NO. 141 Original

In The

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

STATE OF TEXAS v. STATE OF NEW MEXICO and STATE OF COLORADO

TRANSCRIPT OF JUNE 24, 2022, HEARING BEFORE HONORABLE MICHAEL A. MELLOY, SPECIAL MASTER, UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE, taken at THOMAS F. EAGLETON UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE, 111 South 10th Street, St. Louis, Missouri, beginning at 9:00 a.m.

1	APPEARANCES
2 3	FOR THE STATE OF TEXAS: Mr. Stuart L. Somach
4	Ms. Theresa C. Barfield SOMACH SIMMONS & DUNN 500 Capitol Mall, Suite 1000
5	Sacramento, California 95814 (916) 446-7979
6	ssomach@somachlaw.com tbarfield@somachlaw.com
7	
8	-and-
9	Ms. Sarah A. Klahn SOMACH SIMMONS & DUNN 2701 Lawrence Street, Suite 113
10	Denver, Colorado 80205 (720) 279-7868
11	sklahn@somachlaw.com
12	-and-
13	Ms. Priscilla M. Hubenak STATE OF TEXAS ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE
14	Post Office Box 12548 Austin, Texas 78711
15	(512) 463-2012 priscilla.hubenak@oag.texas.gov
16	
17	FOR THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO:
18	Mr. Jeffrey Wechsler MONTGOMERY & ANDREWS
19	325 Paseo De Peralta Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501
20	(505) 986-2637 jwechsler@montand.com
21	-and-
22	
23	Ms. Lisa M. Thompson TROUT RALEY 1120 Lincoln Street, Suite 1600
24	Denver, Colorado 80203
25	(303) 861-1963 lthompson@troutlaw.com

```
1
         -and-
 2
         Ms. Cholla Khoury
         Mr. Zachary E. Ogaz
 3
         NEW MEXICO ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE
         Post Office Drawer 1508
 4
         Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501
         (505) 329-4672
 5
         ckhoury@nmag.gov
         zogaz@nmag.gov
 6
 7
     FOR THE STATE OF COLORADO:
 8
         Mr. Chad Wallace
         COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF LAW
 9
         1300 Broadway, 7th Floor
         Denver, Colorado 80203
10
         (720) 508-6281
         chad.wallace@coag.gov
11
12
     FOR THE UNITED STATES:
13
         Mr. R. Lee Leininger
         U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
14
         999 18th Street, Suite 370
         Denver, Colorado 80202
15
         (303) 844-1375
         lee.leininger@usdoj.gov
16
         -and-
17
         Ms. Judith E. Coleman
18
         U.S. Department of Justice
         Post Office Box 7611
19
         Washington, DC 20044
         (202) 514-3553
20
         judith.coleman@usdoj.gov
21
         -and-
22
         Ms. Shelly Randel
         U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
23
         1849 C Street NW
         Washington, DC 20240
24
         (202) 208-5432
         shelly.randel@sol.doi.gov
25
```

```
1
         -and-
 2
         Mr. Christopher B. Rich
         U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
 3
         125 South State Street, Suite 6201
         Salt Lake City, Utah 84138
 4
         (801) 524-5677
 5
     FOR THE EL PASO COUNTY WATER AND IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT
 б
     NO. 1:
 7
         Ms. Maria O'Brien
         MODRALL SPERLING ROEHL HARRIS & SISK, P.A.
 8
         500 Fourth Street N.W.
         Albuquerque, New Mexico 87103
 9
         (505) 848-1800
         mobrien@modrall.com
10
         -and-
11
         Mr. Renea Hicks
12
         LAW OFFICE OF MAX RENEA HICKS
         Post Office Box 303187
13
         Austin, Texas 78703
         (512) 480-8231
14
         rhicks@renea-hicks.com
15
     FOR THE ELEPHANT BUTTE IRRIGATION DISTRICT:
16
         Ms. Samantha R. Barncastle
17
         BARNCASTLE LAW FIRM, LLC
         1100 South Main, Suite 20
18
         Las Cruces, New Mexico 88005
         (575) 636-2377
19
         samantha@h2o-legal.com
20
     FOR THE ALBUQUERQUE BERNALILLO COUNTY WATER UTILITY
21
     AUTHORITY AND THE CITY OF LAS CRUCES:
22
         Mr. James C. Brockmann
         STEIN & BROCKMANN, P.A.
23
         Post Office Box 2067
         Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504
24
         (505) 983-3880
         jcbrockmann@newmexicowaterlaw.com
25
```

```
1
     FOR THE CITY OF EL PASO:
 2
         Mr. Douglas G. Caroom
         BICKERSTAFF HEATH DELGADO ACOSTA, LLP
 3
         3711 S. MoPac Expressway Building One, Suite 300
         Austin, Texas 78746
 4
         (512) 472-8021
         dcaroom@bickerstaff.com
 5
 б
     FOR THE CITY OF LAS CRUCES:
 7
         Mr. Jay F. Stein
         STEIN & BROCKMAN, P.A.
 8
         Post Office Box 2067
         Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504
 9
         (505) 983-3880
         jfstein@newmexicowaterlaw.com
10
11
     FOR THE NEW MEXICO PECAN GROWERS, NEW MEXICO STATE
     UNIVERSITY, AND SOUTHERN RIO GRANDE DIVERSIFIED CROP
12
     FARMERS ASSOCIATION:
13
         Ms. Tessa T. Davidson
         DAVIDSON LAW FIRM, LLC
14
         4206 Corrales Road
         Post Office Box 2240
15
         Corrales, New Mexico 87048
         (505) 792-3636
16
         ttd@tessadavidson.com
17
     COURT REPORTER:
18
         Ms. Heather L. Garza
19
         WORLDWIDE COURT REPORTERS
         3000 Weslayan Street, Suite 235
20
         Houston, Texas 77027
         (800) 745-1101
21
         heather_garza@ymail.com
22
23
24
25
```

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	JUDGE MELLOY: Please be seated. Good
3	morning, everyone. It's nice after two years to
4	finally be back together in person for a hearing.
5	I've seen a lot of you on camera, but it's nice to be
6	here, as I say, in person for a change. This is, of
7	course, in the United States Supreme Court Original
8	No. 141, State of Texas versus State of New Mexico and
9	State of Colorado with the United States as
10	intervenor. So let me start by indicating that I'll
11	take appearances. I know we do have some people who
12	are participating by telephone or are at least
13	listening in by telephone. I'm not going to take
14	their appearances because they're basically
15	spectators, but I will take the appearances of all the
16	counsel who are present. So we'll start with the
17	State of Texas. Mr. Somach?
18	MR. SOMACH: Yes, Your Honor. Stuart
19	Somach, counsel of record for the State of Texas.
20	With me at counsel table are Theresa Barfield and
21	Sarah Klahn with my office, and Priscilla Hubenak of
22	the Texas Attorney General's Office. In the audience
23	is Mr. Bobby Skov. He's the Texas Rio Grande
24	Commissioner.
25	JUDGE MELLOY: Thank you. And for New

Г

1 Mexico?

2	MR. WECHSLER: Good morning, Your Honor.
3	Jeff Wechsler on behalf of the State of New Mexico.
4	With me in front of the bar we have Cholla Khoury,
5	chief deputy attorney general, Zachary Ogaz, also with
6	the attorney general's office, and Lisa Thompson from
7	Trout Raley. We also have with us the state engineer
8	and Compact commissioner, Mr. Mike Hamman, and the
9	interstate stream commission director, Dr. Rolf
10	Schmidt-Petersen.
11	JUDGE MELLOY: Thank you. State of
12	Colorado?
13	MR. WALLACE: Good morning, Your Honor.
14	Chad Wallace, counsel of record for the State of
15	Colorado. In the audience today is Michael Sullivan,
16	the deputy state engineer.
17	JUDGE MELLOY: And for the United
18	States?
19	MR. LEININGER: Good morning, Your
20	Honor. Lee Leininger for the United States, and at
21	the table with me is Judith Coleman, Department of
22	Justice, and I'm joined from the solicitor's office
23	Chris Rich and Shelly Randel, and for the Bureau of
24	Reclamation, Jennifer Faler.
25	JUDGE MELLOY: Thank you. All right.

1 Do we have anyone here from the Albuquerque Bernalillo 2 County Water Utility Authority? 3 MR. BROCKMANN: Yes, Your Honor. Jim 4 Brockmann, counsel of record for the Albuquerque 5 Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority. б JUDGE MELLOY: City of El Paso. 7 MR. CAROOM: Good morning, Your Honor. 8 Doug Caroom for the City of El Paso. 9 JUDGE MELLOY: City of Las Cruces? 10 MR. STEIN: Yes, Your Honor. Jay Stein 11 appearing for the City of Las Cruces, the city 12 utility's director and assistant director are joining 13 remotely. 14 JUDGE MELLOY: El Paso County Water 15 Improvement District No. 1? 16 MS. O'BRIEN: Good morning, Your Honor. 17 Maria O'Brien and Renea Hicks for El Paso County Water 18 Improvement District No. 1. 19 Elephant Butte Irrigation JUDGE MELLOY: 20 District. 21 MS. BARNCASTLE: Good morning, Your 22 Honor. Samantha Barncastle for the Elephant Butte 23 Irrigation District. 24 JUDGE MELLOY: Hudspeth County 25 Conservation and Reclamation District No. 1, anyone?

	rage
1	
1 2	(No response.)
	JUDGE MELLOY: New Mexico pecan growers?
3	MS. DAVIDSON: Good morning, Your Honor.
4	Tessa Davidson for New Mexico pecan growers, and I've
5	also been asked to appear for the Southern Rio Grande
б	diversified crop farmers and New Mexico State
7	University. Mr. Olsen and Mr. Utton's schedules did
8	not allow them to appear today, and they ask that I
9	speak on their behalf.
10	JUDGE MELLOY: I'm sorry. You're
11	appearing for New Mexico State University, as well?
12	MS. DAVIDSON: Yes, sir.
13	JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Thank you.
14	All right. I think that's all the parties. Did I
15	miss anybody?
16	(No response.)
17	JUDGE MELLOY: And, of course, we have
18	present the mediator in this case, Judge Arthur
19	Boylan. First of all, I do want to thank the district
20	court here in Eastern District of Missouri, Chief
21	Judge Sippel and his staff and the clerk's office for
22	making these facilities available and all their
23	assistance in setting up the hearing this morning. I
24	guess there was a little confusion about my prior
25	order concerning a status report. I had when I

1 entered that order, it was on the assumption that the 2 mediation would be concluded after the session in El 3 Paso because there was some discussion that that was 4 going to be the make or break session and so I was 5 anticipating that we would know one way or the other б where the case stood after that mediation; however, as 7 I understand, mediation has continued up until 8 vesterday here in St. Louis. So in lieu of that 9 written report, maybe I'll ask Judge Boylan to come 10 forward and just tell us from your perspective where 11 you think you are.

12 JUDGE BOYLAN: Good morning, Your Honor. 13 Let me suggest the following that the summary of our 14 -- our meetings are as follows. I think we met for at 15 least 25 days. I've lost count. But we've met with 16 -- in sessions in St. Paul, Minnesota; Denver, 17 Colorado; Albuquerque, New Mexico; El Paso, Texas, 18 Minneapolis, Minnesota; Atlanta, Georgia; Fort Myers, 19 Florida; as well as St. Louis, Missouri. Amici have 20 attended some of these sessions and portions of 21 The parties have worked diligently and in others. 22 good faith in an attempt to reach an appropriate 23 resolution of the matters in litigation. I will say 24 from my own perspective, there's been a great deal of 25 goodwill. There's been a great deal of trust that's

1 been generated by the meetings that we've conducted. 2 I think it's fair to say that the parties have reached 3 tentative agreements on some principles of an 4 agreement, which could and may be finally agreed upon, 5 but we're not there yet. One of the things that I б think the Court is going to be asked is, by the 7 parties, what the Court's thoughts are concerning the 8 scheduling of the trial in October. I think each of 9 the parties, as I understand it in visiting with them 10 this morning, are willing to continue engaging in 11 settlement discussions. I think each of them would 12 tell you that we've made a great deal of progress. I 13 also believe that they have different opinions that 14 you'll hear expressed about whether or not that trial 15 should remain or whether -- so -- so that dual tracks 16 of settlement and trial preparation can take place or 17 whether it's impossible to have a dual track because 18 of various issues call for a party if trial is going 19 to continue to be scheduled in October that settlement 20 be pushed off to the side -- pardon me -- and that --21 that their complete and total efforts be directed 22 towards trial. And you're going to hear, I think, the 23 parties' various views on that.

I have a view that I'll express, and that's this: I think that the trial, if conducted in

1 October, will likely mean an end to the settlement 2 discussions. That's my view, but I'm not positive 3 that that will be true. I do think that if trial is 4 conducted, that there is still a remedies portion of 5 the trial that will have to be scheduled thereafter, б and that remedies schedule and the remedies that may 7 have -- may be imposed by the Court in any such order 8 likely means that it will take years to get back to 9 the spot that we're at today. I would suggest at 10 least in my own view that continued settlement efforts 11 are indeed warranted and will be fruitful if we're 12 allowed to do that. 13 JUDGE MELLOY: Well, one of the -- I 14 quess one of the questions that comes to mind is I --

15 I know that we -- we've had various deadlines 16 established, and in the last status conference, we 17 were talking the El Paso week was going to be the 18 make-of-break week, and now, they continue. And I 19 know it's probably impossible to say, but how much 20 more time do you think is necessary to -- to -- to 21 continue the negotiations to -- I mean, I -- how many 22 issues are still out there and how long do you think 23 it's going to take to get them resolved.

JUDGE BOYLAN: I'm not quite sure if I can nail down the number of issues that are out there,

1 but I can at least give the Court some road map of 2 what I believe would be involved if we were to 3 continue settlement negotiations. I think by the end 4 of September, either we have a written agreement, as 5 opposed to all kinds of oral agreements, and that if б the -- if September 30th arises, and there is no 7 written agreement, then I think that the Court can be told with all assurances from myself that the matter 8 9 should proceed to trial. If we did have a written 10 agreement by September 30th, I would foresee that that 11 would be an agreement that would call for certain 12 measures to be arrived at between September and 13 probably the first quarter of 2023, including perhaps 14 regulatory action by various parts -- parties or 15 legislative action by various parties to make sure 16 that the provisions of the settlement agreement, as 17 described in that written document, would come to 18 fruition. So it would not be a settlement agreement 19 that would be fully enforceable as of that date, but 20 would have some degree of responsible parties doing X, 21 Y, or Z between that date and the end of the first 22 quarter of 2023, and that would be to accomplish the 23 legislative changes that have to be enacted for that 24 settlement to become effective.

25

JUDGE MELLOY: And you would envision

1 that there would be a written agreement by -- by 2 September, if there is an agreement? 3 JUDGE BOYLAN: Correct. JUDGE MELLOY: And maybe I need to 4 5 address this more to the parties, but would you б envision then at that point ultimate Supreme Court 7 approval of that agreement, which would mean, I guess 8 by necessity, notice, hearing, report from me to the 9 Supreme Court or -- or is this something that the 10 Supreme Court wouldn't have to rule upon? 11 JUDGE BOYLAN: I think that the parties 12 would envision that at the end of that legislative 13 action being taken, that an evidentiary hearing would 14 be scheduled before you, the experts would be 15 available to testify to the Court's satisfaction, and 16 that they would ask the Court to undertake making a 17 report and recommendation to the Supreme Court that 18 the settlement, if approved by this Court, be adopted 19 by the Supreme Court. The parties perhaps would have 20 a better handle on it as to the procedural posturing 21 the settlement would take, but I believe that that's a 22 fair -- a fair description of what would take place. 23 JUDGE MELLOY: Have you scheduled a 24 further mediation session at this point? 25 JUDGE BOYLAN: No.

