 anybody 7:24 anymore 38:9 anyone 4:9 5:22 10:13 36:21 39:19 45:23 anyone's 47:10 anything 19:2 52:21 apologize 23:2 37:3 apparent 21:25 appear 15:25 appearing 2:8,11 appears 14:19 appendices 46:18 Appendix 13:9 27:10,10 28:8 46:18 applicability 9:12 apply 9:15 26:4,4 32:15 appraiser 35:3 appreciate 16:5 19:12 22:17 23:1 25:14 31:4 33:5 37:13 39:14 approach 14:22 35:17 appropriate 14:7 approximately 43:11 aquatic 12:20 area 8:4 12:23 17:23 21:23 25:18 37:21 44:12 45:19 areas 35:21 48:6 arid 21:23 around 4:4 9:11 15:8 21:7 40:11 44:5 47:1 artery 15:20 article 5:3 51:25 asked 4:15 10:20 asking 33:19 34:6 assist 14:14 associated 6:4 ATKINSON-BAKER 1:21 attempt 38:3,15 attend 23:6 attendance 11:5 39:16 attention 42:20

47:6 49:16 54:10.11 August 28:17 authority 12:11 24:11 25:13 33:1 47:9 authorized 54.6 available 3:16 Avenue 2:10 avid 21.9 aware 10:8 25:3 32:9 away 22:6,23 23:15 40:17 awful 43:6 a.m 1:12 A009783 1:25 В **B** 12:21

back 7:1,3 8:19 9:20,20 14:9 17:19 26:23 27:17 31:18,18 45:3 45:25 48:10 bad 8:15 17:2,3,3 44:17 Band-Aid 35:15,16 bankruptcies 29:2 barlow 9:6.7 barron 35:4 Barry 26:17 base 34:24 based 38:5 44:7 45:20 basically 9:22 31:19 37:17 38:20 46:19 Basin 1:11 3:4,22 4:14 4:17 5:15 10:11 14:25 16:19,19 17:2,8 19:10 19:16,22 21:7,12,14 21:18 22:2,7,12,16,25 23:18.19 24:9 25:22 25:25 26:5,16 27:17 29:22 31:7,11 32:7,10 32:19:21:37:9:38:12 39:25 40:7,9,20,21 41:22 45:18 48:5,21 48:24 49:5,11 51:9,10 51:11 basis 17:6,12,17 bearing 12:16 became 21:24 50:7 become 32:9 becomes 43:10 becoming 30:16 bed 9:15 13:4 17:23 20:11 27:6 32:16,18 32:18 35:24 37:10 38:17 43:13 44:12.17 46.1 3 48.4 45:25

before 5:1 25:17 34:6 behalf 2:8,11

behind 42:20 being 4:17 18:6 23:1 26:16 30:14 33:5 37:3 39:14 43:16 49:15 believe 31:10 32:13 49:8.23

belly 15:16 beneficial 16:2 23:22,24 34:14 36:4 46:4,6,10 46:14 47:2

beneficially 36:8 benefit 16:2 18:8,14

29:11 34:22 45:12 Bernadette 9:5 bet 36:23 42:5 better 10:25 11:4 27:25 47:17 between 16:21 17:4.17 big 7:3 10:11 14:25 16:19 19:10,16,22 21:14 22:2,6,9,12,16 22:25 23:11,19 24:9 25:21,25 30:9 32:10 39:25 40:9 41:22 45:10 bill 1:17 3:12,13 18:17 28:18 51:2 biological 13:19 birds 40:24 bit 11:3 12:13 16:10.12 16:14 28:12 31:24

33:12 43:8 49:7,21 black 42:12 blakesly 2:15 19:8,9 21:4 23:8,12 24:3 39:21.23 43:15

blanket 44:20 blessed 46:19 **BLM** 40:22 bloom 27:15 boal 1:15 3:11 board 4:22 12:15 31:23 32:1 48:10,11,11 51:1 boat 32:20

