In The  SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  STATE OF TEXAS  V.  STATE OF NEW MEXICO and STATE OF COLORADO  TRANSCRIPT OF JULY 13, 2021, REMOTE HEARING BEFORE HONORABLE MICHAEL A. MELLOY, SPECIAL MASTER, UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE, 111 SEVENTH AVENUE, SE, CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA 52401, beginning at 2:01 p.m.	NO. 141 Original
STATE OF TEXAS  V.  STATE OF NEW MEXICO and  STATE OF COLORADO  TRANSCRIPT OF JULY 13, 2021, REMOTE HEARING BEFORE HONORABLE MICHAEL A. MELLOY, SPECIAL MASTER, UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE, 111 SEVENTH AVENUE, SE, CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA 52401, beginning at	In The
V.  STATE OF NEW MEXICO and  STATE OF COLORADO  TRANSCRIPT OF JULY 13, 2021, REMOTE HEARING BEFORE HONORABLE MICHAEL A. MELLOY, SPECIAL MASTER, UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE, 111 SEVENTH AVENUE, SE, CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA 52401, beginning at	SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
V.  STATE OF NEW MEXICO and  STATE OF COLORADO  TRANSCRIPT OF JULY 13, 2021, REMOTE HEARING BEFORE HONORABLE MICHAEL A. MELLOY, SPECIAL MASTER, UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE, 111 SEVENTH AVENUE, SE, CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA 52401, beginning at	
STATE OF NEW MEXICO and STATE OF COLORADO  TRANSCRIPT OF JULY 13, 2021, REMOTE HEARING BEFORE HONORABLE MICHAEL A. MELLOY, SPECIAL MASTER, UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE, 111 SEVENTH AVENUE, SE, CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA 52401, beginning at	STATE OF TEXAS
TRANSCRIPT OF JULY 13, 2021, REMOTE HEARING BEFORE HONORABLE MICHAEL A. MELLOY, SPECIAL MASTER, UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE, 111 SEVENTH AVENUE, SE, CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA 52401, beginning at	
TRANSCRIPT OF JULY 13, 2021, REMOTE HEARING BEFORE HONORABLE MICHAEL A. MELLOY, SPECIAL MASTER, UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE, 111 SEVENTH AVENUE, SE, CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA 52401, beginning at	
HEARING BEFORE HONORABLE MICHAEL A. MELLOY, SPECIAL MASTER, UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE, 111 SEVENTH AVENUE, SE, CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA 52401, beginning at	
MASTER, UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE, 111 SEVENTH AVENUE, SE, CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA 52401, beginning at	
AVENUE, SE, CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA 52401, beginning at	

1 2	REMOTE APPEARANCES
2	FOR THE STATE OF TEXAS:
3	
4	Mr. Stuart L. Somach Ms. Theresa C. Barfield
_	Mr. Robert B. Hoffman
5	Mr. Francis Goldsberry II Mr. Richard S. Deitchman
6	SOMACH SIMMONS & DUNN
7	500 Capitol Mall, Suite 1000 Sacramento, California 95814
	(916) 446-7979
8	ssomach@somachlaw.com tbarfield@somachlaw.com
9	rhoffman@somachlaw.com
10	mgoldsberry@somachlaw.com rdeitchman@somachlaw.com
11	-and-
12	Ms. Sarah A. Klahn SOMACH SIMMONS & DUNN
13	2701 Lawrence Street, Suite 113
14	Denver, Colorado 80205 (720) 279-7868
	sklahn@somachlaw.com
15	and
16	-and-
17	Ms. Priscilla M. Hubenak
1/	STATE OF TEXAS ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE Post Office Box 12548
18	Austin, Texas 78711
19	(512) 463-2012 priscilla.hubenak@oag.texas.gov
20	priberra.nabenaneoag.cenab.gov
21	FOR THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO:
	Mr. Jeffrey Wechsler
22	MONTGOMERY & ANDREWS
23	325 Paseo De Peralta Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501
0.4	(505) 986-2637
24 25	jwechsler@montand.com -and-
_ •	

```
1
         Ms. Lisa M. Thompson
         Mr. Michael A. Kopp
 2
         TROUT RALEY
         1120 Lincoln Street, Suite 1600
 3
         Denver, Colorado 80203
         (303) 861-1963
 4
         lthompson@troutlaw.com
         mkopp@troutlaw.com
 5
         -and-
 6
         Mr. Luis Robles
 7
         Ms. Susan Barela
         ROBLES, RAEL & ANAYA, P.C.
 8
         500 Marquette Avenue NW, Suite 700
         Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102
 9
         (505) 242-2228
         luis@roblesrael.com
10
         susan@roblesrael.com
11
         -and-
12
         Mr. John Draper
         DRAPER & DRAPER, LLC
13
         325 Paseo De Peralta
         Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501
14
         (505) 570-4591
         john.draper@draperllc.com
15
         -and-
16
         Ms. Cholla Khoury
17
         Mr. Zachary E. Ogaz
         NEW MEXICO ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE
18
         Post Office Drawer 1508
         Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501
19
         (505) 329-4672
         ckhoury@nmaq.gov
20
         zogaz@nmag.gov
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
1
     FOR THE STATE OF COLORADO:
 2
         Mr. Chad Wallace
         Mr. Preston V. Hartman
 3
         COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF LAW
         1300 Broadway, 7th Floor
 4
         Denver, Colorado 80203
         (720) 508-6281
 5
         chad.wallace@coag.gov
         preston.hartman@coag.gov
 6
 7
     FOR THE UNITED STATES:
 8
         Mr. James J. Dubois
         Mr. R. Lee Leininger
 9
         U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
         999 18th Street, Suite 370
10
         Denver, Colorado 80202
         (303) 844-1375
11
         james.dubois@usdoj.gov
         lee.leininger@usdoj.gov
12
         -and-
13
         Ms. Judith E. Coleman
14
         Ms. Jennifer A. Najjar
         U.S. Department of Justice
15
         Post Office Box 7611
         Washington, DC 20044
16
         (202) 514-3553
         judith.coleman@usdoj.gov
17
         jennifer.najjar@usdoj.gov
18
     FOR THE ELEPHANT BUTTE IRRIGATION DISTRICT:
19
         Ms. Samantha R. Barncastle
2.0
         BARNCASTLE LAW FIRM, LLC
         1100 South Main, Suite 20
21
         Las Cruces, New Mexico 88005
         (575) 636-2377
22
         samantha@h2o-legal.com
23
24
25
```

1	FOR THE ALBUQUERQUE BERNALILLO COUNTY WATER UTILITY AUTHORITY:
2	
	Mr. James C. Brockmann
3	STEIN & BROCKMANN, P.A.
	Post Office Box 2067
4	Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504
	(505) 983-3880
5	jcbrockmann@newmexicowaterlaw.com
6	
7	FOR THE CITY OF EL PASO:
8	Ms. Susan M. Maxwell
	BICKERSTAFF HEATH DELGADO ACOSTA, LLP
9	3711 S. MoPac Expressway Building One, Suite 300
	Austin, Texas 78746
10	(512) 472-8021
	smaxwell@bickerstaff.com
11	
12	FOR THE CITY OF LAS CRUCES:
13	Mr. Jay F. Stein
	STEIN & BROCKMAN, P.A.
14	Post Office Box 2067
	Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504
15	(505) 983-3880
1 6	jfstein@newmexicowaterlaw.com
16 17	EOD THE NEW MEYICO DEGAN CDOMEDC.
18	FOR THE NEW MEXICO PECAN GROWERS:  Ms. Tessa T. Davidson
	DAVIDSON LAW FIRM, LLC
19	4206 Corrales Road
	Post Office Box 2240
20	Corrales, New Mexico 87048
	(505) 792-3636
21	ttd@tessadavidson.com
22	
23	
24	
25	

```
1
     FOR THE NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY:
 2
         Mr. John W. Utton
         UTTON & KERY, P.A.
 3
         Post Office Box 2386
         Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504
         (505) 699-1445
 4
         john@uttonkery.com
 5
 6
     FOR THE SOUTHERN RIO GRANDE DIVERSIFIED CROP FARMERS
     ASSOCIATION:
 7
         Mr. A.J. Olsen
 8
         HENNIGHAUSEN OLSEN & MCREA
         604 North Richardson Avenue
9
         Roswell, New Mexico 88202
         (575) 624-2463
10
         ajolsen@h2olawyers.com
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1 JUDGE MELLOY: All right. This is in 2 the matter of State of Texas versus State of New 3 Mexico and State of Colorado, United States Supreme 4 Court Original No. 141. So let's start by asking the 5 parties to enter their appearance. Mr. Somach, are 6 you there? 7 MR. SOMACH: Yes, Your Honor, I am. Can 8 you hear me okay? 9 JUDGE MELLOY: I can. 10 MR. SOMACH: Good. Again, this is 11 Stuart Somach for the State of Texas. With me are 12 Theresa Barfield, Francis Goldsberry, Sarah Klahn, 13 Richard Deitchman, and Robert Hoffman from my office, 14 and then from the Attorney General's Office of the 15 State of Texas, Priscilla Hubenak. 16 JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. Mr. Wechsler, who do you have on board? 17 18 Yeah, thank you, Your MR. WECHSLER: 19 Honor. Jeff Wechsler for the State of New Mexico. Τ 20 also have Kayla Brooks from our office in with me. 21 have Cholla Khoury and Zach Ogaz from the New Mexico 22 Attorney General's Office; Luis Robles and Susan 23 Barela from Robles and Rael; Lisa Thompson and Michael 2.4 Kopp from Trout Raley; John Draper from Draper & 25 Draper; Shelly Dalrymple from the New Mexico

1 Interstate Stream Commission; and we have April 2 Ferguson, our technical coordinator, with us, as well. 3 JUDGE MELLOY: All right. And then 4 Mr. Wallace, anyone on besides yourself? 5 MR. WALLACE: Yes, good morning -- or 6 good afternoon now, Your Honor. Joining us today are 7 Preston Hartman from the Attorney General's Office, 8 and we should also have Michael Sullivan. He's the 9 Deputy State Engineer. And Craig Cotten, who is 10 Colorado's Division Engineer and Engineer Advisor to 11 the Compact. 12 Mr. Dubois, are you on? JUDGE MELLOY: 13 MR. DUBOIS: I am. Good afternoon, Your 14 Honor. 15 JUDGE MELLOY: Good afternoon. 16 MR. DUBOIS: This is Jim Dubois for the 17 United States. Also on are Lee Leininger, Judy 18 Coleman, and Jennifer Najjar from Department of 19 Justice; Chris Rich from the Solicitor's Office; and 20 Seth Allison and Amber Engelke, who are our support 21 staff that have got sort of the technical expertise. 22 JUDGE MELLOY: And the Albuquerque Water 23 Utility Authority, anyone on for them? 2.4 MR. BROCKMANN: Yes, Your Honor. This 25 is Jim Brockmann on behalf of the Albuquerque

1	Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority.
2	JUDGE MELLOY: City of El Paso?
3	MS. MAXWELL: Good afternoon, Your
4	Honor. Susan Maxwell for the City of El Paso.
5	JUDGE MELLOY: City of Las Cruces?
6	MR. STEIN: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
7	This is Jay Stein for the City of Las Cruces.
8	JUDGE MELLOY: El Paso County Water
9	Improvement District No. 1?
10	MR. BLAIR: Yes, this is Al Blair, the
11	district engineer for El Paso County Water Improvement
12	District No. 1.
13	JUDGE MELLOY: Elephant Butte Irrigation
14	District?
15	MS. BARNCASTLE: Good afternoon, Your
16	Honor. Samantha Barncastle for the Elephant Butte
17	Irrigation District.
18	JUDGE MELLOY: Hudspeth County
19	Conservation Reclamation District No. 1?
20	(No response.)
21	JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. Mr. Miller, I
22	assume, is not here.
23	New Mexico pecan growers?
24	MS. DAVIDSON: Good afternoon, Your
25	Honor. Tessa Davidson on behalf of New Mexico pecan

1 growers. 2 JUDGE MELLOY: All right. And then 3 anyone on for New Mexico State University? 4 MR. UTTON: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 5 This is John Utton on behalf of NMSU. 6 JUDGE MELLOY: Southern Rio Grande 7 Diversified Crop Farmers Association? 8 MR. OLSEN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 9 A.J. Olsen on behalf of the Southern Rio Grande 10 Diversified Crop Farmers Association. 11 JUDGE MELLOY: Anyone on that I missed? 12 (No response.) 13 JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Well, let's 14 talk about the demonstration we had. I guess, first 15 of all, let me ask: Is there anyone who's on who was 16 on the -- who listened in on the demonstration who had 17 any problems with either the video or the audio? Was 18 everybody able to hear okay and see okay? What was 19 the reaction to -- to how -- to how the video 20 presentation went? Any --21 MS. MAXWELL: Your Honor, this is Susan 22 Maxwell. Just one comment from my observation is when 23 we were on the two-screen view where we could see both 2.4 witness and exhibit, I found that when you -- at least 25 for the example of the exhibit that we were looking

at, the page from the expert report, when we were in the single view of the exhibit, that was legible on the screen. I found that when we were in the two-screen view with both witness and exhibit, the exhibit became blurry to the point of being difficult to read. I don't know if other folks had that -- had that issue, as well.

2.4

JUDGE MELLOY: Well, let me ask you this, Ms. Maxwell, how would you feel about having only the -- having the single view with just the exhibit and not being able to see the witness who's testifying -- testifying about the exhibit.

MS. MAXWELL: I think personally for exhibits that are at least as text blatant as that example was, it's arguably more important to be able to look at whatever text is being reviewed and -- and commented on by the witness than continually observing the witness demeanor themselves. Now, I say that as one of the parties not cross-examining, so other -- other folks may have a different perspective on that than ours.

JUDGE MELLOY: Let me ask Mr. Wechsler something, and I -- I'll let the other parties jump in if they have any comments. You're going to use Trial Director; is that right, Mr. Wechsler?

MR. WECHSLER: It is, Your Honor.

JUDGE MELLOY: Do you think that would be any more legible or less legible than what we were using today, which is basically a PDF?

2.4

MR. WECHSLER: My experience is that Trial Director is more legible, and the reason is, Your Honor, if there are specific parts of the text that we're asking the witness to focus on then April Ferguson or whoever is operating Trial Director that day will be able to blow up that text and so it won't simply be a full-screen view even if it's on two separate parts.

JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. Well --

MS. BARNCASTLE: Your Honor, this is

Samantha Barncastle, and I just have something to add here that's incredibly key to what I'll be doing. In terms of being able to view what's being testified about in context, it's incredibly important for me to have the actual document at my disposal to be able to not necessarily follow along on your screen but follow along on my own and maybe go ahead and maybe go back to something, so I'm assuming, but I want to just double-check, that we will have the ability to publish these, and even though -- and I didn't see this.