1 JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. 2 JUDGE BOYLAN: We were awaiting your --3 your decision this morning, Judge. 4 JUDGE MELLOY: Thank you. All right. 5 Anything else you can think of? JUDGE BOYLAN: б I don't believe so. 7 JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Thank you. 8 Thank you, Judge. JUDGE BOYLAN: 9 JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Well, I guess 10 let's start with you, Mr. Somach. Where do you think 11 we are? 12 MR. SOMACH: Well, I would echo Judge 13 Boylan's statement that we've spent a lot of days 14 mediating. 15 JUDGE MELLOY: Excuse me a second. Why 16 don't you pull that. There you go. Thank you. 17 MR. SOMACH: Can you hear me? 18 JUDGE MELLOY: Yeah. 19 MR. SOMACH: We've spent a lot of days 20 mediating in a lot of different locations. I think 21 everybody has acted in good faith, and I think we have 22 developed a level of trust in terms of moving forward. 23 We've also made great progress on a lot of issues and, 24 you know, from the State of Texas perspective have --25 have hopes that if we are -- if we continue

1 discussions, that we will -- that we may well reach 2 settlement. But we are not in favor of continuing the 3 trial date. We believe that the trial date should 4 remain October 3rd. That's not to telegraph an 5 unwillingness to continue to -- to talk settlement. б We believe that we can do both of those things. If we 7 thought that there would be a final deal done by September 23rd, we might have a different view, but as 8 9 you'll hear from the other parties, that, in our view, 10 is not what's being proposed. What's being proposed 11 is that there will be a tentative agreement on 12 September 23rd and then there will be need for the 13 United States to decide whether or not they're going 14 to finally agree, which will take them, they say, 15 until December, and that the agreement, even in 16 December, is predicated upon legislative action in New 17 Mexico, which is estimated by New Mexico to be 18 somewhere around April of 2023. So from -- so from 19 September 23rd in this -- this hypothetical timeline 20 when we would have reached agreement, the State of 21 Texas will basically sit on its hands until some time 22 in April with the hope that the United States will 23 approve a settlement and that the New Mexico state 24 legislature will enact legislation. We've been at 25 this since 2013. That puts a decision of settlement

1 or trial into 2023, which is a decade after we 2 initiated this litigation with absolutely no relief on 3 the part of anybody with respect to the real and 4 serious claims that the State of Texas has made. 5 Again, our view is that we should continue with the б trial date. We are willing to continue to talk 7 negotiation with the parties with the hope perhaps, 8 and we would propose an August either status 9 conference or, quite frankly, pre-trial hearing so 10 that we can report back to you either that we have 11 some kind of an agreement that -- that we're willing 12 to -- to endorse that would allow a continuance of the 13 trial or to proceed in the normal pre-trial hearing 14 with -- with those things that we would do. 15 JUDGE MELLOY: Well, where would we be 16 if the parties were able to come to an agreement that 17 was subject to these various contingencies in 18 Where would that leave us? Would you say September? 19 we'd still go ahead with the trial while the United 20 States was getting their approvals and New Mexico was 21 trying to enact their legislation or would we at that 22 point continue the trial? What --23 MR. SOMACH: Yes. The latter is what we 24 were thinking because at that point, we would have 25 more -- more to evaluate from the State of Texas'

1 perspective with respect to whether or not this is a 2 true settlement or not. We just don't have -- we 3 don't have the faith. We don't have a settlement on 4 paper. We have no commitment that we will have a 5 settlement by September 23rd, and that commitment, б whatever it is that comes on September 23rd, won't be 7 a final commitment. It will be a conditional 8 commitment on things that we have absolutely no power 9 We have, quite frankly, no interest in either, of. 10 but -- but those are impediments to -- to our being 11 able to either go to trial or settle the case. We 12 would be willing to commit to a settlement, a final 13 settlement, on September 23rd if we could reach it, 14 but that's not what's being proposed here. That's not 15 the proposal. The proposal is we'll see if we can get 16 a final tentative approval by the 23rd, then it'll 17 have to go through the United States' approval 18 process, and there has to be legislation by the New 19 Mexico legislature, which is quite a different thing. 20 But if we continue to negotiate and have something, an 21 agreement on the 23rd of September, we would be 22 willing to sit down and reevaluate at that point the 23 best way to proceed. But at this point in time, we're 24 not prepared to give up the -- the trial date that --25 that -- that we have, which has been deferred for any

1 number of reasons already for a great deal of time. 2 JUDGE MELLOY: Well, in your view -- and 3 I'll ask the other parties the same thing -- are the 4 issues that remain ones that you think are 5 surmountable or are there some pretty major obstacles that are going to be very, very difficult to get over? б 7 MR. SOMACH: From -- from the Texas 8 perspective, the issues of concern to us, we think 9 we're in pretty good shape with. And this is, of 10 course, part of the problem. It's the issues that 11 other people have posed or -- or imposed, including 12 the need for legislation, that we think we have 13 absolutely no certainty that those things are 14 surmountable. And that's part of it. If we had some 15 faith that after all of this time -- because what 16 we're talking about really is -- is April or May of 17 That's -- that's essentially a year from today, 2023. 18 you know, more or less, by the time we -- if it all 19 fell apart, by the time we get back to trial. We have 20 absolutely no faith or certainty that that will occur, 21 notwithstanding what I think are the good faith 22 representations that are being made. But I just --23 one -- one cannot predict what happens in a 24 legislative process. I'm sorry. You know, it's just 25 not something that one can rely upon, particularly

1 when it's another state's legislative process on top 2 of everything else, state that you're in litigation 3 with. 4 JUDGE MELLOY: Anything else you want to 5 say? б MR. SOMACH: No, Your Honor. 7 JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Thank you. 8 What's your view, Mr. Wechsler? 9 MR. WECHSLER: Your Honor, we talked 10 about this and thought it might be easier for you to understand if the United States went next. 11 12 JUDGE MELLOY: All right. 13 Mr. Leininger? 14 MR. LEININGER: Thank you, Your Honor. 15 Good morning. As -- as Judge Boylan stated, we do --16 the parties do have different views on the likelihood 17 of success of this settlement effort. It has been a 18 long road. We have had at least 25 in-person days. 19 What Judge Boylan didn't mention, we've also had 20 numerous Zoom conferences for this effort. We feel at 21 this point that delaying the trial, postponing the 22 trial, is the right path because what we are proposing 23 is that in September -- we want to put a date on that, 24 September 23rd -- Friday, September 23rd, we have a 25 complete settlement, proposed decree with appendices,

1 ready for respective lines of approval. So they would 2 go up through various states, and in our case, we have 3 certain federal regulatory statutory requirements. So 4 we have discussions with the SG. What would be 5 required would be approval from Department of б interior. It would have to go up through DOJ and the 7 SG's office. That process would take approximately 8 So that's where we land on the end of three months. 9 this year for purposes of signing this document. The 10 effective date continued on the legislation is because 11 the New Mexico legislation does not go into session 12 again until January. So we have a few items that 13 would require legislative approval. I think all the 14 parties agree on that, and that would be addressed in 15 the legislative session. So the conclusion of this 16 process we see in April of next year. We are complete 17 with this process. The problem we have with trying 18 this dual track of continuing negotiations and preparation for trial is that we just don't have the 19 20 resources to do this. We cannot commit the -- the 21 amount of manpower and hours that are required to 22 prepare for this trial. This trial has over 25 23 witnesses, most of whom are expert witnesses. So the 24 preparation for an October 3rd trial needs to 25 commence, and it needs to be the primary focus. So

being able to do that and complete our settlement negotiations with this September 23rd deadline is just unattainable in our view.

Well, I kind of hear two 4 JUDGE MELLOY: 5 things about the settlement. One is you need time to б document it, and I anticipate that that would happen. 7 In fact, at the last status conference, I know Judge 8 Boylan had indicated that he hoped that at some point, 9 we could at least have a term sheet that everybody 10 would tentatively agree upon but then it would take 11 two to three months to reduce whatever is agreed upon 12 to a final written agreement that would be signed and 13 subject to court approval, but I guess I'm not -- it's 14 not clear to me where you think we are. Are we still 15 in a phase where we've got to get to that term sheet 16 stage and then do the final agreement or do you think 17 you're basically at an agreement that you can start 18 drafting?

19 MR. LEININGER: The latter. I think we 20 have made remarkable progress in this -- in this case, 21 especially this week. I mean, nothing like -- nothing 22 like this status conference which allowed the parties to focus on their real efforts. So, yes, I think 23 24 we're -- we're at that stage where putting it to pen. 25 JUDGE MELLOY: Well, Mr. Somach

Page 23

1 indicates that basically Texas seems to be on board with -- with their issues. Are you on board with your 2 3 issues with -- with all the other parties? I mean, I 4 know subject to the various levels of approval, but I 5 assume you've been talking to people in the SG's б office and the Department of Interior and Reclamation 7 and whoever else you have to -- I mean, I assume if --8 if somebody had a big problem with this, you'd know it 9 by now, wouldn't you?

10 Absolutely. MR. LEININGER: I mean, 11 this -- this case has been remarkable in my career the 12 amount of communication that we've had with our 13 advisors and superiors, including in the SG's office. 14 So, yes, it's -- it's -- what -- what is being 15 discussed and envisioned for settlement purposes will 16 not come as a surprise to anyone at our -- at our 17 approval chain. So we do feel that at this point, the 18 effort should be devoted toward drafting that final 19 proposed decree. We have experts also that have put 20 in considerable efforts on this so it's complex, and 21 that part of it is also ongoing, which would be 22 attached to this proposed decree so that we have a 23 final settlement for this -- for this case, for this 24 Compact case.

25

JUDGE MELLOY: Do you envision -- what

1 do you envision the procedure to be as far as the 2 Supreme Court is concerned? What's the involvement of 3 the Supreme Court, this settlement?

MR. LEININGER: Well, I -- I think at 4 5 this point what we are envisioning is just as Judge б Boylan mentioned, that we would have an evidentiary 7 hearing so that we can present to you all of the facts 8 that support what we are proposing in a settled decree 9 amongst the parties, that that would then be subject 10 to your report for purposes of the Supreme Court. 11 Alternatively, if we go to trial and you issue your --12 your order and -- some party will take exception. Ι 13 think there's no -- no doubt we would likely have 14 exception, exceptions will be taken, have to go up, a 15 couple of years, we're back then to proceed under a 16 ruling in which we'll try to draft a remedy. So we 17 are looking at -- at years more of this case versus 18 the settlement route, which ideally could be complete 19 next year.

JUDGE MELLOY: Well, just so I understand, you believe that come Monday, the parties can sit down and start putting together an agreement that you have agreed upon?

24 MR. LEININGER: Right. In writing, yes.
 25 Writing the language for the proposed decree.

1	JUDGE MELLOY: Do you do you believe
2	that you could sit down today and write out a term
3	sheet that basically outlines what the agreement is?
4	MR. LEININGER: We have everything is
5	based upon the terms of of the agreement, but the
6	direction that we have had and it's a very good
7	question because the other parties have asked it, and,
8	in fact, Judge Boylan has asked that question, but
9	that is not the United States doesn't have an
10	agreement until it has an agreement. So we need to
11	have all of these pieces in place and ready for our
12	recommendation that then goes up to the SG's office
13	and to our superiors at at Department of Justice.
14	And, again, as you as you asked, we have have
15	weekly, sometimes even more often communication with
16	all those entities to make sure we are on a path that
17	we think that we have some assurance we can reach
18	final settlement.
19	JUDGE MELLOY: Well, what happens I'm
20	curious. Let do each of these entities within the
21	federal government have veto nower over a gettlement

21 federal government have veto power over a settlement 22 or is it if Interior says yes and SG says no or SG 23 says yes and Interior says no, one has -- one has --24 can outvote the other? How does that work? 25 MR. LEININGER: The SG has -- has

1	ultimate authority. We we, as the line attorneys
2	who have been involved in this case, in my case for
3	six years or more, write our our recommendation,
4	which is then has to be approved. We have to do it
5	in conjunction with Department of Interior so their
б	approval is required. That package then is likely at
7	that point from our assistant AG level to go to the
8	Solicitor General's Office for for ultimately
9	for the SG.
10	JUDGE MELLOY: And does the Solicitor
11	General herself, is that the person who has to
12	ultimately sign the agreement?
13	MR. LEININGER: I believe that's
14	correct.
15	MS. COLEMAN: Ultimately has to approve
16	it. I'm not sure about signing.
17	JUDGE MELLOY: Who signs on behalf of
18	the United States? Does the attorney general himself
19	have to do that or does the solicitor general or chief
20	of the civil division or who?
21	MR. LEININGER: I honestly don't know
22	the answer to that question. The the person that
23	we're dealing with on a regular basis is is the
24	deputy solicitor general, and he has brought this case
25	to the attention numerous times of the SG. But I I

1 don't know who ultimately would sign this. 2 JUDGE MELLOY: Well, I guess I want to 3 make clear, though, as far as you're concerned, there 4 are no terms that need to be negotiated yet that --5 that would prevent you from starting to draft an б agreement today? 7 MR. LEININGER: That is -- that is 8 There are still some terms and some values, correct. 9 which we think have to be completed in our 10 negotiation. That would be part of the process, as we 11 -- as we continue -- as we put this settlement to 12 paper. 13 **JUDGE MELLOY:** Now, what do you mean by 14 terms and values? 15 MR. LEININGER: There are certain 16 parameters to this complex case, and it's all related 17 to how -- how the water would be distributed and how 18 the water would be divvied up really between we're 19 looking at the project deliveries to Texas, New 20 Mexico's use of water. So there are some values that 21 had been discussed in terms of a range. I don't think 22 any of the parties have recognized that we are at --23 at some divisive moment. We're not going to 24 ultimately agree on a value that's going to go into 25 the settlement.

1	JUDGE MELLOY: I'm sorry. Say that
2	again. So what needs to be agreed upon?
3	MR. LEININGER: There there are
4	certain figures, values that have been generated and
5	discussed by our respective engineers. That would be
6	plugged into portions of this written settlement
7	agreement. So the the outline of this agreement is
8	complete. We have the means to settle this case, and
9	I I for one I won't speak for all the
10	parties, but I think the United States is confident
11	that we can reach a final settlement by the end of
12	September.
13	JUDGE MELLOY: Well, when you talk about
14	these values, if you're talking about the water, I
15	mean, that's the whole case. I mean, are these values
16	the type of thing that could potentially become, as I
17	used the term before, insurmountable obstacle to a
18	settlement?
19	MR. LEININGER: No, no. We don't see it
20	that way whatsoever. There there's certain levels
21	of water use that, for lack of a better term, may be
22	viewed as interference with with the project. So
23	there's certain levels of water use that we have to
24	agree for project purposes, and our interest in this
25	is the project and viability of the project. So

there's -- there are certain levels that we will put in the settlement agreement, which recognize the protection of the project, the viability of the project, and those are sort of the threshold values that have been discussed. We just need to have the engineers give us final figures.