Bob 11:23 body 13:25 35:17 book 5:3 boom 47:15 born 21:6

both 17:20 19:19 23:13 25:18 31:17 Boulevard 1:22

bounds 44:19 bovine 15:11,11,12,14 **Brady** 3:15 **Brand 1:22 Brief** 26:20 brisket 15:19 broad 38:23 brought 27:15,19,23 31:5 32:25 34:9 48:6 brush 35:4

hubbles 50:25 Buffalo 6:9 20:14 24:16 25:1,1 39:16 Bureau 24:9 business 25:24

C C 2:5 12:22 54:1.1

busy 29:24

California 1:22 call 23:5 44:4 called 6:18 10:23,24 calls 48:23 came 3:4 4:19 19:20 21:25 28:19 36:22 37:23 49:20 campbell 2:16 26:19.20 26:22 28:15 29:20 capacity 50:24 care 8:3 17:6

careful 27:1 carefully 47:7 Carey 2:10 carved 23:22 cases 22:13 47:16 48:16.17 Casper 2:8 5:1,13 10:18 20:1 cattle 15:14,19 41:17 cause 13:18 15:9 40:13 54:7 **CBM** 27:7 45:11 cell 23:5 century 45:25 certainly 22:4 23:16,25 25:12 28:5 29:3 36:6 36:9 39:15 Certificate 2:21 certify 54:5.10 chairman 1:14 3:7 26:20 30:4 33:8,14 chance 5:8 30:2 change 13:20 14:1 18:3 18:10 changes 18:1,3 39:5 Chapter 17:9 32:2 46:15 46:16:16 character 12:18 charged 12:5 50:23 chemical 13:19 chemistry 18:4 Cheyenne 2:10 3:12 4:9 5:13 37:2,4 choice 36:4 **choose** 51:18 circumstances 12:16 38:25 citizen 47:12.18.22 citizen's 49:10.19 claim 47:10 claims 25:12 clarification 30:25 clarified 7:21,23 clean 7:10 8:20,20,22 23:22 53:1 clear 19:21 30:18 38:22 47:8 49:22 50:7 clearer 30:16 client 11:12 close 15:23 32:25 coal 9:15 13:4 17:22,23 20:11 27:6 32:16.18 32:18 35:24 37:10 38:17 43:13 44:12,17 46:1.3 48:4 coexisted 16:7 coffee 42:13 cognizant 25:19 colleagues 48:22 color 7:19 13:21 come 4:13 5:5.15.22 8:7 8:19 16:9 18:1 20:23 21:21 22:10 27:24 34:25 45:2,3 50:3,18

attorney 2:7,9 6:4 10:20

51:19 52:9

48.12

comes 21:13 45:15

comfortable 18:16

coming 3:2 5:9 16:18

16:19 19:10,13 35:25

A009783 PUBLIC HEARING NOVEMBER 2, 2006

11:6,9,14,19,21,23,25

18:24 19:7 20:14 23:2

13:10,16 14:3 16:5

forbing 25.0
fashion 25:8
February 26:23 27:4
49:8
federal 17:14 feedback 7:24 8:9
feel 14:21 45:1
feet 8:24 44:5
fellow 6:2
felt 9:22 18:16 31:22
fences 8:6
few 4:14 28:20
field 9:13,16 15:5,6
29:22 34:13 40:7,21
41:16 44:9 45:14
fields 7:7,16 8:19 18:1
21:8 35:24 41:16
43:25
FILE 1:25
files 4:9
final 31:25
financially 54:11
find 31:24 32:13
fine 17:15 37:12 43:23
finished 33:20
firm 2:7,10 37:1
first 6:10 7:14 9:11
14:13 19:9 22:15
23:23 27:14,15,22
44:13 50:1
fit 16:4 35:12,14 45:19
five 12:4
fix 31:19
flexibility 35:13,20
Flitner 3:14 48:22
flooding 43:24
Floor 1:22
flowed 43:4
folks 6:8 9:11 10:11
22:2 34:14 41:12,14
43:15
follow 7:5 32:25 33:11
follow-up 8:14
force 47:25 48:14
forced 7:23
foregoing 54:8
foremost 14:13 Fork 15:5
formal 10:5 14:8
formally 52:19
forming 33:23,24,25
formulate 26:25
forth 20:21 21:21 38:11
39:9 50:6
Fortunately 43:21
forum 38:19
forums 3:10 15:8
forward 5:11 10:2 19:25
20:3.7.10 21:2 27:23
20:3,7,10 21:2 27:23 31:17 32:2,4,7 49:24
foul 40:24 41:3
found 18:20
four 7:8 8:24
Fourth 1:10
fragile 28:16
frame 30:13
Frank 49:17
Freelance 2:1 54:4,16
Friends 4:15
from 4:24 5:6 6:9,19
7:13,17,24 8:9,11,12