That's why I'm raising this. Even though you won't be

physically handing a copy to counsel, we have the ability to publish them via Zoom or other trial technology where we can download them on our end and then use them as we need? Is that a correct assumption?

2.4

JUDGE MELLOY: I don't know the answer to that. That's a good question. So what's the -- okay. Let me make -- let's -- something we'll have to investigate before our next demo.

MS. BARNCASTLE: We would rather have the document in hand and be able to watch it, but if we're -- you know, I'm going to have to disagree with Ms. Maxwell, if I have the document in front of me, I don't necessarily need to see it on the screen. I would rather see the witness.

MS. MAXWELL: And I would agree with that if we already have the documents in hand, then I can follow along with that document and watch the witness.

MR. SOMACH: When we did depositions, it was routine, at least for the United States and Texas, to have documents available and shared at the same time. I don't know why we -- that's a pretty easy thing to do, and I think they were PDFs, so that way one could see the witness because I agree with Ms.

Barncastle, it would be good if someone is remote to see the witness actually testifying if one had the document, but I think they could be -- be shared just like they were during depositions immediately.

2.4

MS. BARNCASTLE: The concern arises that that feature wasn't on our task bar on the nonparticipant, the view-only side of things. We didn't even have the ability to, like, raise our hand our chat, and, you know, the chat feature can be incredibly important if we're having some sort of technical issue to go back and forth with the Zoom administrator without interrupting trial or what is more important at that moment. So the -- those sorts of features seem to have been disabled on our end.

JUDGE MELLOY: All right. We'll talk to Worldwide about that and -- and, you know, you've worked with them, as well, so if you want to talk to them directly, I certainly have no objection to that. You certainly all worked actually more closely with them than we have. One thing I would note, also, is that I understand -- we got an alert, someone is recording this hearing. Who's doing the recording?

THE REPORTER: Your Honor, that's Worldwide recording the audio portion only, just in case there are technical glitches during the hearing.

1 JUDGE MELLOY: As I understand, that 2 function will not be available to any of the 3 participants at the trial just so you're aware of 4 that, that the recording is not -- not an option. 5 MR. BROWN: Your Honor, yeah, this is 6 Brandon Brown. I apologize, Your Honor. 7 non-interactive link that we sent out today was 8 literally non-interactive whatsoever, and if 9 Ms. Barncastle or anybody -- we can -- we can make the 10 non-interactive link -- we can enable different 11 features, whatever you tell -- whatever you authorize 12 us to activate. We literally made today's 100 percent 13 non-interactive, but we can certainly activate 14 whatever Your Honor tells us that the non-interactive 15 links can do, raise your hand, send a message, without 16 interrupting the interactive link that's in the 17 courtroom. We can certainly make that happen, as 18 well. But, like, today was literally 100 percent 19 non-interactive. 20 JUDGE MELLOY: Well, Brandon, why don't 21 we -- why don't you plan to enable those two features, 22 as well as the feature to allow documents that are published to be downloaded. I don't know exactly how 23 2.4 that -- that's done. I'm not the techy here, but I

assume if it was done for -- during the depositions,

25

it could be done for -- for the noninteractive. Am I correct?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

MR. BROWN: Let me check into that, Your Honor. As far as -- you know, we're streaming the Zoom interactive feed to a webinar feature of Zoom, which is noninteractive. I can make it a little interactive as far as whatever you allow. We can go over that as far as what we'll be able to do with the noninteractive Zoom part. As far as downloading documents from the noninteractive, I'm not sure that that would be possible. I will double-check that and let everybody know with an e-mail. But as far as the noninteractive, we are going to be very limited as far as to what interaction you can have with the interactive Zoom link, if that makes sense. You know, we -- we can certainly -- there is a chat feature. There is a raise-your-hand feature. I don't know if they would be able to literally download documents that are being viewed in the courtroom, you know, simultaneously. Now, that -- that might be something that we could do an e-mail to everybody like ASAP, like we kind of did it two different ways in the depositions. We used AgileLaw -- some parties used AgileLaw. Some parties had us show documents, and we can go through different scenarios for -- for both of

those functions, as well.

we'll just have to talk about this. The -- if you were to show them, that would be -- I think it would be difficult for the attorneys. I'll go back to Mr. Wechsler. You -- you were planning to have someone in the courtroom doing all that for you. I -- I assume that would not work, as well, to have Worldwide handling the documents. Am I correct, Mr. Wechsler?

MR. WECHSLER: That's correct. We would strongly prefer to have the ability to control what documents are showing. There's various things that we would be doing there. I will add, though, that, you know, as I mentioned last time, we'll be printing out a hard copy of all of our documents. That also means we will be PDFing those documents. We could put all of those PDFs on a ShareFile folder, and parties can download what they want at their leisure.

MR. BROWN: Right. And I agree, Your Honor, and I apologize if I was confusing. There's absolutely no way it would work for Worldwide to handle the documents in trial. I was just simply pointing out that when we were doing it in the deposition setting, multiple parties used multiple

things, but we could download those ourselves and send out folders to each party. But in the trial, it would work different. It was just my understanding that the concern was with the noninteractive feed, that they not have any ability to speak up and interrupt the trial process so the noninteractive, we just made 100 percent noninteractive, but we can certainly tweak that however needs to happen.

JUDGE MELLOY: Well, Ms. Barncastle, do you think if -- if the -- and we're going to be talking about this in a few minutes about these counterproposals concerning the dissemination of exhibits prior to the witness testifying, but if they were put into PDF and downloaded to a shared file, would that work?

MS. BARNCASTLE: Yeah. I think -- but, see, I do think we're also making this more difficult than it has to be. We were all adults, and we got through over a hundred depositions in one summer with the ability to interact, and nobody was disruptive, and we figured it out, and we had one key feature there that would solve all of these problems, and that was the chat feature. Even here, though, I was just about to text Mr. Brown and say I have some ideas, but the chat feature is disabled. I just handled a

full-blown trial a couple of weeks ago where all I did was publish through the chat feature and so they — then the court reporter would download them, slap an exhibit label on them, and republish them, and you could have them either without the exhibit label or with. One of the keys of following along at trial is being able to keep track of the 9,000 documents that are potentially going to be in play, and when it's marked, it does change things for you as an attorney versus not having it marked initially. So I think there's a way we can get around this if we can all just share the chat feature.

MR. BROWN: Absolutely. Absolutely.

And we can -- we can chat with you on the noninteractive if you have a concern, a connection issue, a -- the document's not great quality issue or the audio maybe needs to be a little higher issue. We can absolutely chat with you on the noninteractive. Literally like today, I literally just made it 100 percent noninteractive; but like I said, we can certainly -- we can certainly activate the chat feature or the raise-your-hand feature if you want to talk to the tech and then that tech can get with the people in the courtroom to -- to adjust whatever or -- or whatnot. But we can absolutely activate the chat

portion of the noninteractive link, as well.

what I had hoped for because there -- I can think of numerous times throughout a deposition where counsel had to e-mail somebody like the court reporter and say, you know, hey, we're not hearing the witness as well, can you move the microphone closer to them, but we didn't interrupt the deposition itself. We just fixed the problem behind the scenes. So that, I think, is certainly a possibility if we have the chat feature, I think that's the key about what's missing here.

absolutely have contact with the court reporter or -or somebody in the courtroom on the interactive side,
but you're right, if the -- if the chat feature is
activated on the noninteractive, that would give that
go between that we could be the messengers or
whatever, we can take care of that or if you need
something e-mailed to you or, Hey, can you check with
the court reporter, blah, blah, blah, we can certainly
do that through the chat feature on the noninteractive
link.

JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Well, it sounds like this is a problem that -- for which there

may be differing solutions, but we can hopefully work it out.

The -- let me just ask sort of the overarching question, though. Did the technology seem to work sufficiently for people who may not be personally present in the courtroom? Did you feel that the video and audio quality was such that you would feel comfortable observing a trial from Albuquerque or El Paso or Las Cruces or some place else.

MR. BROCKMANN: Your Honor, this is Jim Brockmann for the Water Authority. The short answer, I think, is yes. We did this with depositions throughout the summer, and subject to -- I agree with Ms. Maxwell, the exhibits were hard to read on the screen, but if we work out the ability to have it on a second screen in our office and actually look at the document itself, I think -- I think it works adequately. So we appreciate the Court setting it up.

MS. BARNCASTLE: Your Honor, I have a little bit different perspective if I might. The -- the answer to your question did this work actually very much depends for me on the District's ability to participate at trial, which is still not nailed down

JUDGE MELLOY: All right.

necessarily. So, you know, EBID is -- and I -- I can't speak for EP No. 1, and I know they're down counsel today, but EBID is still hopeful that if something comes up that we participated on in depositions and we feel that the United States and Texas can't adequately protect our interest, we may need to step in. Now, that being the case, if I am in New Mexico when a line of questioning starts, I can't just be in the courtroom the next day necessarily so I might be requesting the ability to redirect or cross a witness via Zoom. And at that point, I would hope that we could make me an active participant instead of a non-active participant, but I -- you know, that's sort of a bridge that I had hoped to not actually have to cross until we got to trial and something went wrong, but at this point, I don't feel like that I could adequately protect my client being in New Mexico if I didn't have the ability to say hold on, this is going down a path I have a big problem with. JUDGE MELLOY: Well, are you talking about your own employees? Are you talking about witnesses in general? Can you be more specific? MS. BARNCASTLE: There's going to be a

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

huge battle ongoing over what evidence related to the

operating agreement issues is appropriate, and if that

doesn't get cleared up in a way that we're comfortable with, it could be that a non-EBID witness begins to testify on issues that are troubling to EBID that we may be involved in other litigation on that I may need to stand up and say I'm going to just level an objection just in case I have to go back to that other We're not acquiescing to this. It might be just something that simple or it might be that I ask for permission to, you know, jump in and do a few things like we had to do in depositions at times, not necessarily questioning or protecting my own witnesses, but others. So until we see how some of this operating agreement evidence issue rolls out, it's very hard to tell if I'm going to need to be in the courtroom full time or if I feel comfortable that I can do my job from New Mexico most of the time.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and Mr. Brown can correct me if I'm wrong, but we can make you a participant at any time. It's just going to have to -- you're just going to have to ask, and we're going to have to give permission. But I -- I don't think that's a -- I don't think there's any technical impediment to doing that. It's just a question of whether to what extent we ultimately allow your client or any other client to participate in the

examination, and I -- I don't think we're prepared to discuss or really make any decision on that today.

MS. BARNCASTLE: Certainly. And my hope, Your Honor, would be that I've said this all along. To a certain extent, each of the parties here represents EBID's interest, including New Mexico, so my hope would be that the big boys work it out, and I don't have to play ball. But if it comes down to it, at a minimum, I will need to be able to raise my hand and tell the Zoom administrator, next time we go to a break, let him know I want to make a record, you know, and have the ability to at least do that.

JUDGE MELLOY: Yeah. All right.

MR. BROWN: And you're right, Your

Honor, we can do that any time that you tell us, we
can make anybody -- we can get them on the interactive
side whenever you tell us.

JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Well, anything else about the demo other than we're going to do a follow-up, and we're going to -- in about two weeks to -- when the -- when the courtroom is available that we're going to actually be using, and I know, Mr. Wechsler, you indicated you wanted your paralegal there to actually tie into the system, which I think is a good idea. I mean, we did this

yesterday, and we found a couple glitches. We got worked out before this morning, so we may find some more so I think it's a good suggestion. If anybody else wants to have somebody here for the demo, they're certainly welcome to do so.

MR. STEIN: Your Honor, this is Jay Stein. I have a question.

JUDGE MELLOY: Sure.

MR. STEIN: With respect to the feed.

As I understand it, the feed will be directed to attorneys' offices or to a court building such as the federal court building in Las Cruces. Would the attorney's office component also include the Las Cruces city attorney's office? Two -- two attorneys are counsel in this case, Jennifer Vega-Brown, the city attorney, and Robert Caballo, and I'm asking if there could be a conference room available at the city attorney's office as part of the feed for them or others from city utilities.

JUDGE MELLOY: Are they attorneys of record? Mr. Stein, are you attorneys of record?

MR. STEIN: Yes, they are, Your Honor.

Jennifer Vega-Brown is the city attorney, and Robert Caballo is the utilities attorney from the Las Cruces attorney's office.

1 JUDGE MELLOY: Well, they would -- they 2 would automatically, I guess, qualify in my mind for 3 -- as -- as one of the attorney offices to which the 4 feed can be made. I'm -- for instance, I'm looking at 5 Texas here. I wouldn't limit the feed just to 6 Mr. Somach's office. If -- if the attorney general's 7 office wants the feed, that -- since they're attorneys 8 of record, I would have no problem with that. 9 way with New Mexico. You have multiple firms and 10 entities, including the attorney general's office. 11 think they're all entitled to a feed. I would also 12 clarify this point. I think this came up with one of 13 the attorneys last time. Mr. Brockmann, it may have 14 But when I say the attorney office, I'm talking 15 about to wherever the attorney is located. You know, 16 hopefully most people are probably back in the office 17 now, but it very well could be that people are still 18 going to be working from home in September/October. 19 So if -- if -- if you're -- if -- so it's where the 20 attorney is located. It may be their office. 21 be their home. It may be some place else is -- is 22 what I'm -- what I'm envisioning. 23 Thank you, Your Honor. MR. STEIN: 24 JUDGE MELLOY: Any questions about that? 25 This is John Utton. MR. UTTON:

1 make one quick comment on the prior discussion about 2 the -- the visibility of the combined witness and 3 document on the screen, the two boxes. I think it 4 would be helpful to have the exhibits ourselves, but 5 it also is helpful to see what specifically is being 6 referred to. I know in other Zoom contexts, these are 7 mostly in presentations, the document is a larger box, 8 and the speaker is a smaller box. If that's possible, 9 that might help remedy that so we could still see the 10 witness, but they wouldn't take up half the screen. 11 There would be a smaller box off to the side and the 12 document would be bigger, and we could see it better. 13 That might be helpful if that's possible. 14 JUDGE MELLOY: I guess I'll ask 15 Mr. Brown, is that an option? 16 MR. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor. That would 17 be done with the trial presenters that are in the 18 courtroom, Mr. Wechsler's IT guys who will use Trial 19 Director, and somebody else may be using some other 20 But having the PIP, I think we can certainly 21 make that happen where we make the witness a little 22 smaller. 23

JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. All right. I'm sure as we get into this, particularly at the trial, there will be some tweaks as to how the presentation

24

25

is made, and -- so I -- I guess that's all I can say at this point.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. BARNCASTLE: Your Honor, this is Samantha Barncastle again for EBID, and I'll ask for forgiveness, but I'll -- let me just push the envelope a little bit here. I find it very difficult to try a case without seeing the judge, and even though I'm not responsible for trying this case, I feel very handicapped by the fact that we aren't going to have the ability to watch you and evaluate you from where we're sitting. And to me, body language is huge in your trier of fact, and I just would really prefer to be able to see you somehow in addition to the witness. I may be the lone ranger here begging for this opportunity. I'm hopeful there's some way you could arrange the cameras so that it's further back so you could still see you and the witness but not be, you know, clear across the room, whatever we can do to --I recognize you have an interest in not necessarily being on camera all day every day, as well, but it certainly would help from my perspective, particularly when you have in this instance farmers going, well, what did the judge do when so and so said X. know, sometimes the answer is simple. Nothing. He's playing poker just like we are. But sometimes the

answer is, oh, he almost flew out of his chair. So, you know, I -- I would really appreciate your consideration of that matter.