7 JUDGE MELLOY: All right. You've 8 indicated that -- that you've been in continuous 9 contact with the people, Interior, Solicitor General's 10 Office, and other officials, and you don't anticipate 11 any opposition. What about the other interested 12 parties? Do you anticipate there's going to be 13 opposition, and I'll let the amici speak for 14 themselves, but do you anticipate any opposition from 15 any interested party?

16 MR. LEININGER: No. T think the 17 frustration that's being expressed by -- by Texas is 18 more a frustration that keep the thumb on all the 19 parties for purposes of this October 3rd start of 20 trial, and we -- we have -- we cannot express in more 21 direct terms that we don't think that that is the 22 right course here, that we've had successful 23 negotiations with all the parties in this case. So, 24 no, we don't see any deal breakers. 25 JUDGE MELLOY: I'll circle back to

1	Mr. Somach and let him speak again and address this
2	issue, which I didn't ask him about, but I want to
3	hear from Mr. Wechsler first. But Mr. Somach
4	indicated that one of his frustrations is that this
5	case has been going on for nearly ten years, and Texas
6	has gotten no relief. Is that entirely true in the
7	sense that Texas is getting water under the operating
8	agreement, which, of course, New Mexico says is
9	contrary to what the Compact provides for? Is Texas
10	still getting arguably more than its share of water
11	under the operating agreement?
12	MR. LEININGER: Well, we we wouldn't
13	put it as more.
14	JUDGE MELLOY: I used the word arguably,
15	but they're still getting some relief under the
16	operating agreement?
17	MR. LEININGER: Right. Yes, sir.
18	JUDGE MELLOY: And the operating
19	agreement still is governing the distribution of the
20	water?
21	MR. LEININGER: Yes, sir.
22	JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. Anything else you
23	want to add?
24	MR. LEININGER: Nothing other than that,
25	Your Honor.

1	JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Mr. Wechsler?
2	MR. WECHSLER: Thank you, Your Honor.
3	I'll start by saying reminding everyone, this is a
4	very complex dispute that has lasted decades, has a
5	very long history. By our count, it's 35 days of
6	mediation and hopefully counting. The parties have,
7	as you've heard, identified the major issues. We
8	believe there have been tentative agreements, at least
9	on the general contours. We do agree that there are
10	details to be worked out. I think we agree with the
11	United States, and if I heard correctly from Texas,
12	that there are no insurmountable details, but I
13	wouldn't represent that all of those details are
14	worked out. But we are confident, based on those 35
15	days of discussions over all of those issues, that
16	ultimately we would reach a resolution. And so for
17	that reason, we support the United States' proposal
18	that you give us a deadline of September 23rd in order
19	to present a settlement a written settlement in
20	front of you. We think that's an ambitious deadline.
21	If the parties are committed, we think it's
22	achievable. As I said, there are a number of details
23	that will need to go into that settlement.
24	JUDGE MELLOY: Tell me about this
25	legislation. What is the legislation, and have you

been in contact with the governor's office and the legislative leaders to know that -- have some confidence that it'll be enacted?

4 MR. WECHSLER: So, Your Honor, the final 5 contours of -- let me back up and say there are parts б of the settlement that all of the parties would have 7 In fact, in my experience, both in these types to do. 8 of cases, as well as complex litigation in general, 9 it's not uncommon to have a period where you enter 10 into a settlement and then there are a number of 11 contingencies that have to be accomplished. That's 12 true here, as well. There are things that the United 13 States and Texas would have to do. The exact contours 14 of any possible legislation in New Mexico haven't been 15 identified. One possible one is funding for fallowing 16 of land, but, again, I don't want to go into the 17 details of a -- of a settlement. In terms of your --18 JUDGE MELLOY: Let me ask you this: The 19 -- I read an article, oh, three or four years ago now,

I guess, that New Mexico was going to enter into a pilot program to fallow property, and they were going to, in essence, buy out water rights, and they had appropriated a couple million dollars for it, I believe. Is that -- without getting into the weeds of the settlement, is that at least something that's on

1 the table as expanding that type of a program? 2 MR. WECHSLER: So, Your Honor, in terms 3 of the pilot program, that actually did occur, and New 4 Mexico has had now, I think, going on three years of a 5 pilot program there. There's also, actually, б fallowing in the middle Rio Grande, as well, which 7 doesn't impact this case. You know, again, without 8 talking about the details of the settlement, we do 9 anticipate that there would be continued --10 continuation of that project from New Mexico's 11 perspective. That fallowing is likely to continue 12 whether or not there's a settlement because we're 13 interested in simply good groundwater management. So 14 I think I feel comfortable saying there will be 15 fallowing down there, and there certainly have been 16 discussions about that as part of the settlement. You 17 asked have we kept the decision makers informed. Ι 18 mean, you have here in the courtroom the state 19 engineer, who is the chief water official of New 20 Mexico, as well as the interstate stream commission 21 director, who is another one of the primary water 22 officials in New Mexico. Both are appointed by the 23 governor, and so there is a direct link to the governor's office. As you know, any settlement has to 24 25 be -- in New Mexico is ultimately the decision of the

1 attorney general, who has been kept informed on a 2 weekly, sometimes daily, basis of our ongoing 3 discussions. You have in the courtroom our chief 4 deputy, who has been delegated authority to negotiate 5 and make a decision. So I'm quite confident in saying б our decision makers are -- are well aware. There has 7 been some briefing of the legislature. I don't 8 disagree that a legislature can always be predictable, 9 but, again, we wouldn't be entering a settlement that 10 we weren't confident we could ultimately accomplish. 11 So we don't agree that there's any sort of -- we don't 12 agree that it's unlikely in any way, shape, or form. 13 I take Texas' point to be they have concerns about the 14 I would echo what Judge Boylan and the United timing. 15 States said, and that is in the event that we simply 16 litigate this case, you're likely looking at a much 17 longer period of time before there's any resolution. 18 One of the things that I -- I want to express on 19 behalf of New Mexico is that we -- we agree with the 20 United States that if -- if you maintain the October 21 trial date, it will be very challenging to take a dual 22 I mean, all of the parties have limited path. resources. New Mexico is willing to do that. 23 We 24 think it will be very hard. We are willing to do it. 25 The reason that we are willing to do it is that the --

1 the Court itself has often expressed that these cases 2 are best resolved by the parties themselves, and we 3 think that that's true because the parties understand 4 the issues and the nuances of the issues better and 5 ultimately can reach a -- a lasting resolution that б will avoid disputes and make sense for all of the 7 many, many parties that are involved. The other thing 8 I would say about that is, you know, we feel like 9 there has been a -- a large amount of trust and 10 goodwill built up. We feel confident that we're 11 moving towards -- we can see the -- a potential resolution and are confident we can get there. 12 We're 13 less confident that that would happen should we wait 14 some period of months, whether that's political 15 changes or simply changes in the case, and so it's our 16 view that we should postpone the -- the trial, set a 17 date of September 23rd as a time to -- to put forth a 18 settlement agreement. Again, that's ambitious, but 19 we're willing to work towards that. 20 JUDGE MELLOY: Do you envision any amendment to the Compact by the settlement? 21

MR. WECHSLER: No.

22

JUDGE MELLOY: Do you -- do you anticipate that you'll be asking the Supreme Court to obtain any jurisdiction over the course?

1	MR. WECHSLER: We agree with the United
2	States. I'm not sure if you asked Texas that
3	question, but we do agree with the United States that
4	this would be presented to you as a for approval of
5	a settlement with hopefully a decree from the Supreme
б	Court. Again, my experience in almost all of those
7	decrees, the Court retains jurisdiction at the foot of
8	the decree really for any disputes, but there have not
9	been any discussions for anything beyond that, and I
10	think that's par for the course in terms of the way
11	decrees are phrased by the Court.
12	JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Anything
13	else?
14	MR. WECHSLER: Nothing further. Thank
15	you.
16	JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Thank you,
17	Mr. Wechsler.
18	Mr. Wallace, I'll give you a chance to
19	speak.
20	MR. WALLACE: Good morning. Thank you,
21	Your Honor. Colorado continues its position of
22	supporting settlement talks as the best way to resolve
23	the dispute. Echoing the comments from all the other
24	parties, we believe that over the course of
25	discussions, we've built up a good deal of goodwill,
1 understanding, and frankly very good working 2 relationship among all the parties, their experts, and 3 clients through this, and we'd really just hate to see 4 that break down at this stage. As far as the 5 September 23 deadline, Colorado feels that that is б ambitious, not that it's not attainable, but there are 7 a good number of details, and as Your Honor is well 8 aware, lawyers can be particular about putting things 9 into writing and what those terms may -- may mean. 10 For Colorado's part, our interest lies primarily in 11 how a final settlement is reduced to writing with 12 particular emphasis on how any of the terms might 13 actually relate to a Compact obligation. So that --14 that is what Colorado will be looking for. We're much 15 less interested in -- in values, as the United States 16 put it, and more interested in how -- how those terms 17 might relate or not relate to the Compact itself. 18 Is it at least your JUDGE MELLOY: 19 understanding at this point that the settlement would 20 not effect Colorado's rights or obligations, and 21 you're going to be looking to make sure that's true in

22 the written agreement?

23 MR. WALLACE: That is our goal, Your
24 Honor. That's what we're going into these talks with
25 an aim to achieve is that it really doesn't affect us,

1 both on a direct water level and on a -- a larger 2 juris prudence interpretation of Compact level, to 3 make sure it doesn't impact this Compact, the Rio 4 Grande Compact, or leads to unwanted interpretations 5 of other existing Compacts. That's not to say that we're at that point, but that is the goal that we have б 7 through these talks. 8 Like some of the other parties, we're 9 not really in a position to dedicate all of our 10 resources both to settlement talks and trial 11 preparation at the same time. That said, Colorado is 12 deferring to the other parties, who admittedly have a 13 much larger role in the trial as to what their 14 resource allocation is or is not with regard to trial 15 date. 16 JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Thank you. 17 I want to give Mr. -- I'd like to hear 18 from Mr. Somach one more time, and then I'll give the 19 amici a chance to speak if they care to. I quess I --20 I sort of threw out that issue of the operating 21 agreement giving you some relief so I'll give you a 22 chance to respond to that. And, also, let me ask you 23 If a settlement is achieved along the lines this:

that have been discussed, would that supplant the

25 operating agreement?

Page 3	9
--------	---

1	MR. SOMACH: Let me start with the
2	operating agreement just to indicate that the
3	operating agreement was in existence prior to the time
4	we we brought the lawsuit and
5	JUDGE MELLOY: But you brought the
6	lawsuit because Colorado I mean, New Mexico is
7	challenging the operating agreement.
, 8	
	MR. SOMACH: No, that's what New Mexico
9	has alleged. That was not the reason why we brought
10	the lawsuit. It certainly was a factor, but but
11	the lawsuit had been contemplated as far back as the
12	early 2000s, in fact, 2000 and before that. The
13	operating agreement provided some relief, but we filed
14	the lawsuit because it didn't it didn't provide the
15	relief that we thought we were entitled to under the
16	Compact. And so I wouldn't deny that the operating
17	agreement does provide some relief, but that relief
18	preexisted the filing of the lawsuit. And as you
19	know, what we've argued in the lawsuit is
20	significantly greater in terms of what Texas is
21	entitled to than what the operating agreement
22	provides. With respect to whether or not the
23	settlement the settlement does not the proposed
24	settlement would not affect the operating agreement
25	itself. It would affect the operating manual in

L

1 various ways, which is, in a sense, where the rubber 2 hits the road. But going into the details, we could 3 be going into the details of what is being talked 4 about in the settlement. And, again, I think that, 5 you know, you'll see that when we go to trial, if we б go to trial, that is that there is a difference 7 between the operating agreement and this operating 8 I think there's been some testimony to that manual. 9 already. But most of the focus in terms of the terms 10 of the settlement really focus more on the manual than 11 they do the -- the agreement itself.

12 With respect to -- I just want to make 13 clear that -- that, you know, we're not unwilling to 14 sit down and continue settlement. You know, we think 15 that should occur, you know. It's just that with the 16 -- we don't have the same level of certainty and 17 comfort that the other parties apparently have is at 18 the end of the day that we'll reach that settlement. 19 I don't dispute the fact that if we reach settlement, 20 it'll be a quicker road to a decree in the Supreme 21 Court than if we try this case. I have -- I have -- I 22 mean, that -- that should go without question. The 23 issue here from our perspective is what happens if you 24 don't reach settlement because, you know, if in April 25 or May, notwithstanding everybody's good intentions,

1 the legislature doesn't do what the -- the -- the 2 negotiators wanted to do, that time frame that they're 3 talking about that I don't dispute is -- is displaced 4 by a whole year. So we've added a year to the 5 timeline that they're talking about in terms of final б resolution to the Court, and that's our concern. 7 Obviously if we reach agreement, that'd be great. We 8 think it's worth the effort. We'll continue to work 9 with any party that will sit down and continue to talk 10 to us, but we don't think it's mutually exclusive of 11 maintaining the trial date at October 3rd. 12 JUDGE MELLOY: The -- it sounds like

13 it's a little bit of a two-step process, though. Ιf 14 -- if the trial were continued, it could be continued 15 to some time February/March of 2023, with the 16 understanding that if the settlement agreement is not 17 finalized by September, then you go ahead with that 18 trial date; if the settlement is finalized, then we 19 probably continue it again. But we wouldn't have to 20 necessarily continue it for a whole year at the 21 outset, would we?

