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JUDGE MELLOY: Good morning, everyone.
I had a few technical problems there. I'm sorry for starting a little late. This, again, is, of course, in the Texas versus United States, New Mexico, and Colorado. Let me ask to -- for the parties to enter their appearance again. For the State of Texas?

MR. HOFFMAN: I was muted. For the State of Texas, Robert Hoffman, Your Honor.

JUDGE MELLOY: For Colorado? Excuse me. For New Mexico?

MS. ATTON: Your Honor, Corinne Atton for the State of New Mexico.

JUDGE MELLOY: And for United States?
MS. COLEMAN: Good morning, Your Honor.
Judith Coleman for the United States.
JUDGE MELLOY: And Colorado?
MR. WALLACE: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Chad Wallace for the State of Colorado.

JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Well, yesterday, we had this issue about exhibits, but I'm going to hold off on that. I'd like to continue with the cross-examinations and try to get as much of that done today as we possibly can. I was reminded, however, that, Ms. Atton, you had moved the admission of Stevens Demos No. 13 and 14 , to which there was no
objection, but $I$ failed to formally admit them so those are admitted into evidence. One other point, Texas submitted a replacement of Texas Exhibit 696, and we need to take a look at that a little more closely. It's certainly a more legible copy, but I'm not sure it's exactly the same as the 696 that was originally admitted, so I'd ask -- I'd ask Texas and the parties to take a look at that to make sure that that is an exact duplicate of what was admitted into evidence, other than in a more legible form. So with that, is there anything we need to talk about before we proceed with Dr. Stevens' examination? If not then -- go ahead.

MS. ATTON: Sorry, Your Honor. So there was a question you asked yesterday about pre-1906 rights.

JUDGE MELLOY: Oh, yes. Any -- any further thoughts on that issue?

MS. ATTON: So, yes, Your Honor. As background to your question on pre-project rights in New Mexico, there are three active pre-project water rights below Caballo, the Bonita Lateral, which you saw, which serves approximately 200 acres. Below that is a Holguin right, which serves approximately 90 acres through a river pump, and Horner right, which
serves approximately 23.5 acres through a river pump. All told, these rights serve approximately 315 acres of which approximately 115 acres take water below the Caballo gage. New Mexico office of the state engineer data shows that these rights divert approximately 1,200 acre-feet per year. Now, these pre-project rights are important and are being adjudicated in the New Mexico adjudication, but we do recognize that the amounts of water are relatively small. New Mexico is not aware of any claims about these water rights being raised in this case, and we do not think they will make an appreciable difference to the outcome. Nonetheless, we do think recognizing those rights is important and provides context for Project operations that is helpful to understanding the issues in this case. New Mexico believes the Compact protects those rights by virtue of its intention to continue normal operations of the Project.

MR. SOMACH: Your Honor, this is Stuart
Somach. May I be heard?
JUDGE MELLOY: You may.
MR. SOMACH: Yes. I saw the transcript.
Unfortunately, I was pulled away yesterday. I saw most of yesterday, but at the end, I -- I had to leave. I would like to have an opportunity to address
this a bit maybe in a day or so. This is an issue. It has been an issue particularly with respect to the Bonita Lateral. I need to get direction from my client, however, about this. Our general view had been consistent with Hinderlider that what New Mexico decides to do and how it decides to address claims on Rio Grande water under its apportionments in New Mexico was up to New Mexico, but that that should have no effect upon Texas, in the same way any preexisting rights in Texas would be dealt with by Texas and -and not involve New Mexico. We believe the Compact provides an absolute priority for Compact water, notwithstanding any preexisting uses of that water in New Mexico or, quite frankly, in Texas. Some Compacts do have preservation for prior existing rights. On the Colorado River, there are considerable prior, I think they call them prior vested rights, and -- but this Compact doesn't provide for that. But if I could, I'd like to at least get some further direction from my client on how to handle this, but $I$ didn't want it to be gone with silence somehow being acquiescence.

JUDGE MELLOY: Well, $I$ didn't mean to
stir up a hornet's nest about this issue. I thought it was pretty much a nonissue, but since it does
appear to be something that you may need some further discussion on, let's put that on the back burner for now, and we'll proceed with the testimony. We'll take it up at a later time.

MR. SOMACH: Thank you, Your Honor.
JUDGE MELLOY: Thank you, Mr. Somach.
Dr. Stevens, we're going to continue
with the examination this morning. I do need to remind you you're still under oath, and the same admonitions I mentioned yesterday apply today.

You may proceed, Ms. Atton.
MS. ATTON: Thank you, Your Honor. JENNIFER STEVENS,
having been previously duly sworn, testified further as follows:

## FURTHER DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. ATTON:
Q. Good morning, Dr. Stevens.
A. Good morning.
Q. Let's take a look at the 1938 downstream contract, and that's Exhibit JT 0426. Dr. Stevens, what was the context to the 1938 downstream contract?
A. So this contract was intended to identify and sort of lock in the maximum amount of acreage that -that the water could safely irrigate, and what this
did was it divided that acreage, which was 155,000 acres, between the farmers and the lands in New Mexico and EBID and those downstream in Texas and EPI in the proportions of $57 / 43$ or 88,000 acres and 67,000 acres respectively.
Q. Let's just enlarge the "therefore" clause in the paragraph afterwards. And you've taken those numbers from this passage you've seen enlarged on the screen?
A. Yes, that's right. In addition to those numbers, there was an allowance for an increase of 3 percent or a cushion, if you will, for the farmers to increase that acreage as they saw fit or as the farmers needed to.
Q. Now, this downstream contract is dated February 16th, 1938, and that's very close to the date when the 1938 Compact was signed; is that right?
A. Yes, that's right. About five or six weeks, yes, very close.
Q. Let's look at another exhibit. MS. ATTON: Could you bring up New Mexico $1419 ?$
Q. (BY MS. ATTON) What is this exhibit, Dr.

## Stevens?

A. This is a March 1938 letter from Frank

Clayton, the Texas Commissioner for the Rio Grande Compact Commission to Mr. Robertson, and Mr. Robertson was secretary of the Water Conservation Association downstream of Fort Quitman, so he was representing the water users in an area outside of the Compact area.

## Q. Can you give us some context to this letter?

A. Yes. So the downstream users, and when I saw "downstream," I mean downstream of Fort Quitman in this case, were concerned about the fact that the Compact did not provide for a specific amount or specific volume of water to pass into Texas and, therefore, downstream -- downstream to them, and so after the parties signed the Compact, each of the states had to ratify that Compact before it went to Congress, and this was sort of some internal politics, if you will. The people downstream from Fort Quitman were very concerned about this lack of specificity with regard to a volume of water passing the Texas state line -- the Texas/New Mexico state line, and so this was Clayton responding to some of those concerns and explaining how the Compact came to be.

MS. ATTON: Can we please enlarge the last paragraph on Page 2 of this exhibit. Page 2 of the exhibit. Thank you.
Q. (BY MS. ATTON) So there's a reference in this
paragraph here to, "All diversions of water below Elephant Butte and all releases from the reservoir being under the control of the Bureau of Reclamation." Do you see that?
A. I do see that, yes.
Q. What's the significance of that?
A. What Frank Clayton was explaining to the downstream representative here was that the reason for not specifying a volume of water passing the Texas/New Mexico state line was because it wasn't -- that water wasn't in control of either state. It was in control of the Bureau of Reclamation, and so he was explaining that and explaining why such a provision with regard to specificity of volume was not present in the Compact and explaining that the Project was to be operated as a unit and that the Bureau of Reclamation was in control of that water.
Q. Let's look at a passage on the next page, that's Exhibit No. 3. Can you please enlarge the last paragraph on the page, particularly the sentence starting, "As a matter of fact"?

Okay. Do you see, Dr. Stevens, the first

## full sentence here?

A. I do, yes.
Q. Now, Mr. Clayton says here that he feels that
under the Compact, Texas will receive, and I quote, all the water she can reasonably expect. Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. What do you understand Mr . Clayton to mean by this?
A. So as the record shows in this matter, there had been some discussion about the amount that would constitute the, quote, normal release, and Texas, as we know, had been fighting for an 800,000 acre-foot number; however, through the course of various negotiations and the folks upstream of Elephant Butte expressing some concern, the State of New Mexico and Colorado and Texas had come to agree on the 790,000 acre-foot conclusion, and that was -- that amount of water to be released from Elephant Butte was, in fact, considered enough to handle Texas' salinity concerns, and so together, all three states agreed on that, and in this matter -- or in this letter, Clayton is saying this is as much as Texas can expect to receive, and we're happy with it. This is a good number for us. It takes care of our concerns.
Q. Let's look at another exhibit. MS. ATTON: Can you bring up New Mexico 0445 ?
Q. (BY MS. ATTON) Now, we have a letter here dated September 29, 1938, from Sawnie Smith to Mr. Frank Clayton. I think this is one of the exhibits that we saw yesterday.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recognize this exhibit, Dr. Stevens?
A. I do.
Q. Let's step through this letter paragraph by paragraph, if we may. Let's start with the first paragraph. Now, what does Mr. Smith say in this first paragraph?
A. So Mr. Smith, who represents the water -another set of water users downstream of Fort Quitman is writing, again with similar concerns to Mr. Clayton, and he is concerned, also, about the amount of water that has not been specified in the Compact to come across the Texas border, and in addition to that, and I failed to sort of make this connection a minute ago, these folks were making -I'm not sure how overt they were, but there was certainly concern that the downstream folks might fold up ratification in the Texas legislature, so Sawnie Smith, representing some of those folks, is writing to Clayton and asking why some of these things are not present in the Compact, and in this first paragraph,
he specifies the fact that there had been no provision, quote, for the division of waters below Elephant Butte between New Mexico and Texas and no provision made concerning the amount of water to which Texas is entitled. And, again, this is about the volume of water.
Q. Let's take a look at the next paragraph. Now, Mr. Smith sets out certain of his understandings in this paragraph. What were his understandings as he reports in this paragraph of his letter?
A. So Smith here is explaining his understanding that relates to the -- the contract, the downstream contract, that we just talked about a minute ago, and he says here that the Project is established and its water is basically divided, and he says 60 percent, 40 percent. We know it's 57/43, but he's sort of rounding up and down. And he says that if those understandings are correct, the division of the waters would be in proportions of the Rio Grande Project in the said two states. So he's explaining his understanding of what the Compact has laid out.
Q. Let's look at the next paragraph. Now, here in this paragraph, Mr. Smith expresses some concern as to a future controversy, and he says here that he did not find anything in the Compact which ties down and
limits the use or division of the waters according to present usage of physical conditions. Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. What do you understand Mr . Smith to be saying here?
A. Well, I think he's expressing a concerning that there is nothing in the Compact that limits the uses downstream of the dam, and he's -- he's expressing concern, perhaps he's prescient here that there was nothing in that Compact that would prevent a controversy between the two states because of that absence.
Q. Let's look at the last paragraph of his letter. Now, this is the concluding paragraph of Mr. Smith's letter. What does he request of Mr. Clayton?
A. He asks for a response. He says the omission that he has been referring to is, quote, too obvious to have been inadvertent and so he says that the commissioners clearly had a valid reason for it and essentially, please tell us what that valid reason was, so he asked Clayton to respond so he can get back to his clients.

MS. ATTON: Let's look at the next
exhibit, New Mexico 2119.
Q. (BY MS. ATTON) So this is an October 4th, 1938, letter from Mr. Clayton back to Mr. Smith, and I believe it's his response letter; is that correct?
A. Yes. That's right.
Q. And this is, for the record, a letter that Dr. Miltenberger also directed the Court to yesterday. So let's look at what Mr . Clayton says in response to Mr. Smith's letter that we just looked at. Let's enlarge the first paragraph. Now, what does Mr. Clayton tell Mr. Smith in this paragraph?
A. So he explains that the lack of a state line delivery had been determined a long time ago. He said that -- in the middle of the paragraph here, he explains that prior to the signing of the 1929 temporary Compact, that New Mexico's obligations were to deliver into Elephant Butte, and the reason for that were because the state line was always changing, the delivery points went back and forth across the state lines, so it was just very difficult to make that sort of a distinction, and so he explains why the decision was made to make New Mexico's obligations into Elephant Butte and not at a state line.
Q. Let's look at the next paragraph. What responses does Mr . Clayton give Mr. Smith in this

## paragraph?

A. He explains in this paragraph that the releases and the delivery of water from Elephant Butte are in the hands of the Bureau of Reclamation. He says that they're in control of these waters, that at least until the government is, quote, repaid its investment and probably beyond that time, the states themselves have no control over how this water is managed or delivered, and so this is really -- it's not possible to expect any particular fixed delivery to Texas when the dam itself and those deliveries are not in the hands of either of those states.
Q. Let's now look at the last paragraph of Page 1 of the exhibit and the continuation of that paragraph at the top of Page 2. Now, in this section, Mr. Clayton responds to Mr. Smith's questions regarding the decision of project water. What clarifications does he give?
A. So he explains here that the contracts we discussed a moment ago regarding the 57/43 split is how that water is divided and that even though the states don't have control of the deliveries and don't have control of the operations, that they do have this contract that guides and determines how that water is delivered and what proportions, and that's what he's
describing here. And, again, he repeats the figures that I mentioned a moment ago, the 88,000 acres for Elephant Butte Irrigation District in New Mexico and 67,000 acres -- I'm sorry, not acre-feet, acres for the El Paso County Water Improvement District.
Q. And that 88,000 to 67,000 is the 57 percent to EBID, New Mexico, and 54 percent -- sorry -- 57 percent and then 43 percent division to EPCWID in Texas; is that right?
A. That's right. Those are the proportions or the percentages of the total of 155,000 acres.
Q. And Mr. Clayton uses the term, and he quotes it, frozen, in this paragraph. What's the significance of that?
A. So this is the only thing that $I$ see in the entire historical record that is actually frozen, which is that 155,000 acres plus the 3 percent cushion. It's the only place in the record that I see the term frozen, and it's the only thing in the record that -- that is frozen during all of these negotiations and during all of the communications and the formal official documents that relate to the signing of this Compact.

MS. ATTON: Please can you enlarge the third paragraph on this page? Starts, "The
arrangement just..."
Q. (BY MS. ATTON) What explanation does Mr. Clayton give in this passage?
A. He explains here why that contract and the numbers in it were not included in the Compact itself, and he explains that this is a contract between private parties, the two districts, and he says that it was that reason that nobody felt that it was desirable to actually put those terms into the Compact itself.
Q. So Dr. Miltenberger, yesterday, referred to a 1938 condition, and he offered the opinion, I believe, that any depletions occurring within the Project are frozen as of 1938. Do you agree with this opinion, and, please, can you explain your response?
A. I don't agree with that opinion. Sawnie Smith is the one who wrote to Mr. Clayton and said, "I see nothing in this Compact that ties down the uses," and Clayton, in his response, which is up on the screen, never dispels that notion. He never says that depletions are frozen. He only says that the acreage under the Project is frozen at 155,000 acres. If you look at the entirety of the historical record, there's no question that the Bureau of Reclamation's whole -the whole reason behind its existence is to increase
settlement and to grow the west. So it's unlikely, in my mind, that any -- any of the three states would have intended to limit that growth, and certainly the Bureau of Reclamation, to have done so and to have limited depletions and limited growth on the Project would have been contrary to its purpose, to its existence at all. And $I$ think it's -- it's very clear from a historical record, and we talked about some of this yesterday, that the entire discussion leading up to the Compact was not just about present uses and it said over and over and over in the Rio Grande Joint Investigation Report, but also to accommodate and examine the need for the future, both population growth, changes in crops, changes in the water system itself, including things like rectification, which we talked about, potential upstream storage, et cetera. So as far as I read the historical record, and I look at the entire context of all the things that went into it, it's very clear to me that this is a forward-looking document, not a document intended to freeze anything in time except for that acreage number.
Q. From your review of the contemporaneous historical record, have you seen any discussion of any state wanting Project operations frozen in 1938?

Worldwide Court Reporters, Inc.
A. No.
Q. Now, before we move on, Dr. Miltenberger yesterday identified a few documents dated 1968, when he was offering opinions as to what the authors of those documents understood 30 years earlier. From the perspective of an expert historian, what's your response to that testimony?
A. So my methodological approach is to look at everything in the record that is relevant. Certainly the 1968 documents are worth looking at and important to view, but my method and my approach to any historical research that $I$ do is to rely most heavily on materials that come from the time period that I'm studying, and the further away I get from that time period, the less reliable $I$ find the responses to be or the records to be. I'm sure that anybody trained in history knows there's actually an entire area of history called the history of memory, believe it or not, and believe me, I'm not an expert in it, but there's a question as to how good people's memories are as time goes on, so while 1968 is certainly not out of the realm of discussion for understanding this Compact, particularly as it relates to the actions of the parties involved, somebody's recollection 30 years later isn't as reliable a document to me in my view,
in my, you know, ascertaining the body of historical evidence as the materials from the immediate time right around the Compact. So I have no problem using 1968 documents at all. In fact, I think that they could be important, but in my mind, anybody writing in 1968 has accumulated a lot of additional knowledge since the time in this particular matter of the Compact being signed, which was 30 years earlier, and it's hard to separate out that new knowledge that you gain in that interim period from what you knew back in 1938. So, again, $I$ don't find it unreliable. I just think you have to sort of look at it and understand the context of it and then weigh it against the documentation of the time period you're actually studying.
Q. Now, one of the documents Dr. Miltenberger directed the Court to was a 1968 document by Reynolds. Do you recall that?
A. I do.
Q. In that 1968 document, if you recall, there was some discussion as to understandings related to groundwater?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have a response to the use of that document to inform understandings in 1938,
specifically with reference to the issue of groundwater?
A. Well, Steve Reynolds was not part of the negotiations and was not present during the negotiations for the Compact. He was not made state engineer in New Mexico, I don't believe, until 1955, so, again, it's one of those documents that $I$ think is important to look at perhaps. I don't really know the context within which Steve Reynolds gave that speech or why he was giving it, so $I$ would need to know those sorts of things before $I$ offer opinions on it, but as a general matter, because he was not a party to the Compact negotiations and doesn't really enter the scene until much later, I, again, sort of take that as one piece of the puzzle but perhaps not the most significant piece of the puzzle to answer the questions that $I$ was asked to answer.

MS. ATTON: Let's bring up Stevens Demonstrative No. 3.
Q. (BY MS. ATTON) Now, Dr. Stevens, on this demonstrative, you've summarized some of your opinions concerning the Project in the 1938 Compact. Based on your review of the historical record, can you please explain each of these opinions?
A. Yes. So the first opinion on the slide is
that the Project was always operated as a single unit, and that seems clear from -- from the record, that the Bureau of Reclamation was in charge of the Project and that it was intended to be operated that way and that the second point here, each acre was figured to receive the same amount of water. So when they did their annual allocations each year, they figured that water on the same amount per acre for the entire project. The third point here relates to that downstream contract and the fact that the parties agreed amongst themselves that of the 155,000 acres within the Project area, which was considered the safe -- the safe amount to irrigate with the water supply, that 57 percent of those acres were in New Mexico, and 43 percent of those were in Texas. This next point is very important, not more important, not less important, but very important, and that is that the Project was always intended to be flexible. I have studied many irrigation Reclamation projects in the west, and $I$ have never seen a single project that is, you know, limited in time and isn't expected to change and grow over time, and so I -- I believe strongly and the historical record demonstrates that the Rio Grande Project was intended to be flexible, that it was intended to adapt to changing needs, changing crops,
changing technology and many other developments that perhaps I'm not listing here, and then the final thing is that the states -- all three states intended the 1938 Compact to protect that project and to protect the existing rights under that project, and New Mexico intended the project to be the protection for its downstream water users and that's an important point to make.

MS. ATTON: Your Honor, I move to admit Demonstrative No. 3 into evidence.

MR. HOFFMAN: No objection, Your Honor. JUDGE MELLOY: No. 3 is admitted into evidence.
Q. (BY MS. ATTON) I'd like to now turn to groundwater. Now, Dr. Miltenberger briefly identified a number of groundwater reports yesterday, and I'd like to bring these up on the screen and ask you about them. Let's start with the Vernon report of 1903, which is Joint Exhibit 0446. Dr. Stevens, what is this report?
A. This was a report done in 1903 by the agricultural experiment station of the New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, which we know now today as New Mexico State University, and this was a study done by John Vernon and Francis

Lester that was examining the ability or the potential to pump water from wells in the Mesilla Valley for irrigation purposes for crops.
Q. What were the key findings of this study?
A. Well, it was good news for farmers. They essentially found that there was a -- I think the term they used was inexhaustible supply of underground water lined beneath the acreage in the Mesilla Valley. So it was a positive finding for the farmers. It was encouraging them to use pumping in the case of erratic flows or dried-up flows of the surface water of the Rio Grande, and, of course, this predated the project being built so at the time, this was considered good news because the farmers could rely upon, again, what they thought was an inexhaustible supply of underground water.
Q. Let's look at Page 8 of this exhibit.

MS. ATTON: If you could please enlarge the title summary and the first paragraph below it.
Q. (BY MS. ATTON) We've highlighted it here on the screen. What is the significance of this finding that is highlighted here?
A. So, again, what this essentially says is that there's an ample quality of water, and importantly, that it's in a comparatively shallow depth, which
means this is an accessible supply of water for the farmers in the area.
Q. Let's turn to Page 13. And if you could please enlarge the last paragraph on that page. Now, what is reported in this passage?
A. So, again, this is a passage related -- or the whole report is related to southern New Mexico and the Mesilla Valley, and it says here that the whole valley appears to have water underneath it. They didn't know at the time the specifics of this water, whether -- and he says here whether it's an immense reservoir or river flowing, but he says that the amount is enormous and that it's amply sufficient to meet all reasonable needs, and then he says that a sufficient quantity of water exists under every acre of irrigable land in the valley. So they didn't believe that the supply would cease to exist, which it says at the very end here. They thought that the supply was enormous, and they thought that it was close enough to the surface to be reasonably drawn up and used on the fields to crop.

MS. ATTON: Let's turn to Page 58. And if you could enlarge the sentence that starts above the image, starts with, "in the pumping of water." My apologies. It starts "water throughout the valley."

1

That's correct. And if you could -- exactly. Thank you. Enlarge the continuation of this passage below the image.
Q. (BY MS. ATTON) NOw, this is a passage a little later in the same report. What is reported here?
A. So it's reiterating the amount of water, and it's also specifying exactly how deep that water is and the water table they described here is between 15 and 20 feet beneath the surface and, again, this is where they actually say inexhaustible supply of water. They also continue that the water is of good quality and that it's so short a distance beneath the surface of the -- of the ground that it can be raised up and used for irrigation.
Q. Now, Vernon doesn't just talk about New Mexico in this report, does he? He also discusses El Paso?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. But let's first just go back a few pages to Page 54 of the same report.

MS. ATTON: And if you could enlarge -yes -- the first paragraph here under the heading, "Pumping Plants in New Mexico."
Q. (BY MS. ATTON) What is described in this

## section of the Vernon report?

A. So Vernon here is describing the fact that in New Mexico, pumping is still a relatively new phenomenon, but he points out and he points to El Paso as -- as a sort of place to look for experience and an example of how they're using the groundwater there. And he says here that -- that in 1900, when they took a census, that only about a thousand acres of land in New Mexico were irrigated from wells but that in El Paso -- well, actually, don't get to the El Paso part here. We'll get to that in a minute, but that was compared to about 200,000 acres, which were irrigated from the streams in New Mexico. So New Mexico itself was still a little behind the times at this point as compared to El Paso, which I think is coming up in the next section.
Q. So let's look at Page 55.

MS. ATTON: And if you could enlarge the first paragraph on that page.
Q. (BY MS. ATTON) What does Vernon report here?
A. So first, he orients the reader to the location of El Paso, which is about 30 miles down the stream, and he says that the conditions there are very similar to the ones that he is describing in the New Mexico part of the Mesilla Valley, and he says here
that the experience of the farmers in the El Paso area is worthwhile and important to look at. He says here that through a constant failure of the regular supply of the irrigating water from the Rio Grande, the farmers there have had to turn their attention to wells and that they had to do that, otherwise, they were going to have to abandon all possibilities of farming and doing agricultural work.

MS. ATTON: Let's look at another
exhibit. Can we bring up JT 0430?
Q. (BY MS. ATTON) Dr. Stevens, do you recognize this exhibit?
A. I do.
Q. Can you describe what it is and very briefly what it -- what is described in it?
A. Sure. So it was written in 1919, and this is, again, the time that the drainage was being constructed on the Project, and, again, because the Project was sort of continued to evolve over time, this is a report that was looking at the possibility of constructing a high line canal, which ultimately was not done, and, in fact, this report recommends against it. It was also looking at the potential of developing power at the Elephant Butte Dam and then, finally, of supplying water for the City of El Paso
from the Elephant Butte Dam. And it was written, I should say, by the Bureau of Reclamation's Board of Engineers.
Q. Just stepping back a little bit and thinking about what was happening in 1919, can you explain to the Court what was happening, you know, on the Project area more generally at this time?
A. Yes. So by now, the delivery of storage water had commenced. It had begun in 1915 and then, of course, the dam was completed in 1916. So the Project was really beginning to mature, and, of course, as I mentioned, there was a problem of waterlogging and so drainage construction had also begun at the time. So the Project was still -- you know, it wasn't brand new, but it was still evolving and maturing at this time, and they were still trying to figure out as electric power became a potential for creation on hydro -- on dams, they were looking at that sort of thing, that that was sort of a new thing at this point. So the Project was evolving, and they were looking at different ways that they could actually use the Project for new and different reasons.
Q. So let's look at some of the conclusions that were made in this report.