9:20 10:12 13:4,6 16:18 18:8.14 21:13 22:6 23:5 27:3,7,17 30:16,18,19 33:13,19 34:12.16.18.22 35:19 35:23 37:16 38:16 40:7,21 41:6,15 42:22 42:24 43:1.9.11 50:20 51:8,10,13,23 52:9,12 front 4:23 5:25 14:5 15:10 51:6 frustrated 47:23 full 29:24 fully 35:9 36:11 fully-worded 50:4 Funny 5:3 further 5:25 6:7 21:4 31:14 54:10 future 4:17 11:2 16:1 17:24 18:9 23:16 35:25 36:13 44:10

G gain 39:3 gas 8:2 13:6 15:3 16:6 18:5,12 37:7 38:16 44:13.15 gave 4:4 8:9,10 37:23 geez 22:18 general 5:9 18:25 37:18 47:6 49:16 generally 13:12 georges 11:23,24 gets 47:22 50:20 getting 4:1 12:13 17:19 27:11 34:6 36:11 Girardin 3:17 give 4:10 11:3 15:25 30:22 31:3 53:4 given 36:3 giving 39:7 glad 10:1 33:7 Glendale 1:22 go 3:24 5:21.24 8:7 10:2 14:6,9 15:14 22:19 28:3 31:18,18 32:14 40:16 47:18,20,21 49:7,24 50:2 51:5 goes 11:8 22:6 23:20 43:9 50:12 going 5:21 8:16 13:23

43:9 50:12
going 5:21 8:16 13:23
14:1 16:15 17:10
20:15 23:14 24:6
29:16 31:13,15 32:1,6
32:14,20,21,25 33:22
34:8 35:10,22 38:2,8
38:9 44:11,20 45:20
48:18,24 51:2,13,18
51:19,21,23 52:1,2,9
52:11,13
gone 4:21 13:13 22:20
good 5:14 8:15 15:3,16
16:20 17:3 22:10,11
24:23 25:10 28:22
30:1 41:19 44:14,16
45:10

Gooseberry 21:16 43:3

gordon 1:14 3:2,7 6:12

9:1,5,8,24 10:9,12,16

23:9 24:2,4,18,21 25:5 26:7.11.14.19.21 28:10 29:17 30:1 33:7 33:9 36:16,20,23 39:11.18.22 41:25 42:5,9 45:23 51:16,21 52:12,17 53:2 government 12:4 19:12 governor 49:16 Governor's 3:4 grass 33:22 43:2 44:4 gravels 43:10 great 3:5 42:6,17 47:15 47:24 48:13 52:24 grew 42:11 Greybull 43:3 ground 18:20 43:22 group 18:18 29:12 30:22 33:14 grouse 18:14 21:15,17 25:17,18,20 28:23 29:3,5,7,10,12 41:10 grow 7:9 21:7 40:3 guess 3:3 6:1,5 7:2 10:1 10:2 16:18 19:24 20:8 20:12 25:6,11 27:10 28:2 29:17 30:10,15 30:25 31:8 36:23 39:23 51:8 guessing 40:15 guy 4:5 34:18 guys 23:10 24:7,11 34:11 Н