MR. SOMACH: Certainly not. I mean, you could -- in a sense, you could -- you could continue it month to month, you know, if that were something that -- that you would entertain, but I -- I'm -- you

1 know, there's practical ramifications of doing that. We just -- we just feel that we've been at this for a 2 3 very long time. This is -- as you recall, Judge 4 Boylan is the second mediator we had, then we've had 5 half of the trial, then we've been at this since б December, and -- and, now, what's being proposed is 7 something that goes into the next year. The New 8 Mexico attorney general changes at the end of the 9 year, and we have no idea -- talk about uncertainty --10 what that means in terms of conditional settlement. 11 And so with all of that in front of us, that's why we 12 urge, you know, continuing with the trial date of 13 October 3rd. And, again, I just want to be clear, 14 that does not mean we're unwilling or won't sit down 15 and put whatever resources are necessary toward it and 16 also looking to see if we can get a resolution, and 17 notwithstanding Mr. Wallace's statement about ambition 18 and whether September 23rd is ambitious, we're willing 19 to come up with a status conference in as early as the 20 middle of August to come back and have a conversation 21 about where we are and whether we should go to trial 22 on October 3rd or whether or not it should be 23 continued at that point in time. We just don't feel 24 we have the level of comfort or certainty today to be 25 willing to give up a trial date that we have -- we

1 have worked very hard to -- to get in the first place. 2 JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Thank you. 3 Do any of the amici want to be heard? 4 Ms. Barncastle? 5 MS. BARNCASTLE: Yes, Your Honor, and I б think there are others so I'll just defer for a few 7 minutes. 8 JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. All right. Go 9 ahead. Mr. Stein? 10 MR. STEIN: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor. 11 This is Jay Stein, counsel for the amicus city of Las 12 I do have a comment on the debate that's been Cruces. 13 going forward. The City of Las Cruces participates in 14 this process in two respects. We are fully engaged in 15 the settlement process and work with our state, the 16 state of New Mexico in that, and, also, we participate 17 in the trial process, and the City had a witness in 18 the first trial stage, you may remember, Dr. Jorge 19 Garcia, and we will also have a witness in the second 20 trial phase, should that occur, presented by state 21 attorneys. We do not believe that the settlement 22 process can occur simultaneously with the trial 23 preparation process. We are certainly willing to 24 continue with the negotiation process. I want to 25 elaborate that a bit. But we do not believe the

1 October 3rd trial date can reasonably be retained. 2 As Your Honor knows, this case is 3 extremely complicated. It has numerous issues 4 involving hydrology and administration, how the water 5 right -- water rights are actually distributed and б enjoyed and used by the various parties in the state, 7 including the city of Las Cruces, and from our 8 perspective, the negotiations are beginning to move 9 into a new tier of issues. Previously they have 10 focused on the question of agricultural rights, 11 agricultural use and irrigation. Now, they are 12 beginning to address the sleeping giant, and that is 13 the municipal uses. I'm referring to the state's 14 second largest city, the city of Las Cruces, which is 15 in the center of this. Those issues are now beginning 16 to appear. The process that we use and that we employ 17 to assist the -- the state is when proposals are made, 18 we get them to our -- our hydrologist, and proposals 19 are made constantly. New proposals are constantly 20 coming out. We have to get them to our hydrologist. 21 He has to have analyzed them. They then come back to 22 us, which we provide to our state. Our state then 23 makes them part of the negotiation process with the 24 United States and the State of Texas. All of this 25 takes a long time, and those are just the proposals,

1 the specific narrow proposals. We don't have a term 2 There were efforts to create one, but all of sheet. 3 that collapsed. There is no term sheet. Instead, 4 there are principles, and those principles change, and 5 sometimes we can't even be told what the principles б Those are -- are confidential among the are. 7 negotiating parties alone. This makes it a difficult 8 and complicated process for the water users that are 9 actually in the trenches, and I'm referring 10 specifically to Las Cruces, which has a very daunting 11 burden and the burden of -- of providing municipal 12 supply on a daily basis to 125,000 customers. 13 The proposal that I see on the table, a 14 tentative settlement by September 23rd, I think, is 15 highly challenging. We're willing to commit to that 16 and to do what we can to work with New Mexico on that 17 in this new area of -- of municipal supply. I do not 18 believe that it is feasible at all to have a dual 19 track where we engage in that process together with 20 some trial preparation for an October 3rd trial date. 21 JUDGE MELLOY: You say you're in a new 22 phase. Does that mean there's a whole set of issues you feel that still need to be resolved? 23 24 MR. STEIN: There are issues that have

²⁵ emanated from the agricultural discussions and the

1 allocation of agricultural rights that are now 2 beginning to impact the city and creating specific 3 issues for us, yes. 4 JUDGE MELLOY: As a New Mexico citizen 5 and representing a New Mexico entity, are you as б confident as Mr. Wechsler that if -- if you need a 7 legislative solution, that the New Mexico legislature 8 will approve it? 9 MR. STEIN: I believe so. I believe 10 that a -- a legislative solution that is supported 11 both by the cities of Las Cruces and Albuquerque would 12 pass the legislature. 13 JUDGE MELLOY: But if either city were 14 to oppose it then --15 **MR. STEIN:** That would make it a more 16 difficult process, and I couldn't -- I couldn't answer 17 to the result. 18 JUDGE MELLOY: So basically, it's --19 it's not an absolute necessity but highly desirable to 20 have Albuquerque and Las Cruces on board? 21 MR. STEIN: Without question, Your 22 Honor. 23 JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. Thank you, 24 Mr. Stein. 25 Mr. Brockmann?

1	MR. BROCKMANN: Good morning, Your
2	Honor, and thank you for the opportunity, again, for
3	the amici to make a few brief remarks. I do want to
4	say that that New Mexico does keep, I believe, the
5	New Mexico amici fairly well briefed, but just as a
6	matter of process, when they meet with the other
7	parties and then we get briefed on on certain
8	matters, as Mr. Stein indicated, it takes us time to
9	evaluate those on behalf of our clients and come back
10	so I I do think this case is, in addition to the
11	complexity of the case, being an Original Action
12	affecting a lot of water users, there is an additional
13	level of complexity because the the state
14	representatives, I think it's essential for them to
15	continue to keep us involved and informed so that we
16	do support an ultimate settlement, and things have
17	continued to move and evolve. It's hard for for me
18	to say with certainty whether or not there's actually
19	principles of agreement or not because we're not in
20	the room for some of those discussions, but it does
21	seem to continue to evolve, I guess, from our
22	perspective. Albuquerque, the Water Authority,
23	continues to support the settlement process. I I
24	from my perspective, I don't see a settlement yet,
25	but I think the parties are working on general

1 principles, and I think they're better to give their 2 opinions on where it's at and whether or not there are 3 differences between the parties. But I do agree that 4 -- that mid September is extremely ambitious to get 5 this written down. As you've indicated, the parties б worked on a term sheet for a while, and -- and we 7 don't have one, and there's a different set of 8 principles they're working on, and we haven't seen 9 That said, we've been informed generally of the that. 10 discussions. We know generally what the issues are. 11 But to -- to reduce that to writing and -- and 12 actually have the parties agree with that and there is 13 a process within New Mexico where I know the state 14 engineer, the ISC, the attorney general's office are 15 sitting down to work with us on various issues that 16 involve intrastate administration, but that takes 17 time. And from my perspective, the 23rd of September 18 is very ambitious, and it would be difficult for the 19 parties to do both trial and settlement negotiations 20 at the same time, trial preparation.

JUDGE MELLOY: Well, let me ask you this: Is there anything about the principles that have been agreed upon that you're aware of that would cause your client, basically the City of Albuquerque, to -- to object?

1	MR. BROCKMANN: I have to see the
2	principles in writing to answer that. So there have
3	been discussions about issues that do affect the Water
4	Authority, and and I understand sometimes there's a
5	proposal and there's pushback, no, we can't do that,
б	but I haven't seen a document really that I can sit
7	down and talk to our client about and say is there an
8	effect or not. If I was giving you a tentative answer
9	today, I would say I think I think they're pretty
10	comfortable with where we're at, but I can't say that
11	with certainty.
12	JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Thank you.
13	MR. BROCKMANN: Thank you.
14	JUDGE MELLOY: Anyone else? Did you
15	want to speak, Ms. Barncastle?
16	MS. BARNCASTLE: Yes, Your Honor. If
17	anybody should be upset about requesting an extension
18	on the trial deadline, it's EBID. We are getting EP
19	No. 1 their water. We have been doing it for years.
20	EBID, without proper groundwater administration, is
21	going to continue to be harmed while that is the case.
22	So if anybody is concerned here about pushing the
23	trial date, it shouldn't be Texas. It should be me.
24	But I'm here to support pushing off that trial date
25	because we need a holistic response and a proper

1 solution to all of these issues that are older than 2 Multiple of the cases that are impacted, the me. 3 issues that are impacted began long ago. Mr. Somach 4 told you himself, early 2000s was when Texas started 5 thinking about this. Is it realistic to think that we б could settle a case like this in seven months? Т 7 don't think so. There's no possible way. You look at 8 the talent in this room. You look at the work that 9 has been put in. Not a single lawyer in this room 10 will tell you with a straight face that they haven't 11 worked through every single weekend, say, for a couple 12 of minor examples, since we started this mediation 13 There is absolutely no reason we should not process. 14 push trial right now, give ourselves an opportunity 15 that we all deserve, to finish this the right way.

JUDGE MELLOY: Let me -- let me ask you this: Are there other lawsuits that would be effected by this settlement? I should ask maybe some of the other parties, but I know you're very involved with the case.

MS. BARNCASTLE: I can think of three issues in the adjudication directly implicated, multiple federal district court cases in -- and directly related cases, and I have approximately 15 pending water rights protests that would all be

1	effected.
2	JUDGE MELLOY: Does this would this
3	resolve the dispute over the United States' date of
4	-
т 5	priority date?
	MS. BARNCASTLE: I believe so.
6	JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. All right. Any of
7	the other amici want to be heard?
8	MS. O'BRIEN: Yes, Your Honor, just
9	briefly.
10	JUDGE MELLOY: Ms. O'Brien.
11	MS. O'BRIEN: Maria O'Brien on behalf of
12	El Paso County Water Improvement District No. 1. I'll
13	be brief, Your Honor. I just wanted to state for the
14	record that EP1 wholeheartedly supports the diligent
15	and concentrated efforts of the parties to settle and
16	resolve this litigation and is committed to
17	participation to assist in effectuating a settlement.
18	I think as Your Honor has noted in the course of this
19	litigation, a settlement can achieve resolution of
20	broader issues, and as parties have noted here today,
21	hopefully in more expeditious fashion than litigation
22	could. On the issue of deadlines and timing and
23	mutually dedicating the parties' efforts to trial and
24	settlement, we defer to the parties' assessments of
25	their individual capacities and what that presents to

1 them in terms of practicality.

JUDGE MELLOY: Is -- and I -- and I guess I could let Mr. Caroom speak to this, but are you and the City of El Paso on the same page? Are you more as -- as has been sort of the situation about this case, you're more on New Mexico's side of it than -- than Texas' side?

Well, I won't say we're 8 MS. O'BRIEN: 9 more on New Mexico's side. We're on the side of the 10 project, the Rio Grande project, and I believe that 11 both the efforts of Texas and the United States is to 12 protect the project supply, the water apportioned 13 under the Compact, is dedicated to the Rio Grande 14 project, to the two districts, Elephant Butte 15 Irrigation District and downstream El Paso County 16 Water Improvement District No. 1. And with regard to 17 your question regarding the City of El Paso, yes, 18 Mr. Caroom can speak for the City, but if EP1 gets its 19 water, then the City of El Paso gets its water. We do 20 not get our water if the City of El Paso does not. 21 It's a derivative right from the district's rights 22 under the Rio Grande project. 23 JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Thank you. 24 Anyone else wish to speak? Ms.

25 Davidson.

1 Thank you, Your Honor, MS. DAVIDSON: 2 and I appreciate the opportunity to speak today. I 3 won't take long, but I did --4 JUDGE MELLOY: Why don't you enter your 5 appearance just for the people listening in for the record. б 7 MS. DAVIDSON: Yes. Tessa Davidson on 8 behalf of New Mexico pecan growers. I've also been 9 asked to speak on behalf of New Mexico State 10 University and the Southern Rio Grande Diversified 11 Crop Farmers all the amici in the case. We do support 12 New Mexico in their comments and really the general 13 comments of other amici supporting New Mexico. And I 14 just want to circle back on a couple of issues that I 15 heard you -- and questions that I heard you ask 16 regarding specific terms and amounts. You're exactly 17 right. Those are terms, amounts, time periods with 18 regard to water and water use, and it affects water 19 and water use in New Mexico. And although we are not 20 the parties, we are not vested with the legal 21 authority to sign off on behalf of our states, the 22 practical effect of all of this is if you don't have 23 by the amici, it's going to be very hard to implement 24 a lot of the very, very detailed aspects of what's 25 being discussed right now. With regard to continuing

1 litigation in New Mexico, it is going to require New 2 Mexico amici participation to resolve those issues in 3 the litigation. So there's a lot of downhill 4 consequences to what's occurring uphill, and it's --5 it's my belief that we do need additional time. If б this is going to work, amici need to be fully apprised 7 and understanding of what's going on. We need to be 8 able to go back to our clients and sort out issues 9 that affect them. These issues of terms, amounts do 10 directly affect them. So I just wanted to give you 11 that perspective. I'd like to see settlement succeed. 12 I'd like to see all of us not fight about these issues 13 anymore, but it's going to require some also practical 14 on-the-ground support by New Mexicans. 15

JUDGE MELLOY: Is, from what you understand of the principles that have been agreed upon, and you may not know all of them, but is there anything at this point that your clients would have objection to?

MS. DAVIDSON: Not at this point, Your Honor, as far as I understand. There are some items that have yet to be fully flushed and discussed that are very important to my clients. Thank you.

 24
 JUDGE MELLOY: Thank you. Anyone else?

 25
 (No response.)

1 **JUDGE MELLOY:** Anything further from any 2 of the parties? Let me ask you this, Mr. Leininger. 3 You said that -- when you were up here that you could 4 start drafting Monday. Who's going to do the 5 drafting? I mean, what -- has there -- are you to the б point where you've started to divvy up responsibility 7 of who's going to do what and when they're going to do 8 it and how soon they're going to do it and so on and 9 so forth?

10 MR. LEININGER: So we're -- we started 11 preliminary discussions amongst all the parties as to 12 dividing up into drafting committees. So there are 13 blocks of this that we think would be most efficiently 14 addressed with taking -- taking the subject matter and 15 reducing the agreements, principles to date, to -- to 16 writing based upon that. So we -- we -- at least I 17 envision, and we haven't actually come to -- to 18 resolution on how we're going to do this, but we 19 envision rather than spending time flying around the 20 country and -- and visiting sites, we would be doing 21 this via Zoom. We would have small select committees 22 for purposes of writing. We would have screen share 23 capabilities. We'd be devoting hours, days, weeks to 24 that effort.

25

JUDGE MELLOY: I've heard several of the

1	amici in particular indicate that they thought
2	September 23rd may be overly ambitious. What do you
3	think? What's your response to that?
4	MR. LEININGER: Well, I would agree with
5	Ms. Davidson that we have this we have this ability
6	to reach agreement. There are there are terms,
7	there are values, there are amounts, as she mentioned,
8	which I understand will still be negotiated.
9	Primarily, at least from our view, a lot of that
10	negotiation will be going on between New Mexico and
11	its amici.
12	JUDGE MELLOY: New Mexico and who?
13	MR. LEININGER: And its amici.
14	JUDGE MELLOY: Oh, okay.
15	MR. LEININGER: So we'll we'll
16	certainly be involved in that process. I think that
17	will be going on simultaneously with the drafting of
18	the document, but we did talk about immediately
19	beginning this process of putting this agreement to
20	paper.
21	JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Thank you.
22	So, Mr. Wechsler, do I understand that
23	essentially you still need to, in essence, come to
24	some agreement as to how the water is going to be
25	divided between the agricultural interests and Las

Cruces and Albuquerque and other interested parties in
 New Mexico?