MS. ATTON: If we could turn to Page -we're looking at Paragraph No. 109, which I think starts on Page 48 and crosses over to Page 49. If you could enlarge that Paragraph 109 for us completely.

## Q. (BY MS. ATTON) Dr. Stevens, what is reported

 in this Paragraph 109?A. So as I mentioned, this report was related specifically to three issues, and the -- the high line canal, the power, and then the use of storage water for the city of El Paso. This particular paragraph is related to a question about -- about power supply, and its concern here or the concern it's addressing is whether or not power supply might result in a shortage of water sometimes and so it states here that the users on the Project would be okay with having a shortage of water because they could always look to groundwater if they needed to, assuming that provided, and it says this at the end of the paragraph, provided that cheap power was obtainable. So they're looking at that last sentence, there's a possibility that the quality of groundwater may in time improve so that it may be used to reduce the shortages as they occur provided cheap power is obtainable. So what they're saying here, and they're reiterating from what we know from earlier in the Project, that around the turn of
the century, they looked at wells as a possibility for supply, but that when the Project was constructed, they -- you know, the promise of the Elephant Butte Project and the Rio Grande Project was to provide a reliable surface supply to the farmers. What this is essentially saying in 1919 is that, you know, that groundwater supply is still available in times of shortage as a supplement in the event that, you know, we create this power supply, and it messes with the reliability of the surface water.

MS. ATTON: Your Honor, if you will
forgive me, we're having a slight technical issue with Dr. Stevens' microphone. Could we just take one minute just to make sure we fix that so it's clear for everyone?

JUDGE MELLOY: All right. We'll take a couple minutes.
(Recess.)
MS. ATTON: Your Honor, I think we're
fixed.
JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Let's go ahead then.
Q. (BY MS. ATTON) Dr. Stevens, let's look at the next chapter in your timeline.

MS. ATTON: If you could bring up

Stevens Demonstrative No. 15.
Q. (BY MS. ATTON) Please talk us through the events and documents on this timeline.
A. So this timeline takes us from the signing of the Compact through to 1963, and the first couple of entries here are, again, sort of just intended to demonstrate the continual changes that are occurring in the system, in the Rio Grande system. So between 1936 and 1938, the Caballo Dam was constructed, and that was a dam that was partially intended for storage and also partially intended for flood control reasons. The second thing you see here is what I've already referred to a bit, which was the Rio Grande rectification or what I've written here as the canalization, and what that process was, was an effort to make the management of the Rio Grande more efficient by straightening out the channel, which it did, making it more or less into a canal. In 1946, things started to change rather dramatically. It was that year that it became clear that there would be a shortage of water and that they were entering into a drought. So in 1946, the Elephant Butte Irrigation District reached out to the U.S. Geological Survey and asked to cooperatively sign the agreement where they would study the groundwater in the Mesilla Valley in

New Mexico so that they could understand whether or not that could be a supplemental supply for them in times of shortage, and they were -- it was a -- it was really an emergency. They were looking at a reservoir that did not have enough water in it to supply them with a full allotment and so they reached out to the USGS very concerned that they didn't have the information they needed about that groundwater supply, in part because it hadn't really been studied up until this point very much, and so they signed that agreement and there ensued a study by the USGS regarding groundwater, which we'll talk about. The next several entries on the timeline in the upper part represent a series of studies that came out beginning with the results of the study $I$ just mentioned with EBID in 1947, so initially there was a preliminary memo that was issued by the author of that study, Conover, and then following that time, there were a series of additional reports related to groundwater and understanding of groundwater in the valley downstream of Elephant Butte Dam that came out of 1954, 1961, and then finally, in 1963. And just along the bottom here, I've put a placeholder to represent the time period that that drought extended. So it was more or less from the late 1940s until about 1957 that
that drought extended and continued.
Q. Let's look at the 1947 Conover preliminary memo. That's Joint Exhibit No. 444. Now, what is this first page?
A. This is the transmittal letter from C.V. Theis, who we've mentioned in the last couple of days, who oversaw Conover's work on this investigation. And they call this the preliminary memo because, as I mentioned, the Elephant Butte Irrigation District and the farmers thereunder were quite concerned about the lack of water in Elephant Butte Dam at this time, so the folks at Elephant Butte Irrigation District really were pushing for results from this study. They wanted to make sure that the water was available and they wanted to look at what would happen if they pumped this groundwater on their lands and whether or not that was an option for them so they pushed to get some results from that in 1947, and this is the letter that transmitted those results.
Q. Let's look briefly at Page 2 of this exhibit. I think this is where the preliminary memo starts; is that right?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. It says here at the top, the author is Clyde S. Conover?
A. Yes. And it's dated September, 1947.

MS. ATTON: Let's enlarge the second paragraph at the bottom of this page.

## Q. (BY MS. ATTON) What is reported here?

A. So this is, again, sort of an introduction and the reasons -- it's explaining the reasons for the investigation, and it's explaining that the -- what Conover and his colleagues looked at here was what would happen if they pumped water for irrigation, what was the productiveness of wells going to be, and importantly -- and this is really the first time this has been looked at -- what would the effect of that pumping be on the surface water supply in the river and the drains, and then it -- the last thing it says here is that, again, this is urgent. They were entering a drought, and EBID needed to know what the -- what the preliminary results were so that they could make a decision about whether or not to pump.
Q. Are you aware of any investigation before 1947 that focused on the potential effect of pumping on surface water supply?
A. No study prior to this that quantified that impact, no.

MS. ATTON: Let's turn to Page 10 and to the last paragraph on that page, if you could enlarge
that.
Q. (BY MS. ATTON) Now, what is reported here?
A. So going back to the Vernon and Lester report, after that time, several wells were dug, but as I mentioned, once the Project went into effect, those wells had ceased to -- the farmers ceased to use those wells, so what Conover is describing here is that in 1947, very few wells were operating in the Mesilla Valley at the time in New Mexico and that, although there had been several of them in the early 1900s once Elephant Butte Dam went in and there was a reliable surface supply provided by the Project, those wells had been abandoned. However, with the coming drought and the concern over that, new irrigation wells were being drilled and -- and that's the reason that they needed to do this study, and he was explaining sort of laying the groundwork for what was actually going on, on the ground at the time.
Q. Let's look at Page 22 of this exhibit.

MS. ATTON: If you could enlarge the first sentence of the first full paragraph. The second paragraph on the page.
Q. (BY MS. ATTON) Now, looking at this first sentence here, what do you understand this sentence to be saying?
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A. This is the first time in the literature, in the historic literature, where there is actually quantification of what's going to happen if groundwater is pumped, and Conover states here that the debt -- that's what he calls it, he calls it the debt -- of groundwater can be repaid, i.e. by recharging of the aquifer, in four years of average water supply. So it basically is giving the farmers in EBID a sense of what the results are going to be if they pumped groundwater and how long it will take for the surface water to replenish that supply in years of normal supply. So it's really -- you know, it's the first sort of number that's provided that will help them understand that.
Q. Now, when were Conover's findings published?
A. Well, these were made available to the State of New Mexico, but the U.S. Geological Survey didn't publish this as a water supply paper until 1954.
Q. Let's take a look at that report. It's New Mexico 499. Do you recognize this exhibit?
A. I do.
Q. And what is it?
A. This is Conover's findings several years later being published by the U.S. Geological Survey.
Q. Let's look at Page 7.

MS. ATTON: If you could enlarge the second paragraph on this page.
Q. (BY MS. ATTON) What is reported in this paragraph?
A. As I mentioned, there was a coming drought, and Elephant Butte, in 1946, had only a year's worth of normal supply for the Project at that time, and so Conover is explaining that it was due to that provocation that -- that they were basically hired, that Conover was hired by Elephant Butte Irrigation District to come and do this study, so they signed a cooperative agreement whereby the groundwater branch of the survey would make the study that we are now reading about. And he says specifically, I guess I should point out in this last sentence, he says, "The feasibility of using groundwater to supplement the present supply of surface water for irrigation in the district."
Q. Let's look at Page 10.

MS. ATTON: And if you could please enlarge the second-to-last paragraph.
Q. (BY MS. ATTON) What does Conover report here?
A. So, again, he's going a little bit deeper into the reason for the study, and he calls it the impending shortage of water supply from Elephant Butte

Reservoir, and he says that one measure to relieve that coming shortage was the possibility of groundwater use, and he points out here that the district itself wanted to intelligently plan that use and that to intelligently plan that use, they needed information. They needed to understand it. And as we talked about yesterday, there had not been a study of this in the Rio Grande Joint Investigation so there really was a lack of information regarding groundwater conditions in the Mesilla Valley in New Mexico and so because of that -- because of that lack of information, EBID really needed the study to be done by USGS and so asked them to do that mainly again from the standpoint of productiveness of wells and the effect that that pumping would have on the surface water supplies.
Q. Let's look back at Page 8.

MS. ATTON: And if you could enlarge the second-to-last paragraph on that page.
Q. (BY MS. ATTON) Now, this passage reports on the number of wells. What's the significance of these numbers?
A. The significance of this is merely that they were panicking. Maybe that's an overstatement, but I don't really think that it is. They knew there was a
water shortage, and they knew that wells were a possibility because the overall understanding is that there was an underground water supply and so by the end of 1946 -- I'm sorry, there were only 11 at the end of 1946, that had grown to 56 by the end of 1947 so, you know, 46 -- 45 wells had been dug in that year, and then just a couple months later, 14 additional wells. So clearly, things were happening rapidly. People were responding to the shortage of surface water, and this is the -- this is the direction they were turning in.
Q. Let's look at another exhibit.

MS. ATTON: If you could bring up Texas 610.

## Q. (BY MS. ATTON) What is this exhibit?

A. This is a study that was done in 1961, also at the behest of the Elephant Butte Irrigation District, who reached out to the civil engineering department at New Mexico State University and asked them to do -- asked this particular person, Narendra Gunaji to do an additional study of groundwater conditions on Elephant Butte Irrigation District. This is after, by this time, the drought had ended, and this was sort of a request to do a study to look backwards using actual data to see what had happened
in the district during this period of drought.
Q. Let's look at the introduction to the report, which I think is on Page 5.

MS. ATTON: I think might need to go back one. Perfect. Thank you. Can you please enlarge the second paragraph on this page?
Q. (BY MS. ATTON) Now, what does Mr. Gunaji report here?
A. So, again, this is -- this report is being done, and this study is being done after the drought has -- has ended, and he explains that during that time period, from the time of Conover's report to the time he is writing, that there had, in fact, been what he calls the coordinated use of surface and groundwater for irrigation and that had been -- it had been practiced in the district. And he explains that the groundwater had been used to supplement the deficient surface supply. Importantly, and this is really critical here, he takes issue with some of the predictions that Conover made. He says here that the groundwater that was pumped did not de-water the aquifer and that that in and of itself was evidence that there was a very large storage capacity of that groundwater basin. In addition to that, this last sentence is worth reading into the record. He
says, "There is little doubt that the future of the highly-developed agricultural economy in the Elephant Butte Irrigation District is dependent upon the use of groundwater as a supplemental supply when shortage of surface water occurs."
Q. Let's look at the passage that crosses Pages, I think it may be 5 and 6. Yes. Starting, "As a result of," and over to the next page. What does Mr. Gunaji report here?
A. So he's repeating more or less the same thing, that during the time, 1951 to '57, and I would say it started earlier than that, that groundwater was used to supplement shortage of surface water allotments, and while it did, in fact, lower the ground table we know from the previous passage that it didn't de-water the aquifer, and he notes here that it also created a lot of interest in the outflow and the -- the content and the type of groundwater that was in the area.
Q. Let's look at Page 7 and to the first paragraph.
MS. ATTON: Perhaps we could just take the highlights off if it's possible.
Q. (BY MS. ATTON) I'm afraid the highlighting was already on the document, so it is what it is.
A. No problem.
Q. So what Mr . Gunaji reports here on the situation now the drought has ended, what were his findings?
A. So he looks at the water table, and the original location of the water table was about 8 to 10 feet below the surface, and he notes here that after the, what he calls extensive groundwater pumping during the drought, that the water table had dropped to 16 feet. So about twice as deep as it had been before the drought. However, he points -- he points out here that, "When the surface water supply returned to normal in '58, and pumping was more or less discontinued or at least declined dramatically, that the water table returned to an elevation only about 2 feet below the normal water table within a period of two years." So what he's pointing out here is that although Conover had stated four years and would take four years of normal supply to recover the groundwater and, quote unquote, repay the debt, he's actually saying here in 1961, using real data from a real drought and real life conditions, he's saying that that groundwater table recovered far more rapidly and that the -- the -- one of the things he notices here, and he states as a conclusion is that that obviously
means that the ground -- that the surface is actually highly permeable and that things recover much more quickly than people had even thought that they would.

MS. ATTON: And, Your Honor, just for the record, Texas Exhibit 610 has various highlighting, and that's not highlighting from New Mexico. I don't know the basis of that highlighting.

JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Thank you.
Q. (BY MS. ATTON) Let's turn to Page 17. So we've enlarged here a passage that's at Lines, I think, 8 through 20 on Page 17 of this report. And, again, apologies for the highlighting. So I think this is the passage, Dr. Stevens, that you're referring to in which Mr . Gunaji refers to Conover's estimates?
A. That's right.
Q. Can you explain what Mr. Gunaji says here?
A. Yes. So he -- he summarizes Conover at the very beginning of this passage here, and he says that Conover's predictions was that -- were that the flow in the drains would diminish and that it would take eight or nine years before the flow of drains would return to normal. And I just want to point out, just so it's not confusing, Conover's ultimate report is quite long, and he talks about -- he says the
four-year thing, which we talked about a minute ago, that it would take four years to repay the debt, but different parts of the report have different tables that use different time periods for recovery. And here, Gunaji is reporting on a different part of that report where Conover states it would take eight or nine years before the flow of drains would be recovered and returned to normal. But he says here about midway down that actual recovery of the effects of the drought of the '50s actually showed that prediction to not be true. And then he goes through the water table, which I explained just a minute ago, and explains that by 1958, the surface water supply had returned to normal. There was very little pumping in the area, and that the groundwater table had actually recovered as close to normal as they could possibly have expected, more than they expected, actually, and instead of being 8 feet, it was down to 9.75 feet, but that that was pretty close to normal, and, again, a much faster recovery. And then finally in this passage, he says that the flow of drains also recovered much earlier than had been predicted in Conover report.

## Q. Let's turn to Page 37. <br> MS. ATTON: If you could enlarge

Paragraph No. 12 on that page. Thank you.
Q. (BY MS. ATTON) Now, this paragraph is in the summary and conclusions section of the Gunaji report; is that right?
A. It is.
Q. What does Mr. Gunaji conclude here?
A. So in this paragraph, he provides direction to his client, EBID, and he says, "Groundwater should be used as a supplemental water supply for irrigation in years of deficient surface water supply." And then he proceeds to explain that, "The quantity of groundwater in storage is sufficient to supply supplemental irrigation requirements for a drought period of ten years duration." He does qualify that at the end by saying that if there's too much use and then reuse of these waters, that there will be a salt problem. But, again, with regard to the quantity, he is recommending that Elephant Butte Irrigation

District consider groundwater a supplement to surface water in times of shortage.
Q. Let's look at another exhibit.

MS. ATTON: Could you bring up New Mexico 1546?
Q. (BY MS. ATTON) Dr. Stevens, do you recognize this document?
A. I do.
Q. And what is it?
A. So this is now a study of similar topics, but moving a little bit further downstream into Texas, and this was a U.S. Geological Survey study done by Leggat, Lowry, and Hood that was prepared in cooperation not with EBID but instead with the City of El Paso and the Texas Water Commission, but also looking at the groundwater resources of the lower Rio -- I'm sorry -- the lower Mesilla Valley in both New Mexico and also in Texas.
Q. Can you explain the context of this report?
A. The context of this report was that the City of El Paso needed water, and they were looking at the possibility of using the Rio Grande and also just examining the situation with groundwater resources in this area and exploring the data there.
Q. Let's look at Page 5. And if we could enlarge the fifth paragraph on that page. What does Mr. Leggat report here?
A. Mr. Leggat is noting here that the City of El Paso had been pumping groundwater for both public supply, as well as for irrigation, also during the drought period from '51 to '56. He gives us some numbers here in terms of volume, which is interesting,
and it's -- it's not a small amount. He says, "In 1958, the City of El Paso wells pumped an average of 6.8 million gallons per day from the deep and medium aquifers of the Santa Fe." So he's explaining it basically just putting some numbers to it, and he says that it's about 50 percent of the annual recharge to the Santa Fe. So he's basically just laying out what the situation is in the El Paso area.
Q. Let's look at Page 17 and the third paragraph. What is reported here?
A. So the authors of this study here are describing that small water -- small quantities of groundwater had been used for irrigation in this area for what they say many years prior to 1954, which, of course, comports with what we saw with the -- the Lester and Vernon report back in 1903, that El Paso had been deploying wells for quite a long time. And then he explains that the number of wells had increased during the period of shortage during the drought that we've talked about, and that by the end of 1954, there were 250 wells in this area in the El Paso, Texas area taking 40,000 acre-feet of water to irrigate cotton and alfalfa, and by October, 1957, the Bureau of Reclamation, which is another agency in the Department of Interior, reported that 205 irrigation
wells were still in operation.
MS. ATTON: Staying on the same page, let's enlarge the last eight lines of the first paragraph.
Q. (BY MS. ATTON) Now, Mr. Leggat here is reporting on activities in El Paso. What was happening in El Paso at this time?
A. So El Paso was drilling wells in the shallow aquifer and pumping the water into the river for delivery to treatment plant in El Paso for municipal uses and he explains that six additional wells were drilled in 1955 and that the capacity of those wells in the shallow well field was 15 million gallons per day.
Q. There's also reference in this paragraph to a pipeline. Can you give us a bit of background on that?
A. Yes. They found that in the transmission from the wells to the city that they were losing too much of that water so they constructed a pipeline that could -- that had the capacity of delivering 20 million gallons of water per day. They had hoped that the pipeline would reduce those transmission losses?
Q. Now, staying on the same page, could you enlarge the last paragraph, which also crosses over to
the next page? We can just about see that here on the split screen.

Now, again, still reporting on El Paso, what does Mr. Leggat report as to industrial use of groundwater in El Paso at this time?
A. He also reports that there is a lot of industrial use. He calls it large-scale industrial use of groundwater, in particular, which began in 1951, and he describes the 40 wells that were dug in the south end of the valley with the well field that ultimately developed into ten wells. Those 40 wells were just test wells. He also explains that the industrial use of groundwater increased each year except when ASARCO, or American Smelting and Refining Co. abandoned its well field. So, of course, El Paso is a big industrial city, and it was continuing to use groundwater and increase that use during this time period.
Q. Now, you've identified activity by the U.S. Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation that's relevant to groundwater use within the project; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Let's look at some of those documents. MS. ATTON: Could we bring up New Mexico

1657?
Q. (BY MS. ATTON) Dr. Stevens, what is this exhibit?
A. This is a press release from the Department of Interior issued on October 30th, 1950, and its title is, "Groundwater Pumping to Temper Effects of Droughts in Elephant Butte District, New Mexico."
Q. And what was the context of this document?
A. As I mentioned a few minutes ago, Mr. Conover had conducted a study related to the possibility of using groundwater for supplementing the reduced flows on the surface, and the Department of Interior is doing a press release here to publicize the results of that study. As we know, there was preliminary memo issued in 1947. By 1950, according to the context of this, there had been -- the study had been completed, and Conover had issued some sort of report internally that he called the groundwater conditions in the Rincon and Mesilla Valleys and adjacent areas in New Mexico, and this is what this is, is just releasing those results.
Q. Now, 1950 was during this period of drought that we've been talking about; is that right?
A. That's right, yes.
Q. Okay. And what does the Department of

Interior announce or report in this first paragraph here?
A. So the Department of Interior is saying in a publicized press release, "Groundwater in the subsurface reservoirs of the Rincon and Mesilla Valleys, New Mexico, can be pumped from wells to supplement surface supply during drought years in the Elephant Butte District of the Rio Grande Project."
Q. I think you mentioned there was some internal version of the Conover report at this time. Perhaps we could enlarge the paragraph at the top of the next page that might give us a little bit of information on that.
A. Yes.
Q. So this --
A. So this here --
Q. Sorry. Continue. You continue, Dr. Stevens.
A. Okay. This is just an explanation that the report itself, which at this point was 316 pages, could be found either at the state engineer's office of New Mexico or the Elephant Butte Irrigation District in -- in New Mexico. So the intent was here to publish it perhaps later by the state, but as we know, it was published in 1954 as a water supply paper by the Geological Survey.
Q. Let's go back to the first page of this exhibit, and if you could please enlarge the third paragraph. Now, what does the Department of Interior report here?
A. So the Department of Interior is saying that -- reporting really and publicizing that the local interest and the possibility of developing the groundwater supply had been -- had originated when there was lower stream flows between 1942 and 1946, and so he explains that this investigation done by Conover and the U.S. Geological Survey was to examine the water bearing characteristics of the underground flow to determine the feasibility, the possibility of pumping that groundwater as a way to supplement the surface supplies that were low.
Q. Let's enlarge the fourth paragraph. The paragraph above that one. Now, here, there's reference again to Conover, and there's a quote. What do you understand that quote to mean?
A. Conover is pointing out, and he uses this term, that groundwater and surface water supplies are interdependent.
Q. Let's look at another exhibit.

MS. ATTON: Can we bring up New Mexico
1035?
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Q. (BY MS. ATTON) Now, what is this exhibit?
A. This was a notice to the water project users from August, 1946, describing or announcing to them the irrigation schedule for the year or for the remaining time of the growing season.
Q. And I think in this exhibit, we have a collection of water notices from this year and for a number of following years; is that correct?
A. Yeah, that's correct. I think that this exhibit goes -- has similar announcements dating to 1951, if I'm not mistaken.
Q. Let's look at one of those announcements. Can we have a look at Page 3? Now, we have an announcement here from August 12th, 1947; is that right?
A. Yes. That's correct.
Q. Can you just explain what these announcements are?
A. These were issued by the Project to farmers on the Project so that they could know what the possibilities were of water supply and when that water supply could be expected to come.
Q. And do you know how regularly these announcements were made?
A. I think monthly, if I'm not mistaken, during
the growing season. I think that's right.
Q. Okay. Let's look at the next page. If you could enlarge the last paragraph. Page 23. So we're skipping forward a few pages here. Now, this paragraph refers to a fine balance between water supply and irrigation use, and towards the end of this passage, there's a discussion of a change in crop system. What do you understand is reported here?
A. So this particular document and this particular announcement is discussing the water supply for the coming -- coming time, the immediate time. It states here that there might be a change in cropping in times to come and that other crops might have different water requirements, and he actually says -this actually says that such a change in crops may -must inevitably come about, and that makes the delivery of water on an allotment basis each year really critical, but it's difficult to hold to that because those different crops change all the time, and the exact language that he uses is a change in crop system such as a material decrease in acreage planted to cotton with a corresponding increase in the acreage of other crops having a higher water requirement, as must inevitably come about, may make such control and use all the more difficult but imperative.
Q. Let's move forward to another exhibit, New Mexico 0435.
A. If you don't mind, I'm just going to stop for a second. There's some activity outside the window. I just want to close the shades. It's very distracting.

MS. ATTON: Your Honor, may we take a minute just to readjust here?

JUDGE MELLOY: Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
MS. ATTON: Dr. Stevens, is that a better situation?
A. Yes. Just for everybody on the call, suddenly, there were painters right outside the window banging and talking on the outside of the building so bad timing, and I apologize for the disruption.

MS. ATTON: Your Honor, may we continue? JUDGE MELLOY: I'm sorry. You may.
Q. (BY MS. ATTON) Let's look -- so we've brought up another exhibit here, New Mexico 435, on the screen.
A. Yes.
Q. If we could just enlarge the top of that page. Do you recognize this exhibit?
A. I do, yes.
Q. And I think this is a collection of water announcements dated 1951 through 1957 , if you recall?
A. Yes, that's right.
Q. Let's turn to Page 7. So we have here a water announcement from the Bureau of Reclamation dated August 1st, 1951.