JUDGE MELLOY: Well, I will -- I will consider it. There's -- there are some technical limitations to doing that. I think the camera view would have to be so far back to get both me and the witness into the screen, it's -- I'm afraid you may not see either of us all that clearly, but we'll have to -- so anyway, I'll -- I'll think about it, and we'll -- we'll look at what the technical limitations are, as well.

MS. BARNCASTLE: Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. WALLACE: Your Honor, I do -- this is Chad Wallace for Colorado. I do have an additional question on the video feed following on Mr. Stein's question. I've had some of the attorneys from some of the stakeholder groups who were present at our last status conference ask if there is a way that they could get a feed of the trial as attorneys. Do you have any suggested process for doing that. Would you like them to apply to receive video feed? What are your thoughts on that?

JUDGE MELLOY: You can ask them to apply. I don't necessarily -- am opposed to video

1 feeds to other attorneys' offices. What I don't want 2 to do is open it up to anybody who wants to log onto 3 Zoom to participate. Nothing that's -- that's secret 4 or embarrassing about it, other than that's what I 5 told the Supreme Court we were going to do is limit it 6 to the attorney's offices, and I don't want to go back 7 and now tell them that we're going to make it 8 available to anybody who wants to look at it. 9 there are other attorneys, I wouldn't necessarily be 10 opposed to that, but -- but I don't want to open it up 11 to everyone. 12 That's understood. MR. WALLACE: Tf --13 if I understood what you said just correctly, I can 14 inform them they are all attorneys. Would you like it 15 in a form of a motion or a letter requesting access? 16 JUDGE MELLOY: Letter is fine. 17 MR. WALLACE: Thank you. 18 JUDGE MELLOY: All right. And then --19 let's see. In Ms. O'Brien's letter, indicates she 20 wouldn't be available, she had indicated that someone 21 was talking to the folks in El Paso at the U.S. 22 courthouse there. Does anyone know who has been contacted in the El Paso courthouse? 23 24 (No response.) 25 JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. I'll ask Ms.

O'Brien -- would somebody ask Ms. O'Brien to send me an e-mail with that information? I'd like to know who she's dealing with there.

We're going to do the -- the -- the second demonstration in about two weeks. Does anybody -- is there any strong preference as to whether we do it 27th, 28th? I was thinking either Tuesday or Wednesday. Should we just plan on Tuesday, the 27th, same time.

MR. SOMACH: Your Honor, this is Stuart Somach. I just wanted to let you know, we will have someone there in person in addition to -- to us looking at this. We'll have our folks that are going to be working on the technical part of our presentation will be there on this date.

JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. So let's plan on the 27th. We'll do it the same time. We'll do the -- the non-participant feed at 1:00. We'll do the -- then the follow-up at 2:00 like we -- as we did today.

MR. BROWN: And, Your Honor, I heard that the -- the link was a little confusing as far as the 1:00 p.m. run through this afternoon as far as having both links in one e-mail. However it works for you guys, we can send it a different way if -- if this morning was confusing. We can certainly make it how

it's, you know, good for everyone.

JUDGE MELLOY: Why don't you just send it as a non-participation for the 1:00.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Perfect. Yes, sir.
Yes, sir.

JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Anything more about the -- the demonstration or the -- the video feed?

(No response.)

move on to the issue of the tour. As far as dates are concerned, I would probably prefer the 23rd/24th. And as to the question that was raised about the final pre-trial conference, let me ask this, we're about a week out -- I have to look at the schedule, but a week or ten days out on the deadline of filing motions in limine. I guess I'll start with you, Mr. Somach. Are you anticipating filing extensive motions in limine.

MR. SOMACH: Well, we're going to file some motions in limine. They're not extensive. I think in your order, you allowed 20 pages per motion, and I know for a fact that we're way under 20 pages total for what we're going to file so they're not extensive at all. There may be a couple pages per issue, and there may be five issues at the most. So

1 that's -- and I think that's actually more than what 2 they are, but we do intend to file something. 3 JUDGE MELLOY: What about you, 4 Mr. Wechsler, what are your thoughts? 5 MR. WECHSLER: We will be filing 6 I -- I -- I think the volume is similar to something. 7 what Mr. Somach's describing. I think we have 8 approximately five issues that we're raising. 9 JUDGE MELLOY: Well, I think if that's 10 -- if that's what we're talking about, I think then 11 doing something in Texas or New Mexico would probably 12 be doable. So I would be willing to do the final 13 pre-trial conference on the 25th, and we -- and I'll 14 have to talk to the judges down there, whether we do 15 El Paso or Las Cruces, I'll have to see. Probably El 16 Paso, because I think that's where most people are 17 going to be staying, although as I understand, it's 18 not that difficult to drive up to Las Cruces. 19 we'll plan on that unless it turns out the final 20 pretrial is going to be so complex that we're going to 21 need a lot more document accessibility and so on, but 22 let's plan on that. 23 And then Mr. Wechsler brought up the 24 issue of the flyover. I think he's pretty well laid 25 it out in his e-mail or letter. What -- what's your

-- tell me what your thinking is, Mr. Somach, as to why we would need to go all the way up to Albuquerque?

MR. SOMACH: Yeah, I'm going to defer, if I can, to Ms. Klahn who's going to be on the flyover, and who's been working directly with everybody on the issue. So she'll be able to give you a much better and more direct response.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JUDGE MELLOY: Ms. Klahn?

MS. KLAHN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. The thinking was that we wanted to be able to start in Las Cruces and end in Truth or Consequences and see most of the basin. As a logistical matter, it's my understanding that if we go up the east side of the mountains, because they fly at a higher elevation, the plane can go faster. The goal was to try and do this in a couple of hours and not have to refuel. So by doing it in this fashion, we don't have to refuel, so that's the kind of logistical reason. From a substantive point of view, Albuquerque and the middle Rio Grande, which is south of Albuquerque are part of this case in the sense that that's where the water has to come through in order to get to Elephant Butte, and, of course, New Mexico has witnesses from Albuquerque on their witness list and, of course, we have Mr. Brockmann at every status conference.

think it's not really fair to say that Albuquerque and the middle Rio grande aren't part of this case even if they aren't directly at issue because they are both Elephant Butte. So that was the thinking for why we proposed this. This way, we can start from Las Cruces, we can end in Truth or Consequences, and the idea is that the buses or the vans or whatever will pick up for the field trip at the Truth or Consequences airport and -- and take off from there. And any -- any area of the Rincon Valley that you didn't see from the air, you're going to be going through in the van. But it's not -- according to Ms. Barncastle, it's really not a very substantial part of the Rincon Valley. So that's the thinking from our team.

JUDGE MELLOY: Well, as I understand it, what Mr. Wechsler is proposing is we would start in Las Cruces, then fly south to Fort Quitman, then back basically up to Rio Grande Valley to Truth or Consequences, which would, if I'm reading the map correctly here, is only about less than half of what you're proposing in terms of a flight. I don't understand the -- the logistics of why that is more efficient than -- why a flight that's twice as long is more efficient than -- than what is being proposed by

New Mexico.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. KLAHN: I don't disagree that if the -- if Your Honor doesn't want to go all the way north to Albuquerque, starting in Las Cruces, going to Fort Quitman, and then back to Truth or Consequences is more efficient. What our position -- we started from the position that we needed to go all the way to Alamosa because the entire Rio Grande Compact is at issue, and seeing the Compact area from source to out -- output -- outfall seemed like the best true bird's-eye view. You get a sense of how the valley changes from the headwaters as you move down into the desert and so on. After looking at that and looking at the -- getting some pushback from New Mexico and -and talking with the aviation company, we thought maybe Albuquerque was a middle ground and -- and part of the problem with Alamosa, frankly, was that we were going to have to refuel up there. So it would have meant some time on the ground. So we were -- we were trying to approach this in a way that we thought was going to provide the best bird's-eye view of the system to everybody and -- and that's where we -that's where we came down.

**JUDGE MELLOY:** Well, I -- I guess I have to say, I'm not that interested in going 150 miles

north of the basin. I just don't think that would be that efficient, and I would like to see us work on an itinerary that's closer to what Mr. Wechsler suggested. And he did indicate that there -- what was it you indicated, there was a gap, Mr. Wechsler, that you thought should be filled?

2.4

MR. WECHSLER: Well, the -- and the route, Your Honor, that I -- that I suggested would fill that in. If you look at the picture there, you can see the northern pink dot there between there and the southernmost blue dot on the western side, which is the Truth or Consequences dot. There's no route there indicated. That's that Rincon part of the New Mexico basin. But the route that we're proposing would go directly to Truth or Consequences. You would see all of that. You would see the entire basin. We did contact the plane, and we're assured there are no logistical issues with taking the more direct and efficient route.

JUDGE MELLOY: I think that's something
I prefer both in terms of time and just flying -anyway, that's my preference as something along the
lines of what Mr. Wechsler is suggesting. Hopefully
we can work that out between the two of you. And
we'll finalize any details at the hearing in two weeks

on this -- on this issue, if there's anything left unresolved.

Let me talk about the mechanics of the

-- of the tour. You mentioned buses and vans. I don't want this to be a huge group. We've talked about limiting it to one or -- or most two attorneys for each of the parties. The amici will certainly be involved when we visit their particular locations.

Anything in the EBID, I certainly expect Ms.

Barncastle to be there, and anything in El Paso No. 1, I expect Ms. O'Brien to be there. But I -- I don't -- I'm not anticipating the amici, for the most part, going along on the tour, and I don't anticipate more than one or two lawyers from each of the firms. I mean, does anybody have differing thoughts on that or is that -- anybody find that objectionable?

MS. KLAHN: Your Honor, I may have created some confusion by referring to buses and vans. I think the idea is to keep it very limited, and I'm not exactly sure about the number of -- of people who are planning to -- or who are going to be included at this point, but what you just sketched out is at least in the ballpark. I believe it's one lawyer for each party will be on the bus and so that probably isn't a bus. It's probably a van.

JUDGE MELLOY: All right. And -- and certainly if we're visiting a site that an amici has particular interest in, they're certainly welcome to be at that site, but as a general proposition, we're not going to have 30 people on a bus or a van as far as I'm concerned. So is there any question about that?

MS. KLAHN: I don't think so.

JUDGE MELLOY: Any other logistical issues dealing with the tour that we need to talk about today?

would like to briefly just note for the parties that I went out to some of these sites recently and that two of them, there were rattlesnakes. So please dress appropriately. High -- knee-high boots would be excellent, long pants. I know it's going to be summertime but certainly don't need an emergency out on a canal bank, and the snakes like to come out and sun during the day when we're going to be out and about so that, you know, they have the warmth to get them through the cold, desert nights. That is one logistical issue to be very aware of. The other thing is that some of our farmers have -- they keep bees, and bees attract other bugs so if you have any

allergies, make sure you have your Epipen or something available. There are often bees out and about.

And then finally, at least in our District, I'll be placing porta potties at areas that are convenient along the way because this can be a long tour without bathrooms. So we'll try to make those accommodations for everybody there. At the end of the day, they're porta potties, so I highly recommend you go at the restaurant or at the state parks when you have time, but we will have them toward the southern end in case somebody needs them because this can be a long miserable day in the heat with the sun and the rattlesnakes and no bathroom. But those are the only logistical issues I noted.

would -- and I was going to mention, too, and I had forgotten. This reminded me, Ms. Barncastle. I certainly don't expect people to dress the same as they would in -- for a court proceeding. It's going to be hot, I assume, this time of the year, so dress comfortably, short-sleeve shirts or blouses are certainly encouraged, and you're not -- suit and tie is not -- is not required so dress -- dress comfortably for the trip. Anything else?

MR. DUBOIS: Your Honor, I actually have

sort of a curiosity question for you. On -- on the flyover, are you interested in seeing -- getting -- getting out so you can get a view of -- of Elephant
Butte Reservoir and its -- well, we'll see what kind of water is in it at that point, but going up to Truth or Consequences doesn't necessarily give you a full view of Elephant Butte itself. Is that something you would like us to try to include in the itinerary?

JUDGE MELLOY: Yes. I assume that would be in the itinerary. We definitely would fly over the reservoir.

MR. DUBOIS: Okay. We've had enough discussions and enough sort of disagreement internally that understanding what you would like to see would also be helpful.

JUDGE MELLOY: And I'm not saying we can't go a little bit north of Truth or Consequences in order to get a full view of the reservoir and -- and what leads into it, but I'm -- I -- I'm not particularly interested in going all the way up to Albuquerque.

MS. BARNCASTLE: As a practical matter, landing in T or C, you will see the reservoir. You have to because you're going to have to fly north of the reservoir and then shoot out over the west Mesa to

1 be able to land where the airport is so you're going 2 to see it. 3 JUDGE MELLOY: Well, it must be an 4 impressive --5 MS. BARNCASTLE: The question is at what 6 point do you -- the channel is also that comes in, the 7 middle Rio Grande has done a significant amount of 8 work to channelize that and get water to the 9 reservoir, and that, you won't necessarily see, but 10 you could if you went further north. 11 JUDGE MELLOY: Like I say, I don't mind 12 going, you know, 20 miles further north or something 13 like that. I -- I just don't want to go all the way 14 up to Albuquerque. 15 MR. DUBOIS: That's the clarification I 16 was hoping for. Thank you, Your Honor. 17 JUDGE MELLOY: And it must be an 18 impressive airport at Truth or Consequences. 19 understand that Mr. Branson took his space flight off 20 from there. 21 MS. BARNCASTLE: Actually, no, Your 22 Honor, that's at Upham. The original flight plan that 23 directs you behind on the east side of the mountains 24 directs you around the restricted air space that's

above the space port airport, but the T or C airport

25

is actually pretty impressive, too, because Ted Turner had it redone so that he could get his jets in and out. The airport used to not be large enough.

JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Well, good.

If it's good enough for Ted Turner, it should work for us. All right. Thank you. Anything else about the tour that we need to talk about?

(No response.)

this issue about the exhibits and the duelling letters that came in today. I read them, and not sure I entirely understand the disagreement. There seems to be, if I'm understanding correctly, New Mexico and Texas and United States seem to be in agreement that the deadline for filing objections were extended to August 2nd, which I don't have any problem with, and that those objections would be limited to authenticity -- well, Texas' authenticity, New Mexico says authenticity or identification. I'm not sure I know the difference. But -- but basically what we're talking about there are foundational objections, right? Is that what we're saying?

MR. WECHSLER: Your Honor, that's -that's not our position. You are correct about
agreeing on August 2nd. Our thought is your original

order that required us to do objections early is a good one, and that will help facilitate and move things along at trial. We do think, however, that we -- we think Texas' proposal of five or six days in advance of the witnesses testifying actually trying to resolve those objections, that that -- that also makes a lot of sense to us, will be more efficient and allow us to not have to look at all of the exhibits, for example, ones that may never see the light of day in the courtroom. But our view is even though we will have objected on all grounds by August 2nd, that we still need to be able to do a meet and confer on authenticity issues, because in the event that one of the parties is raising certain authenticity issues, we need to be able to take a look at that, see if there's some way we can correct that or if we need a witness at trial, to be able to address that. So that's our rationale for dealing with those up front. Otherwise, we think that identifying all of those objections early and then actually resolving them in the meet and confer later on when those exhibits are actually identified as a part of that five-day process. JUDGE MELLOY: So let me understand, if

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I understand your position correctly. The -- when you talk about authenticity, I guess I tend to think of

foundation, but are we -- we're talking about whether it's, in fact, a business record or whether, in fact, it's a historical record, or whether -- whether it meets one of the other -- one of the exceptions to the hearsay rule or -- or what kind of witness you have to put on to -- to prove that up. Is that what you're talking about with authenticity?

MR. WECHSLER: It is, Your Honor.

JUDGE MELLOY: Okay.

MR. DUBOIS: Your Honor, if I --

JUDGE MELLOY: Yeah, go ahead.

MR. DUBOIS: This is Jim Dubois. I was following Mr. Wechsler for a while, but then we seemed to have a jump, and it may have just been a misstatement because he said that he wanted the objections on all grounds by August 2nd, in which case why are we only talking about authenticity? I'm not clear if we're talking about authenticity by August 2nd or all grounds, because then what's the second -- you know what I mean? What are we going to do with redoing the same objections five days before trial? I'm just -- I'm just not clear, and I want to make sure that we are all on the same page. So I guess the question, Jeff, is: Were you intending to say object based on all grounds by August 2nd or on the

authenticity so we can, as the Court says, sort of get to the foundational issues if there are any?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. WECHSLER: So we -- if I may, Your Honor, we -- we do think that it should be on all grounds by August 2nd, and we don't view that as sort of redoing the objections in that trial. Those same objections would -- would stand. That would be the objections that were applicable. But at that point, you know, let's say one of our witnesses is on the stand, we're now identifying the specific exhibits in advance that we actually are intending to present and so that gives the other parties an opportunity to, again, identify their objections and really walk through the meet-and-confer process, and the efficiency we think that gains is if we do all of the objections now and then we also have to do all of the meet-and-confer process now, that's going to be difficult. That's going to be hours and hours and hours, and it will also cover -- I mean, as you probably saw from our e-mail, there have been over 9,000 exhibits that have been identified so that process would be extremely lengthy. But actually going through the objection meet and confer at the time, you know, right before a witness, as Texas proposes, that makes a lot of sense to us, and it

obviates the need to go through everything. Now, that being said, we do think identifying these objections early is helpful because it allows us to go through our exhibit list, potentially, you know, pare off things if necessary, deal with authenticity issues and also, potentially, we're hopeful that we might be able to -- if we know the objections early, to deal with large categories of documents. You know, so let's say, for example, there's certain types of data sheets that one party or another is objecting to on relevance grounds or something, if there's a hundred of those, we can talk about that before the trial, that might help speed up the process when we actually get to And all of this, our purpose is really to try and be as efficient as possible and to reserve trial time for things that actually matter.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JUDGE MELLOY: So just so I understand, you would still meet and greet over -- over the issues of, as you call them, authenticity or foundational exhibits before the trial, but you would not meet and greet about the other objections, hearsay, relevance, those type of objections until -- until a decision is made five or six days before the witness is called that that exhibit is actually going to be used?

MR. WECHSLER: That's correct, Your

I will also just explain why I'm not using the 1 2 word "foundation." I sometimes would think of 3 foundation like, you know, let's say there's a report 4 that was done in 1989 or something. Certainly there 5 is a witness who you could lay foundation for that 6 witness to testify to that particular exhibit, but I 7 don't know in that initial process that we're going to 8 know that until we understand what exhibit is 9 identified with what witness later on in the process 10 if that makes sense. 11 MS. BARFIELD: Your Honor --12 MR. DUBOIS: I quess, Your Honor -- I'm 13 sorry. Go ahead, Ms. Barfield. 14 MS. BARFIELD: Thank you, Mr. Dubois. 15 On behalf of Texas, Your Honor, I think that the last 16 point that Mr. Wechsler made --17 JUDGE MELLOY: I'm sorry. I'm having a 18 little trouble hearing you. Could you speak up a 19 little bit? 20 Yes, Your Honor. MS. BARFIELD: 21 apologize. I think that the last point that 22 Mr. Wechsler made is a great example of why the 23 process of going through the better part of 9,000 24 exhibits at this juncture in an attempt to make 25 appropriate and meaningful objections is inefficient,

given the volume of documents or exhibits rather that have been exchanged among the parties. Using Mr. Wechsler's example, until we know the purpose for which an exhibit is going to be offered, as well as the person who's going to be testifying about it, we really don't know how we can say now by August 2nd whether or not the State of Texas will have, for example, a foundation objection. So the process for 9,000 documents, we believe, is inefficient. it's more efficient for all the parties and more appropriate to look at the actual exhibits that ultimately will be used for each witness, and that's why we propose this alternative method of presenting the actual exhibits that we intend to present tethered specifically to a reason so that the parties can then evaluate is this particular exhibit relevant for this witness's testimony, appropriate for a foundational perspective for this witness's testimony, have a discussion about it before that witness gets on the stand, try to resolve those objections, and only come to Your Honor when the witness testifies when actual disputes that still exist. But we think that doing it now by August 2nd to 9,000-plus exhibits is going to leave the parties really guessing as to what the purpose of each exhibit is, what witness will testify

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to each exhibit, and we think that this process is a great way to streamline the real issues that could be in dispute. I think all the parties agree that we're not going to be offering 9,000 exhibits into evidence in the trial, but rather, we're going to -- this is our -- this is our universe of what -- what folks are going to choose from, and then we're going to figure out, you know, the subset of 20 documents or 10 documents or whatever it will be for any given witness or perhaps 50. But at any rate, we'll be asserting objections and discussing objections, not in a vacuum, but rather with actual information as to the purpose of the document and the -- and the witness who will use the document.

MR. WECHSLER: I would -- the only thing I would add, I understand we're wrapping up this conversation, is we agree, we're not going to be presenting 9,000 documents, but Ms. Barfield identifies the precise reason that we need to start to whittle those down and address objections as early as possible, so we're not taking trial time for that. I guess I don't understand the problem. I mean, whether or not we're doing objections now or at trial, we're certainly not going to wait until then to review all 9,000 of those exhibits. I mean, that's part of our

due diligence in preparing for trial. I assume that Texas will do the same.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

22

23

2.4

25

JUDGE MELLOY: Well, I guess one of my concerns is one of the -- one of the objections that may be made, I'm assuming, in a case like this is that a document is hearsay, and the -- the counterargument would then be, well, it fits under one of the exceptions to the hearsay rule, whether it be a business record, whether it be a historical document, whatever. And if you don't know that there's going to be a hearsay objection until six days before trial, that means whoever is propounding a witness that wants to rely on that document now has to scramble to get somebody to come in and authenticate it as a business record or come in and authenticate it as -- as a historical document. I'm not sure we can wait that long on some of those types of objections. Anybody have any response to that or am I -- am I missing something here?

20 MR. WECHSLER: We agree, Your Honor. 21 That -- that is our position.

MS. BARFIELD: Your Honor, on behalf of Texas, we do understand that concern. We think that addressing hearsay-styled objections five days in advance of the witness testifying is sufficient time.

We do believe that we'll be looking at a limited set I think right now, again, we're dealing of documents. with a situation where the parties are going to be tasked with identifying potential hearsay objections for 9,000-plus documents, not knowing what witness is going to testify about each of those specific 9,000 documents. So, in other words, there might not be a hearsay objection if we knew the purpose for the document and who was going to be testifying about the document, but because we don't have that information now, I feel like it is potentially an exercise process that would be quite difficult, given the volume, whereas if we have a streamlined process closer to trial tethered to a specific witness, many of those ultimate hearsay objections that the parties may have to preserve will not matter, and the party may not want to assert them anyway. And to alleviate the concern of five to six days, we could even propose an exchange that included a few more days. It could be ten days before trial. We meet and confer for five of those. We attempt to resolve those concerns and provide a little more time. But the point is to tether an exhibit that truly a party does intend to use for a specific witness and that we all know the witness that's going to be used for and the purpose

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

because we do have an understanding of the general categories of testimony for each of the proposed witnesses via the exchange of the -- the witness list themselves. Our fear is that we are going to be -- perhaps have to over object, which we do not want to do. We do not want to create objections to preserve objections, because we don't know the purpose of an exhibit or the witness who might be prefer for some to talk about.

2.4

Dubois. I'll also add that context is obviously going to be very meaningful for things like a relevance objection. That may be affected by the outcomes of the motions in limine, as well. So I guess we were looking at some of those kinds of problems, and as Ms. Barfield said, we end up having to over object to a lot of documents based on -- on relevance of -- of how we think the case is going to go or should go, and it's -- if the noting all of that seems like it's -- it's going to generate an awful lot of work going through thousands of documents without any context.

MR. WECHSLER: We have -- to that point of over objecting, Your Honor, we're certainly attempting to be cautious in our objections. And I can report that we've done between 1,500 and 2,000 of

1 the documents submitted by the United States and 2 Colorado, and it's not so burdensome. 3 Well, let me give this JUDGE MELLOY: 4 some thought. I don't have any objection to extending 5 the deadline until August 2nd, and I'd like to --6 let's -- let's -- I think what I'll order at this time 7 is that by August 2nd, the category what would be referred to A and B documents, those are -- to which 8 9 there are no objections be identified, and those to 10 which there are authenticity objections as that's been 11 described are identified, and the meet-and-greet 12 process will continue. I want to see what the motions 13 in limine look like. I may -- I may very well 14 ultimately agree with New Mexico and require that the 15 other objections be filed in advance of trial, but I 16 want to think about that a little bit and see exactly 17 how -- how things shake out with the -- with the other 18 objections. 19 Is there anything else we need to talk 20 about today? 21 (No response.) 22 JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Well, if not 23 2.4 MR. DUBOIS: Your Honor, I'm sorry. 25 Just to be clear, I want to make sure I -- we're doing

1 the tour the 23rd and 24th would be your preference, 2 and then the final pre-trial conference would be Las 3 Cruces or El Paso on the 25th? 4 JUDGE MELLOY: Right. 5 MR. DUBOIS: Is that correct? Okay. 6 Just double-checking. 7 JUDGE MELLOY: I'm assuming -- I -- I'm 8 -- I'm assuming the pre-trial conference will be more 9 than an hour, so we may be spending the better part of 10 the morning or well into the afternoon. Without any 11 disparagement of El Paso, my daughter, who's a lawyer, 12 and does immigration work, used to spend a lot of time 13 taking depositions in El Paso, and her saying was you 14 can get to El Paso, but you can't get out because 15 there's -- the last flight out is about 2:00 in the 16 afternoon so if you -- if you don't get done in time 17 to make a 2:00 flight, you're pretty much going to be 18 there for the rest of the day. But hopefully we can 19 If not, we'll stay over until the next get done. 20 morning, and -- but -- but I think it will probably 21 take a better part of the morning and maybe into the 22 afternoon to final pretrial conference. Any other 23 questions? 2.4 (No response.) 25 JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Thank you.

1	MR. DUBOIS: Thank you.
2	MR. SOMACH: Thank you, Your Honor.
3	MR. WECHSLER: Thank you, Your Honor.
4	MR. WALLACE: Thank you.
5	(The proceedings adjourned at 3:10 p.m.)