3 I think there's some of MR. WECHSLER: 4 that, Your Honor. I think that there are some --5 these are some of the details that the parties need to б work through. You know, I -- I appreciate some of our 7 amici's concerns about not having seen all of the 8 settlement terms. Of course, that's the nature of 9 settlement discussions. There's only so much that 10 we're able to share. We've done as much as we can so 11 we've had at least weekly calls with our amici. We 12 have sought their input on the things that we think 13 would impact them. We're relatively confident that on 14 most of those issues, the things that have been 15 discussed within the settlement rooms are within the 16 contours of what we have talked about with our amici, 17 so we're confident we could reach all of the necessary 18 agreements. Certainly it's true there are -- there's 19 only so much water that New Mexico is entitled to, and 20 when you have zero sum gain, it's about administering 21 and moving that water around. Some of the 22 decades-long disputes that we've been talking about 23 are precisely that, figuring out the relative water 24 uses within the states. It's our view that we're 25 close to a resolution that we'll be able to put to bed

1 hopefully with a lasting piece, a number of those issues, but there's more to do in those regards. 2 3 JUDGE MELLOY: Do you anticipate Judge Boylan continuing to participate in this process doing 4 5 the drafting or do you think he's essentially done б with his role? I mean, maybe I should ask Judge 7 Boylan, but what is your view of Judge Boylan's role 8 in this? 9 MR. WECHSLER: From our perspective, 10 Judge Boylan has been incredibly helpful, and we do 11 view him having a role going forward. I agree with 12 Mr. Leininger about the nature of the drafting 13 I think through -- through most of those process. 14 sessions and Zoom, Judge Boylan's presence wouldn't be 15 In fact, the parties have shown over the required. 16 last couple weeks that we have had the ability, as 17 we've gone through specific terms in the last couple 18 weeks, I think that we've made very significant 19 progress simply on our own. But I do think that 20 there's likely to be some issues that will really 21 benefit from Judge Boylan's process if he's willing to 22 continue -- or participation, I should say, if he's 23 willing to continue to work with us, and it may be 24 that there is a session on the horizon that involves 25 New Mexico water users, including the United States,

1	EBID, and the New Mexico amici, to help sort through
2	some of the intrastate issues. There has been
3	significant discussion about that amongst the parties.
4	It's just that with the the priority of issues, we
5	haven't been able to have that session yet.
6	JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. All right. Thank
7	you.
8	Anybody else wish to be heard?
9	(No response.)
10	JUDGE MELLOY: Well, let me say this:
11	I'm not prepared to make a final decision today. I
12	want to talk quite frankly, I'm going to visit with
13	the clerk of the Supreme Court, Scott Harris, and I
14	want to kind of see if there's how they feel about
15	how this about going forward on this. I will say
16	this: I think very early on, I believe I said when we
17	first appointed Judge Granger as the mediator that if
18	it came to a point where there was some discussion
19	about whether the case should be stayed for some
20	period of time, that I would be guided to a large
21	extent by the mediator's view of of how we should
22	proceed, and I understand what Judge Boylan is saying
23	here so that'll be certainly a very significant factor
24	in my decision, but I'll let you know next week. But
25	regardless I would like to have a status conference

1	sooner rather than later, probably towards the end of
2	July. We don't have to do that one in person, but I
3	just I want to make sure that we're keeping things
4	moving forward with whether and if we and if I
5	don't continue the trial, we'll need to set some
6	deadlines for exchanging witness exhibits, exhibit
7	lists, witness lists, and so on so forth. So either
8	way, I want to get back together by videoconference
9	some time in, say, three or four weeks. But I'll let
10	you know what I decide next week, and we'll set a date
11	for further status conference at that point.
12	Anything else?
13	JUDGE BOYLAN: Judge, I'm not sure
14	whether or not that status conference is dependent
15	upon my availability, but I thought I would at least
16	alert the Court that on the Friday last Friday of
17	July, I will be out of the country.
18	JUDGE MELLOY: Okay.
19	JUDGE BOYLAN: But apart from that, I
20	will be except for July 29th.
21	JUDGE MELLOY: Thank you. I appreciate
22	that. Thank you, Judge, for all your work in this
23	case. Appreciate it.
24	All right. We're adjourned. Thank you,
25	everyone.



1	CERTIFICATE
2	CERTIFICATE
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
8	the proceedings had at the time of the status hearing.
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 COTCOE
17	on this, the 7th day of November, 2022.
18	
19	Heather Ing
	HEATHER L. GARZA, CSR, RPR, CRR
20	Certification No.: 8262
	Expiration Date: 04-30-24
21	
22	
23	Worldwide Court Reporters, Inc.
	Firm Registration No. 223
24	3000 Weslayan, Suite 235
	Houston, TX 77027
25	800-745-1101

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1	47.00.49.04	17.2.40.17.00	
A	advisors 23:13	47:22 48:24	17:3 49:17,22	arrived 13:12
a.m 1:16 61:1	affect 37:25	57:1	59:8	Arthur 9:18
ability 56:5	39:24,25 49:3	alert 60:16	anymore 54:13	article 32:19
58:16	54:9,10	alleged 39:9	apart 19:19	asked 9:5 11:6
able 17:16 18:11	AG 26:7	allocation 38:14	60:19	25:7,8,14
22:1 54:8	ago 32:19 50:3	46:1	apparently	33:17 36:2
57:10,25 59:5	agree 16:14	allow 9:8 17:12	40:17	53:9
absolute 46:19	21:14 22:10	allowed 12:12	appear 9:5,8	asking 35:24
absolutely 17:2	27:24 28:24	22:22	44:16	aspects 53:24
18:8 19:13,20	31:9,10 34:11	Alternatively	appearance 53:5	assessments
23:10 50:13	34:12,19 36:1	24:11	appearances	51:24
accomplish	36:3 48:3,12	ambition 42:17	6:11,14,15	assist 44:17
13:22 34:10	56:4 58:11	ambitious 31:20	appearing 8:11	51:17
accomplished	agreed 11:4	35:18 37:6	9:11	assistance 9:23
32:11	22:11 24:23	42:18 48:4,18	appendices	assistant 8:12
achievable	28:2 48:23	56:2	20:25	26:7
31:22	54:16	amendment	appointed 33:22	ASSOCIATI
achieve 37:25	agreement 11:4	35:21	59:17	5:12
51:19	13:4,7,10,11	amici 10:19	apportioned	assume 23:5,7
achieved 38:23	13:16,18 14:1	29:13 38:19	52:12	assumption 10:1
ACOSTA 5:2	14:2,7 16:11	43:3 47:3,5	appreciate 53:2	assurance 25:17
acted 15:21	16:15,20 17:11	51:7 53:11,13	57:6 60:21,23	assurances 13:8
action 13:14,15	17:16 18:21	53:23 54:2,6	apprised 54:6	Atlanta 10:18
14:13 16:16	22:12,16,17	56:1,11,13	appropriate	attached 23:22
47:11	24:22 25:3,5	57:11,16 59:1	10:22	attainable 37:6
add 30:23	25:10,10 26:12	amici's 57:7	appropriated	attempt 10:22
added 41:4	27:6 28:7,7	amicus 43:11	32:23	attended 10:20
addition 47:10	29:2 30:8,11	amount 21:21	approval 14:7	attention 26:25
additional 47:12	30:16,19 35:18	23:12 35:9	18:16,17 21:1	attorney 2:13
54:5	37:22 38:21,25	amounts 53:16	21:5,13 22:13	3:3 6:22 7:5,6
address 14:5	39:2,3,7,13,17	53:17 54:9	23:4,17 26:6	26:18 34:1
30:1 44:12	39:21,24 40:7	56:7	36:4	42:8 48:14
addressed 21:14	40:11 41:7,16	analyzed 44:21	approvals 17:20	attorneys 26:1
55:14	47:19 56:6,19	and- 2:7,12,21	approve 16:23	43:21 62:12
adjourned 60:24	56:24	3:1,16,21 4:1	26:15 46:8	audience 6:22
61:1	agreements 11:3	4:10	approved 14:18	7:15
adjudication	13:5 31:8	ANDREWS	26:4	August 17:8
50:22	55:15 57:18	2:18	approximately	42:20
administering	agricultural	answer 26:22	21:7 50:24	Austin 2:14 4:13
57:20	44:10,11 45:25	46:16 49:2,8	April 16:18,22	5:3
administration	46:1 56:25	anticipate 22:6	19:16 21:16	authority 4:21
44:4 48:16	ahead 17:19	29:10,12,14	40:24	8:2,5 26:1 34:4
49:20	41:17 43:9	33:9 35:24	area 45:17	47:22 49:4
admittedly	aim 37:25	58:3	arguably 30:10	53:21
38:12	Albuquerque	anticipating	30:14	availability
adopted 14:18	4:8,20 8:1,4	10:5	argued 39:19	60:15
	10:17 46:11,20	anybody 9:15	arises 13:6	available 9:22
	, ,		l	l

14:15	32:24 36:24	46:25 47:1	center 44:15	52:4,17,18,19
avoid 35:6	43:21,25 45:18	49:1,13	certain 13:11	52:20
awaiting 15:2	46:9,9 47:4	brought 26:24	21:3 27:15	civil 26:20
aware 34:6 37:8	51:5 52:10	39:4,5,9	28:4,20,23	ckhoury@nm
48:23	59:16	Building 5:3	29:1 47:7	3:5
+0.23	benefit 58:21	built 35:10	certainly 33:15	claims 17:4
B	Bernalillo 4:20	36:25	39:10 41:22	clear 22:14 27:3
B 4:2	8:1,5	burden 45:11,11	43:23 56:16	40:13 42:13
back 6:4 12:8	best 18:23 35:2	Bureau 7:23	57:18 59:23	clerk 59:13
17:10 19:19	36:22	Butte 4:15 8:19	certainty 19:13	clerk's 9:21
24:15 29:25	better 14:20	8:22 52:14	19:20 40:16	client 48:24 49:7
32:5 39:11	28:21 35:4	buy 32:22	42:24 47:18	clients 37:3 47:9
42:20 44:21	48:1	Duy 32.22	49:11	54:8,18,23
47:9 53:14	beyond 36:9	C	CERTIFICATE	close 57:25
54:8 60:8	BICKERSTA	C 2:1,3 3:23	62:1	Coleman 3:17
bar 7:4	5:2	4:22 6:1	Certification	7:21 26:15
Barfield 2:3	big 23:8	California 2:5	62:20	collapsed 45:3
6:20	bit 41:13 43:25	call 11:18 13:11	Certified 62:3	Colorado 1:11
Barncastle 4:16	blocks 55:13	calls 57:11	certify 62:5,9,12	2:10,24 3:7,8,9
4:17 8:21,22	board 23:1,2	camera 6:5	Chad 3:8 7:14	3:14 6:9 7:12
43:4,5 49:15	46:20	capabilities	chad.wallace	7:15 10:17
49:16 50:21		55:23	3:10	36:21 37:5,14
51:5	Bobby 6:23 Box 2:14 3:18	capacities 51:25	chain 23:17	38:11 39:6
based 25:5	4:12,23 5:8,14	capacity 62:10		Colorado's
31:14 55:16	Boylan 9:19	Capitol 2:4	challenging 34:21 39:7	37:10,20
basically 6:14	10:9,12 12:24	caption 62:6	45:15	come 10:9 13:17
16:21 22:17	14:3,11,25	care 38:19	chance 36:18	17:16 23:16
23:1 25:3	15:2,6,8 20:15	career 23:11	38:19,22	24:21 42:19,20
46:18 48:24	20:19 22:8	Caroom 5:2 8:7	change 6:6 45:4	44:21 47:9
basis 26:23 34:2	20.19 22.8 24:6 25:8	8:8 52:3,18	changes 13:23	55:17 56:23
45:12	34:14 42:4	case 9:18 10:6	35:15,15 42:8	comes 12:14
bed 57:25	58:4,7,10	18:11 21:2	chief 7:5 9:20	18:6
began 50:3	59:22 60:13,19	22:20 23:11,23	26:19 33:19	comfort 40:17
beginning 1:16	Boylan's 15:13	23:24 24:17	34:3	42:24
44:8,12,15	58:7,14,21	26:2,2,24	Cholla 3:2 7:4	comfortable
46:2 56:19	break 10:4 37:4	27:16 28:8,15	Chris 7:23	33:14 49:10
behalf 7:3 9:9	breakers 29:24	29:23 30:5	Christopher 4:2	coming 44:20
26:17 34:19	brief 47:3 51:13	33:7 34:16	circle 29:25	commence 21:25
47:9 51:11	briefed 47:5,7	35:15 40:21	53:14	comment 43:12
53:8,9,21	briefing 34:7	44:2 47:10,11	CIRCUIT 1:15	comments 36:23
62:11	briefly 51:9	49:21 50:6,20	cities 46:11	53:12,13
belief 54:5	broader 51:20	52:6 53:11	citizen 46:4	commission 7:9
believe 11:13	Broadway 3:9	59:19 60:23	city 4:3,21 5:1,6	33:20
13:2 14:21	BROCKMAN	cases 32:8 35:1	8:6,8,9,11,11	commissioner
15:6 16:3,6	5:7	50:2,23,24	43:11,13,17	6:24 7:8
24:21 25:1	Brockmann	cause 48:24	44:7,14,14	commit 18:12
26:13 31:8	4:22,22 8:3,4	62:13	46:2,13 48:24	21:20 45:15
		-	TU.2,13 TU.27	21.20 TJ.1J

aammitmant	50.25 60.11 14	continuing 16.2	a a sustana	deal 10:24,25
commitment	59:25 60:11,14	continuing 16:2 21:18 42:12	courtroom	,
18:4,5,7,8	conferences		33:18 34:3	11:12 16:7
committed	20:20	53:25 58:4	create 45:2	19:1 29:24
31:21 51:16	confidence 32:3	continuous 29:8	creating 46:2	36:25
committees	confident 28:10	contours 31:9	crop 5:11 9:6	dealing 26:23
55:12,21	31:14 34:5,10	32:5,13 57:16	53:11	debate 43:12
communication	35:10,12,13	contrary 30:9	CRR 62:19	decade 17:1
23:12 25:15	46:6 57:13,17	conversation	Cruces 4:18,21	decades 31:4
Compact 7:8	confidential	42:20	5:6 8:9,11	decades-long
23:24 30:9	45:6	Corrales 5:14,15	43:12,13 44:7	57:22
35:21 37:13,17	confusion 9:24	correct 14:3	44:14 45:10	December 16:15
38:2,3,4 39:16	conjunction	26:14 27:8	46:11,20 57:1	16:16 42:6
52:13	26:5	62:7	CSR 62:19	decide 16:13
Compacts 38:5	consequences	correctly 31:11	curious 25:20	60:10
complete 11:21	54:4	counsel 6:16,19	customers 45:12	decision 15:3
20:25 21:16	Conservation	6:20 7:14 8:4	D	16:25 33:17,25
22:1 24:18	8:25	43:11 62:14		34:5,6 59:11
28:8 62:7	considerable	count 10:15 31:5	D 6:1	59:24
completed 27:9	23:20	counting 31:6	daily 34:2 45:12	decree 20:25
complex 23:20	constantly 44:19	country 55:20	date 13:19,21	23:19,22 24:8
27:16 31:4	44:19	60:17	16:3,3 17:6	24:25 36:5,8
32:8	contact 29:9	County 4:5,20	18:24 20:23	40:20
complexity	32:1	8:2,5,14,17,24	21:10 34:21	decrees 36:7,11
47:11,13	contemplated	51:12 52:15	35:17 38:15	dedicate 38:9
complicated	39:11	couple 24:15	41:11,18 42:12	dedicated 52:13
44:3 45:8	contingencies	32:23 50:11	42:25 44:1	dedicating 51:23
comprise 62:7	17:17 32:11	53:14 58:16,17	45:20 49:23,24	defer 43:6 51:24
concentrated	continuance	course 6:7 9:17	51:3,4 55:15	deferred 18:25
51:15	17:12	19:10 29:22	60:10 62:20	deferring 38:12
concern 19:8	continuation	30:8 35:25	daunting 45:10	degree 13:20
41:6	33:10	36:10,24 51:18	Davidson 5:13	delaying 20:21
concerned 24:2	continue 11:10	57:8	5:13 9:3,4,12	delegated 34:4
27:3 49:22	11:19 12:18,21	court 1:6 5:17	52:25 53:1,7,7	DELGADO 5:2
concerning 9:25	13:3 15:25	5:19 6:7 9:20	54:20 56:5	deliveries 27:19
11:7	16:5 17:5,6,22	11:6 12:7 13:1	day 40:18 62:17	Denver 2:10,24
concerns 34:13	18:20 27:11	13:7 14:6,9,10	days 10:15	3:9,14 10:16
57:7	33:11 40:14	14:16,17,18,19	15:13,19 20:18	deny 39:16
concluded 10:2	41:8,9,19,20	22:13 24:2,3	31:5,15 55:23	Department 3:8
conclusion	41:23 43:24	24:10 35:1,24	DC 3:19,23	3:13,18,22 4:2
21:15	47:15,21 49:21	36:6,7,11	dcaroom@bic	7:21 21:5 23:6
conditional 18:7	58:22,23 60:5	40:21 41:6	5:4	25:13 26:5
42:10	continued 10:7	50:23 59:13	De 2:19	dependent 60:14
conducted 11:1	12:10 21:10	60:16 62:23	deadline 22:2	deputy 7:5,16
11:25 12:4	33:9 41:14,14	Court's 11:7	31:18,20 37:5	26:24 34:4
conference	42:23 47:17	14:15	49:18	derivative 52:21
12:16 17:9	continues 36:21	COURTHOU	deadlines 12:15	described 13:17
22:7,22 42:19	47:23	1:16	51:22 60:6	description
	-		I	I -