H 27:10 46:18 habitat 21:17 29:8 41:3 half 41:6 hamilton 2:16 24:5,6,19 24:20,24 25:16 32:24 34:13 37:6,16 39:4 41:15 43:2.11 hammered 17:11 hand 54:12 handle 15:20,22 happened 23:3,5 happening 17:17 happy 28:9 37:20 hard 25:7 32:13 hardness 44:2 hate 33:10 having 15:13 23:4 31:18 36:19 37:7 44:8,24 47.24 health 12:10.19 hear 5:6.15 8:12 11:1 22:17 33:12 36:17 39:24 42:1 heard 5:12.13 9:17 22:15 24:7 27:25 28:24 30:12 48:16 52:5 hearing 1:7 6:3 9:12,25 14:6 19:11 20:1 21:2 26:10 29:21 50:13 51:5 52:5 53:5 hearings 28:3

heat 4:6 heavily 19:22 heck 39:22 45:12 held 43:22 help 4:1 5:2 25:9 helped 26:25 helpful 47:6 herd 40:6 hereunto 54:12 high 15:9,18 higher 44:1,2 Highway 42:24 Hillman 4:3 him 4:4 6:6 history 31:3 Hix 1:24 2:1 6:2 54:4,16 hold 3:6,22 4:20 holding 9:25 holds 18:9 51:22 hollow 15:16 honor 39:18 45:24 hope 5:19 22:23 25:11 hoping 36:17 44:11 51:2 Horn 10:11 14:25 16:19 19:10,16,22 21:14 22:2,6,12,16,25 23:19 24:9 25:22.25 30:9 32:10 39:25 40:9 41:22 horse 40:6 horses 41:17,22 Hot 9:20 26:22 27:5 28:12 30:8 33:13 37:18 43:19 **House** 30:8 huge 32:9 hundreds 40:19 41:2 hunt 21:10 hurts 22:9 Hutchinson 3:15

Idaho 2:2 54:5,17 identify 34:3 impact 23:16 27:8 37:16 impacts 22:24 important 15:17 16:8,23 20:20 21:14 22:1 40:5 44:15,24 50:9 impose 37:25 impossible 14:2 impressed 16:9 29:13 improve 13:23 34:1,4 improved 18:21 inappropriate 24:14 **INC** 1:21 including 12:18 13:20 inconceivable 13:4 increase 29:7 increased 29:5 incredible 18:5 42:19 43:14 incredibly 15:3 indication 39:8 indifferent 8:15 Indirectly 17:21 industries 27:8 industry 10:22 15:21 18:5 22:9,11 27:7

32:10.11 34:22 influence 49:5 informal 5:8,20 initial 27:18 injected 18:7 injury 12:18 instead 44:7,9 instrumental 27:11 intact 33:16 intent 49:22 interactions 14:20 17:2 interest 37:9 interested 54:11 interference 12:19 involved 12:17,23 53:3 irrigatation 41:7 irrigated 43:21 irrigation 7:18 16:15 21:13 26:1 40:1,3 43.9 25 irrigators 28:15 isaac 2:9.17 36:25 issue 23:11 46:1,9,11 46:24 49:17 52:10,22 52:25 issues 48:1,16 49:4

January 54:18 Jeanie 9:2 Jeff 11:21 46:5 jill 2:14 9:8,24 10:13 20:9 Joe 3:17 JOEGIRARDIN 1:18 john 1:16 3:12,15 4:19 18:17 28:18 18 48:17 jones 2:15 11:19,20 12:1,2 13:15,17 14:9 16:25 19:5 42:2,7,17 judge 50:14 July 52:4 jump 25:12 47:10 jurisdiction 47:19,21,22 48:13 49:14.25 just 4:12 7:2 8:10,14 9:14 11:10 13:11 14:3 15:23 18:7 20:6 21:4 22:1,5,9,23 24:24 26:2,15 27:13 28:6 29:1,7,10,12 30:21,25 31:4,16 32:5 33:20,24 33:25 34:21 36:14 41:10,21 42:9 45:6 51:24 52:8,17

K
Kapp 2:10 37:1
Katrina 41:1
Katrine 40:19
KC 42:11
keep 4:8 6:8 35:19
45:16
keeping 33:16 40:25
keith 2:16 24:5 32:24
Ken 24:19
Kevin 11:19,21
kick 44:4
kind 4:12 7:24 13:11