MS. ATTON: Can we enlarge the last paragraph and the signature block?
Q. (BY MS. ATTON) Now, who is L.R. Fiock, and what was his involvement with the Project at this time?
A. At this time, he was the Project manager for the Rio Grande Project. He had been involved in the Project, though, I think the documents that $I$ have seen date back to at least the 1930 s, so he had been around for quite a while.
Q. Now, what does Mr. Fiock announce in this August, 1951, announcement?
A. So this is one of the water announcements that they issued regularly during the growing season, and in this particular announcement, Fiock is asking water users who have pumps to arrange to transfer their unused surface water allotment to those who were in need of additional water. So, in other words, he was recognizing that pumping was going on on the
project, and he is saying that if -- if possible, those folks who are getting their water from the groundwater from their pumps in their wells should transfer their unused surface water allotment to other farmers on the project who may not have access to similar resources.
Q. What's the significance of the last sentence here?
A. It says here that if these farmers are willing to negotiate a transfer, that they should come to the Bureau of Reclamation offices in either Las Cruces or El Paso or the Bureau of Reclamation Project Division Offices in Las Cruces or Isleta for the facilitation of that transfer, that the Bureau of Reclamation would help them with that.
Q. This statement isn't directed not just to farmers in New Mexico but also to farmers in Texas; is that right?
A. Yes, that's right. He mentions specifically El Paso and Isleta, so this is an announcement that was made, if you look at the top of this document, all the way to -- well, to everybody on the Project in both New Mexico and in Texas.
Q. Let's look at Page 11. We have a water announcement here from March 7, 1952. And apologies
that this page is not the best legibility, but let's enlarge then the last paragraph on Page 12, again, with the signature block. Now, what does the Bureau announce here in March, 1952?
A. So this is spring of the following year, and as we all know, the surface water supply had not improved by this point, and Fiock is, again, asking water users who are intending to use their pumps for all or even a part of their requirements for their cropping as they're anticipating the coming growing season. If they're willing to transfer their allotment to other water right lands, that they should, again, contact either the districts or the water improvement district -- I'm sorry -- or the Bureau of Reclamation districts in Isleta, which is in Texas so same announcement next year, beginning of the growing season instead of middle or toward the end.
Q. And, again, this announcement is not limited to farmers in New Mexico, it's farmers project wide, including in Texas; is that right?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Let's turn to Page 13. What do we have on Page 13?
A. So this is just a month later. It's another water announcement that was issued on April 7, 1952,
also by Mr. Fiock.
Q. Let's enlarge the second-to-last paragraph on this page. What is the Bureau announcing here?
A. So this is a subtle but important shift in language, so this is not just saying those of you on the Project who are willing to do this or who are already pumping the water. Now, Fiock and the Project is issuing formal announcements urging them -- urging these farmers who are using wells to transfer their allotments to those who did not have access to wells. So this is becoming sort of more of a plea, if you will, from the federal agency to the farmers under the Project.
Q. Let's look at Page 30. What do we have here?
A. Another water announcement, this one from two years later, March 1, 1954, so anticipating the growing season.

MS. ATTON: Please enlarge the last paragraph and the signature on the next page, Page 31.
Q. (BY MS. ATTON) Now, who is W.F. Resch, and who -- what was his involvement with the project at this time?
A. So he had taken over as project manager by now, and he was serving in the role that Mr. Fiock had served in previously.
Q. And what is the Bureau announcing here in March, 1954?
A. So in this particular announcement that was sent to all of the farmers in the Project, he wrote that, "Farmers with good irrigation wells are requested to use those to those, quote, greatest extent possible as a source of supply," and then, again, he urges them to make for -- make available their allotments, their surface allotments, for transfer to the farmers who don't have similar options for pumping from wells. And, again, he says where those farmers who were going to make those transfers can go physically to do that, those are the irrigation district offices or the Bureau of -- Bureau of Reclamation division office in Texas and Isleta.
Q. And, again, this announcement is Project wide to farmers both in New Mexico and in Texas?
A. Correct.
Q. Let's turn to Page 34. What do we have here?
A. This is just a couple months later in June, 1954, another water announcement to all of the farmers on the Project in both New Mexico and Texas.
Q. Let's enlarge the second-to-last paragraph on this page. What is the Bureau announcing here in June, 1954?
A. Here, by now things are pretty desperate on the project, and he states here that the water shortage is serious, that the Project in the next ten weeks, of course, which is a critical part of the growing period from June to August, will experience, as he puts it, the, quote, most acute water stress period in the history of the Project unless generous ample rains come, which nobody really expected. And he states at the end the gravity of the situation cannot be minimized.
Q. Let's now look at the next paragraph, the last paragraph on that page. What is the Bureau announcing here?
A. So having set up the situation with the language $I$ just read into the record, he now urges farmers with the irrigation wells that have capacity, he urges them, said, "Are urged to help their neighbors in order to complete -- prevent complete loss of crops in those cases where farmers have not been able to provide themselves with wells." So he is really sort of recognizing and using language that recognizes that the Project itself is in jeopardy here and that there are farmers who have not been able to dig wells and who desperately need the surface allotments to be transferred to them and he's urging
people with the wells to use them to the greatest extent that they can and to transfer those over to the farmers without such wells themselves.
Q. Could you please just briefly explain the last two or three sentences of this passage?
A. So here he's explaining that he can license and he will license pumped water from irrigation wells to farms through Project canals and laterals and he can do that, and he explains that unfortunately transfers from one lateral system to another are impractical, but that they can do the transfers on the same ditch. So he's, again, explaining that the Bureau of Reclamation is there to help them in any way possible so that the Project can be saved, even to the point of physically issuing licenses and physically helping them convey the water.
Q. What do you take here from the reference to helping your neighbor?
A. I think this was a situation where everybody was in the same boat, and there was no way that this project was going to survive without everybody coming together and recognizing the gravity of the situation. There was -- there were -- there was one period at which during which the allotment was a half of a foot a year, and so, you know, there was not enough water
in the system, and they had to band together to make sure that they could save their crops and save the system and protect the federal investment and their own investment that had been made in this project.
Q. And, again, that sort of mentality and action was Project wide, both in New Mexico and in Texas?
A. It was.
Q. Let's turn to Page 37. What do we have here, Dr. Stevens?
A. We have another water announcement. This is now the following year, March, 1955.
Q. Let's enlarge the third paragraph. What does the Bureau announce here in March, 1955?
A. Well, if he wasn't alarmist the previous year, he certainly is now. He states here that the conditions on the Project with respect to water distribution are, quote, the most critical of any time during the drought period. So even worse if you read them in order than the previous year. He also notes here that the drop in groundwater from the pumping had resulted in return flows being minimized and that very little cushion, he says, can be expected from return flows. Of course, many farmers were dependent on those return flows. And so he warns that the reservoir itself might be shut down in May, which is
unheard of. So this is quite -- quite an alarm being sounded here.
Q. Let's enlarge the fifth paragraph starting, "The difficulty in." So what is the Bureau announcing in this paragraph?
A. So, again, because of the lack of return flows, the diminished return flows, he's explaining here that the operation of the distribution system is not going to be as it normally is and that to equally distribute the available water, that's his language here in the middle of this paragraph, that they may have to change the way they operate the -- the Project and that there might be a system of on-and-off diversions of limited periods so that they can accommodate that equal distribution of available water.
Q. Now, 1955, the date of this water announcement, that was the year immediately following the publication of the 1954 Conover report; is that right?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. And there's a reference in this passage we have here on the screen to equitable distribution. What do you understand that to mean here?
A. Well, if you take it with the previous
sentence, it's clear here the way this project operated by distributing equal amounts of water to every acre on the project. So it said here in order to equally distribute the available water, frequent changes in operational programs may be necessary. And then he repeats it. Equitable distribution throughout the Project may require, and then he explains what the Project may have to do to accommodate that equal distribution.
Q. Let's look at another exhibit.

MS. ATTON: Can we bring up US-656?
Q. (BY MS. ATTON) Dr. Stevens, do you recognize this document?
A. I do.
Q. What is it?
A. This is a report put together by the Bureau of Reclamation for the Rio Grande Project, and it relates to water conservation plans. This is, again, still in the middle of the drought and the Bureau of Reclamation recognized across the board that it needed to look at opportunities for conservation, and this is a report related to that on the Rio Grande Project.
Q. So this document was finalized approximately one year after the 1955 water announcement we just looked at?
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A. That's correct, yes.
Q. Let's look at Page 20. If we can enlarge the first paragraph here under the title, "Pumping of groundwater." What does the Bureau report in this passage?
A. So as I mentioned a few minutes ago, it was imperative to save the Project to use groundwater as a supplement during these times of surface water shortage, and this report is reiterating that. It says, "The recent pumping of groundwaters underlying the Project lands has been essential to preservation of the established Project irrigation." But it also points out here that it's going to take a little bit of time to reconvert to surface water irrigation and that a sizable capital investment had been made and that capital investment and those wells had changed Project conditions. So, again, it shows that the project is, you know, evolving still, that it evolves through these periods of difficulty and that conditions are changing a lot.
Q. Let's look at the number of groundwater wells that are operating in 1956, as reported by the Bureau here. Now, what does this passage here tell us about the number of wells on Project lands in 1956?
A. So the total number of Project wells -- wells
on Project lands is probably a better way of putting that, are -- span both New Mexico and Texas. So you see that there are 324 in Rincon Valley, which is entirely in New Mexico, and then in Mesilla Valley, you have 790 wells in the New Mexico part of that valley and 86 in the Texas part of that valley and then in the El Paso Valley, you have 485 wells that had been drilled in the previous period of drought.
Q. Just to be clear, the El Paso Valley is exclusively in Texas; is that right?
A. That's correct. I should have said that. Yes.
Q. And we have a total number of project wells, project wide here, reported to be 1,685 as of 1956 ; is that right?
A. Yes. And, again, those were wells on Project lands, yes.
Q. Do you know how these wells were financed?
A. I can't really speak to each individual well. Of course, I haven't looked at --

MR. HOFFMAN: Objection; relevancy, Your
Honor. Objection; relevancy.
JUDGE MELLOY: Overruled. You may
answer.
A. So the wells themselves, I can't speak to
each individual well, but $I$ can say that they were not financed by Reclamation. Unlike other -- other changes that were made to the Project, such as the drainage that was constructed in the 1910s and 1920s, these wells were financed individually by the farmers, and there were some loans that were available to the farmers that were made available to the farmers, but this was not -- these were not wells that were financed by the federal government through the Reclamation fund.
Q. (BY MS. ATTON) Let's look at another exhibit. MS. ATTON: Can we bring up New Mexico 899?
Q. (BY MS. ATTON) Dr. Stevens, what is this exhibit?
A. This is an article from the El Paso -- the local newspaper, the El Paso Herald Post from 1951.
Q. Now, do you see there in the middle bottom right, an article that's titled, "U.S. Engineer Urges 614 Wells in Valley"?

MR. HOFFMAN: Your Honor, we had an objection to this, I believe.

JUDGE MELLOY: All right. What's your position on its admissibility, Ms. Atton?

MS. ATTON: So, Your Honor, this is a
newspaper article, so a publication from 1951. It's self-authenticating under Federal Rule of Evidence 9026, and it's also an exception to the hearsay rule under 803(16).

JUDGE MELLOY: Well, $I$ think it is admissible as a historic document. I will admit New Mexico 899. Go ahead.
Q. (BY MS. ATTON) Let's show this article enlarged, and that's on the next page of this exhibit. What is described in this 1951 article in the El Paso Herald Post?
A. This is a report of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation engineer recommending that the valley farmers in El Paso area drill wells to satisfy their water needs.
Q. Can you take us, please, to the passages in this exhibit that you think the Court should take note of?

MS. COLEMAN: Your Honor, I'm going to object to this line of questioning. This -- so this exhibit was not among the materials that Dr. Stevens considered or produced to us. She has expressed no opinion about this document or about what it says, and the document is ripe with double and triple hearsay beyond the scope of the exception. The document is
in, and we accept that, but the test -- her testimony about it is outside the scope of anything she's written in her five different submissions to this court.

JUDGE MELLOY: Well --
MS. COLEMAN: And the document speaks
for itself.
JUDGE MELLOY: I think the document
speaks for itself. Let's move on. I'm not too impressed by a newspaper article as very -- having a lot of weight, let me put it that way. Let's move on.
Q. (BY MS. ATTON) Let's look briefly at the Project history for 1953. Before we do that, Dr. Stevens, can you explain what Project history reports are and the kinds of information that they contain?
A. Yes. Every year, the Project -- every Project in the Reclamation -- all the Reclamation projects issue a Project history that provides lots of information about the things that happened on that project during the previous year. They talk about how many acres were irrigated, what crops were grown on different parts, different divisions of the Project. They talk about any sort of changes to diversions, any sort of maintenance that was done on canals, all sorts
of things. So it's really sort of a -- a great diary, if you will, of what happened on the Project in any year. So you can trace all of those different things over time on any Reclamation project.
Q. Let's bring up Exhibit JT-218. Particularly, we're looking at Page 7 here, and we've enlarged the top of Page 7. Do you recognize this, what we have on the screen here?
A. I do.
Q. What is it?
A. This is a part of the Project history where they were reporting on the operation and maintenance of the irrigation system for one particular division of the Rio Grande Project, the Isleta branch, and that is in Texas.
Q. Now, what is reported in this section of the 1953 Project history?
A. So they explain that in 1953, they go through what the allotment was from the reservoir for this area, and it says here at the very end that, the drain return flow and the water from 238 irrigation wells that were installed during 1950 to 1953 ultimately provided enough water for almost having a normal year, even though the allotment itself had been much below normal and expected allotments on the Project.
Q. Now, do the number of wells that are reported here comport with the number that are identified in the 1956 reconnaissance report that we've just been looking at?
A. Yeah. They -- they trend the same direction, yes.
Q. Let's look back at that 1956 reconnaissance report, and that's Exhibit US-656. This is Page 10. We've enlarged the first paragraph under the heading, "Project Growth." What does the Bureau report here?
A. So the Bureau of Reclamation in this reconnaissance report from 1956 reports that for the first time, the Project has reached the maximum amount of acreage that it -- that it could reach under those -- that 1938 contract of the 155,000 acres plus 3 percent. So in 1953, the Project reached that, and the number is 159,768 , and -- well, that's what this particular part says.
Q. What's the significance of what's said in the first paragraph here?

MS. COLEMAN: I'm going to object to this line of questioning -- I'm sorry to interrupt, Ms. Atton. I couldn't tell if you were done. I'm going to object to this, as well. She didn't look at
this document either or express any opinion about it previously, and it says what it says.

MS. ATTON: Your Honor, this is a continuation of Dr. Stevens' testimony on this time period about all of the same issues. This is a document that's part of the record and is an admitted exhibit.

JUDGE MELLOY: All right. I'll let the witness answer, but can you clarify, you said "look at the first paragraph here. What exactly -- could you identify exactly what we're looking at?

MS. ATTON: Yes. So we're on Page 10 of this 1956 Bureau report, and we have enlarged here the first paragraph under the heading, "Project Growth" on that page. Perhaps if we take the callout box down we can see all of Page 10.

JUDGE MELLOY: No, I found it. Go ahead.
Q. (BY MS. ATTON) So we're looking here, Dr. Stevens, at the first sentence of this paragraph.
A. Yes. What he's saying here is that up until the water shortages, the drought, had affected the economy of the area, that the Project had very much flourished and had been recognized as one of the most prosperous developments the Bureau of Reclamation had
constructed.
Q. Let's look at the next paragraph on the same page and the continuation of that paragraph that crosses over to Page 11. Now, taking this snapshot in time in 1956, what does the Bureau report here about the population development in the lower Rio Grande?
A. This is really interesting, and it's an interesting point sort of in the whole history of the area. He notes here or they, the Bureau of Reclamation, notes here that two things -- two really important milestones converged at once. Number one, that the peak development of water use, that is that -- the maximum allowed acreage developed, that 159 number -- thousand number that we talked about a second ago, and the drought occurred at the same time, that they both were ushered in, is what he says, ushered in at the change of the half century, and so it's really interesting that using the groundwater and the pumping, even though we're in the middle of this great drought, allowed the Project to grow and reach its maximum irrigated acreage during this same time period. So that's the significance of this particular callout.
Q. And you referred to, I think, 159, 000 acre-feet, and you mean the -- that's the 155,000
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acre-feet plus the 3 percent cushion that's in the '38 downstream contract?
A. It's not acre-feet. It's acres. So if I said acre-feet, I misspoke. It's the 155,000 acres that is outlined or delineated in that contract, the 1938 contract, plus the 3 percent cushion that is also permitted in that contract, and it's acres.
Q. And just to be clear, this is -- while this is a continuation of the same passage, it actually spreads from Page 10 to Page 14 of the report, there are various, I think, tables that are in between those two pages?
A. That's right.
Q. So let's look at one of those in-between pages, and let's look at Page 11 of the report. So we have here Table 1. What is shown in Table 1?
A. This is a compilation of the total irrigated acreage and the total released water from storage from the year 1915 to 1955, and it shows the growth in acreage from that first delivery of storage water in 1915 to 1955 and showing -- it also shows, just so you know, there's a few years in there where the acreage declines, and that was due to the depression in the 1930s. But generally, you see an upward trend until you reach 1953, when you have that maximum acreage of

159, 768 .
Q. Let's turn to Page 17 of the report and the passage that crosses the bottom of Page 17 to the top of Page 18. So the title of this section in the report is, "Problems and Needs of the Project Area." What is reported in this passage?
A. This particular passage explains that what's happening on the Rio Grande Project, which was intending to be a surface project, had basically because of the drought had come to rely upon groundwater, and it says here that it's similar to the same -- same problems or the same issues that arose on the Salt River Project in Arizona and the Central Valley Project in California. He makes the comparison here and says, "Both of which were developed primarily on the basis of surface water supplies, but ultimately became dependent to a large extent upon pumping of groundwaters to supplement the surface water supply to meet the project's needs."
Q. Now, you testified earlier that you have experience as an expert historian of other Reclamation projects in the west?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have any experience of the Salt River Project in Arizona or the Central Valley Project in

## California?

A. I worked on a study of the Salt River and worked for the Salt River Project that's actually a utility down in Phoenix back in the 1990s, so I have some experience on that. I'm less familiar with the central valley project in California.
Q. What's your understanding of this passage we have on the screen here, which crosses Pages 17 and 18 of the 1956 reconnaissance report?
A. I think there are a couple of things to point out about it. First is that the author of this report makes the comparison that like those two projects, this project, the Rio Grande Project, was developed as a surface water supply project, but similar to those two other projects, Central Valley and Salt River Project, the Rio Grande Project also had come to depend during times of drought on the development of groundwater as a supplemental supply to those surface water supplies when they became short.
Q. Now, based on your review of the historical record, at least up to the early 1960s, did anyone ever complain about groundwater pumping on Project lands and the potential depletive effects to stream flow?
A. Not that I've seen.
Q. Now, Dr. Stevens, you're aware --

JUDGE MELLOY: Is this -- are you about
to kind of change subjects here, Counsel? If so, maybe this might be a good time to take our break.

MS. ATTON: I am, Your Honor, but actually, my next passage here is really rather short and then we will be done with Dr. Stevens' direct examination.

JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Go ahead. Well, let me just say one thing, though, Ms. Atton, and I'll say this for all the counsel. I'm a little bit concerned that the record is going to get muddied in that you refer to page numbers as exhibit -- you're using the exhibit number, which is fine, but then you reference the document as that page number. Other witnesses have used the document page number, but not the exhibit number. I think for consistency purposes, I'd ask everyone to use whatever number is on the exhibit. For instance, you just had -- let me look here, just as an example. I think you had Page 18 up. In any event, for instance, US-0656 underscore 0020, you identified that as Page 20. It's actually Page 15 of the document itself, and I don't have any problem with using the exhibit number, and I think that's probably the way we should go, but we should be
consistent throughout so that the record doesn't become, as I say, become confusing. So as I understand it, you've been using the exhibit numbers page numbers, and I think that's the way to go with other witnesses' counsel, as well. All right. You may proceed.

MS. ATTON: Thank you, Your Honor. We're very happy to take a short break now if that would be your preference.

JUDGE MELLOY: Why don't we take 20
minutes. We've been going for quite a while. We'll go to 1:20. All right?
(Recess.)
JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Looks like we're all back. Should we get started? Go ahead, Ms. Atton.

MS. ATTON: Thank you, Your Honor.
Q. (BY MS. ATTON) Dr. Stevens, you're aware that the United States retained an expert historian, Nicolai Kryloff, in this case?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. And you're aware that the United States has not called Mr. Kryloff to testify at this trial?
A. Yes. That's my understanding.
Q. Now, Mr. Kryloff was deposed in this case
back in August of 2020, and you attended his deposition?
A. I did. MS. ATTON: Can we bring up Exhibit

NM-3000? We have here highlighted on the right side of the screen Page 4 of that exhibit, and it's just illustrating and showing here that Jennifer Stevens was marked as present at Mr. Kryloff's deposition.
Q. (BY MS. ATTON) Dr. Stevens, are you aware that New Mexico designated parts of Mr. Kryloff's deposition testimony for this trial?
A. Yes.
Q. And have you read these designations of Mr. Kryloff's testimony?
A. I have, yes.
Q. Let's look at a couple of those designations. If we could go to Page 8 of this exhibit, and if you could enlarge Mr. Kryloff's transcript at Page 73, Line 23, through Page 74, Line 9. So I am going to read this out loud if I may. So Mr. Kryloff is asked, question here, "And here under this section, you start by saying that, the Special Master's report and the U.S. Supreme Court both reached the conclusion that the Rio Grande Project was fully integrated into the 1938 Rio Grande Compact thereby serving as the vehicle
by which Texas received its apportionment of water, right?"
"ANSWER: Yes."
"QUESTION: And we talked earlier about that also applies to the apportionment of water to part of New Mexico, right?"
"ANSWER: That's how I understand it, yes".
Please now enlarge a little further down at Page 74, Line 16 through Line 24 for the record, this crosses the page of $N M-3000$ Pages 8 to 9. Again, I'm going to read this out loud.
"QUESTION: If we look at that sentence again that $I$ was just reading and we see that you say, They both reached a conclusion that the Rio Grande Project was fully integrated into the 1938 Rio Grande Compact, based on your review of the historical record, does that record support that conclusion?"
"ANSWER: I would say that my reading of the Compact itself leads me to agree with the conclusion reached by Justice Gorsuch and the Special Master."

Dr. Stevens, do you agree with the opinions that Mr. Kryloff states here?

MS. COLEMAN: I'm going to object to that, Your Honor. She didn't provide a rebuttal report to Dr. Kryloff.

JUDGE MELLOY: Well, I think she can answer if she agrees with those opinions. Go ahead.
A. I do.
Q. (BY MS. ATTON) Let's look at one other passage of Mr . Kryloff's deposition.

MS. ATTON: Could you please enlarge Page 125, Line 5 of the deposition, through Line 13, which crosses Exhibit pages NM-3000, 11 to 12. And, again, forgive me, but I'm going to read this out loud.
Q. (BY MS. ATTON) "QUESTION: Turning to your recommendations for further research, I understood this to be suggesting that post-Compact actions can help to understand what the states intending with -intended with the Compact. Is that correct?"
"ANSWER: I think that post-Compact actions could show us how other people have interpreted that intent."
"QUESTION: Including the states themselves?"
"ANSWER: Yes."
Dr. Stevens, do you agree with these opinions expressed by Mr. Kryloff?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Can you just explain?
A. Yes. We talked a little bit earlier about
how I personally interpret as a historian documents and actions after and before a particular moment in time that I'm studying, and this is an example where he's saying that, yes, looking at post-Compact actions by the parties are valuable piece of information to have, and I agree with that.
Q. Now, Dr. Stevens, a few moments ago, we looked briefly at a newspaper article. I'm not going to ask you about that article, but as a general matter, how as an expert historian do you approach newspapers as a source?
A. Newspapers are one of many sources that I tend to use in my research, and they are both a primary source and a secondary source. They're a secondary source in the sense that they're -- you know, the reporter is reporting on something, but they're a primary source in the sense that it helps the historian understand the message that a community is reaching about -- or the message that's reaching the community about any given moment in time or a given event. So I think that they are one of many pieces of documentation $I$ sometimes use in my research, and I -- I weigh them, you know, appropriately for each situation.

MS. ATTON: Now, Dr. Stevens, thank you.

I have no further questions at this time.
JUDGE MELLOY: Ms. Coleman, do you have any questions?

MS. COLEMAN: I do, Your Honor, and we are going to have Mr. Hoffman go first because Dr. Stevens rebuts Texas' witness, but whichever order you prefer?

JUDGE MELLOY: I guess it is New Mexico
-- that's -- okay. I was -- I was thinking when it was Texas presenting the witness. No, I'll have Mr. Hoffman go first then, Ms. Coleman. Go ahead, Mr. Hoffman.

MR. HOFFMAN: Thank you, Your Honor. CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. HOFFMAN:
Q. Dr. Stevens, I'm Robert Hoffman. I represent the State of Texas. I think I met you before at your deposition?
A. Yes, that's right.
Q. Yes. Okay. I'd like to go over a little bit of what you said yesterday. You were asked a question early on in your testimony, and I'll read it. "And Dr. Stevens, Dr. Miltenberger made much this morning about his focus on the delivery schedules in the Compact. Did you consider the delivery schedules in
your expert reports and declarations?" And you answered, "I absolutely did. To imply that I ignored this is totally not true." Do you recall your deposition that was taken on July 27th, 2020?
A. Yes, I remember being deposed.
Q. Page 34 -- sorry. 36 and 37 of that deposition, that issue was discussed, and I'll read from the deposition starting at Page 36, Line 13.

MS. ATTON: Your Honor, can we possibly ask for this to be put on the screen so we can all see it?

MR. HOFFMAN: Peder, do you have it?
MR. RUDLING: I have a video clip if
that helps?
MR. HOFFMAN: Well, I don't need the
video. All $I$ need is the statement, but you can -you can play the video if you want, from Page 36 Line 13 to Page 37, Line 9.
(The video was played.)
MR. HOFFMAN: Thank you. You can stop, Peder. I didn't mean to play that. I'm sorry.