Г

				rage ou
14:22	dispute 31:4	45:18	employ 44:16	47:9
deserve 50:15	36:23 40:19	DUNN 2:4,9	62:12	event 34:15
desirable 46:19	41:3 51:3		employee 62:10	everybody 15:21
detailed 53:24	disputes 35:6	E	enact 16:24	22:9
details 31:10,12	36:8 57:22	E 2:1,1 3:2,17	17:21	everybody's
31:13,22 32:17	distributed	6:1,1	enacted 13:23	40:25
33:8 37:7 40:2	27:17 44:5	EAGLETON	32:3	evidentiary
40:3 57:5	distribution	1:16	endorse 17:12	14:13 24:6
developed 15:22	30:19	early 39:12	enforceable	evolve 47:17,21
devoted 23:18	district 4:5,15	42:19 50:4	13:19	exact 32:13
devoting 55:23	8:15,18,20,23	59:16	engage 45:19	exactly 53:16
difference 40:6	8:25 9:19,20	easier 20:10	engaged 43:14	examples 50:12
differences 48:3	50:23 51:12	Eastern 9:20	engaging 11:10	exception 24:12
different 11:13	52:15,16	EBID 49:18,20	engineer 7:7,16	24:14
15:20 16:8	district's 52:21	59:1	33:19 48:14	exceptions 24:14
18:19 20:16	districts 52:14	echo 15:12	engineers 28:5	exceptions 24.14 exchanging 60:6
48:7	diversified 5:11	34:14	29:6	exclusive 41:10
difficult 19:6	9:6 53:10	Echoing 36:23	enjoyed 44:6	Excuse 15:15
45:7 46:16	divided 56:25	effect 37:20 49:8	enter 32:9,20	exhibit 60:6
48:18	dividing 55:12	53:22	53:4	exhibits 60:6
diligent 51:14	division 26:20	effected 50:17	entered 10:1	existence 39:3
diligently 10:21	divisive 27:23	51:1	entering 34:9	existing 38:5
direct 29:21	divvied 27:18	effective 13:24	entertain 41:25	expanding 33:1
33:23 38:1	divvy 55:6	21:10	entirely 30:6	expeditious
directed 11:21	document 13:17	effectuating	entities 25:16,20	51:21
direction 25:6	21:9 22:6 49:6	51:17	entitled 39:15	experience 32:7
directly 50:22	56:18	efficiently 55:13	39:21 57:19	36:6
50:24 54:10	doing 13:20 42:1	effort 20:17,20	entity 46:5	expert 21:23
director 7:9 8:12	49:19 55:20	23:18 41:8	envision 13:25	experts 14:14
8:12 33:21	58:4	55:24	14:6,12 23:25	23:19 37:2
disagree 34:8	DOJ 21:6	efforts 11:21	24:1 35:20	Expiration
discussed 23:15	dollars 32:23	12:10 22:23	55:17,19	62:20
27:21 28:5	doubt 24:13	23:20 45:2	envisioned	express 11:24
29:5 38:24	Doug 8:8	51:15,23 52:11	23:15	29:20 34:18
53:25 54:22	Douglas 5:2	either 13:4 17:8	envisioning 24:5	expressed 11:14
57:15	downhill 54:3	17:10 18:9,11	EP 49:18	29:17 35:1
discussion 10:3	downstream	46:13 60:7	EP1 51:14 52:18	Expressway 5:3
59:3,18	52:15	El 4:5 5:1 8:6,8	especially 22:21	extension 49:17
discussions	Dr 7:9 43:18	8:14,17 10:2	essence 32:22	extent 59:21
11:11 12:2	draft 24:16 27:5	10:17 12:17	56:23	extremely 44:3
16:1 21:4	drafting 22:18	51:12 52:4,15	essential 47:14	48:4
31:15 33:16	23:18 55:4,5	52:17,19,20	essentially 19:17	
34:3 36:9,25	55:12 56:17	elaborate 43:25	56:23 58:5	F
45:25 47:20	58:5,12	Elephant 4:15	established	F 1:15 5:7
48:10 49:3	Drawer 3:3	8:19,22 52:14	12:16	face 50:10
55:11 57:9	dual 11:15,17	emanated 45:25	estimated 16:17	facilities 9:22
displaced 41:3	21:18 34:21	emphasis 37:12	evaluate 17:25	fact 22:7 25:8
		I		I

32:7 39:12	finalized 41:17	54:6,22	54:8	14:7 15:9
40:19 58:15	41:18	funding 32:15	goal 37:23 38:6	22:13 27:2
factor 39:10	finally 6:4 11:4	further 14:24	goes 25:12 42:7	32:20 38:19
59:23	16:14	36:14 55:1	going 6:13 10:4	47:21 52:3
facts 24:7 62:5	finish 50:15	60:11 62:9	11:6,18,22	guided 59:20
fair 11:2 14:22	Firm 4:17 5:13		12:17,23 16:13	
14:22	62:23	G	19:6 27:23,24	H
fairly 47:5	first 9:19 13:13	G 5:2 6:1	29:12 30:5	half 42:5
faith 10:22	13:21 30:3	gain 57:20	32:20,21 33:4	Hamman 7:8
15:21 18:3	43:1,18 59:17	Garcia 43:19	37:21,24 40:2	HAND 62:16
19:15,20,21	Floor 3:9	Garza 5:18 62:3	40:3 43:13	handle 14:20
Faler 7:24	Florida 10:19	62:19	49:21 53:23	hands 16:21
fallow 32:21	flushed 54:22	general 7:5	54:1,6,7,13	happen 22:6
fallowing 32:15	flying 55:19	26:11,18,19,24	55:4,7,7,8,18	35:13
33:6,11,15	focus 21:25	31:9 32:8 34:1	56:10,17,24	happens 19:23
far 24:1 27:3	22:23 40:9,10	42:8 47:25	58:11 59:12,15	25:19 40:23
37:4 39:11	focused 44:10	53:12	good 6:2 7:2,13	hard 34:24 43:1
54:21	following 10:13	general's 2:13	7:19 8:7,16,21	47:17 53:23
farmers 5:12 9:6	follows 10:14	3:3 6:22 7:6	9:3 10:12,22	harmed 49:21
53:11	foot 36:7	26:8 29:9	15:21 19:9,21	Harris 4:7 59:13
fashion 51:21	foregoing 62:6	48:14	20:15 25:6	hate 37:3
favor 16:2	foresee 13:10	generally 48:9	33:13 36:20,25	hear 11:14,22
Fe 2:19 3:4 4:23	form 34:12	48:10	37:1,7 40:25	15:17 16:9
5:8	Fort 10:18	generated 11:1	47:1	22:4 30:3
feasible 45:18	forth 35:17 55:9	28:4	goodwill 10:25	38:17
February/Ma	60:7	Georgia 10:18	35:10 36:25	heard 31:7,11
41:15	forward 10:10	getting 17:20	gotten 30:6	43:3 51:7
federal 21:3	15:22 43:13	30:7,10,15	governing 30:19	53:15,15 55:25
25:21 50:23	58:11 59:15	32:24 49:18	government	59:8
feel 20:20 23:17	60:4	giant 44:12	25:21	hearing 1:14 6:4
33:14 35:8,10	four 32:19 60:9	give 13:1 18:24	governor 33:23	9:23 14:8,13
42:2,23 45:23	Fourth 4:8	29:6 31:18	governor's 32:1	17:9,13 24:7
59:14	frame 41:2	36:18 38:17,18	33:24	62:8,11
feels 37:5	frankly 17:9	38:21 42:25	Grande 5:11	HEATH 5:2
fell 19:19	18:9 37:1	48:1 50:14	6:23 9:5 33:6	Heather 5:18
fight 54:12	59:12	54:10	38:4 52:10,13	62:3,19
figures 28:4 29:6	Friday 20:24	GIVEN 62:16	52:22 53:10	heather_garza
figuring 57:23	60:16,16	giving 38:21	Granger 59:17	5:21
filed 39:13	front 7:4 31:20	49:8	great 10:24,25	help 59:1
filing 39:18	42:11	go 15:16 17:19	11:12 15:23	helpful 58:10
final 16:7 18:7	fruitful 12:11	18:11,17 21:2	19:1 41:7	hereto 62:6
18:12,16 22:12	fruition 13:18	21:6,11 24:11	greater 39:20	Hicks 4:11,12
22:16 23:18,23	frustration	24:14 26:7	groundwater	8:17
25:18 28:11	29:17,18	27:24 31:23	33:13 49:20	highly 45:15
29:6 32:4	frustrations	32:16 40:5,6	growers 5:11 9:2	46:19
37:11 41:5	30:4	40:22 41:17	9:4 53:8	history 31:5
59:11	fully 13:19 43:14	42:21 43:8	guess 9:24 12:14	hits 40:2
	l v	l		l

impediments	29:9	43:11	59:17,22 60:13
18:10	interpretation	jcbrockmann	60:13,18,19,21
implement	-	•	60:22
-		Jeff 7:3	Judith 3:17 7:21
	-		judith.colema
-		v	3:20
			July 60:2,17,20
-		0	JUNE 1:14
L .			juris 38:2
			jurisdiction
-		•	35:25 36:7
			Justice 3:13,18
-		0	7:22 25:13
,			jwechsler@m
		· · ·	2:20
-			2.20
6		· · · ·	K
			keep 29:18 47:4
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	47:15
•	0		keeping 60:3
	0		kept 33:17 34:1
	,		Khoury 3:2 7:4
			kin 62:13
			kind 17:11 22:4
			59:14
			kinds 13:5
6		· · · · · ·	Klahn 2:8 6:21
			know 6:11 10:5
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · ·	
		,	12:15,19 15:24
	,	,	19:18,24 22:7
	, , ,	,	23:4,8 26:21
-	,	, ,	27:1 32:2 33:7
	,	<i>'</i>	33:24 35:8
		,	39:19 40:5,13
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	40:14,15,24
			41:24 42:1,12
	57:14 58:2,20	41:12 42:3	48:10,13 50:19
interested 29:11	59:2,4	43:2,8 45:21	54:17 57:6
29:15 33:13	it'll 18:16 32:3	46:4,13,18,23	59:24 60:10
37:15,16 57:1	40:20	48:21 49:12,14	knows 44:2
62:13	items 21:12	50:16 51:2,6	L
interests 56:25	54:21	51:10 52:2,23	
interference		53:4 54:15,24	L 2:3 5:18 62:3
28:22		55:1,25 56:12	62:19
interior 3:22 4:2		56:14,21 58:3	lack 28:21
21:6 23:6	January 21:12	58:3,6,7,10,14	Lake 4:3
2110 2010	Jay 5:7 8:10	· -) -) ·) -)	land 21:8 32:16
	18:10 implement 53:23 implicated 50:22 important 54:23 imposed 12:7 19:11 impossible 11:17 12:19 Improvement 4:5 8:15,18 51:12 52:16 in-person 20:18 including 13:13 19:11 23:13 44:7 58:25 incredibly 58:10 indicate 39:2 56:1 indicated 22:8 29:8 30:4 47:8 48:5 indicates 23:1 indicates 23:1 indicating 6:10 individual 51:25 informed 33:17 34:1 47:15 48:9 initiated 17:2 input 57:12 insurmountable 28:17 31:12 interest 18:9 28:24 37:10 interested 29:11 29:15 33:13 37:15,16 57:1 62:13 interests 56:25 interference 28:22 interior 3:22 4:2	18:10 interpretation implement 38:2 53:23 interpretations implicated 38:4 50:22 interstate 7:9 important 54:23 33:20 imposed 12:7 interstate 7:9 19:11 interstate 48:16 imposed 12:7 intervenor 6:10 19:11 intrastate 48:16 impossible 11:17 59:2 12:19 involve 48:16 Improvement 4:5 8:15,18 4:5 8:15,18 26:2 35:7 51:12 52:16 47:15 50:19 in-person 20:18 56:16 including 13:13 19:11 23:13 19:11 23:13 24:2 indicate 39:2 involves 58:24 including 13:13 involving 44:4 indicate 39:2 51:12 56:1 8:19,23 44:11 51:22 issue 24:11 30:2 indicates 23:1 indicates 23:1 indicates 23:1 51:22 indicates 23:1 19:4,8,10 23:2 issue 11:18 12:22,25 15:23 indicated 17:2 35:4,4 44:3,9	18:10 interpretation 38:2 jcbrockmann 53:23 interpretations 38:4 Jeff 7:3 50:22 interstate 7:9 Jeff 7:3 important 54:23 33:20 jfstein@newm imposed 12:7 intervenor 6:10 5:9 19:11 intervenor 6:10 5:9 19:11 involve 48:16 joined 7:22 inpossible 11:17 59:2 joined 7:22 12:19 involve 48:16 joineg 8:12 Improvement involved 13:2 Jorge 43:18 4:5 8:15,18 26:2 35:7 Judge 1:15 6:2 51:12 52:16 47:15 50:19 6:25 7:11,17 including 13:13 involves 58:24 10:9,12 12:13 incredibly 58:10 involving 44:4 12:24 13:25 indicate 39:2 irrigation 4:15 14:3,4,11,23 56:1 8:19,23 44:11 14:25 15:1,2,3 indicate 22:8 52:15 15:4,6,7,8,8,9 29:8 30:4 47:8 ISC 48:14 15:12,15,18 issue 24:11 30:2 20:4,7,12,15 indicate 22:1 <