A009783 **PUBLIC HEARING NOVEMBER 2, 2006**

19:18 23:20 25:24
31:7 32:10 34:11,14
40:15 45:5,7 51:13
overlooked 32:4
overtime 42:21
overview 30:22
Owl 33:21 34:10 43:2,19
owners 46:23

P P 2:5.5 packages 46:17 pages 54:8 paper 5:2 paralegal 1:18 3:18 Park 15:2,11 part 14:7 16:8 17:22 24:22 34:17,19 35:9 43:12 50:17 participate 3:10 participated 27:23 particular 23:23 25:24 48.2 particularly 21:15 25:20 34:13 36:2 40:1 parties 26:25 54:10 partners 18:4 partnership 37:20 pass 43:12 45:11 52:18 passed 20:17 50:6 past 4:12,13,19 pastures 41:17 Pat 49:16 patch 44:4 Peaks 40:6 pending 5:1 20:11 people 3:24 4:14 5:4 10:22 12:20 16:22 19:15,18 22:4,20 23:13 27:23 28:20 32:20 33:19 37:11 42:12,20 46:25 48:21 48:23 51:10 percent 40:4,13,15 44:7 44:7.9 perception 49:13 perhaps 15:9 17:15 30:21 period 10:4 50:13 permanent 4:9 permission 4:4 permit 12:15 Permits 12:12 person 36:21 personal 43:5 perspective 51:8 pertain 49:4 pertinent 5:7 petition 4:25 5:12 11:2 17:10 19:20 20:4,5,10 21:19,21 23:14 26:10 28:11 30:23,24 31:2 31:10,11 35:10 39:8 40:12.17 44:23,25

49:10,19,24 52:7,11

petitions 38:11,13

52:13

ph 40:19

phase 33:22

phone 4:11 23:5

physical 13:19 picked 5:3 pieces 50:1 pinpoint 52:10.14 pipe 45:14 pipeline 18:7 Pitch 15:5 pits 8:23 place 3:5 6:17 20:18 23:23 26:1 36:2,7 51:24 places 5:13 44:1 47:14 47:14,15 **Plain** 38:7 plan 33:21 35:12 planner 9:21 28:13 32:12 plant 12:20 play 34:25 plays 6:9 please 22:24 53:3 pleased 21:20 pleasure 21:6 plugged 18:2 podium 5:21 point 11:16 20:18 22:5 25:4 34:18 38:21 39:12 49:15 50:15 pointed 15:6,8 points 24:23 poison 8:16 policy 4:21 14:18 15:21 15:25 16:4 19:19 23:14 29:19 31:6.12 31:20,21 32:3,4,6 35:11 50:18.24 polio 15:12.15 polluted 6:22 pollution 12:17,22,25 14:12 38:23 poor 48:17 population 29:6 populations 21:17 Porter 2:7 10:18 posed 24:16 position 26:24 27:18 29:4 37:6 38:3 44:6 possibility 33:24 possible 5:20 39:6 51.19 possibly 18:6 38:4 potable 7:21 44:1 Powder 16:18 17:2,7 26:4 27:16 31:11,16 32.7 21 37.9 38.11 45:17 48:5,15 49:10 Powell 6:9 powers 2:10 37:1 38:22 practicabilities 14:10 practicability 12:23 practicable 14:22 practices 13:12 26:16 precisely 20:15 52:14 prescribed 25:13 present 24:14,17 40:10 51:3 presented 24:19 40:17