THE WITNESS: No problem.
Q. (BY MR. HOFFMAN) I'm at home, also. I'm not at my office, and my cats might show up so I apologize in advance.
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You also had made reference to that issue in your second declaration, did you not? And I'll refer to Texas Exhibit 532 at Page 8.

MR. HOFFMAN: Peder, if you could put that up. Just the first sentence of the paragraph that starts 24 , enlarge that for us.
Q. (BY MR. HOFFMAN) I'll read that. "The historical record does not provide details on precisely how the schedules in the Compact's Articles 3 and 4 were ultimately derived, nor is it material to the allocation of water" --

JUDGE MELLOY: Mr. Hoffman.
MR. HOFFMAN: Yeah, I can't see it
either.
JUDGE MELLOY: Also, you're speaking
awful fast. Poor Heather is going to get burned out before the day is over so slow down a little bit.

MR. HOFFMAN: Okay. Can you make -- I can't see the entire quote on the screen. Can anybody else? It's cut off.

THE WITNESS: I can see it.
MR. HOFFMAN: Okay. Can you, Judge?
JUDGE MELLOY: I can see part of it. Go ahead.

MR. HOFFMAN: Yeah. Well, I'd like you
to see the -- there you go. So I'll start again.
Q. (BY MR. HOFFMAN) "The historical record does not provide details on precisely how the schedules in the Compact's Articles 3 and 4 were ultimately derived, nor is it material to the allocation of water represented by the Compact; the schedules speak for themselves." Is that what your rebuttal report said?
A. Yes. No, this is actually from the declaration.
Q. I'm sorry. Your second declaration, right, Exhibit 532?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Let's turn to Texas Demo No. 1, Demonstrative Exhibit No. 1. And I want to --

MR. HOFFMAN: Could you take that down, please? Actually, $I$ want to show your Demo No. 3, if you have it first, Stevens Demo No. 3.

MR. RUDLING: I have 1 and 2 , but not 3 .
MR. HOFFMAN: It's in 1. It's the No. 3 and No. 1 in Stevens Demo, direct demo. That's not it. There we go. Again, make it so that everybody can see it while they're watching the picture. In other words, make it a little smaller. There we go. Move it. Okay. That's fine.
Q. (BY MR. HOFFMAN) Now, these are your opinions
about the project and the Compact, correct?
A. These are some of them, yes.
Q. Some of them. One of them -- one of them, No. 4, is, "The Project was intended to be flexible, able to adapt to changing needs, technology and other developments." Now, was your -- with respect to that opinion, is there any limit you believe with respect to what effects those developments can have on Project waters -- I'm sorry -- Compact waters?
A. Can you say the question again?
Q. Yeah. Is there -- you talk about the Project being flexible to adapt to changing needs in technology and other developments. Well, is that flexibility limited in any way by the Compact?

MS. ATTON: Your Honor, I object to the extent that Dr. Stevens is asked about -- to give testimony beyond that in her expert reports and declarations and that she has given today and yesterday.

JUDGE MELLOY: I certainly -- she's talked about this. I think this is within the scope of cross-examination.
Q. (BY MR. HOFFMAN) Can you answer the question?
A. Yeah, I think I can. I think I said that the Project -- that the Compact was intended to protect
existing uses, so I -- I do believe that that's one of the limitations. I think beyond that, I don't -- I can't really think of any of the other limitations, but I do think that it was intended to protect existing uses.
Q. Okay. Let's go to Page 5 of the Special Master's Report of May 21, 2021 which is our Demo Exhibit 1, Page 5.

MR. RUDLING: I need an exhibit number, please.

MR. HOFFMAN: It's Demo 1 on our list of exhibits. It's the first demo on the first list of exhibits. Page 5, please. There you go.
Q. (BY MR. HOFFMAN) You've read the Special Master's Report of May 21, 2021, have you not?
A. I did when it first came out. I don't remember all of it, but, yes, I read it back then.
Q. Okay. We'll try to refresh your recollection. That paragraph at the bottom, can we enlarge it. It basically says the Compacting states intended to protect not only water deliveries into the reservoir, but a baseline level of Project operations generally reflected in Project operations prior to the Compact formation. Have you studied Project operations prior to the Compact formation?
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MS. ATTON: Your Honor, objection. Dr. Stevens is an expert historian. She's not presented as an expert on Project operations in any time period.

MR. HOFFMAN: Your Honor, she's been testifying about Project operations from 1938 on interminably. I think I can ask her whether she's, in fact, looked at it prior to 1938.

MS. ATTON: Same objection.
JUDGE MELLOY: Overruled. The witness may answer.
A. I think you asked me about whether I -- I definitely looked at Project operations in the sense that $I$ read all of the project histories. Can you remind me again exactly what you wanted to ask me about that?
Q. (BY MR. HOFFMAN) I was asking whether -excuse me. I asked you whether you've studied Project operations prior to the Compact formation, and, now, you've told me you looked at the -- what did you say you looked at?
A. So I -- I mean, I've read a lot of documents, as you can imagine, and some of them certainly dealt with Project operations. I looked at the Project histories so, yes, I've studied that.
Q. Did you have any opinion with respect to Project operations prior to the Compact formation?
A. Can you be more specific? That's a very broad question.
Q. Well, I mean, I don't see any of your opinions on your Demo 3 that relate to Project operations prior to 1938.
A. I think my -- the first two chapters of my original report talk specifically about how the Project came to be, about the construction of the dam, about the different divisions that were constructed beginning in 1906. So maybe I'm not understanding what you mean by Project operations, but I certainly don't think that it's absent from my materials.
Q. Okay. Now, I'm going to read further on with respect to this paragraph in Demo 1. The Special Master says, "The Compacting states did not express an intent for agricultural practices, irrigation practices, and other forms of development to remain static. But they also did not express an intent to allow unlimited indirect capture of the Rio Grande surface flows through unregulated capture of hydrologically connected water or the elimination of Project return flows. The protection of a baseline level of Project operations required, at a minimum,
the protection of return flows to effectuate the Compact's apportionment. In broad strokes, this condition can be viewed as Akin to a 1938 condition as urged generally by Texas. But the exact contours of that condition remain to be established at trial."

Are you presenting testimony today about the exact contours of the condition that remain to be established at trial, the baseline level of Project operations?

MS. ATTON: And, Your Honor, I object to the extent this seeks an opinion that's beyond Dr. Stevens' expertise as a historian in this case. JUDGE MELLOY: I'm going to overrule. You may answer.
A. I think that I -- I have expressed an opinion. I said earlier this morning that the only thing that $I$ saw in the historical record that was frozen was the acreage that was represented by the 1938 downstream contracts, and I think that I also expressed my observation in the review of the historical record regarding the flexibility of the Project, that the Project changed a great deal over time, and that the plans leading up -- the data that was collected leading up to the signing of the Compact made very clear that they were looking at the future.

So I -- I do think that those things are important as the Special Master and Your Honor weighs what that baseline condition is and what it was intended in the Compact, and -- and my job today and yesterday has been to illuminate the parts of the historical record that help -- I hope that help the Court determine what that is.
Q. (BY MR. HOFFMAN) Now, you testified about the 57/43 split provided for in the 1938 contract between the two districts, correct?
A. I have.
Q. That was a contract between the two districts approved by the Bureau of Reclamation, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And did Texas agree to that contract?
A. Texas did not sign that contract.
Q. Nor did New Mexico, correct?
A. That's right.
Q. Now, on Page 6 of the May 21, 2021, order, His Honor continued later on, on Page 6, bottom -middle of that full paragraph starting with the word "taking the record." "Taking the record in the light most favorable to Texas, the Compact and the closely related downstream contracts together establish the $57 / 43$ split as a rough protected
baseline division of the Project deliveries as between New Mexico and Texas downstream of the Reservoir, at least in water short years. Although actual acres under cultivation and actual water orders and deliveries varied around this baseline amount, there exists no benchmark for assessing the intent of the Compacting parties as to the downstream apportionment or the general framework of the bargain they sought and achieved through Compact formation." Then he goes onto say, "This determination, however, begs the question, division of what?" Are you providing any opinions today on what the -- the division of what is?

MS. ATTON: Your Honor, I object just to
the extent that Mr. Hoffman didn't completely
accurately read the passage there. He didn't -- he missed at least one critical word.

MR. HOFFMAN: I give up. What was it?
MS. ATTON: You said that there exists no benchmark when the text says there exists no other benchmark.

MR. HOFFMAN: Okay. I'm sorry.
Q. (BY MR. HOFFMAN) With that amendment, can you answer my question?
A. I think you asked me whether or not I'm opining or offering any thoughts on what is being
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divided?
Q. Correct.
A. It would be helpful to have the contract in front of me, but my recollection is that that contract is talking about the delivery of water from -- or the allocation of water is probably -- I'd have to look at the contract and have it up in front of me between the two states in that proportion as it relates to the irrigated acres.
Q. The contract is not between the two states, is it?
A. I'm sorry. I apologize. Between the two districts. I apologize. I misspoke. So as it relates to the delivery between the two districts, my recollection, without having the document in front of me, is that it is talking about the allocation of water in those proportions based on the irrigated acreage, as it's represented here as 57/43. That's my recollection, but $I$ don't have the document in front of me.
Q. Yeah. But that's -- his Honor is asking not about the division, but what is being divided.
A. I answered that. And, again, I'd like to have the language in front of me, the actual document, but my recollection is that the allocation of water is
being split based on that acreage.
Q. So that -- you're saying, as I understand it, that what is delivered into Elephant Butte by New Mexico pursuant to the contract is what is being divided?
A. I think you meant Compact.
Q. Yeah, I meant Compact.
A. And, again, I would really -- I would prefer if we can have the document up in front of me before we continue down the line of questions because I know it's a very important document, and I don't want to go based on my recall without the language in front of me, but that is my understanding, yes.
Q. Talking about the Compact? You want to see the Compact?
A. No. The contract, because you're asking me if the contract and what $I$ believe the contract to be saying relates to the water coming in to Elephant Butte Reservoir based on what's in the Compact, and I'm saying I'm happy to answer the question, but I don't want to from recall. That's all.
Q. Well, let me see if I can find it for you. I have those exhibits somewhere. MS. COLEMAN: If I may, it's Joint

Exhibit 426.

MR. HOFFMAN: Thank you. Can you put that up, please, Joint 426?

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
Q. (BY MR. HOFFMAN) What is it in this contract that tells you what is being divided?

MS. ATTON: Your Honor, I object to the extent this calls for a legal opinion.

MR. HOFFMAN: I'm asking her as a
historian. I'm not asking for a legal opinion.
JUDGE MELLOY: Why don't you tell us -restate your question, Mr. Hoffman. I'm not sure where we are with this, what you're asking at this point.

MR. HOFFMAN: Well, Your Honor's order --

JUDGE MELLOY: Just state your question.
MR. HOFFMAN: Okay.
Q. (BY MR. HOFFMAN) One of the triable issues in this case, as I understand it, is to determine what is being divided 57/43, and my question to you is: What, in your opinion as a historian, is being divided 57/43?
A. Project water.
Q. And Project water is what is delivered to Texas under the Compact at Elephant Butte, correct?

MS. ATTON: Your Honor, objection. I'm sorry. I'm not following the question.

JUDGE MELLOY: If you can answer.
A. The water in Elephant Butte is Project water that belongs both to Elephant Butte Irrigation District and to El Paso 1. Project water is in those two states.
Q. (BY MR. HOFFMAN) Does the Compact itself say that?
A. Say what specifically?
Q. What you just said, that it goes to -- that it belongs to Texas, EP1, and Elephant Butte Irrigation District?

MS. ATTON: Your Honor, I object to the extent this seeks legal opinion.

MR. HOFFMAN: Again, I'm not seeking a legal opinion. I just wonder what --

JUDGE MELLOY: I think we are starting to wander into legal opinions here. I'm going to sustain that objection.

MR. HOFFMAN: Okay. Can you put up
Texas Exhibit 544?
Q. (BY MR. HOFFMAN) Do you recognize this document, Dr. Stevens?
A. Yes.
Q. What is this document?
A. I believe that's the '29 Compact.
Q. And let's go to Article 3 of the Compact, which is on two pages down, I believe, or three pages down. Do you recall that -- I take it you reviewed the ' 29 contract -- Compact as part of your historical research, correct?
A. I did.
Q. And Article 3 provides that the parties shall do a bunch of information collection at gages, establishing gages and to collect data during the term of the 1929 contract, right -- Compact? I keep saying contract. Compact.
A. The words are pretty close. Yes.
Q. Yes. Okay. And let's go down through it. Colorado maintain gages on the Rio Grande at Del Norte, Rio Grande near Conejos near Mogote, Rio Grande at the Colorado/New Mexico state line.

MR. HOFFMAN: Continue down. Can't see that on the right-hand line. Enlarge it please.
Q. (BY MR. HOFFMAN) Such other stations as may be necessary to comply with the provisions of the Compact and New Mexico is supposed to do the same for a gage at Rio Grande at Buckman, Rio Grande at San Marcial, Rio Grande at the Elephant Butte Reservoir
outlet and other stations, et cetera, and then Texas is obligated to provide gaging stations and information at the gaging stations for the period of the Compact -- I got Compact right that time -- at the Rio Grande at Courchesne, at the Rio Grande at Tornillo, and Rio Grande at Fort Quitman and such other gaging stations. And I believe you testified yesterday that because of the depression, they apparently didn't -- you didn't think that they gathered the information, correct?

MS. ATTON: Your Honor, I'm sorry, just
to object. I object to the extent it mischaracterizes the evidence. I also just want to object, and I apologize to Mr. Hoffman, but just so I do get this clear, there are multiple versions of this same exhibit, I think now in the record. Yesterday, we were using US-620, and now, we're using this Texas one. I just ask, and I'm sorry for interrupting, that by the end of this cross-examination, which is clear as to which exhibit version we're using, and ideally only have one in the record.

MR. HOFFMAN: That's all right with me.
THE WITNESS: For the record, I don't seem to have either of these in the binders in front of me so I don't have access to the full document in
front of me to refer to. I just want to make that clear, as well.

MS. ATTON: Your Honor, if I may just explain that, that's because this exhibit we're looking at at the screen right now was only produced -- we were only notified about it minutes before Dr. Stevens took the stand this morning so her binders, of course, were already prepared.

JUDGE MELLOY: All right. I think --
okay. Restate your question, Mr. Hoffman. I think we can probably do it without having to look at the exhibit.

MR. HOFFMAN: All I was concerned about was this portion of the Compact.
Q. (BY MR. HOFFMAN) You testified yesterday as follows: "Sure, immediately after they signed the truce, we had a fairly major event occur worldwide known as the Great Depression, so all of the best-laid intentions to collect data during this time did not occur and so what they found was they got to 1935. The Compact that they had signed in 1929 was coming to an end, was set to expire, and none of the data that they were hoping to have gathered there had been gathered. At this time, we had a new president, President Roosevelt," et cetera, et cetera. Do you
recall that testimony?
A. I do, yes.
Q. Let's go to US-456, Pages 15 to 16. Let's start on the first page so we can orient ourselves, Page 1. You testified about this document yesterday, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. This is part of the -- this is minutes of the -- proceedings of the Rio Grande Compact Commission in Santa Fe, New Mexico on December 2nd and

December 3rd, 1935, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Let's go to Page -- let's go to Page 16, I believe. I need to -- go on to the next page. Continue on. I'm trying to find where Dr. Hinderlider -

MR. HOFFMAN: I apologize, Your Honor. I can't read this very well, and it's not in front of me either.

JUDGE MELLOY: Can you just ask a
question? Do you have a question?
MR. HOFFMAN: Yeah.
Q. (BY MR. HOFFMAN) I mean, this is the proceedings, and they were talking about the agreement or the potential of JI -- of the research committee
doing the JIR, and they're sort of negotiating the terms of an agreement between them as to what should be in the JIR; is that correct?
A. This is when Barrows and Adams come and present their ideas for it so this is the beginning of that discussion, yes.
Q. And you recall in here that Dr. -Mr. Hinderlider told those gentlemen about the extensive data they had collected pursuant to -- to the 1929 contract -- Compact?
A. I don't specifically recall that, no, but I -- I over spoke yesterday if I said none of the data because clearly had been data collected, just not everything that they wanted, which is obviously the reason they needed the Rio Grande Joint Investigation.
Q. And do you recall in this document that Mr. Clayton was critical of -- of an expansive project and wanted to limit what the JIR included?
A. I don't recall that from this particular document until -- unless you're pointing to something, but Mr. Clayton, as I mentioned yesterday in the subsequent letters over the next two months, he and his engineering advisor made clear that -- to the National Resources Committee that they wanted the scope to be limited.
Q. And they wanted it focused on what they thought was important, correct?
A. I don't recall that language.
Q. Look at --
A. I mean, I know they wanted to limit it definitely.

MR. HOFFMAN: Let's look at, I believe it's Texas 202. No. That's not it. That's not it. Pardon me, Your Honor. My exhibit list is missing, and I need it. Here it is. I'm sorry. It's New Mexico 2302. This is the letter Frank Clayton. I apologize. That's not the one I wanted.

JUDGE MELLOY: Why don't we take five or ten minutes and maybe you can get your exhibits in order, Mr. Hoffman.

MR. HOFFMAN: Thank you.
JUDGE MELLOY: So we can maybe be a little bit more efficient. So let's -- let's take a ten-minute break.

MR. HOFFMAN: Thank you.
(Recess.)
JUDGE MELLOY: All right. You may proceed.

MR. HOFFMAN: Thank you. I've got to get my witness here. There we go.
Q. (BY MR. HOFFMAN) Okay. Do you recognize this as part of the JIR?
A. Yes.
Q. And you testified concerning this letter yesterday?
A. Yes.
Q. And it's a letter from Frank Adams and Harlan Barrows to -- to Abel Wolman, chairman of the water resources committee, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And the tone of this letter is that Mr. Barrows and -- and Mr. Abrams are sort of proud of what they've done. Do you agree with that?
A. Yes, I think so.
Q. Let's go to the top of the next page, the first sentence there. Can you read that for us, the first sentence?

MR. HOFFMAN: Enlarge it for us, the first whole sentence. There you go.

THE WITNESS: I can read it.
Q. (BY MR. HOFFMAN) Yes. Can you read it aloud for us?
A. "It is our conviction that the report transmitted herewith furnishes a sound factual basis for an apportionment of the waters of the river above

Fort Quitman that would be fair and just to each of the states and to its water users dependent on the river."
Q. And, in fact, it did -- it did form a sound factual basis for the apportionment, did it not?
A. I think with the information that was in it, it provided a lot of information for the Compact, yes.
Q. And the Compact commissioners relied on that report, correct?
A. They did.
Q. Okay. Now, let's go to your Demo Exhibit No. 10, I believe, Stevens Demo No. 10. You called this out and talked about the meager data available in the Rincon and Mesilla and El Paso Valleys, correct?
A. That's the language that's in the report, yes.
Q. And you sort of blamed that on Hill and -and Clayton, right, because they refused to fund groundwater studies, right?

MS. ATTON: Objection to the extent it mischaracterizes the expert's testimony. JUDGE MELLOY: Well, I think it's within the scope of cross. Go ahead.
A. Yes. The -- the record shows that Texas tried to keep the groundwater investigation much more
narrowly focused, and the letter between Hill and Clayton and Clayton and the National Resources Committee demonstrate that Texas -- that that was Texas' position with regard to groundwater study for the Rio Grande Joint Investigation.
Q. (BY MR. HOFFMAN) And Your point besides that with respect to this citation is that -- is that -that the reliance that the commissioners placed upon the groundwater study in the Joint Investigation Report was unfounded?
A. I'm not sure that I followed the trail of that question, but $I$ will say that they did rely on the report, and the report says that the data in these three valleys, which is downstream of the Elephant Butte Dam, is meager.
Q. And the groundwater section of this report was prepared under the direction of $C . V$. Theis, was it not?
A. He was involved, yes.
Q. And he's a famous groundwater hydro-geologist, correct?
A. He is today. He wasn't in 1937.
Q. But in 1935, he formulated his opinions, or at least his formula, with respect to the interaction of groundwater and surface water and depletions?

MS. ATTON: I object to the extent this seeks any expert testimony outside the scope of an expert historian.

JUDGE MELLOY: Well, it just asking for a fact, if whether he formulated a formula so I don't think that's expert testimony, if -- if the witness knows.
A. So I actually can't recall exactly what his work was in the '30s. I do recall, and I believe it's in my rebuttal report, that his materials were not widely disseminated and that they were sort of published in -- in pretty low distribution channels at that point, but I don't recall exactly when he came up with his formulas. I absolutely concede he became a very well-known groundwater specialist.

## Q. (BY MR. HOFFMAN) Okay.

A. What he did by 1935, I can't recall.

MR. HOFFMAN: Could you put up Texas 29, please? And I would like you to turn to Page 12 and 13 of the report. You're on Page 30 and 31 . I'm sorry. I can't see the page numbers. Page 12. Okay. Is that the page on the exhibit or is it the page on the document? That is the page on the document. Okay.

JUDGE MELLOY: Just a second. This is
why I'm afraid the record is going to get confusing. Use the exhibit number, Texas dash 0029, Page 14 of 56. Is that the page we want to be on?

MR. HOFFMAN: Yes, it is, Your Honor.
JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. Go ahead.
Q. (BY MR. HOFFMAN) Do you recall reading

Dr. Miltenberger's rebuttal report?
A. I did read it. I haven't reviewed it very closely in recent days, but is there a particular part you want me to look at?
Q. Yes. At the bottom of the page, 14 of 56 , the pioneering work, do you want to read that? You don't have to read it aloud, but --

MR. HOFFMAN: Could you highlight the last paragraph on that, other than the footnotes up above? There you go.
A. Now, I can't read it.

MR. HOFFMAN: Enlarge, "The pioneering work of Bryan," not the footnotes. That right there. And then continues on the paragraph of the next page.
Q. (BY MR. HOFFMAN) You can read it to yourself if you want. Talks about C.V. Theis and who he was and -- and when his -- his first published --
A. I see it, yes.
Q. Yes. And it was first published in '35 and
then reprinted in the '50s or '40s? '50s?
A. Doesn't say anything about that here, but I know that he was a well-known groundwater hydrologist.
Q. So in 1935, when he was advising the -- or actually supervising the work on the groundwater information, he already come out with his -- his theory, correct?

MS. ATTON: Objection; foundation. JUDGE MELLOY: Well, I'm going to sustain that. As I understand, this witness doesn't know what he came on with this theory.
Q. (BY MR. HOFFMAN) You didn't object -- or comment on Mr. -- Dr. Miltenberger's analysis of Dr. -- of Mr. C.V. Theis' work, did you, in your rebuttal report?
A. I -- I did actually comment specifically on Mr. Theis. I don't recall exactly where, but there is a passage where I do talk about Mr. Theis, and I don't recall if it's in my rebuttal report or one of the declarations, but I -- I did. I looked at it, and I looked at exactly where his materials were published and something about if I remember correctly that he was recommended by a mentor to publish it in some other thing. I don't remember all the details, but I do address it, absolutely, in one of my submissions in
this case.
Q. The joint investigation report wasn't the only place -- only entity or person that we've -- a report that we've talked about today that C.V. Theis was cited for support for, wasn't -- do you agree with that?
A. I didn't understand the question.
Q. Okay. Did you -- are you aware that the Conover report of 1954 also relied on C.V. Theis and his work at the -- in the JIR?

MS. ATTON: Objection; foundation.
A. I know that Mr. Theis -JUDGE MELLOY: Just a second. Just a second.

THE WITNESS: Apologies.
JUDGE MELLOY: Overruled. If the witness knows. She's read the Conover report so go ahead.
A. So I know that the Conover preliminary memorandum was transmitted with a letter from Theis. I don't recall seeing anything in the Conover documents that indicated it relied on the JIR, which I think is what you just asked me.
Q. (BY MR. HOFFMAN) Correct.
A. I don't recall that specifically.

Worldwide Court Reporters, Inc.
Q. Let's look at Joint 444, please, and go to Page --

MR. HOFFMAN: And I apologize, Your
Honor. When I get there, I'll correct the record. But of the report, it's Page 135.
A. Can you clarify for me, do you mean 444? Are we looking at the --
Q. (BY MR. HOFFMAN) NO, I meant 444.
A. That's what I thought you said. Okay.
Q. Yeah. This is the letter you talked about?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Let's go to Page 135 of the report. I will correct you.

MR. RUDLING: I'm sorry. This does not have a 135 that I'm aware of?

MR. HOFFMAN: Joint 444 does not have a

135? It just has one page?
MR. RUDLING: No, sir, it has multiple
pages. It has 28 pages to be precise.
MR. HOFFMAN: That's not the -- no, that's -- that's not the right one. Just a second. New Mexico 499. There.
Q. (BY MR. HOFFMAN) That's the 1954 report, correct?
A. Yes.

MR. HOFFMAN: And if you would go to Page 135 of that report. There you go. And it's Page 141 of the document.
Q. (BY MR. HOFFMAN) It cites, "Literature cited." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And it cites Kirk Bryan, 1938, a geologist and Rio Grande Joint Investigation in the upper Rio Grande Basin in Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas 1936 to '37, Volume 1, Pages 197 through 225.
A. Right. And if $I$ recall correctly, that part of the Joint Investigation Report is on the groundwater, which deals specifically with the areas above Elephant Butte.
Q. And it's the geology, correct?
A. I'd have to look at it again. I think that's right, yes.
Q. Okay. Let's -- let's turn to the next page, 142?