Г

language 24:25	55:2,10 56:4	M	mediator 9:18	9:11 10:17
large 35:9 59:20	56:13,15 58:12	$\frac{101}{M}$ M 2:13,22	42:4 59:17	16:17,17,23
larger 38:1,13	let's 15:10	Main 4:17	mediator's	17:20 18:19
largest 44:14	level 15:22 26:7	maintain 34:20	59:21	21:11 30:8
Las 4:18,21 5:6	38:1,2 40:16		meet 47:6	32:14,20 33:4
8:9,11 43:11	42:24 47:13	maintaining 41:11	meetings 10:14	33:20,22,25
43:13 44:7,14	levels 23:4 28:20	major 19:5 31:7	11:1	34:19,23 39:6
45:10 46:11,20	28:23 29:1	make-of-break	MELLOY 1:15	39:8 42:8
56:25	lies 37:10	12:18	6:2,25 7:11,17	43:16 45:16
lasted 31:4	lieu 10:8	makers 33:17	7:25 8:6,9,14	46:4,5,7 47:4,5
lasting 35:5 58:1	likelihood 20:16	34:6	8:19,24 9:2,10	48:13 53:8,9
LAW 3:8 4:12	limited 34:22	making 9:22	9:13,17 12:13	53:12,13,19
4:17 5:13	Lincoln 2:23	14:16	13:25 14:4,23	54:1,2 56:10
Lawrence 2:9	line 26:1	Mall 2:4	15:1,4,7,9,15	56:12 57:2,19
lawsuit 39:4,6	lines 21:1 38:23	management	15:18 17:15	58:25 59:1
39:10,11,14,18	link 33:23	33:13	19:2 20:4,7,12	Mexico's 27:20
39:19	Lisa 2:22 7:6	manpower	22:4,25 23:25	33:10 52:6,9
lawsuits 50:17	listening 6:13	21:21	24:20 25:1,19	Michael 1:15
lawyer 50:9	53:5	manual 39:25	26:10,17 27:2	7:15
lawyers 37:8	lists 60:7,7	40:8,10	27:13 28:1,13	mid 48:4
leaders 32:2	litigate 34:16	map 13:1	29:7,25 30:14	middle 33:6
leads 38:4	litigation 10:23	Maria 4:7 8:17	30:18,22 31:1	42:20
leave 17:18	17:2 20:2 32:8	51:11	31:24 32:18	Mike 7:8
Lee 3:13 7:20	51:16,19,21	MASTER 1:15	35:20,23 36:12	million 32:23
lee.leininger@	54:1,3	matter 13:8 47:6	36:16 37:18	mind 12:14
3:15	little 9:24 41:13	55:14	38:16 39:5	Minneapolis
legal 53:20	LLC 4:17 5:13	matters 10:23	41:12 43:2,8	10:18
legislation 16:24	LLP 5:2	47:8	45:21 46:4,13	Minnesota
17:21 18:18	locations 15:20	MAX 4:12	46:18,23 48:21	10:16,18
19:12 21:10,11	long 12:22 20:18	mean 12:1,21	49:12,14 50:16	minor 50:12
31:25,25 32:14	31:5 42:3	14:7 22:21	51:2,6,10 52:2	minutes 43:7
legislative 13:15	44:25 50:3	23:3,7,10	52:23 53:4	Missouri 1:16
13:23 14:12	53:3	27:13 28:15,15	54:15,24 55:1	9:20 10:19
16:16 19:24	longer 34:17	33:18 34:22	55:25 56:12,14	mobrien@mo
20:1 21:13,15	look 50:7,8	37:9 39:6	56:21 58:3	4:9
32:2 46:7,10	looking 24:17	40:22 41:22	59:6,10 60:18	MODRALL 4:7
legislature 16:24	27:19 34:16	42:14 45:22	60:21	moment 27:23
18:19 34:7,8	37:14,21 42:16	55:5 58:6	mention 20:19	Monday 24:21
41:1 46:7,12	lost 10:15	means 12:8 28:8	mentioned 24:6	55:4
Leininger 3:13	lot 6:5 15:13,19	42:10	56:7	MONTGOM
7:19,20 20:13	15:20,23 47:12	measures 13:12	met 10:14,15	2:18
20:14 22:19	53:24 54:3	mediating 15:14	Mexicans 54:14	month 41:24,24
23:10 24:4,24	56:9	15:20	Mexico 1:11	months 21:8
25:4,25 26:13	Louis 1:16 10:8	mediation 10:2	2:17,19 3:3,4	22:11 35:14
26:21 27:7,15	10:19	10:6,7 14:24	4:8,18,23 5:8	50:6
28:3,19 29:16	lthompson@t	31:6 50:12	5:11,11,15 6:8	MoPac 5:3
30:12,17,21,24	2:25		7:1,3 9:2,4,6	morning 6:3 7:2

7:13,19 8:7,16	44:23 56:10	O 6:1	34:2	43:13
8:21 9:3,23	negotiations	O'Brien 4:7	operating 30:7	participating
10:12 11:10	12:21 13:3	8:16,17 51:8	30:11,16,18	6:12
15:3 20:15	21:18 22:2	51:10,11,11	38:20,25 39:2	participation
36:20 47:1	29:23 44:8	52:8	39:3,7,13,16	51:17 54:2
move 44:8 47:17	48:19	object 48:25	39:21,24,25	58:22
moving 15:22	negotiators 41:2	objection 54:19	40:7,7	particular 37:8
35:11 57:21	new 1:11 2:17	obligation 37:13	opinions 11:13	37:12 56:1
60:4	2:19 3:3,4 4:8	obligations	48:2	particularly
multiple 50:2,23	4:18,23 5:8,11	37:20	opportunity	19:25
municipal 44:13	5:11,15 6:8,25	obstacle 28:17	47:2 50:14	parties 9:14
45:11,17	7:3 9:2,4,6,11	obstacles 19:5	53:2	10:21 11:2,7,9
mutually 41:10	10:17 16:16,17	obtain 35:25	oppose 46:14	13:14,15,20
51:23	16:23 17:20	Obviously 41:7	opposed 13:5	14:5,11,19
Myers 10:18	18:18 21:11	occur 19:20 33:3	opposition 29:11	16:9 17:7,16
	27:19 30:8	40:15 43:20,22	29:13,14	19:3 20:16
<u> </u>	32:14,20 33:3	occurring 54:4	oral 13:5	21:14 22:22
N 2:1 6:1	33:10,19,22,25	October 11:8,19	order 9:25 10:1	23:3 24:9,21
N.W 4:8	34:19,23 39:6	12:1 16:4	12:7 24:12	25:7 27:22
nail 12:25	39:8 42:7	21:24 29:19	31:18	28:10 29:12,19
narrow 45:1	43:16 44:9,19	34:20 41:11	Original 1:3 6:7	29:23 31:6,21
nature 57:8	45:16,17,21	42:13,22 44:1	47:11	32:6 34:22
58:12	46:4,5,7 47:4,5	45:20	outline 28:7	35:2,3,7 36:24
nearly 30:5	48:13 52:6,9	office 2:13,14	outlines 25:3	37:2 38:8,12
necessarily	53:8,9,12,13	3:3,3,18 4:12	outset 41:21	40:17 44:6
41:20	53:19 54:1,1	4:12,23 5:8,14	outvote 25:24	45:7 47:7,25
necessary 12:20	54:14 56:10,12	6:21,22 7:6,22	overly 56:2	48:3,5,12,19
42:15 57:17	57:2,19 58:25	9:21 21:7 23:6		50:19 51:15,20
necessity 14:8	59:1	23:13 25:12	P P	53:20 55:2,11
46:19	nice 6:3,5	26:8 29:10	P 2:1,1 6:1	57:1,5 58:15
need 14:4 16:12	normal 17:13	32:1 33:24	P.A 4:7,22 5:7	59:3 62:10,14
19:12 22:5	noted 51:18,20	48:14 62:16	package 26:6	parties' 11:23
25:10 27:4	notice 14:8	official 33:19	page 52:4	51:23,24
29:5 31:23	notwithstandi	officials 29:10	pages 62:6	parts 13:14 32:5
45:23 46:6	19:21 40:25	33:22	paper 18:4	party 11:18
49:25 54:5,6,7	42:17	Ogaz 3:2 7:5	27:12 56:20	24:12 29:15
56:23 57:5	November 62:17	oh 32:19 56:14	par 36:10	41:9
60:5	nuances 35:4	okay 15:1 30:22	parameters	Paseo 2:19
needs 21:24,25	number 12:25	43:8 46:23	27:16	Paso 4:5 5:1 8:6
28:2	19:1 31:22	51:6 56:14	pardon 11:20	8:8,14,17 10:3
negotiate 18:20	32:10 37:7	59:6 60:18	part 17:3 19:10	10:17 12:17
34:4	58:1	older 50:1	19:14 23:21	51:12 52:4,15
negotiated 27:4	numerous 20:20	Olsen 9:7	27:10 33:16	52:17,19,20
56:8	26:25 44:3	on-the-ground	37:10 44:23	pass 46:12
negotiating 45:7	NW 3:23	54:14	participate	path 20:22
negotiation 17:7		ones 19:4	43:16 58:4	25:16 34:22
27:10 43:24	Ο	ongoing 23:21	participates	Paul 10:16

pecan 5:11 9:2,4	position 36:21	56:9	52:22	Q
53:8	38:9	primary 21:25	proper 49:20,25	quarter 13:13
pen 22:24	positive 12:2	33:21	property 32:21	13:22
pending 50:25	possible 32:14	principles 11:3	proposal 18:15	question 25:7,8
people 6:11	32:15 50:7	45:4,4,5 47:19	18:15 31:17	26:22 36:3
19:11 23:5	Post 2:14 3:3,18	48:1,8,22 49:2	45:13 49:5	40:22 44:10
29:9 53:5	4:12,23 5:8,14	54:16 55:15	proposals 44:17	46:21 52:17
Peralta 2:19	postpone 35:16	prior 9:24 39:3	44:18,19,25	questions 12:14
period 32:9	postponing	priority 51:4	45:1	53:15
34:17 35:14	20:21	59:4	propose 17:8	quicker 40:20
59:20	posturing 14:20	Priscilla 2:13	proposed 16:10	quite 12:24 17:9
periods 53:17	potential 35:11	6:21	16:10 18:14	18:9,19 34:5
person 6:4,6	potentially	priscilla.hube	20:25 23:19,22	59:12
26:11,22 60:2	28:16	2:15	24:25 39:23	
perspective	power 18:8	probably 12:19	42:6	R
10:10,24 15:24	25:21	13:13 41:19	proposing 20:22	R 2:1 3:13 4:16
18:1 19:8	practical 42:1	60:1	24:8	6:1
33:11 40:23	53:22 54:13	problem 19:10	protect 52:12	Raley 2:23 7:7
44:8 47:22,24	practicality 52:1	21:17 23:8	protection 29:3	ramifications
48:17 54:11	pre-trial 17:9,13	procedural	protests 50:25	42:1
58:9	precisely 57:23	14:20	provide 39:14	Randel 3:22
phase 22:15	predicated	procedure 24:1	39:17 44:22	7:23
43:20 45:22	16:16	proceed 13:9	provided 39:13	range 27:21
phrased 36:11	predict 19:23	17:13 18:23	provides 30:9	reach 10:22 16:1
piece 58:1	predictable 34:8	24:15 59:22	39:22	18:13 25:17
pieces 25:11	preexisted 39:18	proceedings	providing 45:11	28:11 31:16
pilot 32:21 33:3	preliminary	61:1 62:8	provisions 13:16	35:5 40:18,19
33:5	55:11	process 18:18	prudence 38:2	40:24 41:7
place 11:16	preparation	19:24 20:1	pull 15:16	56:6 57:17
14:22 25:11	11:16 21:19,24	21:7,16,17	purposes 21:9	reached 11:2
43:1	38:11 43:23	27:10 41:13	23:15 24:10	16:20
Please 6:2	45:20 48:20	43:14,15,17,22	28:24 29:19	read 32:19
plugged 28:6	prepare 21:22	43:23,24 44:16	55:22	ready 21:1 25:11
point 14:6,24	prepared 18:24	44:23 45:8,19	push 50:14	real 17:3 22:23
17:22,24 18:22	59:11	46:16 47:6,23	pushback 49:5	realistic 50:5
18:23 20:21	presence 58:14	48:13 50:13	pushed 11:20	really 19:16
22:8 23:17	present 6:16	56:16,19 58:4	pushing 49:22	27:18 36:8
24:5 26:7	9:18 24:7	58:13,21	49:24	37:3,25 38:9
34:13 37:19	31:19	program 32:21	put 20:23 23:19	40:10 49:6
38:6 42:23	presented 36:4	33:1,3,5	27:11 29:1	53:12 58:20
54:18,20 55:6	43:20	progress 11:12	30:13 35:17	reason 31:17
59:18 60:11	presents 51:25	15:23 22:20	37:16 42:15	34:25 39:9
political 35:14	pretty 19:5,9	58:19	50:9 57:25	50:13
portion 12:4	49:9	project 27:19	puts 16:25	reasonably 44:1
portions 10:20	prevent 27:5	28:22,24,25,25	putting 22:24	reasons 19:1
28:6	Previously 44:9	29:3,4 33:10	24:22 37:8	recall 42:3
posed 19:11	primarily 37:10	52:10,10,12,14	56:19	Reclamation
	· ····································			

	1		·	
7:24 8:25 23:6	remedy 24:16	respond 38:22	S	14:2 16:8,12
recognize 29:2	remember 43:18	response 9:1,16	S 2:1 5:3 6:1	16:19 17:18
recognized	reminding 31:3	49:25 54:25	Sacramento 2:5	18:5,6,13,21
27:22	remotely 8:13	56:3 59:9	Salt 4:3	20:23,24,24
recommendati	Renea 4:11,12	responsibility	Samantha 4:16	22:2 28:12
14:17 25:12	8:17	55:6	8:22	31:18 35:17
26:3	report 9:25 10:9	responsible	samantha@h	37:5 41:17
record 6:19 7:14	14:8,17 17:10	13:20	4:19	42:18 45:14
8:4 51:14 53:6	24:10	result 46:17	Santa 2:19 3:4	48:4,17 56:2
reduce 22:11	Reporter 5:17	retained 44:1	4:23 5:8	serious 17:4
48:11	62:4	retains 36:7	Sarah 2:8 6:21	session 10:2,4
reduced 37:11	Reporters 5:19	rhicks@renea	satisfaction	14:24 21:11,15
reducing 55:15	62:23	4:14	14:15	58:24 59:5
reevaluate 18:22	represent 31:13	Rich 4:2 7:23	saying 31:3	sessions 10:16
referring 44:13	representations	right 7:25 9:13	33:14 34:5	10:20 58:14
45:9	19:22	9:14 15:4,7,9	59:22	set 35:16 45:22
regard 38:14	representatives	20:7,12,22	says 25:22,22,23	48:7 60:5,10
52:16 53:18,25	47:14	24:24 29:7,22	25:23 30:8	setting 9:23
regarding 52:17	representing	30:17 31:1	schedule 12:6	settle 18:11 28:8
53:16	46:5	36:12,16 38:16	scheduled 11:19	50:6 51:15
regardless 59:25	requesting	43:2,8 44:5	12:5 14:14,23	settled 24:8
regards 58:2	49:17	49:12 50:14,15	schedules 9:7	settlement 11:11
Registration	require 21:13	51:6 52:21,23	scheduling 11:8	11:16,19 12:1
62:23	54:1,13	53:17,25 56:21	Schmidt-Peter	12:10 13:3,16
regular 26:23	required 21:5,21	59:6 60:24	7:10	13:18,24 14:18
62:10,12	26:6 58:15	rights 32:22	Scott 59:13	14:21 16:2,5
regulatory 13:14	requirements	37:20 44:5,10	screen 55:22	16:23,25 18:2
21:3	21:3	46:1 50:25	SEAL 62:16	18:3,5,12,13
relate 37:13,17	resolution 10:23	52:21	seated 6:2	20:17,25 22:1
37:17	31:16 34:17	Rio 5:11 6:23	second 15:15	22:5 23:15,23
related 27:16	35:5,12 41:6	9:5 33:6 38:3	42:4 43:19	24:3,18 25:18
50:24	42:16 51:19	52:10,13,22	44:14	25:21 27:11,25
relationship	55:18 57:25	53:10	see 18:15 21:16	28:6,11,18
37:2	resolve 36:22	road 5:14 13:1	28:19 29:24	29:2 31:19,19
relative 57:23	51:3,16 54:2	20:18 40:2,20	35:11 37:3	31:23 32:6,10
relatively 57:13	resolved 12:23	ROEHL 4:7	40:5 42:16	32:17,25 33:8
relief 17:2 30:6	35:2 45:23	role 38:13 58:6,7	45:13 47:24	33:12,16,24
30:15 38:21	resource 38:14	58:11	49:1 54:11,12	34:9 35:18,21
39:13,15,17,17	resources 21:20	Rolf 7:9	59:14	36:5,22 37:11
rely 19:25	34:23 38:10	room 47:20 50:8	seen 6:5 48:8	37:19 38:10,23
remain 11:15	42:15	50:9	49:6 57:7	39:23,23,24
16:4 19:4	respect 17:3	rooms 57:15	select 55:21	40:4,10,14,18
remarkable	18:1 39:22	route 24:18	sense 30:7 35:6	40:19,24 41:16
22:20 23:11	40:12	RPR 62:19	40:1 41:23	41:18 42:10
remarks 47:3	respective 21:1	rubber 40:1	September 13:4	43:15,21 45:14
remedies 12:4,6	28:5	rule 14:10	13:6,10,12	47:16,23,24
12:6	respects 43:14	ruling 24:16		48:19 50:18