47:22 price 17:25 primary 33:16 prime 29:8 prior 31:25 priority 12:22 probably 6:5 7:8 18:11 23:7 32:12 40:14 44:14 48:8 problem 15:10 35:15 47:13,18 49:6 problems 15:19.20 17:1 17:15 42:14 43:18.24 45:18 47:14 48:7 proceed 25:3 49:5.9 50:11 proceeds 30:17 process 17:14 31:8.19 32:14 33:4,21 34:2,7 35:12 36:1 53:4 produce 35:5 produced 4:16 5:15 9:13,16 13:17,25 16:6 19:21 21:13 22:1.16 23:20 28:13 36:13 37:16 38:16 40:4,6,11 40:20,25 41:6 46:12 producers 14:24 15:4 15:13,18 16:21 produces 40:23 production 13:6 17:18 17:24 18:12 37:8 46:3 productive 41:11 46:9 47:4 Professional 2:1 program 17:15 programs 16:11,16 projects 34:3 proper 44:19 50:4 properly 8:21 properties 13:19 29:24 proposals 51:20 proposed 37:25 39:5 40:13 43:12 50:15 protected 39:2 protecting 34:23 protection 4:21 19:19 29:19 31:6.12.20 32:2 33:15.16 50:18.24 provide 16:2 provided 18:15 29:8 provides 21:16 40:18 40:21 45:12 public 1:7,24 2:2 12:10 15:8 20:8,20 53:5 54:5,17 publication 52:2 publish 50:2,11 published 10:4 13:14 14:6 21:1 pulmonary 15:20 purchased 6:15 purport 37:25 purposes 3:20 5:18 put 18:7 20:18,25 35:5 35:16 36:3 38:2,11 44:2,20 46:14 52:24 putting 24:25 P.C 2:7 p.m 53:5

Qaulity 6:5 quality 1:2 3:8,14,23 4:23 8:18 13:23 27:16 35:6 38:1 44:16 45:10 46:8.20 47:5.11 49:9 50:20,21,22 51:2,4,6 52:20,20 quantity 24:12 49:12 quarum 20:22 question 20:13 24:16 questions 4:15 5:25 10:12 27:21 30:14,20 quite 28:19 30:18 31:23 42:20 R R 2:5 54:1 raise 44.6 raised 21:6

ranch 34:10 43:19 ranchers 14:14 17:18 19:11 29:3,11,23 37:21 39:25 ranches 41:11.18 read 24:17 27:3 real 17:1 35:2 45:18 realize 8:1 23:4 really 5:6 9:24 13:13 14:22 15:2 16:1 18:21 19:2 20:24 22:22 26:14 27:14 29:17,18 30:13,15,17 42:18 44:11.17 46:10,21,22 47:6 48:1 49:15 52:6 realtime 13:24 reason 4:13 5:5 22:19 32:3 42:10,15 48:3,25 reasonableness 12:17 12:24 14:11 reasons 23:21 38:18 receive 9:19 received 6:21 recognize 12:11 17:1 21:22 28:7 46:3 recommend 20:23 recommendation 27:5 32:3 recommended 32:1 recommending 12:14 record 9:19,23,25 12:2 14:8 recording 3:17,20 4:8 recover 42:22 recycle 43:9 recycles 45:4 reducing 12:24 14:11 refer 51:25 reference 48:6 register 19:3

regulate 24:12

reiterating 26:3

relates 25:17

reinject 38:4

41:21

regulations 12:12,14

reiterate 31:13 37:15

related 25:21 52:19

relationship 15:3 16:21

22:12 relative 54:10 rely 43:8 44:9 remains 37:24 remember 46:12 remind 12:9 28:10 report 20:5 54:6 reported 1:24 2:1 reporter 2:2.21 6:3 10:20 54:4.16 **REPORTERS 1:21** represent 10:19 12:3 24:9 37:2 representation 10:25 representative 6:18 30:7 representing 30:7 represents 27:14 request 31:13 32:5 39:7 requested 49:16 required 13:24 requirement 14:23 residing 2:3 54:5,17 resolutions 20:16 resolved 9:22 Resource 27:17 31:11 38:12 49:11 resources 12:8 14:16 14:17 34:20 44:19 respect 22:14 response 8:11 9:21 24:22 25:5 29:18 responsibility 34:19 36:8 47:9 rest 14:14 18:18 restrict 44:21 result 7:1 18:6 22:24 resulted 39:2 results 6:22 7:13,14 8:15 return 30:19 revised 9:15 46:15,16 Rick 3:11 right 6:10 7:3 8:23 19:2 24:20 25:5 26:11 32:20 33:22 34:5.8 35:23 45:23 51:25 rights 41:12,14 43:20 riparian 41:2 River 16:18 17:2,8 26:4 27:17 31:11,16 32:7 32:21 37:9 38:11 43:3 45:18 48:5,15 49:11 riveted 42:19 RO 44:3 road 35:25 role 48:3 rolled 46:17 room 23:12 rotting 8:6 routinely 15:18 rule 4:25 5:12 9:13,14 13:24 18:21 19:25 20:3,10 31:19 32:14 39:9 43:13 44:20 45:18 50:14,23 rules 12:12.14 13:22 20:21 26:4 37:25 45:11 46:17 50:20