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1 CERTIFICATE 2 3 I, HEATHER L. GARZA, a Certified 4 Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of Texas, do 5 hereby certify that the facts as stated by me in the 6 caption hereto are true; that the foregoing pages 7 comprise a true, complete and correct transcript of the proceedings had at the time of the status hearing. 8 9 I further certify that I am not, in any 10 capacity, a regular employee of any of the parties in 11 whose behalf this status hearing is taken, nor in the 12 regular employ of any of the attorneys; and I certify 13 that I am not interested in the cause, nor of kin or 14 counsel to any of the parties. 15 16 GIVEN UNDER MY HAND AND SEAL OF 17 on this, the 26th day of August, 2021. 18 19 HEATHER L. GARZA, CSR, RPR, CRR 2.0 Certification No.: 8262 Expiration Date: 04-30-22 21 22 23 Worldwide Court Reporters, Inc. Firm Registration No. 223 24 3000 Weslayan, Suite 235 Houston, TX 77027

25

800-745-1101

			1.50.15	45.7.17.10
A	administrator	alternative	assert 52:17	45:7,17,18
<b>A.J</b> 6:7 10:9	14:12 24:10	49:13	asserting 50:10	46:1 47:5,19
ability 12:23	adults 18:18	Amber 8:20	Association 6:6	54:10
13:2 14:8	advance 44:5	amici 38:7,12	10:7,10	Authority 5:1
17:12 18:5,20	46:11 51:25	39:2	assume 9:22	8:23 9:1 21:12
21:16,24 22:10	54:15	amount 42:7	15:25 17:8	authorize 15:11
22:18 24:12	Advisor 8:10	ANAYA 3:7	40:20 41:9	automatically
28:10	afraid 29:8	and- 2:11,15,25	51:1	26:2
<b>able</b> 10:18 11:11	afternoon 8:6,13	3:5,11,15 4:12	assuming 12:22	available 13:22
11:15 12:10,17	8:15 9:3,6,15	ANDREWS	51:5 55:7,8	15:2 24:22
12:19 13:11	9:24 10:4,8	2:22	assumption 13:5	25:17 30:8,20
16:8,18 19:7	31:22 34:9	answer 13:6	assured 37:17	40:2
24:9 28:13	55:10,16,22	21:12,23 28:24	attempt 48:24	<b>Avenue</b> 1:15 3:8
34:6,10 42:1	AgileLaw 16:23	29:1	52:21	6:8
44:12,15,17	16:24	anticipate 38:13	attempting	aviation 36:15
47:6	ago 19:1	anticipating	53:24	aware 15:3
absolutely 17:22	agree 13:16,25	32:18 38:12	attorney 2:17	39:23
19:13,13,18,25	17:20 21:14	anybody 15:9	3:17 7:14,22	<b>awful</b> 53:20
20:14	50:3,17 51:20	24:16 25:3	8:7 19:9 25:16	B
access 30:15	54:14	30:2,8 31:5	25:23,24 26:3	
accessibility	agreeing 43:25	38:15,16 51:17	26:6,10,14,15	<b>B</b> 2:4 54:8
33:21	agreement 22:25	<b>anyway</b> 29:10	26:20	back 12:21
accommodati	23:13 43:14	37:22 52:17	attorney's 25:13	14:11 17:5
40:7	ahead 12:21	apologize 15:6	25:14,18,25	23:6 26:16
ACOSTA 5:8	45:11 48:13	17:21 48:21	30:6	28:16 29:7
acquiescing 23:7	air 35:11 42:24	appearance 7:5	attorneys 17:5	30:6 35:18
activate 15:12	airport 35:9	applicable 46:8	25:14,20,21	36:5
15:13 19:21,25	42:1,18,25,25	<b>apply</b> 29:22,25	26:7,13 29:17	ball 24:8
activated 20:17	43:3	appreciate	29:20 30:9,14	ballpark 38:23
<b>active</b> 22:12	ajolsen@h2ol	21:19 29:2	38:6 57:12	bank 39:19
<b>actual</b> 12:19	6:10	approach 36:20	attorneys' 25:11	bar 14:6
49:11,14,21	<b>Al</b> 9:10	appropriate	30:1	Barela 3:7 7:23
50:12	<b>Alamosa</b> 36:8,17	22:25 48:25	attract 39:25	Barfield 2:4
add 12:15 17:14	Albuquerque	49:11,17	<b>audio</b> 10:17	7:12 48:11,13
50:16 53:11	3:8 5:1 8:22,25	appropriately	14:24 19:17	48:14,20 50:18
addition 28:13	21:9 34:2,19	39:16	21:7	51:22 53:16
31:12	34:20,24 35:1	approximately	<b>August</b> 43:16,25	Barncastle 4:19
additional 29:15	36:4,16 41:21	33:8	44:11 45:16,18	4:20 9:15,16
address 44:17	42:14	<b>April</b> 8:1 12:8	45:25 46:5	12:14,15 13:10
50:20	<b>alert</b> 14:21	<b>area</b> 35:10 36:9	49:6,23 54:5,7	14:1,5 15:9
addressing	allergies 40:1	areas 40:4	57:17	18:9,16 20:2
51:24	alleviate 52:17	arguably 11:15	<b>Austin</b> 2:18 5:9	21:21 22:23
adequately	Allison 8:20	arises 14:5	authenticate	24:3 28:3,4
21:19 22:6,17	<b>allow</b> 15:22 16:7	arrange 28:16	51:14,15	29:13 35:13
adjourned 56:5	23:24 44:7	<b>ASAP</b> 16:21	authenticity	38:10 39:12
adjust 19:24	allowed 32:21	<b>asking</b> 7:4 12:8	43:17,18,19	40:17 41:22
•	allows 47:3	25:16	44:13,14,25	42:5,21
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

	-		-	
based 45:25	<b>boxes</b> 27:3	29:6	16:16 18:23,25	11:17
53:17	boys 24:7	cameras 28:16	19:2,12,14,18	comments 11:24
basically 12:4	Brandon 15:6	<b>canal</b> 39:19	19:21,25 20:10	Commission 8:1
35:19 43:20	15:20	capacity 57:10	20:16,22	Compact 8:11
<b>basin</b> 34:12 37:1	Branson 42:19	Capitol 2:6	check 16:3 20:20	36:8,9
37:14,16	<b>break</b> 24:11	caption 57:6	Cholla 3:16 7:21	company 36:15
bathroom 40:13	bridge 22:14	care 20:19	choose 50:7	complete 57:7
bathrooms 40:6	<b>briefly</b> 39:13	case 14:25 22:7	<b>Chris</b> 8:19	complex 33:20
<b>battle</b> 22:24	Broadway 4:3	23:6 25:15	CIRCUIT 1:14	component
bees 39:24,25	BROCKMAN	28:7,8 34:21	city 5:7,12 9:2,4	25:13
40:2	5:13	35:2 40:11	9:5,7 25:14,16	comprise 57:7
begging 28:14	<b>Brockmann</b> 5:2	45:16 51:5	25:17,19,23	concern 14:5
beginning 1:15	5:3 8:24,25	53:18	ckhoury@nm	18:4 19:15
begins 23:2	21:11,12 26:13	categories 47:8	3:19	51:23 52:18
<b>behalf</b> 8:25 9:25	34:25	53:2	clarification	concerned 32:12
10:5,9 48:15	Brooks 7:20	category 54:7	42:15	39:6
51:22 57:11	brought 33:23	cause 57:13	clarify 26:12	concerning
believe 38:23	<b>Brown</b> 15:5,6	cautious 53:24	clear 28:18	18:12
49:9 52:1	16:3 17:20	<b>CEDAR</b> 1:15	45:18,22 54:25	concerns 51:4
Bernalillo 5:1	18:24 19:13	certain 24:5	cleared 23:1	52:21
9:1	20:13 23:18	44:14 47:9	clearly 29:9	confer 44:12,21
best 36:10,21	24:14 27:15,16	certainly 14:18	client 22:17	46:23 52:20
<b>better</b> 27:12	31:20 32:4	14:19 15:13,17	23:25,25	conference
34:7 48:23	bugs 39:25	16:16 18:7	closely 14:19	25:17 29:19
55:9,21	building 5:9	19:21,21 20:10	<b>closer</b> 20:7 37:3	32:14 33:13
BICKERSTA	25:11,12	20:21 24:3	52:13	34:25 55:2,8
5:8	burdensome	25:5 27:20	cold 39:22	55:22
big 22:19 24:7	54:2	28:21 31:25	Coleman 4:13	confusing 17:21
bigger 27:12	bus 38:24,25	38:7,9 39:2,3	8:18	31:21,25
<b>bird's-eye</b> 36:11	39:5	39:18 40:18,22	Colorado 1:10	confusion 38:18
36:21	buses 35:7 38:4	48:4 50:24	2:13 3:3 4:1,3	connection
bit 21:22 28:6	38:18	53:23	4:4,10 7:3	19:15
41:17 48:19	business 45:2	CERTIFICATE	29:15 54:2	Consequences
54:16	51:9,14	57:1	Colorado's 8:10	34:11 35:6,9
<b>blah</b> 20:21,21,21	<b>Butte</b> 4:18 9:13	Certification	combined 27:2	35:20 36:5
<b>Blair</b> 9:10,10	9:16 34:22	57:20	come 34:22	37:12,15 41:6
blatant 11:14	35:4 41:4,7	Certified 57:3	39:19 49:20	41:17 42:18
blouses 40:21		<b>certify</b> 57:5,9,12	51:14,15	Conservation
<b>blow</b> 12:10	C	Chad 4:2 29:15	comes 22:4 24:8	9:19
<b>blue</b> 37:11	C 2:1,4 5:2	chad.wallace	42:6	consider 29:5
blurry 11:5	41:23 42:25	4:5	comfortable	consideration
board 7:17	Caballo 25:16	<b>chair</b> 29:1	21:8 23:1,15	29:3
<b>body</b> 28:11	25:24	change 19:9	comfortably	contact 20:14
<b>boots</b> 39:16	California 2:7	changes 36:12	40:21,24	37:17
box 2:17 4:15	<b>call</b> 47:19	channel 42:6	comment 10:22	contacted 30:23
5:3,14,19 6:3	<b>called</b> 47:23	channelize 42:8	27:1	context 12:18
27:7,8,11	camera 28:20	<b>chat</b> 14:9,9	commented	53:11,21
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	l

	I	I	I	
contexts 27:6	<b>cover</b> 46:19	Deitchman 2:5	12:6,9 27:19	53:21 54:1,8
continually	Craig 8:9	7:13	directs 42:23,24	<b>doing</b> 12:16
11:17	create 53:6	<b>DELGADO</b> 5:8	disabled 14:14	14:22 17:7,14
continue 54:12	created 38:18	demeanor 11:18	18:25	17:24 23:23
control 17:12	<b>Crop</b> 6:6 10:7	<b>demo</b> 13:9 24:19	disagree 13:12	29:6,21 33:11
convenient 40:5	10:10	25:4	36:2	34:17 49:22
conversation	cross 22:10,15	demonstration	disagreement	50:23 54:25
50:17	cross-examining	10:14,16 31:5	41:13 43:12	<b>dot</b> 37:10,11,12
coordinator 8:2	11:19	32:7	discuss 24:2	double-check
<b>copy</b> 13:1 17:16	<b>CRR</b> 57:19	<b>Denver</b> 2:13 3:3	discussing 50:11	12:23 16:11
<b>Corrales</b> 5:19,20	Cruces 4:21	4:4,10	discussion 27:1	double-checki
correct 13:4	5:12 9:5,7 21:9	<b>Department</b> 4:3	49:19	55:6
16:2 17:9,11	25:12,14,24	4:9,14 8:18	discussions	download 13:3
23:18 43:24	33:15,18 34:11	depends 21:24	41:13	16:18 17:19
44:16 47:25	35:6,18 36:4	deposition 17:25	disparagement	18:1 19:3
55:5 57:7	55:3	20:4,8	55:11	downloaded
correctly 30:13	<b>CSR</b> 57:19	depositions	disposal 12:19	15:23 18:14
35:21 43:13	curiosity 41:1	13:20 14:4	dispute 50:3	downloading
44:24	D	15:25 16:23	disputes 49:22	16:9
Cotten 8:9		18:19 21:13	disruptive 18:20	<b>Draper</b> 3:12,12
counsel 13:1	Dalrymple 7:25	22:5 23:10	dissemination	3:12 7:24,24
20:4 22:3	data 47:9	55:13	18:12	7:25
25:15 57:14	date 31:15 57:20	<b>Deputy</b> 8:9	<b>district</b> 4:18 9:9	Drawer 3:18
counterargum	dates 32:11	described 54:11	9:11,12,14,17	dress 39:15
51:6	daughter 55:11	describing 33:7	9:19 40:4	40:18,20,23,23
counterpropo	<b>Davidson</b> 5:18	<b>desert</b> 36:13	District's 21:24	<b>drive</b> 33:18
18:12	5:18 9:24,25	39:22	<b>Diversified</b> 6:6	<b>Dubois</b> 4:8 8:12
<b>County</b> 5:1 9:1	day 12:10 22:9	details 37:25	10:7,10	8:13,16,16
9:8,11,18	28:20,20 39:20	difference 43:20	<b>Division</b> 8:10	40:25 41:12
<b>couple</b> 19:1 25:1	40:8,12 44:9	different 11:20	doable 33:12	42:15 45:10,12
32:24 34:16	55:18 57:17	15:10 16:22,25	document 12:19	45:12 48:12,14
course 34:23,24	days 32:16 44:4	18:3 21:22	13:11,13,18	53:10,11 54:24
<b>court</b> 1:5 7:4	45:21 47:23	31:24	14:3 21:18	55:5 56:1
19:3 20:5,14	51:11,24 52:18	differing 21:1	27:3,7,12	<b>due</b> 51:1
20:21 21:19	52:19,20	38:15	33:21 50:13,14	duelling 43:10
23:7 25:11,12	DC 4:15	difficult 11:5	51:6,9,13,16	<b>DUNN</b> 2:6,12
30:5 40:19	De 2:22 3:13	17:5 18:17	52:9,10	
46:1 57:23	<b>deadline</b> 32:16	28:6 33:18	document's	<u>E</u>
courthouse	43:15 54:5	46:18 52:12	19:16	<b>E</b> 2:1,1,1,1 3:17