MS. ATTON: Your Honor, I apologize. Just to make sure the record is clear, I'm not sure the court reporter was able to capture everything Dr. Jennifer Stevens said then.

JUDGE MELLOY: Just a second here. Let me look at the transcript. I think she got it. Go
ahead.
Q. (BY MR. HOFFMAN) Okay. Let's enlarge the first entry there for C.V. Theis, and you can see there that under C.V. Theis, there's a date for 1935 for one of his papers, and then with respect to 1938, he cites the JIR, Pages 268 through 291, as a source that he's relying on for the 1954 Conover report, correct?
A. Yes. He's citing to the section that is labeled groundwater in the Middle Rio Grande Valley in New Mexico, which is, of course, above Elephant Butte Dam.
Q. Let's go to that section of the report, Colorado 5.

JUDGE MELLOY: I think it's actually
Colorado 4 if you're talking about the JIR.
MR. HOFFMAN: Colorado 4. I'm sorry.
Colorado 4. The cited pages were 68 to 91.
MR. RUDLING: Could you repeat the page number, please?

MR. HOFFMAN: Yeah, I'm trying to find it.

JUDGE MELLOY: What is your question, Mr. Hoffman?

MR. HOFFMAN: I want to look to see
what, in fact, was -- the record is clear that somewhat relied on Theis in the --

JUDGE MELLOY: Well, 268 is part Roman Numeral 2, Section 3, dash Groundwater in the Middle Rio Grande Valley, New Mexico.

MR. HOFFMAN: Correct. Okay. Okay. Let's go to Texas Exhibit 610. This is the report in 1962 by Gunaji.
A. Yes. The date on it is November, 1961.
Q. Did you collect this document?
A. I did. I believe so. Although I can't recall off the top of my head.
Q. Do you know where you collected it?
A. No.

MS. ATTON: Your Honor, I apologize. Just to be clear, this is a Texas version of this document, and just so we're clear that there was a New Mexico version, as well, but that is not the version that has been entered into evidence.

JUDGE MEILOY: Excuse me. Which version is in evidence? Is it the New Mexico or the Texas?

MS. ATTON: I believe it's the Texas exhibit we have on the screen, but just for clarity, Dr. Stevens may not have personally collected this Texas exhibit version.

JUDGE MELLOY: What I'm asking is, is this in evidence as Texas 610 or is it in evidence as a New Mexico exhibit? Or is it in evidence at all?

MR. HOFFMAN: It's in evidence.
JUDGE MELLOY: Do you know what the New Mexico exhibit number is?

MR. HOFFMAN: Yes, I do. 445.
JUDGE MELLOY: Go ahead.
MR. HOFFMAN: I guess I'm wrong on that one. I'm sorry. It's not 445.

MS. ATTON: So, Your Honor, I believe the Texas 610 exhibit, which is on the screen right now, is the admitted version in this case.

JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Okay. Let's go ahead.
Q. (BY MR. HOFFMAN) Okay. You called out certain pages of this exhibit, and I'm trying to find out which ones. I'll find it. You talked about how the groundwater levels had recovered. Do you recall that? They hadn't completely recovered, had they?
A. No, not entirely. They -- he says that they were still 2 feet lower than before the drought had started, if $I$ remember correctly.
Q. Do you know how long it would take for them to recover completely?
A. Do I know?
Q. Yeah.
A. No, I don't.
Q. You don't? You're not a technical expert, are you?
A. No, I'm not.
Q. So we'll have to leave it to the technical experts to testify as to how long it would take for the groundwater levels to recover completely?
A. Right. I was reading this report into the record because of the difference that he, which who is a technical expert, stated it would take, which was a difference than the earlier technical expert, Conover, had said it would take.
Q. Do you know if Mr. Gunaji studied the -- the effect of groundwater pumping on reservoir levels?
A. I don't recall.
Q. As a layman, where do you think the water came from to allow the groundwater levels to recover? MS. ATTON: Objection. This calls for expert testimony outside the scope of Dr. Stevens' expertise.

JUDGE MELLOY: Well, I'll let
Dr. Stevens answer to the extent that she has reviewed reports or other documents in her historical analysis
that might shed light on that issue.
A. Sure. So that's exactly what $I$ can speak to, and my recollection is that there were different reports in different parts of the basin from Colorado all the way down to -- to Fort Quitman that describe different sources for the groundwater. Some of it was from the stream; some of it was from precipitation; some of it was from Mesa lands, if I remember correctly, and I can't remember all of the other ones, but I do know that there were several reports that, over the course of time, that talked about where that water came from, and it came from different places and was known at different times.
Q. (BY MR. HOFFMAN) Would you agree with me that the major source of the water that replaced it would be the river?

MS. ATTON: Objection on the basis it asks for technical expertise.

JUDGE MELLOY: If you can answer, go ahead.
A. I would ask you to define for me where specifically in the basin and when. When they knew, when you're asking me about their knowledge, just generally, because I think what I said in my report is that it depended and that the different basins were
different, and the knowledge of --
Q. (BY MR. HOFFMAN) I'm asking you about your -your personal opinion with respect to the Mesilla Valley. Where do you think the water came from that Gunaji was talking about that refilled the aquifer to 2 feet below the prior to groundwater-pumping levels?
A. That's a specific question I can answer. He says the river. Most of it came from the river.
Q. Okay. And -- I'll leave that to the technical experts. Okay. You talked about how certain people or certain information was more or less reliable depending on the distance from the event that they were describing. Do you recall that? And distance I mean in years.
A. Right. I said something along those lines, yes.
Q. Yeah. And then you talked about Mr. Reynolds and -- and said that -- what was your criticism of Mr. Reynolds' testimony? I can't remember.
A. I wouldn't characterize it as criticism. I think what $I$ said was that he was not present during the Compact negotiations, and he became state engineer in 1955.
Q. And, in fact, Mr. Hill, who did his affidavit in 1968, was, in fact, present during the
negotiations, was he not?
A. I don't recall that Hill did that. I mean, I'll take your word for it, but -- and if you're talking about Raymond Hill, then, yes, he was present there for the negotiations, but I don't remember those together.
Q. He was engineering advisor to Clayton, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And he was -- his name is all over the reports of the engineer advisors, right?

MS. ATTON: Objection; foundation. JUDGE MELLOY: She's indicated she's read the report, so I'll let her answer.
A. I lost the -- the question. You asked if Hill's name is all over the engineering advisor's reports from --
Q. (BY MR. HOFFMAN) Yeah. He signed every one of them, correct?
A. Absolutely, yeah. He was very involved.
Q. Okay. And he would be in a better position than you to be able to tell us what the contract -contact -- Compact commissioners intended, would he not?
A. Well, I'm not sure that I'm comparing my
ability to -- I mean, I think I was just simply commenting that when 30 years have passed and the amount of information has changed since the '30s, that what he says in 1968, you need to take it as -- you have to put it in that context and understand that he was talking about it 30 years later and so I have to weigh that as a historian against all of the documents that his name was all over, you're right, in the '30s, and ascertain sort of how to weigh his opinions and what he says about the $\quad 30$ s versus what he did in the '30s. So I guess I'll leave it at that.
Q. Well, how much weight did you give to his opinions in 1968?
A. I don't think I really used that document at all, if I remember correctly. I'd have to go back --
Q. So you gave it no weight?
A. I don't think that it was a document $I$ spent a lot of time focusing on to analyze the questions $I$ was asked to investigate.
Q. So the answer to my question is you gave it no weight; isn't that right?
A. Well, I certainly looked at it since then. No, I wouldn't agree with that. I think that's too stark of a statement, but I've already answered the question and explained how $I$ view documents and how I
do my historical methodology and why I look at '68, in this particular matter, different than documents from the '30s.

MR. HOFFMAN: Okay. I'm going to turn you over to Ms. Coleman. I'm through, Your Honor.

JUDGE MELLOY: Thank you, Mr. Hoffman.
Ms. Coleman, you may proceed.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. COLEMAN:
Q. Good afternoon, Dr. Stevens. I'm sorry. I was taken off guard there for a minute. Also, it's freezing cold in this room so I'm a little shivery. It has nothing to do with this. They're trying to get me tea. All right. So $I$ wanted to start by talking about your historic -- some of your professional experience, and yesterday your updated CV was admitted as an exhibit. Do you remember that?
A. Yes.

MS. COLEMAN: Actually, just as an advance comment for all involved, we're going to look at the CV, but we're going to spend a good bit of time with your two reports so you might want to just have those handy as we go.
Q. (BY MS. COLEMAN) Starting with the CV, so this is -- this is an updated CV that you produced
this summer, correct?
A. Yes, I believe so.
Q. Or earlier this year?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So we -- we're going to pull up New Mexico Exhibit 1508. So there it is. And let's go to Page 2. And you'll see the first entry under water rights slash irrigation there, expert historian for principal defendants in the Walker River matter. This is a matter involving the Walker River rights Nevada?
A. It is.
Q. Is one of your assignments in that case to prepare a report rebutting the historian's report submitted by the United States?
A. It is.
Q. Has your rebuttal report been submitted in that matter?
A. It has not.
Q. Can you tell us why?
A. Can we just blame everything on COVID? The national archives unfortunately have been inaccessible for 18 months, and I have not been able to access a large number of records that I need to look at to render opinions in that matter.
Q. Let's go to Page 4 of your C V. When I say

4, I mean of the exhibit. We see at the bottom there, there's a heading for R.S. 2477, road right of way 1866 Mining Act. Now, Dr. Stevens, you're not a lawyer, as we've established, correct?
A. I'm not.
Q. Okay. But in the course of your work, you've become familiar with certain legal concepts, correct?
A. As a layperson, yes.
Q. Okay. Can you just tell us briefly what R.S. 2477 refers to?

MS. ATTON: Objection; relevance.
MS. COLEMAN: Can I have a few more questions to get to the relevance?

JUDGE MELLOY: You may.
Q. (BY MS. COLEMAN) Can you tell us briefly what R.S. 2477 is?
A. Sure. I'll try. I'm certainly not prepared to talk about this, but I'll give it a shot. R.S. 2477 is a statute in the 1866 Mining Act that provides for actual right of ways over public lands not reserved for other purposes. It was part of the law that was passed in the 1860 s that was also intended to settle parts of the country that were not settled at the time and so it provided rights for roads and ditches.
Q. In the course of your work on R.S. 2477, you addressed the question of prescriptive easements?
A. Not -- not really directly, no.
Q. Have you heard of the concept of prescription?
A. I have.
Q. Are you offering any opinion about prescription today?
A. No.
Q. Thank you. Let's go to Page 5, and we'll look at the second entry on Page 5, 2015 to 2019, consulting historian for consortium of counties in North Dakota. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. This is the case in North Dakota that you mentioned yesterday; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. I see at the bottom of that entry, you referenced trial testimony in November, 2019, three days of trial testimony; is that right?
A. That's my recollection, yes.
Q. And that was approximately three weeks after your expert report in this matter, your first expert report?
A. Which was October, 2019. I don't recall the
exact amount of weeks between them, but obviously a month later, within a month.
Q. And your testimony in that case was offered by a party opposing the United States, correct?
A. I'm sorry. Can you repeat that?
Q. Yes. Your expert testimony in that case was offered by a party opposing the United States, correct?

MS. ATTON: Objection; relevance. JUDGE MELLOY: I'll overrule it. You may answer.
A. Yes.
Q. (BY MS. COLEMAN) And scrolling -- not scrolling down, but later on the same page under CERCLA/Superfund, that first entry there, "2020 to present, expert historian for confidential client in the Silverton, Colorado region," do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And your client, $I$ understand, is no longer confidential in that matter; is that correct?
A. I believe that's true, yes.
Q. Okay. So this entry is referring to your work for the Sunnyside Gold Corporation in the Gold King Mine case, correct?
A. Yes.

MS. ATTON: Objection; relevance.
MS. COLEMAN: We are getting there.
JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. Go ahead.
Q. (BY MS. COLEMAN) And notwithstanding the closure of the archives, you produced your expert report in that case earlier this year, correct?
A. That's true. I did produce the report this year and traveled to several archives for that matter that were not closed.
Q. And is it fair to characterize -- sorry. Let me withdraw that.

And is your report and expert testimony in the Gold King Mine case being offered by a party opponent to the United States?
A. I haven't offered any expert testimony in that matter yet and, yes, my understanding is that they are opposed to the United States.
Q. Thank you. So still just in the realm of your experience, you spoke earlier about the history of memory being its own field; do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you aware of the field of the history of science?
A. Yes, of course.
Q. Do you have training in the history of
science?
A. No, not specifically.
Q. Does that field have its own methods of research?

MS. ATTON: Objection; relevance.
JUDGE MELLOY: Overruled. Go ahead.
A. I don't know.
Q. (BY MS. COLEMAN) Okay. But you're not testifying today as an expert in the history of science, are you?
A. Not specifically, no, not in the way that that term is understood in the historical profession.
Q. Okay. Thank you. Okay. Turning to this litigation, so you were retained by the State of New Mexico in this matter in 2013; is that right?
A. I believe it was 2013, yes.
Q. Okay. Or around 2013. And when you were retained, were you aware that there was an ongoing state adjudication of the Lower Rio Grande Basin?
A. I don't recall. I don't know.
Q. Were you aware at that time of any other ongoing litigation involving the Rio Grande Project?
A. Not that I remember, no.
Q. Okay. So in that case, you hadn't submitted reports in any other matter for New Mexico involving
the Lower Rio Grande, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Now, returning to this action, are you aware that New Mexico moved to dismiss the complaints of Texas and the United States in 2014?
A. I'm sure I was aware at some point about that, yes, but I don't recall specifically.
Q. Okay. And I believe you testified at your deposition that around the time you were retained, you worked with attorneys at the New Mexico Attorney General's Office to discuss your assignment; do you remember that testimony?
A. Not specifically, but that's true, yes.
Q. Okay. And you testified yesterday that you were given a large set of materials to review at the time you were retained; do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall how those materials were provided to you, electronically, for example?
A. I can't remember exactly at the start how the materials were provided. I -- I went to New Mexico several times over the course of the last seven years, and there were boxes of materials that the State Engineer had. I think at some point, those were -some of them at least were digitized and have been
produced herein, but $I$ can't remember exactly how I accessed that material right off the -- off the bat seven or eight years ago. I don't recall.
Q. I understand. Okay. But do you know how those materials were collected?
A. I don't know about all of them, no, but $I$ was -- it was clear to me that some of them had been collected by Doug Littlefield, merely because I worked for him, and $I$ knew his handwriting, so $I$ can see his handwriting, and, in fact, $I$ think even some of the exhibits in the trial today have his name typed on the front of a request, a photocopy request for some of these materials so I think that some of them had been collected by him over the years, but that's pure conjecture. I don't know that for a fact.
Q. So let's go to your October, 2019, report, and we'll go to Page 8. We'll look at those three bullets there under -- actually, we're going to look at the full version under Methodology and Materials Consulted. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Do you recall Dr. Miltenberger's testimony, I believe, his assignment was to look at the meaning of the 1938 Compact more or less?
A. I believe so, yes.
Q. Was your assignment broader than that?
A. I would say so, yes.
Q. Okay. And looking specifically at that second bullet there, it says, "How did officials manage groundwater, and what connections did they make between groundwater use and Project surface water?" Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Was -- so was part of your assignment under that question to reconstruct the historical record of the scientific understanding of the relationship between surface water and groundwater?
A. Yes. I think that's accurate.
Q. Okay. Now, looking at the -- the text there underneath the bullet points, you said you began by reviewing materials provided to me by counsel, all of which can be found at the New Mexico Office of the State Engineer, parenthesis, NM OSE, close parenthesis, library. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you ever visit the OSE library?
A. Yes.
Q. And actually, for the benefit of the record, we're going to use OSE to refer to the Office of the State Engineer, if that's okay with you.
A. Sure. Yeah, of course.
Q. Okay. So throughout your first report, you put the notation NM OSE library in some of your footnotes. Do you remember that?
A. I'm sure that's true, yes.
Q. Okay. So it's not possible to tell then from the citation saying that whether you got the document from counsel or whether you got it from the library directly?
A. That's true, yes. That's accurate.
Q. Okay. So let us go to Page 94 of this first report, and we'll look just down at the footnotes. Using Footnote 113, just as an example, we see you're referring to a water announcement by L.R. Fiock, and you provide the citation, and at the end it says, "NM OSE library." Do you see that?
A. I do, yes.
Q. Do you recall -- do you see it refers to the water announcement as located within a Project history for the calendar year 1951, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Does that mean in your work on this report that you were looking at a complete volume of the Project history?
A. So my recollection is that the Project
histories are all microfilmed, and they're microfilmed in for whatever reason 60 -page chunks so, yes, I reviewed the entirety of all the Project histories up until approximately 1960.
Q. Until approximately 1960, you say?
A. Approximately. Through the '60s. I can't remember exactly when the date the last one was that I examined, but around 1960 or thereabouts, maybe the middle of the '60s.
Q. Okay. And you hadn't conducted that review prior to this first report?
A. I had or had not? I'm sorry. What was the question?
Q. Had you completed your review of all of the Project histories up to approximately 1960 at the time you had -- you submitted this first report?
A. I believe so. I'd have to go back and reconstruct, but I think I did, yeah.
Q. So you spoke a little bit with Ms. Atton about what a Project history is. Do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. And these are voluminous volumes, for lack of a better word, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And even broken into 60-page chunks, they total well over a hundred pages sometimes, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And as we've seen today, the Project histories for the Rio Grande Project also contain some documents called water announcements; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And you spoke earlier with Ms. Atton about what $a$ water announcement is, and you said these went -- these went to the farmers, right?
A. I -- I do think -- I think that's what I said. I can't recall exactly, but I know that the information was provided to farmers in some way, shape, or form. How that got transmitted to them, I don't know.
Q. So you don't actually know who received these water announcements, do you?
A. I think it was the districts that received the water announcements, if I'm not mistaken, and then it was disseminated to the farmers.
Q. And do you have documents -- are there documents cited anywhere that describe that process?
A. No. That's just my recollection from looking at a lot of Reclamation histories over time as how that -- that that's how that was done, but $I$ don't --
can't point to any specific document saying that.
Q. Okay. And notwithstanding differing views about the value of newspapers, did you check newspapers to see if the water announcements were published there?
A. I did -- I did look at newspapers, and water announcements were frequently published there on many projects throughout the west. If you look back at Page 8 of my report, it's clear that $I$ did look at newspapers through a subscription to newspapers.com. I don't recall specifically whether or not the water announcements were published there. I didn't look specifically for that.
Q. Okay. So I know you've cited a number of newspapers, but you're not citing them for the proposition that the water announcements were published there, correct?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Thank you. You also address the water announcements in your rebuttal report, correct?
A. I believe so.
Q. And your rebuttal report was submitted in June of 2020 , right?
A. Yes.
Q. And is responding to Dr. Miltenberger's
report of December, 2019, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And it did not respond to the report
submitted by Mr. Kryloff, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Now, between December, 2019, and June, 2020, we were -- we went into the pandemic mode. Did that affect your ability to conduct research for your rebuttal report?
A. I don't recall that being -- having an impact on my ability to do my rebuttal report, no.
Q. Okay. Let us get your rebuttal report open then. It's New Mexico Exhibit 2098, Page 19 of that document. We will, again, go to the footnotes, and let's take a look at Footnote 100. So this is the stream citation, as lawyers call it, water announcements -- or it's one of the stream citations of water announcements here. Let's see. And in this case, for these ones, you're not citing the OSE library as the location of the document, right?
A. I don't appear to have that in here, no.
Q. Okay. Were you looking at a different set of water announcements?
A. I cannot be sure based on this. We use a citation tool called Zotero, and for whatever reason
it's not in here, and I don't know why, so I can't -I can't answer that just by looking at this. I'd have to go back and reconstruct on the computer so I'm sorry to say I can't tell you.
Q. That's okay. So you see there in Footnote 100, there's a reference to the water announcements from April 7th, 1952, which I believe you looked at with Ms. Atton earlier. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Let's pull up New Mexico Exhibit 1446 . It says at the top there April 7th, 1952, water announcement, and this is -- what we're looking at here is the version that you used, correct?
A. I believe so, yes.
Q. Okay. And you see that legend on the left there?
A. I was just going to say, it may have come from the EBID collection at New Mexico State.
Q. But you see there's also an EBID Bates stamp there on the bottom right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Does that -- what does that signify to you?
A. It could mean anything. It could be litigation that they were involved in and that that's
how they stamped it. There's also two other Bates stamps on there that start with NM and NM2, so I have no idea what the EBID stamp means here.
Q. Okay. Was this document provided to you by counsel?
A. I can't recall. I went to New Mexico State and did research in the EBID collection, so I -again, without my computer in front of me and the ability to go back and look since we don't -- I don't have it in this footnote, which is a mistake, I can't tell you. I don't know.

## Q. Okay. All right.

JUDGE MELLOY: Ms. Coleman, maybe this will be a time to take a break. Why don't we -- why don't we break for 15 minutes, and then we'll come back. All right, everyone? Thank you.

MS. COLEMAN: Thank you.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
(Recess.)
JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Are we ready to resume?

MS. ATTON: We are. But, Your Honor, if I may just before we start, I apologize. We have a restriction on Dr. Stevens' time today. We didn't expect to be an issue. After court ends today,

Dr. Stevens has to catch a flight for personal family reasons, and she's not able to come back tomorrow. I don't know if that's going to be an issue with the U.S.'s cross-examination of Dr. Stevens today, but I just wanted to flag it at this point.

JUDGE MELLOY: How much time do you
think you'll need, Ms. Coleman?
MS. COLEMAN: It is possible that I will go to the end of the day. I can't say. I'm not good at estimating this.

JUDGE MELLOY: Let's see where we're at. Let's go, and we'll see how far we get. And I don't mind going a little late if it's -- if -- if Heather is up for it. I'm always concerned about -- I don't want to overtax the court reporter, but the lawyers I don't worry about so much. But go ahead. Go ahead.
Q. (BY MS. COLEMAN) All right. Moving right along then -- or, actually, moving back to Page 19 of your rebuttal report, we're going to go to the text that's above the footnote. Okay. We see there, "The federal agency continued such encouragement throughout the 1952, 1953, 1954, and 1955 irrigation seasons." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And so you're saying here that

Reclamation encouraged groundwater pumping in each irrigation season, 1952 to 1955?
A. Yes. That's my recollection.
Q. Okay. Let's look at Footnote 100. Can you tell me looking here what you cited as evidence that Reclamation encouraged groundwater pumping in 1953?
A. It's not in the footnote, but I presumably looked at the water announcement for those -- for that year, the water announcements for that year.
Q. Is it standard historical practice not to put the citation in for something you are asserting?
A. No. Clearly it's an error.
Q. Okay. Thank you. So you wouldn't agree with me then that there is no water announcement from 1953 that encourages pumping?
A. Can you rephrase that?
Q. Yes. Thank you for asking me to. To your recollection, is there any water announcement from 1953 that encourages groundwater pumping?
A. I cannot recall off the top of my head, other than the documents that we've been looking at for the last two days, and I can't recall if any of those were from '53.
Q. Okay. We can revisit that soon. Let's look back at Footnote 100. Can you tell me what you've
cited as evidence that Reclamation encouraged groundwater pumping in the year 1955?
A. Same answer.
Q. Okay. For the benefit of saving time, I'll represent that on the next page, you cite a statement from the Elephant Butte Irrigation District Board of Directors from 1955, but as far as I can see, nothing from Reclamation. So to your -- sitting here today, you cannot think of a water announcement from 1955 that encouraged pumping?
A. Other than the ones that we've brought up as evidence in the exhibits in the last couple days, and I -- I can't recall off the top of my head what all those dates were, I don't remember any other ones at this time. That doesn't mean they weren't there, but I don't remember what they are.
Q. Okay. So by my count, the Project managers -- well, let me back up a second. This is critical to supporting your Rebuttal Opinion 2, is it not?
A. When you say "this," can you identify what you --
Q. The statement that Reclamation continued such encouragement throughout the 1952, 1953, 1954, and 1955 irrigation seasons is a critical fact for your Rebuttal Opinion No. 2, correct?
A. So my Rebuttal Opinion No. 2 on Page 15 states that, "Reclamation encouraged pumping in order to make irrigation a continued reality and essentially enable the Project to survive." So even if you take out '53 and '55 from Footnote 100 and the sentence to which that adheres, that does not change my opinion as stated in Rebuttal Opinion No. 2, no.
Q. Well, I'm not -- I'm not asking if it changes your opinion. I'm asking whether it is a critical fact for your opinion.
A. It's a critical fact that Reclamation issued the water announcements that we've been going over that very clearly stated that they're encouraging well owners to -- to use those wells and to transfer their allotments, yes, that's a critical part of my evidence, absolutely.
Q. Okay. And the opinion that you've stated there as to statements by the Bureau of Reclamation is based solely on, as far as you know, water announcements from 1951, 1952, and 1954; is that correct?
A. I don't think -- it doesn't change my opinion if we rely -- if $I$ rely only on these three years, if that's what you're asking me.
Q. Again, I'm not asking if that changes your
opinion. I'm asking if that is what your opinion is based on three years of water announcements?
A. It's based on the collective historical record related to this, so the documents that we just talked about, the water announcements that we've been looking at the last couple of days, as well as the reconnaissance report in 1956 that acknowledges that Reclamation knew about the pumping and that it was an important critical part of a supplemental water supply in years of shortage. So it's not just those things. It's also the complete historical record that I looked at.
Q. Dr. Stevens, can you show me where in your reports you cite the 1956 reconnaissance report for your opinions?
A. I don't think that $I$ do.
Q. In fact, you didn't review it for your reports, correct?
A. I became aware of it in the production for the case after this report was written. That's true.
Q. Okay. So, again, your Rebuttal Opinion No. 2 is based -- as to Reclamation's statements specifically is based on water announcements from 1951, 1952, and 1954, correct? MS. ATTON: Objection; mischaracterizes
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the witness' testimony.
Q. (BY MS. COLEMAN) I would like to know what documents specifically continued such encouragement relates to as it pertains to the Bureau of Reclamation?