49:10

presenting 25:1

pretty 11:11 28:8,22

running 6:21

A009783 PUBLIC HEARING NOVEMBER 2, 2006

	T	1	1	1
U	want 4:3 5:6,23 18:24	western 25:25		Constitution of the Consti
	22:5 23:25 26:3 28:10	wetlands 40:19,22		
unable 48:19	28:12 33:12 35:7,19	we'll 5:24 10:3 11:8	1 17:9 32:2 33:22 35:4	
unclear 20:2	38:13 44:18,20 45:2	21:2 25:2 26:9 28:2,6	1,000 40:24	
under 20:20 38:24		39:15 50:13,14 52:12	1,200 6:23	
underlying 17:22	wanted 4:13 5:5,7 9:9		100 19:18 22:12 40:4,13	
understand 5:17 13:12	9:18 10:7,21,22,24	we're 9:24 20:15,24	44:7	
14:3 30:24 37:13	13:11 21:21 26:14,14	21:19,23 24:23 25:19	11-302 14:10	
38:12 48:24 49:4	27:13 37:4,15 39:24	26:2,24,24 28:4,5,5,8	11-32 12:11	
understood 50:10	42:1,10,15 48:3,15,25	28:9 30:21 31:2,3	117 1:10	
undertaken 37:19	49:2	32:20,21 33:23 34:6	120 42:24	
unique 37:6	wanting 42:2	34:21 36:6 38:20 42:7	13th 20:14 39:12,13	
unpaid 12:4	wants 4:9 5:17	44:24 48:18 51:21	50:9 51:17	
	warning 53:4	52:1,13,19	159 2:8	
unregulated 49:12	wasn't 11:14 25:19	we've 6:15 7:15,24 9:17	1	
until 8:1 24:15 25:2	waste 31:17 50:25	23:15 25:9 28:17 29:1	1725 2:10	
31:15	Wastewater 31:25	41:1 48:16 51:23	1998 48:9	
ups 5:22 33:11	water 4:17 5:16 6:20,23	WHEREOF 54:12	1999 48:8	
usage 28:24	7:17,21 8:3,5 9:13,16	While 44:22		
use 4:5 16:2 17:20		white 42:12	2	
23:19,22 28:15,17	12:7 13:3,4,5,6,6,8,23	I.	2 1:12 3:1,22 35:4,6	
31:6,12,19 32:2,22	13:25,25 14:16,16,20	whole 11:16 31:8 35:17	46:15,16	
34:21 35:16 36:3,4,8	15:7,22,24 16:1,6,14	36:1 39:12 40:10	2,500 43:11	
36:15 40:2 41:3 42:23	16:22 17:2,3,19,22	wife 4:4 33:11	20 17:9 31:14	
44:13 46:4,6,9,10,14	18:4,6,11 19:5,16,21	wild 40:6 41:22	l control of the cont	
47:2,4 51:18 52:11,24	19:23 21:8,10,12,13	wildlife 12:20 19:22	2000 48:8	
used 4:17 15:13 17:14	22:1,6,16,18,20,21,22	21:11,11,15 22:8,11	2006 1:12 3:1,22 25:21	
1	22:25 23:15,17,17,20	26:1 29:11 34:15	54:13	
17:20 28:13,25 34:10	23:22,24 24:12 25:20	37:17 40:5 41:10,23	2008 54:18	
39:24,25 41:7,21 42:3	26:2 27:6 28:13,24,25	43:18 45:3	23rd 28:18	
46:4	32:9,22 33:3 34:4,12	William 10:18	28 30:8	
uses 23:24 40:6 42:23	34:12 35:1,5,7,22	Williams 2:7	288-3376 1:23	
45:5,15	36:3,10,10 37:16,20	winners 22:7		