30:22,23	deal 47:5,7	diligence 51:1	documents	4:13
courtroom	<b>dealing</b> 31:3	<b>direct</b> 34:7	13:17,22 15:22	<b>e-mail</b> 16:12,21
15:17 16:19	39:10 44:18	37:18	16:10,18,24	20:5 31:2,23
17:7 19:24	52:2	directed 25:10	17:9,13,16,17	33:25 46:20
20:15 21:6	decision 24:2	directly 14:18	17:23 19:7	e-mailed 20:20
22:9 23:15	47:22	34:5 35:3	47:8 49:1,9	early 44:1,20
24:21 27:18	<b>defer</b> 34:3	37:15	50:8,9,18 52:2	47:3,7 50:20
44:10	definitely 41:10	Director 11:25	52:5,7 53:17	east 34:13 42:23
	•	•	•	

	•		1	
easy 13:23	16:12,21 34:6	extent 23:24	32:23 33:2	forgiveness 28:5
<b>EBID</b> 22:1,3	36:22 40:7	24:5	<b>filed</b> 54:15	forgotten 40:17
23:3 28:4 38:9	evidence 22:24	extremely 46:22	<b>filing</b> 32:16,18	<b>form</b> 30:15
<b>EBID's</b> 24:6	23:13 50:4		33:5 43:15	Fort 35:18 36:4
efficiency 46:15	exactly 15:23	F	<b>fill</b> 37:9	<b>forth</b> 14:11
efficient 35:24	38:20 54:16	<b>F</b> 5:13	<b>filled</b> 37:6	<b>found</b> 10:24
35:25 36:6	examination	facilitate 44:2	<b>final</b> 32:13 33:12	11:3 25:1
37:2,19 44:7	24:1	<b>fact</b> 28:9,12	33:19 55:2,22	foundation 45:1
47:15 49:10	example 10:25	32:22 45:2,2	finalize 37:25	48:2,3,5 49:8
<b>either</b> 10:17	11:15 44:9	facts 57:5	<b>finally</b> 40:3 43:9	foundational
19:5 29:9 31:7	47:9 48:22	<b>fair</b> 35:1	<b>find</b> 25:2 28:6	43:21 46:2
<b>El</b> 5:7 9:2,4,8,11	49:3,8	<b>far</b> 16:4,7,8,9,12	38:16	47:19 49:17
21:9 30:21,23	excellent 39:17	16:13 29:7	<b>fine</b> 30:16	<b>Francis</b> 2:5 7:12
33:15,15 38:10	exceptions 45:4	31:21,22 32:11	<b>Firm</b> 4:20 5:18	<b>frankly</b> 36:17
55:3,11,13,14	51:8	39:5	57:23	<b>front</b> 13:13
Elephant 4:18	exchange 52:19	<b>farmers</b> 6:6 10:7	<b>firms</b> 26:9 38:14	44:18
9:13,16 34:22	53:3	10:10 28:22	<b>first</b> 10:14	<b>full</b> 23:15 41:6
35:4 41:3,7	exchanged 49:2	39:24	<b>fits</b> 51:7	41:18
elevation 34:14	exercise 52:11	fashion 34:17	<b>five</b> 32:25 33:8	full-blown 19:1
embarrassing	<b>exhibit</b> 10:24,25	<b>faster</b> 34:15	44:4 45:21	full-screen 12:11
30:4	11:2,4,5,11,12	<b>Fe</b> 2:23 3:13,18	47:23 51:24	function 15:2
emergency	19:4,5 47:4,24	5:4,14 6:3	52:18,20	functions 17:1
39:18	48:6,8 49:4,16	fear 53:4	<b>five-day</b> 44:22	further 28:16
<b>employ</b> 57:12	49:25 50:1	feature 14:6,9	<b>fixed</b> 20:9	42:10,12 57:9
employee 57:10	52:23 53:8	15:22 16:5,16	flew 29:1	
employees 22:21	exhibits 11:14	16:17 18:21,23	<b>flight</b> 35:22,24	G
<b>enable</b> 15:10,21	18:13 21:15	18:25 19:2,12	42:19,22 55:15	gains 46:15
encouraged	27:4 43:10	19:22,22 20:11	55:17	gap 37:5
40:22	44:8,21 46:10	20:16,22 27:20	Floor 4:3	<b>GARZA</b> 57:3,19
Engelke 8:20	46:21 47:20	features 14:14	<b>fly</b> 34:14 35:18	general 22:22
engineer 8:9,10	48:24 49:1,11	15:11,21	41:10,24	39:4 53:1
8:10 9:11	49:14,23 50:4	federal 25:12	<b>flying</b> 37:21	general's 2:17
enter 7:5	50:25	feed 16:5 18:4	flyover 33:24	3:17 7:14,22
entire 36:8	<b>exist</b> 49:22	25:9,10,18	34:5 41:2	8:7 26:6,10
37:16	<b>expect</b> 38:9,11	26:4,5,7,11	<b>focus</b> 12:8	generate 53:20
entirely 43:12	40:18	29:16,20,22	<b>folder</b> 17:18	<b>getting</b> 36:14
entities 26:10	experience 12:5	31:18 32:8	folders 18:2	41:2,3
entitled 26:11	expert 11:1	feeds 30:1	<b>folks</b> 11:6,20	give 20:17 23:21
envelope 28:5	expertise 8:21	<b>feel</b> 11:9 21:6,8	30:21 31:13	34:6 41:6 54:3
envisioning	Expiration	22:5,16 23:15	50:6	given 49:1 50:9
26:22	57:20	28:8 52:11	follow 12:20,20	52:12 57:16
EP 22:2	explain 48:1	Ferguson 8:2	13:18	gives 46:12
<b>Epipen</b> 40:1	Expressway 5:9	12:9	<b>follow-up</b> 24:20	glitches 14:25
evaluate 28:10	extended 43:15	field 35:8	31:19	25:1
49:16	extending 54:4	figure 50:7	following 19:6	go 12:21,21
event 44:13	extensive 32:18	figured 18:21	29:16 45:13	14:11 16:7,25
L AVAPVIDATE TO TO		file 18.1/ 22.10		17.5 20.19
everybody 10:18	32:20,24	<b>file</b> 18:14 32:19	foregoing 57:6	17:5 20:18

	l	l	l	1
23:6 24:10	48:22 50:2	52:15	HONORABLE	12:18 14:10,13
30:6 34:2,13	greet 47:18,21	hearsay-styled	1:14	impressive 42:4
34:15 36:3,7	<b>ground</b> 36:16,19	51:24	hope 22:11 24:4	42:18 43:1
37:15 40:9	grounds 44:11	heat 40:12	24:7	Improvement
41:17 42:13	45:16,19,25	<b>HEATH</b> 5:8	<b>hoped</b> 20:3	9:9,11
45:11 47:1,3	46:5 47:11	HEATHER	22:14	include 25:13
48:13 53:18,18	<b>group</b> 38:5	57:3,19	hopeful 22:3	41:8
<b>goal</b> 34:15	<b>groups</b> 29:18	help 27:9 28:21	28:15 47:6	included 38:21
<b>going</b> 11:24	growers 5:17	44:2 47:13	hopefully 21:1	52:19
13:12 16:13	9:23 10:1	<b>helpful</b> 27:4,5	26:16 37:23	including 24:6
18:10 19:8	guess 10:14 26:2	27:13 41:15	55:18	26:10
22:19,23 23:5	27:14 28:1	47:3	<b>hoping</b> 42:16	incredibly 12:16
23:14,19,20,21	32:17 36:24	HENNIGHA	<b>hot</b> 40:20	12:18 14:10
24:19,20,22	44:25 45:23	6:8	hour 55:9	indicate 37:4
26:18 28:9,22	48:12 50:22	hereto 57:6	<b>hours</b> 34:16	indicated 24:23
30:5,7 31:4,13	51:3 53:14	hey 20:6,20	46:18,18,19	30:20 37:5,13
32:19,23 33:17	guessing 49:24	<b>High</b> 39:16	Houston 57:24	indicates 30:19
33:20,20 34:3	<b>guys</b> 27:18	higher 19:17	Hubenak 2:16	inefficient 48:25
34:4 35:11,11	31:24	34:14	7:15	49:9
36:4,18,21,25		highly 40:8	Hudspeth 9:18	<b>inform</b> 30:14
38:13,21 39:5	<u>H</u>	historical 45:3	huge 22:24	information
39:17,20 40:16	half 27:10 35:21	51:9,16	28:11 38:5	31:2 50:12
40:19 41:5,20	hand 13:11,17	Hoffman 2:4	hundred 18:19	52:10
41:24 42:1,12	14:8 15:15	7:13	47:11	initial 48:7
45:20 46:17,18	24:9 57:16	hold 22:18		initially 19:10
46:23 47:24	handicapped	home 26:18,21	$\frac{I}{I}$	instance 26:4
48:7,23 49:4,5	28:9	<b>Honor</b> 7:7,19	idea 24:25 35:7	28:22
49:23 50:4,5,7	handing 13:1	8:6,14,24 9:4,6	38:19	intend 33:2
50:7,17,24	handle 17:23	9:16,25 10:4,8	ideas 18:24	49:14 52:23
51:10 52:3,6,9	handled 18:25	10:21 12:1,7	identification	intending 45:24
52:25 53:4,11	handling 17:9	12:14 14:23	43:19	46:11
53:18,20,20	happen 15:17	15:5,6,14 16:4	identified 44:22	interact 18:20
55:17	18:8 27:21	17:21 21:11,21	46:21 48:9	interaction
Goldsberry 2:5	hard 17:16	24:4,15 25:6	54:9,11	16:14
7:12	21:15 23:14	25:22 26:23	identifies 50:19	interactive
<b>good</b> 7:10 8:5,6	Hartman 4:2 8:7	27:16 28:3	identify 46:13	15:16 16:5,7
8:13,15 9:3,6	headwaters	29:13,14 31:10	identifying	16:15 20:15
9:15,24 10:4,8	36:12	31:20 34:9	44:19 46:10	24:16
13:7 14:1	hear 7:8 10:18	36:3 37:8	47:2 52:4	interest 22:6
24:25 25:3	heard 31:20	38:17 39:12	II 2:5	24:6 28:19
32:1 34:9 43:4	hearing 1:14	40:25 42:16,22	immediately	39:3
43:5 44:2	14:22,25 20:6	43:23 45:8,10	14:4	interested 36:25
grande 6:6 10:6	37:25 48:18	46:4 48:1,11	immigration 55:12	41:2,20 57:13
10:9 34:20	57:8,11	48:12,15,20		internally 41:13
35:2,19 36:8	hearsay 45:5 47:21 51:6,8	49:21 51:20,22	impediment 23:23	interrupt 18:5
42:7	51:11 52:4,8	53:10,23 54:24		20:8
<b>great</b> 19:16	31.11 32.4,8	56:2,3	important 11:15	interrupting
	•	•	•	•

	-			1 490 03
14:12 15:16	26:25	K	language 28:11	52:1
Interstate 8:1	john.draper@	<b>Kayla</b> 7:20	large 43:3 47:8	limiting 38:6
investigate 13:9	3:14	keep 19:7 38:19	larger 27:7	Lincoln 3:2
involved 23:4	john@uttonk	39:24	Las 4:21 5:12	line 22:8
38:8	6:4	<b>KERY</b> 6:2	9:5,7 21:9	lines 37:23
<b>IOWA</b> 1:15	Joining 8:6	key 12:16 18:21	25:12,13,24	link 15:7,10,16
Irrigation 4:18	judge 1:14 7:1,9	20:11	33:15,18 34:11	16:15 20:1,23
9:13,17	7:16 8:3,12,15	keys 19:6	35:5,18 36:4	31:21
<b>issue</b> 11:7 14:11	8:22 9:2,5,8,13	<b>Khoury</b> 3:16	55:2	links 15:15
19:16,16,17	9:18,21 10:2,6	7:21	<b>LAW</b> 4:3,20	31:23
23:13 32:11,25	10:11,13 11:8	kin 57:13	5:18	<b>Lisa</b> 3:1 7:23
33:24 34:6	11:22 12:2,13	kind 16:22	Lawrence 2:13	list 34:24 47:4
35:3 36:9 38:1	13:6 14:15	34:18 41:4	<b>lawyer</b> 38:23	53:3
39:23 43:10	15:1,20 17:2	45:5	55:11	listened 10:16
issues 22:25 23:3	18:9 20:24	kinds 53:15	lawyers 38:14	literally 15:8,12
32:25 33:8	21:20 22:20	Klahn 2:12 7:12	lay 48:5	15:18 16:18
37:18 39:10	23:17 24:13,18	34:4,8,9 36:2	leads 41:19	19:19,19
40:14 44:13,14	25:8,20 26:1	38:17 39:8	leave 49:24	litigation 23:4
46:2 47:5,18	26:24 27:14,23	knee-high 39:16	Lee 4:8 8:17	<b>little</b> 16:6 19:17
50:2	28:7,23 29:4	knew 52:8	lee.leininger@	21:22 27:21
itinerary 37:3	29:24 30:16,18	<b>know</b> 11:6 13:6	4:11	28:6 31:21
41:8,10	30:25 31:16	13:12,23 14:9	<b>left</b> 38:1	41:17 48:18,19
	32:2,6,10 33:3	14:16 15:23	<b>legible</b> 11:2 12:3	52:22 54:16
J	33:9 34:8	16:4,12,15,17	12:3,6	<b>LLC</b> 3:12 4:20
J 4:8	35:16 36:24	16:19 17:15	Leininger 4:8	5:18
<b>James</b> 4:8 5:2	37:20 39:1,9	20:6 22:1,2,13	8:17	<b>LLP</b> 5:8
james.dubois	40:15 41:9,16	23:9 24:11,11	leisure 17:19	located 26:15,20
4:11	42:3,11,17	24:23 26:15	lengthy 46:22	locations 38:8
<b>Jay</b> 5:13 9:7	43:4,9 44:23	27:6 28:18,24	<b>let's</b> 7:4 10:13	log 30:2
25:6	45:9,11 47:17	29:2 30:22	13:8 30:19	logistical 34:12
jcbrockmann	48:17 51:3	31:2,11 32:1	31:16 32:10	34:18 37:18
5:5	54:3,22 55:4,7	32:22 39:17,21	33:22 46:9	39:9,23 40:14
Jeff 7:19 45:24	55:25	42:12 43:19	47:8 48:3 54:6	logistics 35:23
Jeffrey 2:21	<b>judges</b> 33:14	45:20 46:9,24	54:6	lone 28:14
<b>Jennifer</b> 4:14	<b>Judith</b> 4:13	47:4,7,8 48:3,7	<b>letter</b> 30:15,16	long 35:24 39:17
8:18 25:15,23	judith.colema	48:8 49:3,6	30:19 33:25	40:6,12 51:17
jennifer.najja	4:16	50:8 51:10	letters 43:10	look 11:16 21:17
4:17	Judy 8:17	52:24 53:7	level 23:5	29:11 30:8
jets 43:2	JULY 1:13	knowing 52:5	<b>light</b> 44:9	32:15 37:9
jfstein@newm	jump 11:23 23:9	<b>Kopp</b> 3:1 7:24	limine 32:17,18	44:8,15 49:11
5:15 <b>Jim</b> 8:16 25	45:14		32:20 53:14	54:13
Jim 8:16,25	juncture 48:24	<u>L</u>	54:13	looking 10:25
21:11 45:12 53:10	<b>Justice</b> 4:9,14	L 2:3 57:3,19	limit 26:5 30:5	26:4 31:13