JUDGE MELLOY: You may answer the question.
A. So, yes, it definitely relies on those and that probably, off the top of my head, is the majority of my explanation for that plus the -- well, hang on. Give me just a second. So in that footnote, there's also a statement from the Elephant Butte Irrigation District regarding the water situation from June, 1953. I don't have instant recall as to what that says, which $I$ imagine is going to be your next question, but obviously $I$ relied upon that to make that statement.
Q. (BY MS. COLEMAN) That will not be my next question. My next question will be is the Elephant Butte Irrigation District the same as the Bureau of Reclamation?
A. No, of course not. They're separate entities, but it was a district that received water from a Reclamation project.
Q. Okay. So you're done looking through your
footnotes for other Reclamation documents on this to support this statement?
A. In Footnote 104, I also reference Elephant Butte Irrigation District Board of Directors to all irrigation well owners from 1955. So without having my computer right with me and looking at all those documents right now, $I$ imagine, $I$ think, $I$ am sure, that I relied upon a series of these documents to make that particular part of my opinion.
Q. Dr. Stevens, do I understand your opinion to be that the 1700 wells that were drilled in the Project by 1956 can all be attributed to the Bureau of Reclamation's encouragement?
A. No. I don't think $I$ ever said that.
Q. Let's look at your Rebuttal Opinion 2 on Page 15. If we are looking at Rebuttal Opinion 2, which we're pulling up out of order. I'm sorry. "Improving scientific understanding about the groundwater supply in the Mesilla Valley in the post-Compact era led to Reclamation-led conjunctive, parenthesis, joint, close parenthesis, management of the overall supply." So here, you are alleging it is Reclamation-led -- a Reclamation-led movement to supplemental groundwater pumping, correct?
A. That's what I said, but that's not what you
asked me a second ago so --
Q. Okay. Correct. Your opinion is not that Reclamation's encouragement is the reason for 1,700 wells being drilled by 1956?
A. You asked me if every single one of those wells is attributable to Reclamation, and I think I probably don't know enough about each of those individual wells to say that.
Q. Okay. Thank you for that. Let me just take a minute here. Okay. But can we agree at least taking your Footnote 100 at face value that there are no water announcements from after 1955 that encouraged groundwater pumping?
A. No, I can't say that. I don't know because I haven't reviewed recently enough to know if there were no announcements in post 1955.
Q. But, Dr. Stevens, you said that you reviewed the water announcements up through 1960, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. It seems to me, and correct me if I'm wrong, that the opinion that the post-Compact era of conjunctive management was led by Reclamation might have alleging to confirm the documentary bases for that opinion prior to testifying today; is that wrong? MS. ATTON: Objection. I'm sorry, Your

Honor. I'm not following that question.
THE WITNESS: I'm not either.
MS. COLEMAN: Neither am I, so great.
Q. (BY MS. COLEMAN) Okay. So sitting here today, the documentary bases for your opinion that Reclamation-led conjunctive joint management are water announcements from 1951, 1952, and 1954, correct?
A. That's what's cited in my Footnote 100 , yes.
Q. Okay. Thank you. Now, you also reviewed the complete set of water announcements from 1946 to 1950; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. You haven't cited any water announcements from that era. Should I assume from that, that there must be some that encouraged pumping?

MS. ATTON: Your Honor, objection. I think this might be mischaracterizing the expert's testimony.

JUDGE MELLOY: Rephrase your question.
MS. COLEMAN: Okay.
Q. (BY MS. COLEMAN) Sitting here today, are you aware of any water announcements issued by Reclamation between 1946 and 1950 that encouraged groundwater pumping?
A. I don't remember.
Q. And I believe we covered earlier, you would agree that the opinions stated in your rebuttal report are not based -- did not -- sorry, did not account for that 1951 article in the El Paso Herald -- sorry. Let me withdraw that.

Would you agree that your opinions did not address the June 12th, 1951, El Paso Herald Post article that is New Mexico Exhibit 899?
A. I don't believe I cited that article, no.
Q. All right. Let's go back to Rebuttal Opinion 2. All right. So first sentence again, "Improving scientific understanding," et cetera, "Led to Reclamation-led conjunctive, parenthesis, joint management of the overall supply." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And is that consistent with the opinion you're offering today and testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Do you define conjunctive use anywhere in your reports?
A. Probably not, no.
Q. Do you define conjunctive management anywhere in your reports?
A. I'm sure I don't, no.
Q. Now, you have extensive experience working on
matters relating to -- to Reclamation projects, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And -- and as well as general irrigation district matters and such?
A. Yes.
Q. Is there -- is conjunctive management a term Of art for historians?
A. I don't really understand the meaning of your question, a term of art for historians, can you maybe phrase it differently so $I$ know what you're asking.
Q. You're testifying today as a historian, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you're using the term here conjunctive management. I'm going to read out the word joint in there just for simplicity. You're using the term conjunctive management, and that term is not defined. So I'm asking you as a historian, is there a accepted definition of conjunctive management that historians use?
A. I'm quite sure not too many historians talk about conjunctive management, but $I$-- I mean, certainly what $I$ mean and what $I$ understand it to mean is -- is management of the water supply as one whole
the groundwater and the surface water but certainly not a technical expert. That's my understanding of what it is, and that's what $I$ mean here.
Q. When you say "management," who is doing the managing?
A. Well, in this case, it's Reclamation on the Rio Grande Project.
Q. So you're saying Reclamation managed surface and groundwater supply? Is that what you're saying?
A. No. Probably I'm not saying that. If I think back to historically how this was done and how I understand it to be done, the private individuals drilled the wells and then Reclamation asked those farmers to transfer their surface allotments to -through -- that Reclamation would facilitate that transfer to other farmers that didn't have access to groundwater. So how that worked sort of an operational day-to-day basis, I -- I don't really know, but clearly they were paying attention to groundwater being pumped and the effect that that was having on surface flows.
Q. So conjunctive management is Reclamation helping farmers move groundwater that they pumped around the Project to supplement surface water; is that what you just said?
A. I don't think that's what I just said. I wouldn't put it that way. Definitely getting into what feels like technical sort of details, but I can just tell you that historically, I mean, and we went through this in the documents, that that's how it -that -- they were asking the farmers in the Project to come to their offices, and they offered to facilitate transfer of allotments, surface water allotments, so that the people who had access to well water would give -- would basically temporarily transfer their -their allotment to somebody else and then everybody would have enough water to grow their crops. I mean, I can only tell you from a historical standpoint what they were doing and what the documents tell me that they were doing, and that's what I read the documents to say they were doing.
Q. Okay. And your opinion is that the states, when they entered into the Compact, intended to leave room for conjunctive management in the future?

MS. ATTON: Your Honor, objection to the extent this calls for a legal opinion.

MS. COLEMAN: She is testifying extensively about what states intended as a matter of historical fact.

JUDGE MELLOY: All right. The witness
can answer.
A. I think that the farmers and the farmers under the district, which would, you know, which were in both states, intended for supplemental water to come from groundwater after -- like, during times of shortage. So I don't know that they talked about it. They didn't talk about it in terms of, quote unquote, conjunctive management, but $I$ do think that there was always a knowledge or an intent to tap the groundwater in times of shortage, and the documents that we've looked at over the last few days support that.
Q. (BY MS. COLEMAN) So just to confirm, your opinion is not that the Compacting states intended for Reclamation to manage the groundwater, right?
A. I'm sorry. I lost it. Can you repeat it? You can just read it back. It's not that $I$ didn't understand it. It's just that I lost it.
Q. Let me -- I will rephrase it not in a negative way.

Is your opinion that the Compacting states intended for Reclamation to manage the groundwater? MS. ATTON: Objection, again, to the extent it calls for a legal opinion. MS. COLEMAN: Same response. JUDGE MELLOY: Well, she's talked quite
a bit about what she understands the Compact to mean, so I'm going to allow the answer.
A. I don't think that specific issue was addressed in the Compact, and as I've said before, there was no discussion of -- of groundwater in the negotiations for the Compact so, no, I -- I don't think that the parties intended that as they signed the Compact.
Q. (BY MS. COLEMAN) So -- but looking at your Rebuttal Opinion 2, "The post-Compact era led to Reclamation-led conjunctive management of the overall supply." Are you really just saying there it led to the conjunctive or supplemental use of groundwater to surface water by individual farmers?
A. I probably wouldn't simplify it that much because then that takes away that the -- that Reclamation encouraged this and knew about it so, you know, we could wordsmith it if you want, but I think Reclamation is an important part of this and was aware of the pumping and was aware and encouraging the pumping as we've seen so, yeah, that's my answer.
Q. I'm asking you these questions because conjunctive management is a term that is thrown around in this case, and I would like to understand how your opinion relates to the use of that term by, in
particular, the state of New Mexico and its amici, but we will move on from that.

Okay. Let's look at the next sentence there. "The Bureau of Reclamation and other parties' conduct in the post-Compact era indicates that no contemporary actor believed that the Compact prohibited groundwater pumping." See that?
A. Yes.
Q. And that is -- that is the opinion you are testifying to today, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Forgive me for the wordsmithing again, but the word contemporary, in layman's usage, don't we usually talk about things being contemporary with other things? For example, something occurred at the same time as something else?
A. Yes.
Q. So when you say contemporary actor, it's actors contemporary with what?
A. With people in the post-Compact era. It's a reference back to the clause immediately prior.
Q. And the -- you define the post-Compact era to be what?
A. Well, my report in this particular case goes up to the Gunaji, I believe -- or, no, the Leggat
study, and so up to approximately 1967, if I'm not mistaken.
Q. So you're not talking about contemporary with the Compact, correct?
A. This is a very general term. I didn't really honestly define it in my own head when $I$ wrote it. I -- I do talk -- I mean, I am thinking about the Compact people, the people who were part of the Compact, and then their actions after the Compact was signed.
Q. After up to 1960 something?
A. I haven't given it enough thought to be able to put an end date, but $I$ can tell you my rebuttal report stops in about 1967.
Q. Okay.
A. And I didn't research beyond that.
Q. Okay. Now, still looking at the sentence, and you see the phrase "other parties"? Do you see that term?
A. Yes. I do. Sorry. Yes.
Q. And are you using that term in a legal sense?
A. No.
Q. So would you say you're using the term party there to mean the same as a contemporary actor?
A. Yes. I think $I$-- I mean -- yes, that's
correct. I didn't mean anything -- I don't even know what that means, a legal party.
Q. It's actually been a subject of dispute in this case, so you're not alone. Okay. So looking to the third sentence, "In fact, during periods of drought in mid-century," and then goes on, "Reclamation encouraged pumping," et cetera. When you say "periods of drought," do you, in fact, mean the one period of drought from, $I$ believe you said it in your direct testimony, 1946 to 1957?
A. Yes. And I think when I said "periods," you know, it varied each year. It was different in terms of how severe it was so that's what $I$ was referring to.
Q. Okay. Thank you. And I don't have the citation handy, but $I$ think you referred a number of times to the '50s drought. We're going to call it the '50s drought. Is that okay with you?
A. That's fine.
Q. Okay. The conditions during the 1950s drought were emergency conditions; is that a fair characterization?
A. I think it felt that way to the people living through it, yes.
Q. Would you agree it was also an emergency for

## the Project itself?

A. I've never really thought about it that way. It was definitely an emergency for the -- the farmers in the Project, no question about it. I guess I would -- I'm not sure if the Project itself is -- can be animated that way, so I'm not -- I'm not really sure that I -- I'd have to give that some thought. I don't know.
Q. Okay. Well, you say later in that sentence, "To essentially enable the Project to survive." It's a little bit animated there, right?
A. Okay. Fair enough.
Q. So on -- what did you mean by "enable the Project to survive"?
A. So the -- the whole -- the way that Reclamation is set up is that the federal government pays for the construction up front. The farmers are then gathered into or they come together and join in the irrigation districts, which then turn around and repay the federal government for the construction and the various other things. Excuse me. And so if the crops fail and the farmers can't make their payments, then the Project fails, and the government can't get its money back. So in the sense that the settlements would fail, people would lose their jobs or their
income, I should say, their livelihoods, and that the farmers might not be able to pay the federal government back, and the irrigation districts couldn't be whole in that, that's what I'm referring to there. And there was definitely that sense in the -- in the records that the people themselves were very concerned and, you know, there was a feeling of -- of emergency.
Q. Okay. And you mentioned what I'll refer to in shorthand as the repayment under Federal Reclamation a law, is that a fair abbreviation?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you also heard the term operation and maintenance in your work in Federal Reclamation projects?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So in addition to repaying the construction cost, the districts also paid operation and maintenance charges; is that your understanding?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And, in fact, during this period, the districts requested deferment of payment of their operations and maintenance charges, correct?
A. That sounds right, but I don't remember the details of that.
Q. Okay. So to the extent the project managers
encouraged pumping during the 1950 s drought, they didn't suggest that it should continue after the drought, correct?
A. Well, in the '56 report, that is not cited in my report, it does say that they believe that it's -in the future, it's an important part of the supply. I don't know that you can characterize that as encouraging it, but $I$ think they recognized that it was going to be an important future part of the supply.
Q. But you're not offering opinion about the significance of that report, correct?

MS. ATTON: Objection; mischaracterizes
the testimony.
MS. COLEMAN: Well, let me ask.
Q. (BY MS. COLEMAN) Are you -- you -- we've agreed that prior to today, you haven't offered an opinion on the significance of the 1956 report, correct?
A. I can't remember if it was today or yesterday, but during the course of this testimony, that's right.
Q. Okay. Thank you. Okay. So setting aside the 1956 reconnaissance report, there's no statement by Reclamation during the 1950s drought characterizing
groundwater pumping as anything other than an emergency measure, correct?
A. You know, I didn't see any reference frankly at all to the temporal nature of the encouragement, whether it was emergency, and -- and they were saying stop as soon as -- as soon as we're out or if it was intended to be long term. I don't think it specified -- any of the announcements specified that.
Q. Okay. But by the time of the first water announcement you've cited, which is 1951, a number of farmers in EBID had already drilled their wells, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. I believe it was that conover found 37 wells in 1947. Do you remember talking about that?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Well, let's -- let's move on to the -- the 1940s. So let's go back to your 2019 report, and I'm just going to go to the page instead of -- okay. So, actually, before we get to that, in your October, 2019, report, you actually start your discussion about the 1940s by talking about the U.S. Geological Survey study of El Paso groundwater from the 1930s. Do you remember that?
A. Can you point me to a page?
Q. Yes, I can. Page 92 of your 2019 report. I'll just pull that up.
A. Thank you. Can you repeat the question for me?
Q. I'm sorry. Yes. We can zoom in on that paragraph. Okay. That's fine. Okay. So you see there, "In 1946, EBID followed the City of El Paso's lead and requested that the USGS study the groundwater supply in the Rincon and Mesilla Valleys." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So here, you are giving context for a drought that began in the 1940 s by reference -referencing a study that was being conducted in the 1930s; is that fair to say?
A. If I understood what you just said -- I'm not sure I understood what you just said. I'm sorry. Could you repeat it?
Q. Okay. What do you mean by EBID followed the City of El Paso's lead there?
A. So in my report, I talk and I -- I think it's earlier in this same section so give me just a second. Yeah. Begins on Page 83. I discuss starting on Page 83, it says, "The City of El Paso's request and cooperation with the U.S. Geological Survey to study
groundwater supplies for municipal purposes," and so that's what I'm referring to in that sentence you just read.
Q. Okay. So what do you mean by EBID followed the City of El Paso's lead on Page 92?
A. Also requesting a study by USGS to study groundwater.
Q. Okay. So that's just a statement of -- of it follows in time?
A. Yes.
Q. Not that they were thinking of the City of El Paso study?
A. That's correct. It's just that El Paso had asked the USGS to do a study, and now EBID was. That's all.
Q. All right. Backing up for a second, I'm going to probably refer to the U.S. Geological Survey as the USGS throughout our discussion today.

Understood?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And in your work as an environmental historian, you're often looking at USGS reports, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you've -- you're generally familiar with
the history of the USGS, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And based on what you know about the USGS as a historian, would you agree that one of the USGS's functions is study of the groundwater resources in the United States?
A. Starting in the late 19th and into the 20th century, yes.
Q. Okay. Thank you. Okay. So let's focus in on this Page 92, the paragraph beginning in 1946, EBID followed. So you've done consulting project for a number of irrigation districts in your experience, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you're familiar with the types of records that irrigation districts maintain in the ordinary course of business?
A. I think that's fair, yes.
Q. Okay. And -- and you did visit the EBID -I'm sorry. When I say "EBID," I'm referring to Elephant Butte Irrigation District.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Thank you. And you visited the EBID collection housed at New Mexico State University, right?
A. I did. It's enormous.
Q. Okay. Now, when you were discussing the EBID request in 1946, you discussed their intention in seeking that request by reference to the statements in Conover. Am I recalling that correctly?
A. I referenced -- you asked -- I just want to make sure $I$ understand the question. You're asking if I referenced the district's intent by referencing what Conover said?
Q. Correct. So, for example, if we look at Footnote 94 on Page 92, you're citing there to Conover?
A. Yes. That's right.
Q. Okay. Did you look at any EBID board meeting minutes about this request to the USGS?
A. I did, yes.
Q. Okay. Which minutes were those?
A. I don't recall off the top of my head exactly what day they discussed it.
Q. Okay. Let's go to your rebuttal report, Page 17, and let's go right to the top there to the paragraph, "When Project supplies began to wane in the mid 1940s due to the onset of drought conditions, the Elephant Butte Irrigation District, EBID, contracted with the USGS." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And then it ends in Footnote 77?
A. Yes.
Q. Then if we go to Footnote 77, it refers to Conover, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So, again, here you are citing Conover to characterize the EBID's request to the USGS that resulted in the Conover study, right?
A. Yes. And I'll just say, the previous document we looked at was a letter to EBID and didn't seem to me that there was any controversy over what this report was. There was a letter to Greg of EBID stating Conover's understanding of the investigation and then report and preliminary memo that resulted from that, of course, actually did those things.
Q. Okay. But your footnote in your previous report begins with citation to the 1947 memo, but that doesn't -- that doesn't matter. So, now, we look -let's see here. Let's go to the next sentence. The next sentence is, "The mere initiation of the study is in and of itself significant since such a study would have been unnecessary if there was a prevailing understanding that either the Project filings had included groundwater or conversely that the Compact
had precluded such use." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. So you're characterizing the initiation of the study as significant, but you're not citing any EBID minutes or documents about the initiation of the study; is that right?
A. It's been established in my report that the study was initiated.
Q. All right. But here, you're attributing significance to the initiation, and I'd like to understand what you're relying on to talk about the significance of the initiating the study?
A. This is a part of my opinion. I'm relying on the fact that the study was initiated, and my opinion is related to the significance of that.
Q. Okay. So there's no citation for the sentence, right?
A. It's -- it's my opinion. I'm the citation.
Q. Got it. Okay. Let's go to the fourth
sentence. "The district knew its own history, which included use of well water for irrigation in the years before Reclamation constructed the Project. In fact, Conover noted pumping from groundwater," et cetera, "as long ago as about 1896." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So in your opinion, when EBID requested a USGS study of groundwater in 1946, it was looking to the use of wells in the 1890s and early 1900s as historical precedent?
A. Well, he's -- he did it as a -- so the USGS study, the Conover study, was done as a cooperative agreement with EBID, and I don't know what you mean by "precedent," but this is a quote from -- from the Conover study that states that the Mesilla Valley pumping had happened as long ago as 1896. So I don't know what you mean by "precedent," but this is a quote from a report that was done cooperatively with EBID.
Q. Okay. Well, let me focus you then on "the district knew its own history." So you are saying the district knew the history of groundwater pumping back to 1896 at the time that it requested the report from the USGS?
A. I think that's a pretty fair statement, yeah. Yes.
Q. But I -- and your discussion of the history of memory, you questioned the reliability of memory 30 years or more, right?
A. That's not what $I$ said, no.
Q. Okay. Well, you agree and the parties have stipulated that EBID was formed in 1918, right?
A. Yes. Originally it had been what was called the Water Users Association. It adopted the new -under the new laws as an irrigation district, but those farmers, the same people -- many of the same people had been in a cooperative association prior to that called the Water Users Association.
Q. What year was the Water Users Association formed?
A. I believe it was 1907, but I'm not a hundred percent sure on that.
Q. So, really, when you say water -- when you're referring here to water use back to 1896, you're not talking about the district's history specifically, right?
A. No, you're right. Probably not. I think my reference here is really more to -- this is a small area, low population, and so this is more of a historical reference to that a lot of these farms are handed down generation to generation, and they -- they know what happened before. It's sort of the culture of these types of farming rural communities, so that's -- that's really all this is a reference to, and there was an understanding that well water had been used prior to the reliability of surface supply coming from Elephant Butte Reservoir.
Q. Do you have any documents showing that the EBID board in 1946 was thinking about groundwater pumping in the early 1900s when it requested the Conover study?
A. Not at my hands, no.
Q. Did you compare who was on the EBID board in 1946 to who was on the board even in 1918 --
A. No.
Q. -- to see if there was overlap?
A. No.
Q. The answer is no, correct?

Okay. Let's go to the next paragraph on Page 17 there. Again, "With this background of knowledge and use, it would be difficult to conclude that EBID would have requested," et cetera. Okay. So, again, with this background of knowledge and use, do I understand that to mean that your assumption that there was knowledge handed down in the farming families of EBID about groundwater pumping in the early 1900s?
A. Well, the farmers were deeply dependent on these agricultural experiment stations, which existed throughout the west, and that's where those -- that early study that we talked about yesterday at the Lester and Vernon report came from. And just in terms
of western water history and agricultural history, those experiment stations were really critical to establishing these projects and establishing irrigation and farming on -- on western territories on these arid lands. So that's where that document came from, and yes, I am making an assertion that people understood that history and that people who were farming on these lands had a general understanding of the land on which they were farming and an understanding of the resources they had available to them. Yes, that is a pretty well-formed opinion in my -- in my thought.
Q. But you have no documents to show that the EBID board was referring to that general understanding of historical groundwater use when they requested the Conover study, correct?
A. I don't have a specific document, no, but a lot of long -- long study of this stuff makes me think that they probably knew about it, but, no, I don't have a document.
Q. But Hill, in 1968 , wouldn't have remembered his work on the Compact?
A. I did not say that.
Q. His memory would have been unreliable?
A. I didn't say that either.
Q. What did you say?
A. I said that when I look at historical documents and I'm doing historical research, I find the materials from the time I'm studying to be more reliable than things that people say many years later. I don't at all -- I never said it was unreliable. I said I look at those kinds of documents differently, and the further away you get from the events that actually took place, the less reliable I think those documents are. But I -- I'm not saying he doesn't have -- that he was -- didn't remember anything, but I think that -- and I'm not a historian of memory. I just know that there's a field out there that as you, you know, gather more information over the course of time, you know, those things can filter into your memory. All you have to do is read the newspaper to see that, you know, two people who observe the exact same incident don't have the same memory of it so that's all I'm saying, and I never said that he was unreliable and that his memory was wrong.
Q. Thank you. Let's return to this paragraph here. This is the part after the semicolon.
"Likewise, the federal USGS would not have undertaken the study if it was commonly understood within the federal government that such pumping would either harm

Project beneficiaries or violate the Compact," et cetera, ending in Footnote 82. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. When we look to Footnote 82, that is a citation to Conover, and that -- I'm pulling it up. And that is a citation to the 1954 Conover, correct?
A. I believe so, yes.
Q. But Conover doesn't discuss the factors that the USGS considers when it decides to fund groundwater studies, right?
A. No.
Q. And you agree that studying underground water resources is one of USGS's functions, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you cited any document that the USGS conducts a legal analysis before deciding whether to undertake the study of groundwater resources?
A. No.
Q. Let's see here. Okay. Let's pull up New Mexico Exhibit 1439, and let's go to -- yes, let's zoom in on that letter. Oops, too zoomed in. Okay. So this is the -- this is the letter, I'll just represent to you, you cited this letter in your October, 2019, report from C.V. Theis to Sayre, I believe, within the USGS.
A. Okay.
Q. All right. And let's -- just focusing in there on the second paragraph, and if our trial director is too slow, we can just -- can you read it fine there? Okay. There we go. All right. Let's -do you see that sentence in the middle beginning, "The purpose of the memorandum"?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. "Is to give at least the consequences of sump pump irrigation and to indicate that it will probably be uneconomical to try to install a system of wells that would irrigate all the land, and that any new land brought in will necessarily detract from the water supply of existing irrigated acreage."