using 46:11		wish 19:14 23:6 30:1	3	
Usually 42:13	38:1,4,4,9,16,25	WITNESS 54:12	3 35:6 40:21	
utilize 16:1 41:23	39:24 40:4,6,10,11,18		I I	
	40:20,24,25,25 41:3,6	wiz 3:19	30 40:8	
V	41:9,12,14,20,21,23	Wolcott 2:8	300 6:15	
And the state of t	42:3,23,25 43:8,9,9	wonderful 3:5 40:3	35 12:10 14:9	
valuable 18:11 25:15	43:10,11,13,14,20,21	41:16 44:3		
value 12:21 16:17	43:22,25 44:1,3,3,10	wondering 52:8	4	
values 35:3	44:10,14,16,17 45:5,5	work 4:1,6 14:14 17:16	40 40:8	
various 3:10 38:10 50:3	45:6,9,10 46:3,12,14	25:16 29:22,22 32:11	400 2:8	
verbal 6:22	46:20 47:2 48:5 49:12	worked 39:1	45 50:13	
verification 28:17 29:15	50:25 52:23,23	working 20:15 29:12	43 30.10	
verified 28:20,23,24	waters 13:17,20 18:15	34:20 51:12	F	
40:23	watershed 33:21 34:1	Worland 4:20 19:17	5	
verify 6:25	43:15	23:13 29:21	500 1:22 40:22,24	
version 52:7	watersheds 43:7	wrap 35:17	54 2:21	
versus 32:16		wrestling 24:23		
very 3:25 5:8 10:24 16:8	way 11:12 27:17 42:15	, ,	6	
16:20,20,22 18:16,24	45:6 48:10 50:25	writing 33:20		
19:15,17,22 20:2 21:9	ways 16:21 41:22	written 43:13	6 12:13	
	weeds 7:9	wrong 15:14	6:15 1:12 3:21	
21:11,14,16,23 22:11	week 9:14 33:25	wyoming 1:1,11 2:8,10		
23:13 24:4,23 25:7,8	well 7:17 11:1,10 13:4	3:22,25 15:16 23:20	7	
25:13,14,14,19,23	13:22 19:18 27:11	23:23 24:8 27:9 37:2	7:45 53:5	
26:7,7 31:12,21 32:11	31:12 32:9,11 36:11	40:16 46:5 47:12		
32:13,25 33:3 36:18	36:12 37:10 39:1		8	
38:2,15,22 40:20 41:4	40:15 41:10 43:22	Y		
41:11,19,24 48:7,19	45:23 50:2 52:23	year 3:3 7:11 25:21 29:6	8 54:18	
50:9 51:7 52:3	wells 6:17 18:1 22:19		80 40:15 44:6,8	
viability 12:6	38:8 43:23	40:9 43:21,22	800 1:23	
viable 38:7	well-being 12:19	years 7:8 8:19 22:12	82003-0328 2:10	
video 3:9	Wendy 3:15		82602 2:8	
virtue 43:16		Z		
visit 37:23	went 23:24 28:20 41:8	zones 41:2	9	
visited 15:5	41:13		9th 54:13	
1	were 7:15 8:2 10:10	**************************************		
voted 49:20	16:24 20:16,17 23:13		90 40:15	
votes 49:6	26:12 27:11,19 28:19	\$300 35:4	91203 1:22	
	28:23 31:22 41:18	\$4,000 35:6		
W	42:11 43:13,23 46:13			
Wagner 28:18 29:13	46:16,17 52:6	0		
wait 24:15 25:2	West 3:24	05 6:16,16		
		55 5.75,15		