	8:19	label 19:4,5	limitations 29:6	36:13,13 52:1
<b>job</b> 23:16 <b>John</b> 3:12 6:2	jwechsler@m	laid 33:24	29:11	53:15
7:24 10:5	2:24	land 42:1	limited 16:13	lot 33:21 44:7
1.24 10.3		landing 41:23	38:19 43:17	46:25 53:17,20
	•	•		

55:12	12:13 13:6	<b>middle</b> 34:19	20:19 22:7	<b>noting</b> 53:19
lthompson@t	14:15 15:1,20	35:2 36:16	23:4,14 24:9	number 38:20
3:4	17:2 18:9	42:7	33:21 34:2	numerous 20:4
Luis 3:6 7:22	20:24 21:20	miles 36:25	39:10,18 43:7	NW 3:8
luis@roblesra	22:20 23:17	42:12	44:12,15,16	
3:9	24:13,18 25:8	Miller 9:21	47:1 50:19	0
	25:20 26:1,24	mind 26:2 42:11	54:19	<b>O</b> 2:1
M	27:14,23 29:4	minimum 24:9	needed 36:7	<b>O'Brien</b> 31:1,1
<b>M</b> 2:1,16 3:1 5:8	29:24 30:16,18	minutes 18:11	needs 18:8 19:17	38:11
<b>Main</b> 4:20	30:25 31:16	miserable 40:12	40:11	<b>O'Brien's</b> 30:19
making 18:17	32:2,6,10 33:3	missed 10:11	never 44:9	<b>object</b> 45:24
<b>Mall</b> 2:6	33:9 34:8	missing 20:11	New 1:10 2:20	53:5,16
<b>map</b> 35:20	35:16 36:24	51:18	2:23 3:8,13,17	objected 44:11
marked 19:9,10	37:20 39:1,9	misstatement	3:18 4:21 5:4	objecting 47:10
Marquette 3:8	40:15 41:9,16	45:15	5:14,17,20 6:1	53:23
MASTER 1:14	42:3,11,17	mkopp@trout	6:3,9 7:2,19,21	objection 14:18
matter 7:2 29:3	43:4,9 44:23	3:4	7:25 9:23,25	23:6 46:23
34:12 41:22	45:9,11 47:17	<b>moment</b> 14:13	10:3 22:8,17	49:8 51:11
47:16 52:16	48:17 51:3	MONTGOM	23:16 24:6	52:8 53:13
<b>Maxwell</b> 5:8 9:3	54:3,22 55:4,7	2:22	26:9 33:11	54:4
9:4 10:21,22	55:25	MoPac 5:9	34:23 36:1,14	objectionable
11:9,13 13:13	<b>mention</b> 40:16	morning 8:5	37:13 43:13,18	38:16
13:16 21:15	mentioned	25:2 31:25	54:14	objections 43:15
MCREA 6:8	17:15 38:4	55:10,20,21	<b>nights</b> 39:22	43:17,21 44:1
mean 24:25	Mesa 41:25	<b>motion</b> 30:15	NMSU 10:5	44:6,19 45:16
38:15 45:20	message 15:15	32:21	non-active 22:13	45:21 46:6,7,8
46:19 50:22,25	messengers	motions 32:16	non-EBID 23:2	46:13,16 47:2
meaningful	20:18	32:18,20 53:14	non-interactive	47:7,21,22
48:25 53:12	<b>method</b> 49:13	54:12	15:7,8,10,13	48:25 49:20
means 17:16	Mexico 1:10	mountains	15:14,19	50:11,11,20,23
51:12	2:20,23 3:8,13	34:14 42:23	non-participant	51:4,17,24
meant 36:19	3:17,18 4:21	move 20:7 32:11	31:18	52:4,15 53:6,7
mechanics 38:3	5:4,14,17,20	36:12 44:2	non-participa	53:24 54:9,10
meet 44:12,20	6:1,3,9 7:3,19	multiple 17:25	32:3	54:15,18
46:23 47:18,20	7:21,25 9:23	17:25 26:9	noninteractive	observation
52:20	9:25 10:3 22:8	N	16:1,6,9,10,13	10:22
meet-and-con 46:14,17	22:17 23:16	$\frac{1}{\mathbf{N} \cdot 2:1}$	18:4,6,7 19:15	<b>observing</b> 11:17 21:8
·	24:6 26:9	nailed 21:25	19:18,20 20:1	obviates 47:1
meet-and-greet 54:11	33:11 34:23	Najjar 4:14 8:18	20:17,22	obviously 53:11
meets 45:4	36:1,14 37:14	necessarily	nonparticipant	offered 49:4
MELLOY 1:14	43:13,18 54:14	12:20 13:14	14:7	offering 50:4
7:1,9,16 8:3,12	mgoldsberry 2:9	22:1,9 23:11	north 6:8 36:3	office 2:17,17
8:15,22 9:2,5,8	2:9 <b>Michael</b> 1:14	28:19 29:25	37:1 41:17,24 42:10,12	3:17,18 4:15
9:13,18,21	3:1 7:23 8:8	30:9 41:6 42:9	northern 37:10	5:3,14,19 6:3
10:2,6,11,13	microphone	necessary 47:5	note 14:20 39:13	7:13,14,20,22
11:8,22 12:2	20:7	need 13:4,14	noted 40:14	8:7,19 21:17
11.0,22 12.2	20.7		1101CU 40.14	3,1,21.1,

25:13,14,18,25 26:6,7,10,14 26:16,20 57:16 offices 25:11 26:3 30:1,6 Ogaz 3:17 7:21 oh 29:1 25:13,14,18,25 paralegal 24:24 pare 47:4 parks 40:10 part 16:9 25:18 31:14 34:20 35:2,13 36:16 37:13 38:12 31:14 34:20 37:13 38:12 37:13 38:12	,17 <b>position</b> 36:6,7 <b>prior</b> 18:13 27:1 <b>Priscilla</b> 2:16 7:15
26:6,7,10,14 pare 47:4 parks 40:10 21:5 26:16 30:1,6 part 16:9 25:18 33:16 38:2  39:5 40:18	20:1 <b>printing</b> 17:15 <b>position</b> 36:6,7 <b>prior</b> 18:13 27:1 43:24 44:24 <b>Priscilla</b> 2:16 7:15
offices 25:11       part 16:9 25:18       33:16 38:2         26:3 30:1,6       31:14 34:20       39:5 40:18         Ogaz 3:17 7:21       35:2,13 36:16       Peralta 2:22         oh 29:1       37:13 38:12       3:13	0   43:24 44:24   <b>Priscilla</b> 2:16
26:3 30:1,6 Ogaz 3:17 7:21 oh 29:1  31:14 34:20 39:5 40:18 Peralta 2:22 37:13 38:12  31:14 34:20 39:5 40:18	51:21 7:15
Ogaz 3:17 7:21       35:2,13 36:16       Peralta 2:22         oh 29:1       37:13 38:12       3:13	
<b>oh</b> 29:1 37:13 38:12 3:13	possibility 20:10 priscilla.hube
1 7 9 16 9 21 44 22 49 22	<b>possible</b> 16:11 2:19
okay 7:8,16 9:21   44:22 48:23   percent 15:1	_
10:18,18 12:13   50:25 55:9,21   18:7 19:20	50:21 32:12 33:11,15
13:8 27:23 <b>participant Perfect</b> 32:4	<b>Post</b> 2:17 3:18 38:24,25 46:20
30:25 31:16 22:12,13 23:19 <b>permission</b> 2	23:9 4:15 5:3,14,19 55:20
32:4 41:12 <b>participants</b> 23:21	6:3 <b>problem</b> 20:9,25
45:9 55:5   15:3   <b>person</b> 31:13	2 <b>potential</b> 52:4 22:19 26:8
<b>Olsen</b> 6:7,8 10:8   <b>participate</b>   49:5	<b>potentially</b> 19:8 36:17 43:16
10:9 21:25 23:25 <b>personally</b> 1	1:13 47:4,6 52:11 50:22
ones 44:9 30:3 21:6	<b>potties</b> 40:4,8 <b>problems</b> 10:17
ongoing 22:24 participated perspective	practical 41:22 18:22 53:15
open 30:2,10 22:4 11:20 21:2	pre-trial 32:14 proceeding
operating 12:9   particular 38:8   28:21 49:1	8 33:13 55:2,8 40:19
22:25 23:13 39:3 48:6 <b>physically</b> 1	3:1 <b>precise</b> 50:19 <b>proceedings</b>
opportunity 49:16 pick 35:8	<b>prefer</b> 17:12 56:5 57:8
28:15 46:12 <b>particularly picture</b> 37:9	28:12 32:12 <b>process</b> 18:6
opposed 29:25 27:24 28:21 pink 37:10	37:21 53:8 29:21 44:22
30:10 41:20 <b>PIP</b> 27:20	<b>preference</b> 31:6 46:14,17,22
option 15:4   parties 7:5 11:19   place 21:9 2	
27:15 11:23 16:23,24 <b>placing</b> 40:4	<b>prepared</b> 24:1 48:23 49:8
order 32:21 17:18,25 24:5 plan 15:21 3	
34:22 41:18 38:7 39:13 31:16 33:1	9,22 <b>present</b> 21:6 54:12
44:1 54:6 44:14 46:12 42:22	29:18 46:11 <b>proposal</b> 44:4
original 1:2 7:4   49:2,10,15,24   plane 34:15	49:14 <b>propose</b> 49:13
42:22 43:25 50:3 52:3,15 37:17	presentation 52:18
<b>outcomes</b> 53:13   57:10,14   <b>planning</b> 17	_
outfall 36:10 parts 12:7,12 38:21	31:15 35:25 53:2
output 36:10   party 18:2 38:24   play 19:8 24	:8 <b>presentations proposes</b> 46:25
overarching 47:10 52:16,23 playing 28:2	
21:4 <b>Paseo</b> 2:22 3:13 <b>please</b> 39:15	
Paso 5:7 9:2,4,8 point 11:5 2	<del>-</del>
P 9:11 21:9 22:16 26:1	
<b>P</b> 2:1,1 30:21,23 33:15 28:2 34:19	
<b>P.A</b> 5:3,13 6:2 33:16 38:10 38:22 41:5	_
<b>P.C</b> 3:7 55:3,11,13,14 42:6 46:8	Preston 4:2 8:7 protecting 23:11
<b>p.m</b> 1:15 31:22 <b>path</b> 22:19 48:16,21 5	
56:5 <b>PDF</b> 12:4 18:14 53:22	4:5 <b>provide</b> 36:21
<b>page</b> 11:1 45:23 <b>PDFing</b> 17:17 <b>pointing</b> 17:	
pages 32:21,22   PDFs 13:24   poker 28:25	55:22 <b>publish</b> 12:23
32:24 57:6   17:18   <b>port</b> 42:25	<b>pretty</b> 13:23 13:2 19:2
pants 39:17   pecan 5:17 9:23   porta 40:4,8	_ *
	I I -

	111 - 61 - 5	20.21.55.	<b>D.</b> 6 6 4 0 6 0	10.10.22
purpose 47:14	read 11:6 21:15	20:21 57:4	<b>Rio</b> 6:6 10:6,9	see 10:18,23
49:3,25 50:12	43:11	Reporters 57:23	34:20 35:2,19	11:11 12:24
52:8,25 53:7	reading 35:20	represents 24:6	36:8 42:7	13:14,15,25
<b>push</b> 28:5	real 50:2	republish 19:4	<b>Road</b> 5:19	14:2 18:17
pushback 36:14	really 24:2 28:12	requesting	<b>Robert</b> 2:4 7:13	23:12 27:5,9
<b>put</b> 17:17 18:14	29:2 35:1,13	22:10 30:15	25:16,23	27:12 28:13,17
45:6	46:13 47:14	require 54:14	<b>Robles</b> 3:6,7	29:9 30:19
	49:6,24	required 40:23	7:22,23	33:15 34:11
Q	reason 12:6	44:1	rolls 23:13	35:11 37:2,10
qualify 26:2	34:18 49:15	reserve 47:15	room 25:17	37:16,16 41:4
quality 19:16	50:19	reservoir 41:4	28:18	41:14,23 42:2
21:7	receive 29:22	41:11,18,23,25	Roswell 6:9	42:9 44:9,15
<b>question</b> 13:7	Reclamation	42:9	route 37:8,12,14	54:12,16
21:4,23 23:24	9:19	resolve 44:6	37:19	<b>seeing</b> 28:7 36:9
25:7 29:16,17	recognize 28:19	49:20 52:21	routine 13:21	41:2
32:13 39:6	recommend	resolving 44:20	<b>RPR</b> 57:19	send 15:15 18:1
41:1 42:5	40:9	respect 25:9	rule 45:5 51:8	31:1,24 32:2
45:24	record 24:11	response 9:20	run 31:22	sense 16:15
questioning 22:8	25:21,21 26:8	10:12 30:24		34:21 36:11
23:11	45:2,3 51:9,15	32:9 34:7 43:8	$\frac{S}{G_{2} + 5.5}$	44:7 46:25
questions 26:24	recording 14:22	51:18 54:21	<b>S</b> 2:1,5 5:9	48:10
55:23	14:22,24 15:4	55:24	Sacramento 2:7	sent 15:7
quick 27:1	redirect 22:10	responsible 28:8	<b>Samantha</b> 4:19	separate 12:12
quite 52:12	redoing 45:21	rest 55:18	9:16 12:15	September/Oc
Quitman 35:18	46:6	restaurant 40:9	28:4	26:18
36:5	redone 43:2	restricted 42:24	samantha@h	set 52:1
R	referred 27:6	review 50:24	4:22	<b>Seth</b> 8:20
<b>R</b> 2:1,1 4:8,19	54:8	reviewed 11:16	Santa 2:23 3:13	setting 17:25
Rael 3:7 7:23	referring 38:18	rhoffman@so	3:18 5:4,14 6:3	21:19
raise 14:8 15:15	<b>refuel</b> 34:16,17	2:9	Sarah 2:12 7:12	SEVENTH 1:14
24:9	36:18	<b>Rich</b> 8:19	saw 46:20	<b>shake</b> 54:17
	Registration	Richard 2:5	saying 41:16	<b>share</b> 19:12
raise-your-hand 16:17 19:22	57:23	7:13	43:22 55:13	shared 13:22
raised 32:13	regular 57:10,12	Richardson 6:8	says 43:18 46:1	14:3 18:14
raising 12:25	related 22:24	<b>right</b> 7:1 8:3	scenarios 16:25	ShareFile 17:18
33:8 44:14	relevance 47:10	10:2,13 11:25	scenes 20:9	<b>she'll</b> 34:6
Raley 3:2 7:24	47:21 53:12,17	14:15 17:20	schedule 32:15	sheets 47:9
ranger 28:14	relevant 49:16	20:16,24 21:20	scramble 51:13	Shelly 7:25
RAPIDS 1:15	<b>rely</b> 51:13	24:13,14,18	screen 11:3	<b>shirts</b> 40:21
rate 50:10	remedy 27:9	27:23 30:18	12:20 13:14	<b>shoot</b> 41:25
rationale 44:18	reminded 40:17	32:6,10 39:1	21:16,17 27:3	<b>short</b> 21:12
rattlesnakes	remote 1:13	40:15 43:4,6	27:10 29:8	short-sleeve
39:15 40:13	14:1	43:22 46:24	SE 1:15	40:21