Actually, let me back up one moment. You see at the top there in the first sentence, it says, "The reason for this preliminary memorandum," do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And this is a reference to Conover's 1947 memorandum, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So in that second highlighting there, he's talking about the purpose of the memorandum, and then -- and you see there that any new land brought in will necessarily detract from the water supply of the
existing irrigated acreage. I'm sorry. We did not read this whole paragraph out loud. I was trying to save time. But we're referring to the drilling of wells here. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And C.V. Theis is telling Mr. Sayre that, "Increasing the existing irrigated acreage with the drilling of wells will necessarily detract from the water supply of the existing irrigated acreage." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Then in the last sentence, it says, "The memorandum is needed in order to help the Elephant Butte Irrigation District" -- or "Elephant Butte District," excuse me, "and the state engineer establish a policy before the situation gets out of hand." Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. Does this suggest to you that the USGS thought the drilling of wells was consistent with the Compact?
A. Doesn't mention the Compact.
Q. Does it suggest to you that C.V. Theis thought that pumping was acceptable?
A. He does not state whether or not he thinks
it's acceptable. What he does do is note that there is going to be an effect on the existing, meaning the surface water supply.
Q. Okay. And then he refers to, "Before the situation gets out of hand." Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. And what do you -- you quoted this document. Can you tell me what you think he means there?
A. I think he's saying that the district and the state engineer need to have a policy about groundwater pumping before there's too many of it and it effects -- it effects the existing surface supply, which then, you know, not too many years later, the Bureau of Reclamation encourages it, and also, so did Conover. Conover did mention -- well, I'll stop there. You didn't ask.
Q. Okay. So C.V. Theis, as Mr. Hoffman, spoke to you about, was involved in the preparation of the Joint Investigation Report, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And you are suggesting that to C.V. Theis, at least, there might be a situation where there are too many wells, correct?
A. I think it could be read that way, yes.
Q. Okay. And that -- and to C.V. Theis, there
might be a situation where the wells impact the surface water supply, correct?
A. I mean, it says what it says. It says, "Any new land brought in will necessarily detract from the water supply of existing irrigated acreage." So, yes, he's making that connection.
Q. Okay. Does he sound happy about it?
A. I can't characterize whether or not he's
happy.
Q. All right. Back to Rebuttal Report Page 17. Okay. So, now, "Instead, considering the Compact's silence on the issue of groundwater and the dearth of available data on the subject, EBID commissioned the USGS," et cetera. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And that ends in Footnote 83, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And if we go to Footnote 83, we will see minutes of the regular meeting of the board of directors of the Elephant Butte Irrigation District held on October 7th, 1947. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And there, you have attributed, $I$ guess, the source of that document to counsel, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Let's actually --

MS. COLEMAN: I just wanted to offer if the Special Master wanted to take a break or -- we're about to get into a new topic. Oh, you're on mute.

JUDGE MELLOY: Let's keep going.
Q. (BY MS. COLEMAN) All right. Let's pull up -we originally had this on the exhibit list as US-376, but then it was amended to New Mexico 1605, so here is New Mexico 1605. We are going to scroll through enough in the hope that you will -- okay. Do you see that highlighting there? Is this a copy of the 1947 minutes that you're citing in your report?
A. It appears to be, yes.
Q. Okay. And the highlighting that we saw when we scrolled through that, that was your highlighting, right?
A. I am not sure. It might have been.

MS. ATTON: Your Honor, objection. I think it's fair to say that we don't know whose highlighting this is.

MS. COLEMAN: Well, actually, we do. We do. And I'm happy to pull up the native version of this PDF, which will show in the comments that Jennifer Stevens made the annotations and includes what is in her comment on the third page there. I'm
not interested in what's in that comment bubble, but $I$ can bring it up for you if you like, Ms. Atton.

JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Go to that section again. What is the question, and what is the objection? I'm not sure where we're at, at this point.

MS. COLEMAN: I'm just asking if this is the version of the EBID board minutes that Dr. Stevens reviewed in preparing her rebuttal report.
A. It appears to be.
Q. (BY MS. COLEMAN) Okay. And this document, New Mexico Exhibit 1605 is 34 pages long. Perhaps you can't see that, but I'll represent that for the record. So other than what I'll represent are your highlighting annotations, is this how the document was given to you by counsel?
A. No. I don't believe so. I think I had access to all of -- $I$ know $I$ had access to all of the EBID minutes, and this relates back to a question you asked earlier. I can't remember how everything was given to me, but I -- they did not just give me certain parts of it. I had access to the entire thing, to all of the minutes.
Q. Okay. So but the footnote for this identifies the source as counsel?
A. That only means that we received it from counsel and then we excerpted parts of it internally, not that -- well, I guess I don't understand what you're asking.
Q. I just want to understand that the document -- if this is the scope of the document that you looked at -- if this is the scope of the EBID minutes that you looked at in -- in connection with Footnote 83?
A. I can't answer that. I don't remember.
Q. Okay.
A. As I said before, I looked at the EBID minutes.
Q. Okay. And you looked at the EBID minutes, all of the EBID minutes for 1947?
A. I'm sure that I did, yes. I'll just say, I looked at so many documents in this case, as you can imagine, I can't remember with specificity every single document I looked at.
Q. Okay. So let's go to Page 3 of this document, and we'll zoom in on that highlighted part that says, "USGS investigation on groundwater" in the margin. So would you agree that this entry here is discussing Conover's September, 1947, memorandum?
A. It appears to be, yes.
Q. Okay. And do you see that at the end, they're talking about calling the board into session again within the near future for the purpose of discussing the report and the pumping situation in greater detail, do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And then let's go to Page 6, and at the top there is the heading so we're looking at the minutes of the special meeting held October 17th, 1947. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Then look at the first entry there next to discussion of U.S. Geological Survey report. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And we'll look at the last sentence of this one. It says, "Definite conclusions and recommendations on the part of the Board were deferred until a later date pending further consideration of the matter and a determination of the consensus of opinion among water users in the district." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Pending a consensus means there wasn't a consensus about how to address pumping at the time of
this meeting, right?
A. You could read it that way or you could read it that they wanted to make sure that more people were in on the discussion. I wouldn't necessarily read that, that there wasn't a consensus. I mean, it could mean that, but it could not, too.
Q. Okay. But you see they're deferring conclusions and recommendations, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Let's go to Page 8 of this document, and that's fuzzy, but it is the minutes of a meeting of December 5th, 1947. Will you accept that, Dr. Stevens?
A. I will.
Q. Okay. Thank you. And we will go to Page 9, and you have some highlighting there, again, next to the heading "pumping," and, again, says, "The total number of wells reported by the Bureau was 37. After a brief discussion of the pumping situation, it was deemed advisable to carry the matter over to the January meeting for more extensive discussion and possible action." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So does this suggest that the Board had a clear view that pumping was acceptable?
A. Because this is just a set of minutes and not a transcript, I'm not sure that we can really say, but I think they -- they took it very seriously, and they intended to talk about it as much as they needed to, to come to a decision.
Q. Okay. Let's get New Mexico Exhibit 175 open, please. This exhibit is previously admitted with Mr. Esslinger. Let's go to Page 371 of the exhibit and look at the heading. And our trial director is slow. Trial director is the -- the program we use to show these exhibits. Page 371 shows the heading of the minutes dated August 5th, 1947. We'll get there. So, anyway, we'll go to Page 373, and we'll look at the bottom paragraph on 373. So this is reporting, for the sake of paraphrasing, about the drilling of additional wells by the end of -- by -- as of August, 1947, so we see 14 irrigation wells have been drilled in the Rincon Valley, and then in the next sentence, it says, "In the Mesilla Valley, about five wells have been drilled." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. So that's 19, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, let's look at the last sentence, which is going to carry over. "It was pointed out most
wells drilled on the floor of the valley will be used for emergency only during the time that storage is badly depleted or entirely exhausted, and that operation of these wells will be discontinued in most instances, when surface water conditions return to normal." Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. So would you agree that this discussion contemplates supplemental or conjunctive use as an emergency measure?
A. It specifically says emergency only in this 1947 set of minutes.
Q. So let's go down in the paragraph -- that paragraph. This document is, like, a hundred megabytes, and I'm convinced that it slows the whole -- the whole system down.
A. I feel your pain.
Q. Let me -- while this is loading, let me just ask you, if I recall correctly from your CV, you served on the Boise Planning and Zoning Commission; is that right?
A. Yes. For many years.
Q. You're no longer on the commission, right?
A. Correct.
Q. Let me see where we are with the callout for
-- yes. Okay. So this next sentence here on Page 373, the top -- sorry, this is 374. "The possibility of direct encroachment upon the District groundwater supply, together with later indirect encroachment upon surface water supply, by wells drilled on bench lands adjacent to the valley was called to the attention of the Board." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. So the term encroachment typically refers to something that is impinging on somebody else's rights, correct?
A. I -- I don't know about rights, but it's something impinging -- or infringing on something else, yes.
Q. Okay. Could we say an encroach refers to something adversely impacting something else?
A. Probably in most cases, yeah. I think so.
Q. So the use of the word encroachment here would suggest that pumping outside of the emergency context would be impermissible, doesn't it?

MS. ATTON: Your Honor, just so the record is clear, this passage, I think relates to and expressly says wells drilled on bench lands and lands adjacent to the valley.

JUDGE MELLOY: And what's your point?

MS. ATTON: Just for clarity, Your Honor.

JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Go ahead.
A. I don't think it says anything about the permissibility here at all, actually, but it does -it's basically consistent with what Conover -- I think it was Conover said regarding the interdependence of groundwater and surface water, but I don't think that this particular statement says anything about permissibility.
Q. (BY MS. COLEMAN) But it suggests it would be an adverse impact, correct, adverse pumping -- let's except the clarification from wells drilled on the bench lands adjacent to the valley, would have an adverse impact upon the -- indirect adverse impact on the surface water supply, correct?
A. I think I'm probably most comfortable with just sticking with the language that it says, which is an indirect encroachment on surface supply. So I don't think I'm comfortable substituting other words for that. It just says what it says.
Q. Okay. Thank you. I'd like to bring up Texas Exhibit 695. So this is a letter dated January 9th, 1926, from D.C. Henny to J.W. Taylor, president of Elephant Butte Irrigation District. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. So who was D.C. Henny, Dr. Stevens?
A. He had previously been with the federal
government. I think by now, he was a private consultant, if I'm not mistaken. Sorry for all the movement. I'm trying to get the copy out.
Q. And wasn't D.C. Henny New Mexico's consulting engineer in the Compact negotiations?
A. Yes, I believe that's right.
Q. Okay. So looking to -- on the first page there, we'll just zoom in on the top part of that if possible. Okay. So the first paragraph there is referring to some letters, your letters of December 19th and 22nd. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Referring to letters from EBID, and then we'll look at Paragraph 2. Well, let me just ask you quickly, Dr. Stevens, have you seen this document before?
A. Not sure that $I$ have. Maybe have seen it in passing, but not studied it in any great detail, and it's ten pages long so...
Q. I believe Dr. Miltenberger references this document in his report. Does that refresh your recollection?
A. It doesn't, to be honest with you. And like I said, I'm sure I've seen it and skimmed it, but I don't have immediate recall of what it's about.
Q. Okay. So we see in Paragraph 2, the immediate question before you is the attitude which the districts should assume as to the inclusion of pumped mesa lands. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And let me just skip to Paragraph 3. I'm sorry. The -- yes. Paragraph 3 and its little subparagraphs there. Okay. So in Paragraph 3, I'll read it, "Additions of pumped lands, which will not affect the project water supply, may be made in two ways, $A$, by transfer of reservoir rights from less valuable valley lands to pumped lands; $B$, by pumping from underground water sources below El Paso," with below underlined. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. So here with the somewhat confusing use of which there, would you agree he's saying that pumped lands can be added to the district if they have a transfer of reservoir rights through the district or if the pumping is occurring below El Paso; is that -is that a fair translation?
A. I think you more or less just used the exact
same words that he wrote. It says -- it says what it says.
Q. I'm sure Ms. Atton would tell me if I did not so we'll leave it like that. So if it's true, in 1946, that the district knows its own history, as you say, the district would have been aware of this D.C. Henny letter, correct?
A. I don't know what the district is in that sense. Do you mean the board of directors? Do you mean all the farmers under it? I don't agree with that.
Q. Okay.
A. With that --
Q. When you said the district knew its own history, who were you referring to?
A. Well, as I explained, I think that the people who worked those lands have a common understanding of their history and what their resources are. I don't know what you mean when you're saying the district would know about this letter.
Q. Okay. So here, let's -- let's talk about the district board then.
A. Okay.
Q. We'll agree in 1946 that the EBID board requested the USGS study, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And in your view, at least as I read Page 17 of your rebuttal report, when the district board made that request, the district board knew the history of water use below Elephant Butte back to the 1900s; is that a fair summary?
A. I think that's probably a fair assessment of what I've said, yes.
Q. Okay. Would they also have known about this letter from D.C. Henny from 1926?
A. I think being familiar with the general history of the district is really different than knowing about a specific letter that was written in 1926, so, no, I don't -- I don't believe that that's an analogy that $I$ can abide by.
Q. Fair enough. Okay. So wanted to bring back up New Mexico Exhibit 175 here. And the first two pages of it, so the first page we see is the minutes of the regular meeting of the board of directors for EBID held July the 3rd, 1933. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And we'll go to, I believe it's the second page of this. Okay. In the left-hand margin there, we see, "Legal opinion regarding use of water from river." Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. Okay. Now, in the first sentence there, it says, "At a previous meeting of the board of directors, the office was directed to secure from Judge Mechem on opinion pertaining to the use of water from the river by municipalities, corporations, and other agencies. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know who Judge Mechem is?
A. I think he was the legal -- the lawyer for EBID, if I'm not mistaken.
Q. I believe we're referring to Edwin Mechem. We'll find that out later on. Was Judge Mechem involved in the Compact negotiations?
A. I think he was, yes, but $I$ don't recall specifically what his role was.
Q. Is it correct that he was on the committee of legal advisors for Texas?
A. That could be right, yes, before it was Major Burgess. Maybe they worked together or maybe it was one after the other. I can't recall specifically right now.
Q. So let me just read the next sentence, "In Judge Mechem's opinion in this matter, which was read to the Board, he sets out that no agency has any right
to diminish the flow of water in the river, whether they do it directly by pumping out of the river, or indirectly by building sumps into which the water filters from the river, the use of same is illegal." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So Judge Mechem was counsel for EBID and involved in the Compact negotiations, and he's offering this opinion, correct?
A. He's -- yes, that's what this document says.
Q. Thank you. Now, going back to your rebuttal Page 17 , if we -- you have -JUDGE MELLOY: Ms. Coleman, maybe we should take a little break here. We've been going quite a while. I would like to try to finish at least the cross-examination this afternoon. How much more do you think you have?

MS. COLEMAN: Unfortunately, quite a bit, Your Honor.

MS. ATTON: Your Honor, if I may, and I do apologize. This wasn't anticipated on our end. Dr. Stevens has to catch a flight, as I said, for personal reasons, I believe at about 4:15 today, and then she 's not available again until later next month, and we'd have to have a discussion about that
as to when she might be able to be brought back. But, of course, in this case, I want to make sure the records are clear that Texas has finished its cross-examination, and it would only be the U.S. and anything that Colorado might want to ask.

JUDGE MELLOY: Well -- all right. Well, is this a good stopping point, Ms. Coleman, or do you have a logical stopping point?

MS. COLEMAN: I have one or two more questions, and then it's a stopping point.

JUDGE MELIOY: All right. Let's do
that, and then we'll break for the evening.
MS . COLEMAN: Sure.
Q. (BY MS. COLEMAN) So let's -- let's just look at -- sorry. Let's go back to Page 17 of your rebuttal report at the top, and that second sentence, if we can, is, "The mere initiation of the study is in and of itself significant, since such a study would have been unnecessary if there was a prevailing understanding that either the Project filings had included groundwater," et cetera. Do you see that? A. Yes.
Q. But a study would have been necessary if EBID wanted to refute the opinions of Henny and Mechem that we just talked about, correct?

MS. ATTON: Objection; foundation.
MS. COLEMAN: She's testified --
JUDGE MELLOY: Well, she -- I'm going to overrule. You may answer.
A. Which opinion specifically are you -- are you -- can you just clarify for me what the opinion is?
Q. (BY MS. COLEMAN) So we saw in the Henny letter his opinion that new pumped lands could not be added to the district unless they had a right to draw from the reservoir taking underground water from below El Paso, and we saw Judge Mechem express the opinion that both pumping from the river and the building of sumps that would filter water from the river would be illegal. So I'm referring to those two opinions, and I'm asking you whether a study would have been necessary for the Board to refute those opinions, correct?
A. I'm not sure that -- well -- I'm not sure that one leads to the other. In other words, it -- it seems to me, when you look at the context of the initiation of the study in 1946, that the farmers and the board of the EBID were concerned about the lack of surface flow and trying to figure out a solution to that so, yes, they reached out to the USGS. Now, whether that was -- I mean, I don't see any evidence
that that was in specific relation or had anything to do with either a letter from Henny or from Judge Mechem. I think they were merely concerned about not being able to irrigate their lands and grow their crops. So I guess I'm not -- I don't see any evidence in the historical record that the former two things had anything to do with the latter thing.
Q. But you also don't see any evidence in the record that pumping in the early 1900s had anything to do with this request of the USGS, correct?
A. I don't -- I don't think I said that it did. I don't think I ever said that the 1947 study had anything to do with the early 1900s.
Q. I'll just refer you back to the district knew its own history, and with this background of knowledge and use, it would be difficult to conclude that EBID would have requested the USGS study. So you're not saying then that the district was thinking of pumping that existed in the 1900 s when it requested this study?
A. I think that they knew from the previous studies that there was a lot of groundwater under the valley so I think that that's what I'm referring to there, but I think -- I don't know if you're just, like, trying to -- I'm not sure. I mean, I'm not
disagreeing with what you're saying, but when $I$ say they knew of their own history, I'm referring to a general knowledge amongst the farmers in the district that there was an underground water supply, and I believe in the 1940s, they were extremely concerned about the lack of water in Elephant Butte and a potential -- a potential short in their surface water supply. So I -- I am simply saying that because they knew, they had a -- they had knowledge, general knowledge, of the existence of this underground water supply because, like I said, I think they knew their own history, that they reached out to USGS for details on what to do and whether or not they could use it and what the impacts would be, so that's the connection I'm making, and I don't see anything in the record where EBID is talking about the Henny letter or about the Mechem opinion that has anything to do with why they're asking for the USGS to do this study. I just don't see a direct line there.
Q. If they knew from previous studies that there was a lot of groundwater under the valley, would it be necessary for them to ask the USGS to confirm that?
A. Well, that's not specifically what they were asking. They were asking the USGS to tell them and asking Conover to explain to them and provide
information about what the impacts of pumping would be on surface flow, and that's the first time that question had been studied and asked.
Q. And if pumping was anticipated or at least not precluded by the Compact, do you have any -- why would they need to understand the impacts of pumping on the surface flow?
A. Can you read that back to me again?
Q. Oh, okay. Let me just ask you. Why, in your view, having reviewed the historical record, on what basis -- I'm sorry. Let me withdraw that.

Having reviewed the historical record, are you of the -- aware of the reason why EBID wanted to understand the impacts of pumping on surface flow?
A. They were an irrigation district under a surface water project so, I mean, I think it's as simple as that. They needed to understand what the impacts of groundwater pumping would be on the surface supply of the Project of which they were part.

MS. COLEMAN: We'll leave it there on this topic.

JUDGE MELLOY: Let me just follow up. Do I understand you to be saying that to the extent pumping would effect surface water, that would be a matter of concern?
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THE WITNESS: I think that they needed
-- they felt they needed to understand that, Your Honor, yes.

JUDGE MELLOY: All right. We'll -- the witness can be excused subject to recall at a later time. Let me just make a couple comments. You made some statement about Mr. Hoffman -- his cross-examination being completed, Ms. Atton. I'm not going to make any ruling on that at this point, and certainly that may depend to some extent on whether or not you redirect, but I'm just not going to make a ruling on that at this point yet. There is one exhibit issue I wanted to take up aside from the exhibits we have to resolve for Dr. Miltenberger. The sheets that were filed represented that Joint Exhibit 430, which is also US-472, had been admitted. Our records do not show that that exhibit has, in fact, been admitted. I assume it's not objected to since it's a joint exhibit, and for your information, I looked at it. It's the 1919 engineering report on water supply and project area, high line canal construction, power development, and city water supply from storage. I think there was testimony about it so unless there's any objection, I will admit that exhibit.

MR. HOFFMAN: No objection. JUDGE MELLOY: All right.

MS. ATTON: Your Honor, if I may --
MR. SOMACH: For a moment with respect
to --
JUDGE MELLOY: Just a second,
Mr. Somach. Let me finish. So that exhibit is admitted. As far as the Miltenberger exhibits are concerned, it's been a long day. I'm going to take that up tomorrow first thing, and we'll go over those exhibits at that time and try to reconcile what's -what's in evidence and what isn't.

All right. Go ahead, Mr. Somach.
MR. SOMACH: I just -- I wanted -- we're -- I understand the witness' unavailability because she's getting on a plane. I don't understand why she can't be available by Zoom from wherever she's going to be, because waiting a month and breaking up the cross-examination by a month just seems unreasonable unless there's some specific reason why she can't be available by -- by Zoom. And I -- I just don't want to leave it tonight without some idea of when the cross-examination of Dr. Stevens will -- will be able to resume.

MS. COLEMAN: The United States joins in
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a request for New Mexico to tell us immediately when Dr. Stevens is available.

JUDGE MELLOY: Ms. Atton?
MS. ATTON: So, Your Honor, I don't want to misspeak so if we could just take two minutes so I could speak to Dr. Stevens and ascertain her availability, I would appreciate that.

JUDGE MELLOY: All right.
MS. ATTON: And before we -- before we do that just quickly, just housekeeping, I believe I moved Stephens Demonstrative No. 15 into evidence, but I've been informed that $I$ may not have done that, and if I didn't, I do move now to admit Stevens Demonstrative No. 15 into evidence.

MR. HOFFMAN: No objection from Texas.
JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Exhibit 15 is admitted. All right. We'll take a couple of minutes. (Recess.)

JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Where are we, Ms. Atton?

MS. ATTON: Thank you, Your Honor. So I just want to be clear, I understand that it may have been misunderstood. I wasn't saying it would take a month, it's just with the week's break that I understand we have next week, we are necessarily into

November. So Dr. Stevens unfortunately is unavailable tomorrow and Friday because she is traveling on airplanes for those times, and she is back and could be available to follow the next New Mexico witness, which we would expect would finish testifying perhaps on Monday, the 1st.

JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Let's do that. And -- all right. We'll do that. Anything else we need to talk about tonight now that -- your next witness is going to be Schmidt-Petersen; is that right?