	<b>report</b> 11:1 48:3	52:2 54:22	SEAL 57:16	Shorthand 57:4
rdeitchman@ 2:10	53:25	55:4,25	second 21:17	<b>show</b> 16:24 17:4
	reporter 14:23	<b>Rincon</b> 35:10,14	31:5 45:19	showing 17:13
reaction 10:19	19:3 20:5,14	37:13	secret 30:3	side 14:7 20:15
	ı	ı	ı	<u> </u>

24:17 27:11	21:3 22:14	22:5 43:14	30:5	24:10,15,17
34:13 37:11	41:1,13 46:1,5	54:1	sure 16:10 25:8	30:7 34:1
42:23	sorts 14:13	status 29:19	27:24 38:20	tells 15:14
significant 42:7	sounds 20:25	34:25 57:8,11	40:1 43:11,19	ten 32:16 52:20
similar 33:6	source 36:9	stay 55:19	45:23 51:16	tend 44:25
SIMMONS 2:6	south 4:20 34:20	staying 33:17	54:25	terms 12:17
2:12	35:18	Stein 5:3,13,13	Susan 3:7 5:8	35:22 37:21
<b>simple</b> 23:8	southern 6:6	9:6,7 25:6,7,9	7:22 9:4 10:21	Tessa 5:18 9:25
28:24	10:6,9 40:11	25:21,22 26:23	susan@robles	testified 12:17
simply 12:11	southernmost	Stein's 29:16	3:10	testifies 49:21
17:23	37:11	step 22:7	system 24:24	testify 23:3 48:6
simultaneously	space 42:19,24	Stream 8:1	36:22	49:25 52:6
16:20	42:25	streaming 16:4		testifying 11:12
single 11:2,10	speak 18:5 22:2	streamline 50:2	T	11:12 14:2
sir 32:4,5	48:18	streamlined	<b>T</b> 2:1 5:18 41:23	18:13 44:5
site 39:2,4	speaker 27:8	52:13	42:25	49:5 51:25
sites 39:14	SPECIAL 1:14	Street 2:13 3:2	take 20:19 27:10	52:9
sitting 28:11	specific 12:7	4:9	35:9 44:15	testimony 49:17
situation 52:3	22:22 46:10	strong 31:6	55:21	49:18 53:2
six 44:4 47:23	52:6,14,24	strongly 17:12	taken 57:11	tether 52:23
51:11 52:18	specifically 27:5	Stuart 2:3 7:11	talk 10:14 14:15	tethered 49:14
sketched 38:22	49:15	31:10	14:17 17:3	52:14
sklahn@soma	speed 47:13	<b>subject</b> 21:14	19:23 33:14	Texas 1:8 2:2,17
2:14	spend 55:12	submitted 54:1	38:3 39:10	2:18 5:9 7:2,11
slap 19:3	spend 55:12 spending 55:9	subset 50:8	43:7 44:25	7:15 13:21
smaller 27:8,11	ssomach@so	substantial	47:12 53:9	22:6 26:5
27:22	2:8	35:13	54:19	33:11 43:14
smaxwell@bic	staff 8:21	substantive	talked 38:5	46:24 48:15
5:10	stakeholder	34:19	talking 18:11	49:7 51:2,23
snakes 39:19	29:18	sufficient 51:25	22:20,21 26:14	57:4
Solicitor's 8:19	stand 23:5 46:7	sufficiently 21:5	30:21 33:10	<b>Texas'</b> 43:18
solutions 21:1	46:10 49:20	suggested 29:21	36:15 43:21	44:4
solve 18:22	start 7:4 32:17	37:4,8	45:1,7,17,18	text 11:14,16
Somach 2:3,6,12	34:10 35:5,17	suggesting 37:23	task 14:6	12:7,10 18:24
7:5,7,10,11	50:19	suggesting 37.23	tasked 52:4	thank 7:18
13:20 31:10,11	started 36:6	suit 40:22	tbarfield@so	26:23 29:13
32:17,19 34:1	starting 36:4	Suite 2:6,13 3:2	2:8	30:17 42:16
34:3 56:2	starting 30.4	3:8 4:9,20 5:9	team 35:15	43:6 48:14
Somach's 26:6	state 1:8,10,10	57:24	tech 19:23,23	55:25 56:1,2,3
33:7	2:2,17,20 4:1	Sullivan 8:8	technical 8:2,21	56:4
somebody 20:5	6:1 7:2,2,3,11	<b>summer</b> 18:19	14:11,25 23:23	<b>Theresa</b> 2:4 7:12
20:15 25:4	7:15,19 8:9	21:14	29:5,11 31:14	thing 13:24
27:19 31:1	10:3 40:9 49:7	summertime	technology 13:3	14:20 39:23
40:11 51:14	57:4	39:18	21:4	50:15
sorry 48:13,17	stated 57:5	sun 39:20 40:13	techy 15:24	things 14:7
54:24	States 1:5,14 4:7	support 8:20	<b>Ted</b> 43:1,5	17:13 18:1
sort 8:21 14:10	7:3 8:17 13:21	<b>Supreme</b> 1:5 7:3	tell 15:11 23:14	19:9 23:10
			<u> </u>	

44:3 47:5,16	22:3 24:2	tweak 18:7	9:1	53:5,6 54:12
53:12 54:17	31:19 39:11	tweaks 27:25	<b>Utton</b> 6:2,2 10:4	54:16,25
think 11:13 12:2	43:11 54:20	twice 35:24	10:5 26:25,25	<b>wanted</b> 24:23
13:24 14:3	today's 15:12	two 12:11 15:21		31:11 34:10
17:2,4 18:10	<b>told</b> 30:5	16:22 24:20	V	45:15
18:16,17 19:10	total 32:23	25:14,14 27:3	v 1:9 4:2	wants 25:4 26:7
20:3,10,11	tour 32:11 38:4	31:5 37:24,25	vacuum 50:11	30:2,8 51:12
21:13,18,18	38:13 39:10	38:6,14 39:14	valley 35:10,14	<b>warmth</b> 39:21
23:22,22 24:1	40:6 43:7 55:1	two-screen	35:19 36:11	Washington
24:25 25:3	<b>track</b> 19:7	10:23 11:4	van 35:12 38:25	4:15
26:11,12 27:3	transcript 1:13	<b>TX</b> 57:24	39:5	<b>wasn't</b> 14:6
27:20 29:6,10	57:7	<b>type</b> 47:22	vans 35:7 38:4	watch 13:11,18
32:21 33:1,6,7	<b>trial</b> 11:24 12:6	<b>types</b> 47:9 51:17	38:18	28:10
33:9,10,16,24	12:9 13:2		various 17:13	water 5:1 8:22
35:1 37:1,20	14:12 15:3	<u>U</u>	Vega-Brown	9:1,8,11 21:12
38:19 39:8	17:23 18:2,6	<b>U.S</b> 4:9,14 30:21	25:15,23	34:21 41:5
44:3,4,19,25	19:1,6 21:8,25	ultimate 52:15	versus 7:2 19:10	42:8
46:4,15 47:2	22:15 27:17,18	<b>ultimately</b> 23:24 49:12 54:14	video 10:17,19	way 13:24 17:22
48:2,15,21	27:24 29:20		21:7 29:16,22 29:25 32:7	19:11 23:1
49:9,22 50:1,3	44:3,17 45:21	understand 14:21 15:1	view 10:23 11:2	26:9 28:15
51:23 52:2	46:6 47:12,14	23:17 25:10	11:4,10 12:11	29:19 31:24
53:18 54:6,16	47:15,20 50:5	33:17 35:16,23	12:17 29:6	32:22 34:2
55:20	50:21,23 51:1	42:19 43:12	34:19 36:11,21	35:5 36:3,7,20
thinking 31:7	51:11 52:14,20	44:23,24 47:17	41:3,7,18	40:5 41:20
34:1,10 35:4	54:15	48:8 50:16,22	44:10 46:5	42:13 44:16
35:14	trier 28:12	51:23	view-only 14:7	50:2
Thompson 3:1	trip 35:8 40:24	understanding	viewed 16:19	ways 16:22
7:23	trouble 48:18	18:3 34:13	visibility 27:2	we'll 13:8 14:15
thought 36:15	troubling 23:3	41:14 43:13	visit 38:8	16:8 17:3,15
36:20 37:6	Trout 3:2 7:24	53:1	visiting 39:2	29:9,11,11
43:25 54:4	<b>true</b> 36:10 57:6	understood	visiting 33:2 volume 33:6	31:13,17,17,18
thoughts 29:23	57:7	30:12,13	49:1 52:12	33:19 37:25 40:6 41:4
33:4 38:15 thousands 53:21	truly 52:23 Truth 34:11	<b>United</b> 1:5,14		50:10 52:1
tie 24:24 40:22	35:6,8,19 36:5	4:7 7:3 8:17	$\mathbf{W}$	55:19
time 13:23 17:15	37:12,15 41:5	13:21 22:5	<b>W</b> 6:2	we're 12:8 13:12
23:15,16,19	41:17 42:18	43:14 54:1	wait 50:24 51:16	14:10 16:4
24:10,15 26:13	try 28:6 34:15	universe 50:6	<b>walk</b> 46:13	18:10,17 20:6
31:9,17 36:19	40:6 41:8	University 6:1	<b>Wallace</b> 4:2 8:4	23:1,7,21 24:1
37:21 40:10,20	47:14 49:20	10:3	8:5 29:14,15	24:19,20,22
46:24 47:16	trying 28:8	unresolved 38:2	30:12,17 56:4	28:11 30:7
50:21 51:25	36:20 44:5	<b>Upham</b> 42:22	want 12:22	31:4 32:14,19
52:22 54:6	ttd@tessadavi	use 11:24 13:4	14:17 17:19	32:22,23 33:8
55:12,16 57:8	5:21	27:18 50:14	19:22 24:11	33:10,20 37:14
times 20:4 23:10	<b>Tuesday</b> 31:7,8	52:24	30:1,6,10 36:3	37:17 39:2,4
today 8:6 12:4	<b>Turner</b> 43:1,5	<b>utilities</b> 25:19,24	38:5 42:13	39:20 43:20,22
15:7,18 19:19	turns 33:19	<b>Utility</b> 5:1 8:23	45:22 52:17	45:1,18 46:10
,	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	,

47:6 48:7 50:3	34:24 44:16	<b>Zach</b> 7:21	<b>2067</b> 5:3,14	<b>570-4591</b> 3:14
50:5,7,16,17	45:5 46:24	Zachary 3:17	<b>223</b> 57:23	<b>575</b> 4:21 6:9
50:21,23,23	47:23 48:5,6,9	zogaz@nmag	<b>2240</b> 5:19	
52:2 53:23	49:12,19,21,25	3:20	<b>235</b> 57:24	6
54:25	50:9,13 51:12	<b>Zoom</b> 13:2	<b>2386</b> 6:3	<b>604</b> 6:8
we've 38:5 41:12	51:25 52:5,14	14:11 16:5,5,9	23rd 55:1	<b>624-2463</b> 6:9
53:25	52:24,25 53:3	16:15 22:11	23rd/24th 32:12	<b>636-2377</b> 4:21
webinar 16:5	53:8	24:10 27:6	<b>242-2228</b> 3:9	<b>699-1445</b> 6:4
Wechsler 2:21	witness's 49:17	30:3	24th 55:1	
7:16,18,19	49:18		<b>25th</b> 33:13 55:3	7
11:22,25 12:1	witnesses 22:22	0	<b>26th</b> 57:17	<b>700</b> 3:8
12:5 17:6,10	23:12 34:23	<b>04-30-22</b> 57:20	<b>2701</b> 2:13	<b>720</b> 2:14 4:4
17:11 24:23	44:5 46:9 53:3		<b>279-7868</b> 2:14	<b>7611</b> 4:15
33:4,5,23	word 48:2	1	<b>27th</b> 31:7,8,17	<b>77027</b> 57:24
35:17 37:3,5,7	words 52:7	<b>1</b> 9:9,12,19 22:2	<b>28th</b> 31:7	<b>78711</b> 2:18
37:23 43:23	work 17:8,22	38:10	<b>2nd</b> 43:16,25	<b>78746</b> 5:9
45:8,13 46:3	18:3,15 21:1,5	<b>1,500</b> 53:25	44:11 45:16,19	<b>792-3636</b> 5:20
47:25 48:16,22	21:16,23 24:7	<b>1:00</b> 31:18,22	45:25 46:5	<b>7th</b> 4:3
50:15 51:20	37:2,24 42:8	32:3	49:6,23 54:5,7	
53:22 56:3	43:5 53:20	<b>10</b> 50:8		8
Wechsler's	55:12	<b>100</b> 15:12,18	3	800-745-1101
27:18 49:3	worked 14:17,19	18:6 19:19	<b>3:10</b> 56:5	57:25
Wednesday 31:8	25:2	<b>1000</b> 2:6	<b>30</b> 39:5	<b>80202</b> 4:10
week 32:15,15	<b>working</b> 26:18	<b>1100</b> 4:20	<b>300</b> 5:9	<b>80203</b> 3:3 4:4
weeks 19:1	31:14 34:5	<b>111</b> 1:14	<b>3000</b> 57:24	<b>80205</b> 2:13
24:21 31:5	works 21:18	<b>1120</b> 3:2	<b>303</b> 3:3 4:10	<b>8262</b> 57:20
37:25	31:23	<b>113</b> 2:13	<b>325</b> 2:22 3:13	<b>844-1375</b> 4:10
welcome 25:5	Worldwide	<b>12548</b> 2:17	<b>329-4672</b> 3:19	<b>861-1963</b> 3:3
39:3	14:16,24 17:9	<b>13</b> 1:13	<b>370</b> 4:9	<b>87048</b> 5:20
went 10:20	17:22 57:23	<b>1300</b> 4:3	<b>3711</b> 5:9	<b>87102</b> 3:8
22:15 39:14	wouldn't 26:5	<b>141</b> 1:2 7:4		<b>87501</b> 2:23 3:13
42:10	27:10 30:9,20	<b>150</b> 36:25	4	3:18
Weslayan 57:24	wrapping 50:16	<b>1508</b> 3:18	<b>4206</b> 5:19	<b>87504</b> 5:4,14 6:3
west 41:25	wrong 22:16	<b>1600</b> 3:2	<b>446-7979</b> 2:7	88005 4:21
western 37:11	23:18	<b>18th</b> 4:9	<b>463-2012</b> 2:18	<b>88202</b> 6:9
whatnot 19:25		<b>1989</b> 48:4	<b>472-8021</b> 5:10	9
whatsoever 15:8	X	2	5	<b>9,000</b> 19:7 46:21
whittle 50:20	<b>X</b> 28:23	<del></del>		48:23 49:9
willing 33:12		<b>2,000</b> 53:25	<b>50</b> 50:10	50:4,18,25
witness 10:24	<u>Y</u>	<b>2:00</b> 31:19 55:15	<b>500</b> 2:6 3:8	52:6
11:4,11,17,18	yeah 7:18 15:5	55:17	<b>505</b> 2:23 3:9,14	9,000-plus 49:23
12:8 13:15,19	18:16 24:13	<b>2:01</b> 1:15	3:19 5:4,15,20	52:5
13:25 14:2	34:3 45:11	<b>20</b> 4:20 32:21,22	6:4	<b>916</b> 2:7
18:13 20:6	year 40:20	42:12 50:8	<b>508-6281</b> 4:4	<b>95814</b> 2:7
22:11 23:2	yesterday 25:1	<b>20044</b> 4:15	<b>512</b> 2:18 5:10	<b>983-3880</b> 5:4,15
27:2,10,21	$\overline{\mathbf{z}}$	<b>202</b> 4:16	<b>514-3553</b> 4:16	<b>986-2637</b> 2:23
28:13,17 29:8		<b>2021</b> 1:13 57:17	<b>52401</b> 1:15	700- <b>2</b> 03   2.23
<u>,</u>			<u> </u>	<u> </u>

Page 70

	 	Page 70
<b>999</b> 4:9		