MS. ATTON: That's correct.
JUDGE MELLOY: Who's going to take that
witness?
MS. ATTON: For the State of New Mexico?
JUDGE MELLOY: Yes.
MS. ATTON: It is going to be
Mr. Wechsler.
JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. And then what I'm
going to do in the morning before we start with -with that witness, Mr. Somach, I'm going to take up your motion to exclude witnesses, and I'm going to take up the exhibits from Dr. Miltenberger, and if there's any other procedural matters, we'll take care of those in the morning. Otherwise, we'll plan to

```
resume the cross-examination of Dr. Stevens after we
finish with Schmidt-Petersen.
MS. ATTON: Thank you, Your Honor.
JUDGE MELLOY: If nothing else, then we'll see everybody in the morning. Thank you.
(The proceedings adjourned at 5:11 p.m.)
```
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| 161:8 165:17 | 17:20 35:12 | reliability 33:10 | repayment | 126:13,16 |
| 197:14 | 41:9 95:21 | 170:21 171:24 | 161:9 | 128:23,24 |
| reference 10:25 | 147:13 188:7 | reliable 21:15,25 | repeat 117:19 | 130:6,7,12 |
| 23:1 51:15 | 192:24 | 33:5 38:12 | 129:5 155:15 | 133:16 135:2 |
| 55:18 65:17 | region 129:17 | 122:12 174:5,9 | 164:3,18 | 135:12,23 |
| 67:22 81:15 | Registration | reliance 110:8 | repeating 44:10 | 136:11,16 |
| 89:1 140:6 | 205:23 | relied 109:8 | repeats 18:1 | 138:9,20,22 |
| 148:3 157:21 | regular 30:3 | 114:9,22 118:2 | 68:6 | 139:1,3,9,11 |
| 163:3 164:13 | 179:19 192:19 | 147:16 148:8 | rephrase 143:16 | 139:12 142:19 |
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| 146:7,14,20 | 144:5 175:23 | 190:22 196:10 | 174:21 186:5 | 115:21 116:11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 151:2 157:24 | 181:13,14 | reservoirs 54:5 | returned 45:12 | 116:17 119:12 |
| 158:14 162:4,5 | representative | resolve 200:14 | 45:15 47:8,14 | 119:14 120:10 |
| 162:12,18,24 | 11:8 | resources 49:9 | returning 132:3 | 122:15 123:11 |
| 163:19,21 | represented | 49:16 60:6 | reuse 48:16 | 124:8,21 |
| 164:1,21 | 90:6 95:18 | 106:24 108:9 | review 20:23 | 125:14 127:2 |
| 167:20 168:13 | 98:18 200:15 | 110:2 166:5 | 23:23 80:20 | 127:20 128:16 |
| 168:15,18 | representing | 173:10 175:13 | 84:16 95:20 | 128:20 131:15 |
| 169:7 170:12 | 10:4 13:23 | 175:17 191:18 | 132:15 136:10 | 133:2 137:2,6 |
| 170:16 172:25 | represents 13:12 | respect 7:2 | 136:14 146:17 | 137:10 138:23 |
| 175:24 178:19 | reprinted 113:1 | 66:16 91:6,7 | reviewed 102:5 | 139:1,20 |
| 179:10 180:12 | request 15:16 | 94:1,16 110:7 | 112:8 120:24 | 140:20 141:12 |
| 181:9 183:4,13 | 42:24 133:12 | 110:24 117:5 | 136:3 149:15 | 141:16,20 |
| 189:24 192:3 | 133:12 164:24 | 122:3 201:4 | 149:17 150:9 | 142:17,17 |
| 195:16 200:20 | 167:3,4,15 | respectively 9:5 | 181:9 199:10 | 148:6,7 151:10 |
| reported 1:13 | 168:8 192:4 | respond 15:23 | 199:12 | 151:11 154:25 |
| 27:5 28:5 32:5 | 197:10 202:1 | 139:3 | reviewing | 155:14 160:11 |
| 37:4 38:2 40:3 | requested 63:6 | responding | 134:16 | 161:23 162:22 |
| 50:10,25 57:8 | 161:21 164:8 | 10:20 42:9 | revisit 143:24 | 163:17 165:16 |
| 69:22 70:14 | 170:2,16 172:3 | 138:25 | Reynolds 22:17 | 165:23 166:1 |
| 74:16 75:1 | 172:15 173:15 | responds 17:16 | 23:3,9 122:17 | 166:25 167:13 |
| 79:6 184:18 | 191:25 197:17 | response 15:18 | Reynolds' | 167:21 168:9 |
| reporter 1:13 | 197:19 | 16:4,8 19:15 | 122:19 | 169:6,9,17 |
| 86:16 116:22 | requesting | 19:19 21:7 | rhoffman@so... | 170:22,25 |
| 142:15 205:4 | 165:6 | 22:24 155:24 | 2:7 | 171:14,15 |
| REPORTER'S | require 68:7 | responses 16:25 | right 4:19 5:24 | 175:10,13 |
| 3:7 | required 94:25 | 21:15 | 5:25 9:10,17 | 176:2,5 179:10 |
| Reporters | requirement | restate 100:11 | 9:18 16:5 18:9 | 179:16,24 |
| 205:23 | 57:23 | 104:10 | 18:10 22:3 | 180:6,16 181:3 |
| reporting 47:5 | requirements | restriction | 33:16,21 36:22 | 184:1,8 185:22 |
| 51:6 52:3 55:6 | 48:13 57:14 | 141:24 | 46:8,16 48:4 | 186:21,23 |
| 74:12 86:16 | 61:9 | result 32:13 44:8 | 52:22 53:23,24 | 188:3 189:9 |
| 185:14 | Resch 62:20 | resulted 66:21 | 56:15 57:1 | 193:19,22,25 |
| reports 14:10 | research 21:12 | 168:9,15 | 58:14 59:3 | 195:6,11 196:9 |
| 25:16 35:19 | 85:12 86:13,23 | results 35:15 | 60:18,19 61:12 | 200:4 201:2,13 |
| 41:20 45:2 | 102:7 105:25 | 36:13,18,19 | 61:20 67:20 | 202:8,16,17,19 |
| 52:673:15 | 131:4 139:8 | 37:17 39:9 | 70:10,15 71:19 | 203:7,8,11 |
| 75:13 88:1 | 141:7 158:16 | 53:13,21 | 71:23 76:8 | right-hand |
| 91:17 120:25 | 174:3 | resume 141:21 | 78:13 81:9 | 102:20 |
| 121:4,10 | reserved 127:21 | 201:24 204:1 | 82:5,12,14 | rights 5:16,20 |
| 123:11,17 | reservoir 11:2 | retained 82:19 | 83:5 84:2,6 | 5:22 6:2,5,7,10 |
| 125:22 131:25 | 27:12 35:4 | 131:14,18 | 87:19 90:10 | 6:13,17 7:10 |
| 146:14,18 | 41:1 66:25 | 132:9,16 | 96:18 102:12 | 7:15,17 25:5 |
| 151:20,23 | 74:19 92:22 | return 46:23 | 103:4,22 104:5 | 126:8,10 |
| 165:22 | 97:2 99:19 | 66:21,22,24 | 104:9 105:11 | 127:24 187:10 |
| represent 35:14 | 102:25 120:16 | 67:6,7 74:21 | 107:22 109:18 | 187:12 190:14 |
| 35:23 87:16 | 171:25 190:14 | 94:24 95:1 | 109:19 112:19 | 190:22 |
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| Rincon 53:19 | Roosevelt | 102:12 135:7 | schedules 87:24 | 62:2 63:23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 54:5 70:3 | 104:25 | 138:1 142:25 | 87:25 89:9 | secondary $86: 14$ |
| 109:14 164:9 | rough 96:25 | 153:8,9,10 | 90:3,6 | 86:15 |
| 185:18 | rounding 14:17 | 156:12 163:5 | Schmidt-Peter... | secretary 10:3 |
| Rio 7:7 10:1 | RPR 205:19 | 170:14 174:10 | 203:10 204:2 | section 17:15 |
| 14:19 20:11 | RUDLING | 174:19 178:9 | science 130:23 | 29:1,16 48:3 |
| 24:23 26:12 | 88:13 90:18 | 190:20 191:19 | 131:1,10 | 74:16 79:4 |
| 30:4 33:4 34:8 | 92:9 115:14,18 | 197:18 198:1,8 | scientific 134:11 | 83:21 110:16 |
| 34:13,16 41:8 | 117:19 | 199:23 202:23 | 148:18 151:12 | 117:9,13 118:4 |
| 49:9,15 54:8 | rule 72:2,3 | Sayre 175:24 | scope 72:25 73:2 | 164:22 181:4 |
| 59:13 68:17,22 | ruling 200:9,12 | 177:6 | 91:21 106:25 | secure 193:4 |
| 74:14 77:6 | rural 171:21 | says 11:25 14:14 | 109:23 111:2 | see 11:4,5,22 |
| 79:8 80:13,16 | S | 14:15,17,24 | 120:21 182:6,7 | 12:2 15:2 |
| 83:24,25 84:14 | S | 15:18,20 16:8 | screen 9:9 19:20 | 18:15,18 19:18 |
| 84:15 94:21 | s 2:1 36:25 | 17:5 19:7,20 | 25:17 26:21 | 34:12 42:25 |
| 102:16,17,17 | 194:24 | 19:21 26:23 | 52:2 58:21 | 52:170:3 |
| 102:24,24,25 | Sacramen | 27:8,11,12,14 | 67:23 74:8 | 71:18 76:16 |
| 103:5,5,6 | safe 24:12,13 | 27:18 29:7,23 | 80:8 83:6 | 78:24 84:13 |
| 105:9 106:15 | safely 8:25 | 29:25 30:2 | 88:10 89:19 | 88:10 89:13,19 |
| 110:5 116:8,8 | sake 185:15 | 32:18 36:24 | 104:5 118:23 | 89:21,23 90:1 |
| 117:10 118:5 | salinity 12:17 | 37:14 40:14,15 | 119:12 | 90:22 94:5 |
| 131:19,22 | salt 48:16 79:13 | 41:1 43:20 | scroll 180:9 | 99:14,22 |
| 132:1 137:5 | 79:24 80:2,3 | 44:1 46:17,19 | scrolled 180:15 | 102:19 111:21 |
| 153:7 | 80:15 | 46:25 47:8,21 | scrolling 129:13 | 112:24 116:5 |
| ripe 72:24 | San 102:24 | 48:8 50:1,5 | 129:14 | 117:3,25 126:7 |
| river 5:25 6:1 | Santa 2:11 50 | 57:14,15 60:9 | SEAL 205:16 | 127:1 128:13 |
| 7:16 27:12 | 50:7 105:10 | 63:11 66:22 | season 56:5 57:1 | 128:18 129:17 |
| 37:13 51:9 | satisfy 72:14 | 69:10 72:23 | 59:20 61:11,17 | 133:9,20 134:7 |
| 79:13,24 80:2 | save 66:2,2 69:7 | 74:20 75:19 | 62:17 143:2 | 134:19 135:13 |
| 80:3,15 108:25 | 177:3 | 76:2,2 77:16 | seasons 142:22 | 135:16,18 |
| 109:3 121:16 | saved 65:14 | 79:11,15 92:20 | 144:24 | 138:4 139:18 |
| 122:8,8 126:9 | saving 144:4 | 94:17 97:19 | second 24:5 | 140:5,8,15,19 |
| 126:10 192:25 | saw 5:23 6:22,23 | 110:13 119:21 | 34:12 37:2 | 142:11,12,20 |
| 193:6 194:1,2 | 9:13 10:8 13:4 | 122:8 124:4,10 | 38:22 40:2 | 142:23 144:7 |
| 194:4 196:12 | 50:15 95:17 | 134:4 135:15 | 43:6 58:4 | 151:14 157:7 |
| 196:13 | 180:14 196:7 | 140:11 147:15 | 77:15 89:2 | 158:18,18 |
| road 127:2 | 196:11 | 164:24 176:16 | 90:10 111:25 | 163:3 164:6,9 |
| roads 127:24 | Sawnie 13:2,22 | 177:12 179:3,3 | 114:13,14 | 167:25 168:20 |
| Robert 2:4 4:8 | 19:16 | 179:3 182:22 | 115:21 116:24 | 169:1,24 172:9 |
| 87:16 | saying 12:19 | 183:17 184:17 | 128:11 134:4 | 174:17 175:2 |
| Robertson 10:2 | 15:5 32:24 | 185:19 186:11 | 144:18 147:11 | 175:19 176:6 |
| 10:2 | 33:6 38:25 | 187:23 188:4,9 | 149:1 164:22 | 176:15,17,24 |
| role 62:24 | 45:21,22 48:15 | 188:18,21,21 | 165:16 176:3 | 177:4,10,17 |
| 193:16 | 54:3 55:5 60:1 | 191:1,1,2 | 176:22 192:23 | 178:5 179:14 |
| Roman 118:3 | 62:5 76:21 | 193:3 194:10 | 195:16 201:6 | 179:18,21 |
| room 125:12 | 83:22 86:4 | scene 23:14 | second-to-last | 180:10 181:13 |
| 154:19 | 99:2,18,20 | schedule 56:4 | 40:21 41:19 | 183:1,5,10,14 |


| 183:22 184:7 | 185:24 187:1 | shortage 32:13 | 168:22 169:4 | smaller 90:23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 184:22 185:17 | 193:2,23 | 32:16 33:8 | 195:18 | Smelting 52:14 |
| 185:20 186:6 | 195:16 | 34:21 35:3 | signify 140:22 | Smith 13:2,10 |
| 186:25 187:7 | sentences 65:5 | 40:25 41:2 | signing 16:15 | 13:12,23 14:8 |
| 188:25 189:14 | separate 22:9 | 42:1,9 44:4,13 | 18:23 34:4 | 14:11,23 15:5 |
| 190:4,7,17 | 147:22 | 48:20 50:19 | 95:24 | 16:3,11,25 |
| 192:18,20,24 | September 13:2 | 64:3 69:9 | silence 7:21 | 19:17 |
| 192:25 193:7 | 37:1 182:24 | 146:10 155:6 | 179:12 | Smith's 15:16 |
| 194:5 195:21 | series 35:14,19 | 155:10 | Silverton 129:17 | 16:9 17:16 |
| 196:25 197:5,8 | 148:8 | shortages 32:22 | similar 13:14 | snapshot 77:4 |
| 198:15,19 | serious 64:3 | 76:22 | 29:24 49:3 | solely 145:19 |
| 204:5 | seriously 185:3 | shorthand 1 | 56:10 60:6 | solution 196:23 |
| seeing 114:21 | serve 6:2 | 161:9 205:4 | 63:10 79:11 | Somach 2:4,5 |
| seeking 101:16 | served 62:25 | Shorthand/Co... | 80:14 | 6:19,20,22 8:5 |
| 167:4 | 186:20 | 1:13 | SIMMONS 2:5 | 8:6 201:4,7,13 |
| seeks 95:11 | serves 5:23 | shot 127:18 | simple 199:17 | 201:14 203:21 |
| 101:15 111:2 | 6:1 | show 72:8 85:17 | simplicity | somebody |
| seen 9:8 20:24 | serving 62:24 | 88:24 90:16 | 152:17 | 154:11 187:10 |
| 24:20 59:15 | 83:25 | 146:13 173:13 | simplify 156:15 | somebody's |
| 80:25 137:4 | session 183:2 | 180:23 185:11 | simply 124:1 | 21:24 |
| 156:21 189:18 | set 13:13 64:14 | 200:17 | 198:8 | somewhat 118:2 |
| 189:20 190:2 | 104:22 132:15 | showed 47:10 | single 24:1,20 | 190:19 |
| self-authentic... | 139:22 150:10 | showing 78:21 | 149:5 182:19 | soon 143:24 |
| 72:2 | 160:16 185:1 | 83:7 172:1 | sir 115:18 | 163:6,6 |
| semicolon | 186:12 | shown 78:16 | sitting 144:8 | sorry 4:2 5:14 |
| 174:22 | sets 14:8 193:25 | shows 6:5 12:7 | 150:4,21 | 18:4,7 42:4 |
| sense 39:9 86:15 | setting 162:23 | 69:17 78:19,21 | situation 45:3 | 49:10 54:17 |
| 86:17 93:13 | settle 127:23 | 109:24 185:11 | 49:16 50:8 | 58:18 61:14 |
| 158:21 160:24 | settled 127:23 | shut 66:25 | 58:12 64:9,14 | 75:23 88:6,21 |
| 161:5 191:9 | settlement 20:1 | side 83:5 | 65:19,22 86:24 | 90:10 91:9 |
| sent 63:4 | settlements | $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { s i g n }} 34: 24$ 96:16 | 147:13 177:16 | 97:21 98:12 |
| sentence 11:20 | 160:24 | signature 59:8 | 178:5,22 179:1 | 101:2 103:11 |
| 11:23 27:23 | seven 132:22 | 61:3 62:19 | 183:4 184:19 | 103:18 107:10 |
| 32:20 38:21,24 | 133:3 | signed 9:17 | $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { s i x }} 9: 1851: 11$ | 111:21 115:14 |
| 38:24 40:15 | severe 159:13 | 10:13 22:8 | sizable 69:15 | 117:17 119:10 |
| 43:25 60:7 | shades 58:5 | 35:10 40:11 | skimmed 190:2 | 125:10 129:5 |
| 68:1 76:20 | shallow 26:25 | 104:16,21 | skip 190:9 | 130:10 136:12 |
| 84:12 89:5 | 51:8,13 | 123:18 156:7 | skipping 57:4 | 140:4 148:17 |
| 108:16,17,19 | shape 137:14 | 158:10 | slash 126:8 | 149:25 151:3,4 |
| 145:5 151:11 | shed 121:1 | significance | slide 23:25 | 155:15 158:20 |
| 157:3 158:17 | sheets 200:15 | 11:6 18:14 | slight 33:12 | 164:5,17 |
| 159:5 160:10 | shift 62:4 | 26:21 41:21,23 | slow 89:17 176:4 | 166:20 177:1 |
| 165:2 168:20 | shivery 125:12 | 60:7 75:20 | 185:10 | 187:2 189:5 |
| 168:21 169:17 | short 28:13 | 77:22 162:12 | slows 186:15 | 190:10 195:15 |
| 169:20 176:6 | 80:19 81:6 | 162:18 169:10 | small 6:9 50:1 | 199:11 |
| 176:16 177:12 | 82:8 97:3 | 169:12,15 | 50:12,12 | sort 8:24 10:15 |
| 183:16 185:18 | 198:7 | significant 23:16 | 171:16 | 13:18 14:16 |
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| 16:21 22:12 | 32:8 40:14 | started 34:19 | 10:14 12:18 | 87:6,16,23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23:14 29:5 | 60:19 94:9 | 44:12 82:15 | 14:20 15:12 | 90:17,20 91:16 |
| 30:19 31:19,19 | 101:10 106:11 | 119:23 | 17:7,12,22 | 93:2 101:24 |
| 34:6 37:5 | 113:16 114:25 | starting 4:3 | 20:2 25:3,3 | 104:7 109:12 |
| 38:17 39:13 | 116:13 121:22 | 11:21 44:7 | 32:14 39:4 | 116:23 118:24 |
| 42:24 53:17 | 131:2,11 132:7 | 67:4 88:8 | 45:25 47:6 | 120:24 125:10 |
| 62:11 64:21 | 132:13 134:3 | 96:21 101:18 | 57:12 64:2,9 | 127:3 142:1,4 |
| 66:5 73:24,25 | 138:11,13 | 125:24 164:23 | 66:15 82:19,22 | 146:13 148:10 |
| 74:1 77:8 | 146:23 147:3 | 166:7 | 84:22 85:14,19 | 149:17 180:24 |
| 106:1 108:12 | 171:13 186:11 | starts 18:25 | 92:20 94:17 | 181:8 184:13 |
| 109:17 111:11 | 193:16,21 | 27:23,24,25 | 98:8,10 101:7 | 189:2,18 |
| 124:9 153:17 | 196:5 198:23 | 32:3 36:21 | 109:2 126:14 | 194:22 201:23 |
| 154:3 171:20 | specificity 10:17 | 89:6 | 129:4,7 130:14 | 202:2,6,13 |
| sorts 23:11 | 11:14 182:18 | state 1:3,6,6 2:3 | 130:17 132:5 | 203:1 204:1 |
| 73:25 | specifics 27:10 | 2:9,14 4:6,8,12 | 145:2 154:17 | Stevens' 5:12 |
| sought 97:8 | specified 13:16 | 4:18 6:4 10:19 | 154:23 155:4 | 33:13 76:4 |
| sound 108:24 | 163:7,8 | 10:19 11:10,11 | 155:13,20 | 81:7 95:12 |
| 109:4 179:7 | specifies 14:1 | 12:13 16:12,18 | 166:6 170:9 | 120:21 141:24 |
| sounded 67:2 | specifying 11:9 | 16:20,23 20:25 | 201:25 | sticking 188:18 |
| sounds 161:23 | 28:8 | 23:5 25:24 | static 94:20 | stipulated |
| source 63:7 | speech 23:9 | 39:16 42:19 | stating 168:14 | 170:25 |
| 86:11,14,14,15 | spend 125:21 | 54:20,23 87:17 | station 25:22 | stir 7:24 |
| 86:17 117:6 | spent 124:17 | 100:16 102:18 | stations 102:21 | stop 58:3 88:20 |
| 121:15 179:24 | split 17:20 52:2 | 122:22 131:14 | 103:1,2,3,7 | 163:6 178:15 |
| 181:25 | 96:9,25 99:1 | 131:19 132:23 | 172:22 173:2 | stopping 195:7,8 |
| sources 86:12 | spoke 106:12 | 134:18,25 | status 205:11 | 195:10 |
| 121:6 190:16 | 130:19 136:19 | 140:18 141:6 | statute 127:19 | stops 158:14 |
| south 52:10 | 137:8 178:17 | 157:1 166:24 | staying 51:2,24 | storage 20:16 |
| southern 27:7 | spreads 78:10 | 177:15,25 | step 13:8 | 31:8 32:9 |
| span 70:2 | spring 61:5 | 178:10 203:15 | Stephens 202:11 | 34:10 43:23 |
| speak 70:19,25 | ssomach@so... | 205:4 | stepping 31:4 | 48:12 78:18,20 |
| 90:6 121:2 | 2:7 | stated 45:18 | Steve 23:3,9 | 186:2 200:23 |
| 202:6 | stamp 140:19 | 120:12 145:7 | Stevens 3:4 4:25 | straightening |
| speaking 89:15 | 141:3 | 145:13,17 | 8:7,13,18,21 | 34:17 |
| speaks 73:6,9 | stamped 141:1 | 151:2 205:5 | 9:24 11:22 | stream 29:23 |
| special 1:11 | stamps 141:2 | statement 60:16 | 13:6 23:18,20 | 55:9 80:23 |
| 83:22 84:20 | stand 104:7 | 88:16 124:24 | 25:19 30:11 | 121:7 139:16 |
| 92:6,14 94:16 | standard 143:10 | 144:5,22 | 32:5 33:23 | 139:17 |
| 96:2 180:3 | standpoint | 147:12,17 | 34:1 46:13 | streams 29:13 |
| 183:9 | 41:14 154:13 | 148:2 162:24 | 48:24 53:2 | stress 64:6 |
| specialist 111:15 | stark 124:24 | 165:8 170:18 | 54:17 58:11 | strokes 95:2 |
| specific 10:10,11 | start 13:9 25:18 | 188:9 200:7 | 66:9 68:12 | strongly 24:22 |
| 94:3 122:7 | 83:21 90:1 | statements | 71:14 72:21 | Stuart 2:4 6:19 |
| 138:1 156:3 | 105:4 125:14 | 145:18 146:22 | 73:14 76:20 | studied 24:19 |
| 173:17 192:13 | 132:20 141:2 | 167:4 | 81:1 82:18 | 35:9 92:24 |
| 197:1 201:20 | 141:23 163:21 | states 1:1 2:19 | 83:7,9 84:21 | 93:18,25 |
| specifically $23: 1$ | 203:20 | 4:4,13,15 | 85:21 86:7,25 | 120:15 189:21 |
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| 199:3 | 106:22 | supply 24:13 | 135:1,5 139:24 | sustain 101:20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| studies 35:14 | substituting | 26:7,15 27:1 | 148:7 151:24 | 113:10 |
| 109:19 175:10 | 188:20 | 27:17,19 28:11 | 152:22 160:5,6 | sworn 8:1 |
| 197:22 198:20 | subsurface $54: 5$ | 30:3 32:11,13 | 164:17 167:7 | system 20:14 |
| study 25:25 26:4 | subtle 62:4 | 33:2,5,7,9 35:2 | 171:10 180:17 | 34:8,8 57:8,21 |
| 34:25 35:11,15 | suddenly 58:14 | 35:5,8 37:13 | 181:5 182:16 | 65:10 66:1,3 |
| 35:17 36:13 | sufficient 27:13 | 37:21 38:12 | 184:3 185:2 | 67:8,13 74:13 |
| 37:22 38:16 | 27:15 48:12 | 39:8,11, 12,18 | 189:20 190:2 | 176:11 186:16 |
| 40:11,13,24 | suggest 162:2 | 40:7,17,25 | 191:3 195:2,13 |  |
| 41:7,12 42:16 | 177:19,23 | 42:3 43:18 | 196:18,18 | T |
| 42:21,24 43:10 | 184:24 187:19 | 44:4 45:12,19 | 197:25 | T 2:1 |
| 49:3,5 50:11 | suggesting 85:13 | 47:13 48:9,10 | surface 26:11 | table 28:9 44:15 |
| 53:10,14,16 | 178:21 | 48:12 49:23 | 27:20 28:10,13 | 45:5,6,9,15,16 |
| 80:2 110:4,9 | suggests 188:11 | 54:7,24 55:8 | 33:5,10 37:13 | 45:23 47:12,15 |
| 158:1 163:23 | Suite 2:5 205:24 | 56:21,22 57:6 | 37:21 38:12 | 78:16,16 |
| 164:8,14,25 | summarized | 57:10 61:6 | 39:11 40:17 | tables 47:3 |
| 165:6,6,12,14 | 23:21 | 63:7 79:18 | 41:15 42:10 | 78:11 |
| 166:5 168:9,21 | summarizes | 80:14,18 146:9 | 43:14,18 44:5 | take 5:4,8 6:3 |
| 168:22 169:4,6 | 46:18 | 148:18,21 | 44:13 45:7,12 | 8:3,20 14:7 |
| 169:8,12,14 | summary 26:19 | 151:14 152:25 | 46:1 47:13 | 23:14 33:13,16 |
| 170:2,6,6,9 | 48:3 192:6 | 153:9 156:12 | 48:10,19 53:12 | 39:10,19 44:22 |
| 172:4,24 | summer 126:1 | 162:6,10 164:9 | 54:7 55:15,21 | 45:18 46:21 |
| 173:16,18 | sump 176:10 | 171:24 176:14 | 59:23 60:4 | 47:2,6 58:7 |
| 174:24 175:17 | sumps 194:3 | 176:25 177:9 | 61:6 63:9 | 65:17 67:25 |
| 191:25 195:17 | 196:13 | 178:3,12 179:2 | 64:24 69:8,14 | 69:13 72:16,17 |
| 195:18,23 | Sunnyside | 179:5 187:4,5 | 79:9,16,18 | 76:15 81:4 |
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