51:17,19,24	42:14 49:6	45:10	34:15,20 36:2	49:24 53:11
54:11 57:8,9	sites 55:20	spectators 6:15	36:3 37:15	54:14
57:15	sitting 48:15	speedators 0.15	44:24 52:11	supported 46:10
seven 50:6	situation 52:5	spent 15:13,19	53:21 57:24	supporting
SG 21:4 25:22	six 26:3	SPERLING 4:7	58:25	36:22 53:13
25:22,25 26:9	sklahn@soma	spot 12:9	States' 18:17	supports 51:14
26:25	2:11	spot 12.9 ssomach@so	31:17 51:3	Supreme 1:6 6:7
SG's 21:7 23:5	Skov 6:23	2:6	status 9:25	14:6,9,10,17
23:13 25:12			12:16 17:8	14:19 24:2,3
	sleeping 44:12 small 55:21	St 1:16 10:8,16 10:19	22:7,22 42:19	24:10 35:24
shape 19:9 34:12				36:5 40:20
share 30:10	solicitor 26:8,10	staff 9:21 stage 22:16,24	59:25 60:11,14 62:8,11	59:13
55:22 57:10	26:19,24 29:9 solicitor's 7:22	37:4 43:18		sure 12:24 13:15
			statutory 21:3	
sheet 22:9,15 25:3 45:2,3	solution 46:7,10 50:1	start 6:10,16 15:10 22:17	stayed 59:19 Stein 4:22 5:7,7	25:16 26:16 36:2 37:21
,				
48:6 Shally 2:22 7:22	Somach 2:3,4,9	24:22 29:19	8:10,10 43:9	38:3 60:3,13 surmountable
Shelly 3:22 7:23	6:17,18,19	31:3 39:1 55:4	43:10,11 45:24	
shelly.randel	15:10,12,17,19	started 50:4,12	46:9,15,21,24	19:5,14
3:24	17:23 19:7	55:6,10	47:8	surprise 23:16
Shorthand 62:4	20:6 22:25	starting 27:5	stood 10:6	T
shown 58:15	30:1,3 38:18	state 1:9,11,11	straight 50:10	T 5:13
side 11:20 52:6,7	39:1,8 41:22	2:2,13,17 3:7	stream 7:9 33:20	table 6:20 7:21
52:9,9	50:3	4:3 5:11 6:8,8	Street 1:16 2:9	33:1 45:13
sign 26:12 27:1	somebody 23:8	6:9,17,19 7:3,7	2:23 3:14,23	take 6:11,13,15
53:21	soon 55:8	7:11,14,16 9:6	4:3,8 5:19	11:16 12:8,23
signed 22:12	sooner 60:1	9:11 15:24	Stuart 2:3 6:18	14:21,22 16:14
significant 58:18	sorry 9:10 19:24	16:20,23 17:4	subject 17:17	21:7 22:10
59:3,23	28:1	17:25 20:2	22:13 23:4	24:12 34:13,21
significantly	sort 29:4 34:11	33:18 43:15,16	24:9 55:14	53:3
39:20	38:20 52:5	43:20 44:6,17	succeed 54:11	taken 1:15 14:13
signing 21:9	54:8 59:1	44:22,22,24	success 20:17	24:14 62:11
26:16	sought 57:12	47:13 48:13	successful 29:22	takes 44:25 47:8
signs 26:17	sounds 41:12	51:13 53:9	suggest 10:13	48:16
SIMMONS 2:4	South 1:16 4:3	62:4	12:9	talent 50:8
2:9	4:17	state's 20:1	Suite 2:4,9,23	talk 16:5 17:6
simply 33:13	Southern 5:11	44:13	3:14 4:3,17 5:3	28:13 41:9
34:15 35:15	9:5 53:10	stated 20:15	5:19 62:24	42:9 49:7
58:19	speak 9:9 28:9	62:5	Sullivan 7:15	56:18 59:12
simultaneously	29:13 30:1	statement 15:13	sum 57:20	talked 20:9 40:3
43:22 56:17	36:19 38:19	42:17	summary 10:13	57:16
single 50:9,11	49:15 52:3,18	states 1:6,15,16	superiors 23:13	talking 12:17
Sippel 9:21	52:24 53:2,9	3:12 6:7,9 7:18	25:13	19:16 23:5
sir 9:12 30:17,21	SPECIAL 1:15	7:20 16:13,22	supplant 38:24	28:14 33:8
SISK 4:7	specific 45:1	17:20 20:11	supply 45:12,17	41:3,5 57:22
sit 16:21 18:22	46:2 53:16	21:2 25:9	52:12	talks 36:22
24:22 25:2	58:17	26:18 28:10	support 24:8	37:24 38:7,10
40:14 41:9	specifically	31:11 32:13	31:17 47:16,23	57.24 50.7,10

tbarfield@so	15:4,7,8,16	Thompson 2:22	12:3,5 13:9	22:3
2:6	20:7,14 31:2	7:6	16:3,3 17:1,6	uncertainty 42:9
telegraph 16:4	36:14,16,20	thought 16:7	17:13,19,22	uncommon 32:9
telephone 6:12	38:16 43:2,10	20:10 39:15	18:11,24 19:19	understand 10:7
6:13	46:23 47:2	56:1 60:15	20:21,22 21:19	11:9 20:11
tell 10:10 11:12	49:12,13 52:23	thoughts 11:7	21:22,22,24	24:21 35:3
31:24 50:10	53:1 54:23,24	three 21:8 22:11	24:11 29:20	49:4 54:16,21
ten 30:5	56:21 59:6	32:19 33:4	34:21 35:16	56:8,22 59:22
tentative 11:3	60:21,22,24	50:21 60:9	38:10,13,14	understanding
16:11 18:16	that'd 41:7	threshold 29:4	40:5,6 41:11	37:1,19 41:16
31:8 45:14	Theresa 2:3 6:20	threw 38:20	41:14,18 42:5	54:7
49:8	thing 18:19 19:3	thumb 29:18	42:12,21,25	undertake 14:16
tentatively	28:16 35:7	tier 44:9	43:17,18,20,22	United 1:6,15,16
22:10	things 11:5 16:6	time 12:20 16:21	44:1 45:20,20	3:12 6:7,9 7:17
term 22:9,15	17:14 18:8	18:23 19:1,15	48:19,20 49:18	7:20 16:13,22
25:2 28:17,21	19:13 22:5	19:18,19 22:5	49:23,24 50:14	17:19 18:17
45:1,3 48:6	32:12 34:18	34:17 35:17	51:23 60:5	20:11 25:9
terms 15:22 25:5	37:8 47:16	38:11,18 39:3	Trout 2:23 7:7	26:18 28:10
27:4,8,14,21	57:12,14 60:3	41:2,15 42:3	true 12:3 18:2	31:11,17 32:12
29:21 32:17	think 9:14 10:11	42:23 44:25	30:6 32:12	34:14,20 36:1
33:2 36:10	10:14 11:2,6,8	47:8 48:17,20	35:3 37:21	36:3 37:15
37:9,12,16	11:11,22,25	53:17 54:5	57:18 62:6,7	44:24 51:3
39:20 40:9,9	12:3,20,22	55:19 59:20	trust 10:25	52:11 58:25
41:5 42:10	13:3,7 14:11	60:9 62:8	15:22 35:9	University 5:11
52:1 53:16,17	15:5,10,20,21	timeline 16:19	try 24:16 40:21	9:7,11 53:10
54:9 56:6 57:8	19:4,8,12,21	41:5	trying 17:21	unwanted 38:4
58:17	21:13 22:14,16	times 26:25	21:17	unwilling 40:13
Tessa 5:13 9:4	22:19,23 24:4	timing 34:14	ttd@tessadavi	42:14
53:7	24:13 25:17	51:22	5:16	unwillingness
testify 14:15	27:9,21 28:10	today 7:15 9:8	two 6:3 22:4,11	16:5
testimony 40:8	29:16,21 31:10	12:9 19:17	43:14 52:14	uphill 54:4
Texas 1:9 2:2,13	31:20,21 33:4	25:2 27:6	two-step 41:13	upset 49:17
2:14 4:13 5:3	33:14 34:24	42:24 49:9	TX 62:24	urge 42:12
5:20 6:8,17,19	35:3 36:10	51:20 53:2	type 28:16 33:1	use 27:20 28:21
6:22,23 10:17	40:4,8,14 41:8	59:11	types 32:7	28:23 44:11,16
15:24 16:21	41:10 43:6	told 13:8 45:5		53:18,19
17:4 19:7 23:1	45:14 47:10,14	50:4	U	users 45:8 47:12
27:19 29:17	47:25 48:1	top 20:1	U.S 3:13,18,22	58:25
30:5,7,9 31:11	49:9,9 50:5,7	total 11:21	4:2	uses 44:13 57:24
32:13 36:2	50:21 51:18	track 11:17	ultimate 14:6	Utah 4:3
39:20 44:24	55:13 56:3,16	21:18 45:19	26:1 47:16	Utility 4:20 8:2
49:23 50:4	57:3,4,12 58:5	tracks 11:15	ultimately 26:8	8:5
52:11 62:4	58:13,18,19	transcript 1:14	26:12,15 27:1	utility's 8:12
Texas' 17:25	59:16	62:7	27:24 31:16	Utton's 9:7
34:13 52:7	thinking 17:24	trenches 45:9	33:25 34:10	
thank 6:25 7:11	50:5	trial 11:8,14,16	35:5	V
7:25 9:13,19	THOMAS 1:15	11:18,22,25	unattainable	v 1:10
	-	l ·	-	-

value 27:24	warranted 12:11	42:2,4,5 48:9	31:10,14 43:1	0
values 27:8,14	Washington	57:10,11,22	48:6 50:11	04-30-24 62:20
27:20 28:4,14	3:19,23	58:17,18	working 37:1	04-30-24 02.20
28:15 29:4	water 4:5,20 8:2	Wechsler 2:18	47:25 48:8	1
37:15 56:7	8:5,14,17	7:2,3 20:8,9	Worldwide 5:19	14:68:15,18,25
various 11:18,23	27:17,18,20	30:3 31:1,2	62:23	49:19 51:12
12:15 13:14,15	28:14,21,23	32:4 33:2	worth 41:8	52:16
17:17 21:2	30:7,10,20	35:22 36:1,14	wouldn't 14:10	10:18 61:1
23:4 40:1 44:6	32:22 33:19,21	36:17 46:6	23:9 30:12	1000 2:4
48:15	38:1 44:4,5	56:22 57:3	31:13 34:9	10th 1:16
versus 6:8 24:17	45:8 47:12,22	58:9	39:16 41:19	1100 4:17
vested 53:20	49:3,19 50:25	weeds 32:24	58:14	111 1:16
veto 25:21	51:12 52:12,16	week 12:17,18	write 25:2 26:3	1120 2:23
viability 28:25	52:19,19,20	22:21 59:24	writing 24:24,25	1120 2:23
29:3	53:18,18,18,19	60:10	37:9,11 48:11	115 2:9 125 4:3
videoconference	56:24 57:19,21	weekend 50:11	49:2 55:16,22	125,000 45:12
60:8	57:23 58:25	weekly 25:15	written 10:9	12548 2:14
view 11:24 12:2	way 10:5 18:23	34:2 57:11	13:4,7,9,17	1300 3:9
12:10 16:8,9	28:20 34:12	weeks 55:23	14:1 22:12	141 1:3 6:8
17:5 19:2 20:8	36:10,22 50:7	58:16,18 60:9	28:6 31:19	15 50:24
22:3 35:16	50:15 60:8	went 20:11	37:22 48:5	1508 3:3
56:9 57:24	ways 40:1	weren't 34:10	57.22 40.5	1600 2:23
58:7,11 59:21	we'll 6:16 18:15	Weslayan 5:19	X	1849 3:23
viewed 28:22	24:16 40:18	62:24	X 13:20	1849 3:25 18th 3:14
views 11:23	41:8 56:15,15	whatsoever		10111 5.14
20:16	57:25 60:5,10	28:20	Y	2
visit 59:12	we're 11:5 12:9	wholeheartedly	Y 13:21	20 4:17
visiting 11:9	12:11 17:11	51:14	Yeah 15:18	2000 39:12
55:20	18:23 19:9,16	willing 11:10	year 19:17 21:9	2000s 39:12 50:4
55.20	22:24,24 24:15	17:6,11 18:12	21:16 24:19	20044 3:19
W	26:23 27:18,23	18:22 34:23,24	41:4,4,20 42:7	2013 16:25
wait 35:13	33:12 35:10,12	34:25 35:19	42:9	2013 10:25 202 3:19,24
Wallace 3:8 7:13	35:12 35:10,12	42:18,25 43:23	years 6:3 12:8	2022 1:14 62:17
7:14 36:18,20	38:6,8 40:13	45:15 58:21,23	24:15,17 26:3	2023 13:13,22
37:23	42:14,18 45:15	wish 52:24 59:8	30:5 32:19	16:18 17:1
Wallace's 42:17	47:19 49:10		33:4 49:19	19:17 41:15
want 9:19 20:4		witness 43:17,19 60:6,7	yesterday 10:8	20240 3:23
20:23 27:2	52:8,9 55:10	,		20240 5:25 2067 4:23 5:8
30:2,23 32:16	55:18 57:10,13	witnesses 21:23	Z	208-5432 3:24
34:18 38:17	57:17,24 60:3	21:23	Z 13:21	203-3432 3.24 223 62:23
40:12 42:13	60:24	word 30:14	Zachary 3:2 7:5	223 02.23 2240 5:14
43:3,24 47:3	we've 10:15 11:1	work 25:24	zero 57:20	2240 3.14 23 37:5
49:15 51:7	11:12 12:15	35:19 41:8	zogaz@nmag	235 5:19 62:24
53:14 59:12,14	15:13,19,23	43:15 45:16	3:5	235 5.19 02.24 23rd 16:8,12,19
60:3,8	16:24 20:19	48:15 50:8	Zoom 20:20	18:5,6,13,16
wanted 41:2	22:15 23:12	54:6 57:6	55:21 58:14	18:21 20:24,24
51:13 54:10	29:22 36:25	58:23 60:22		22:2 31:18
51.15 54.10	39:19 41:4	worked 10:21		22.2 31.10

Г

			_
35:17 42:18	7		
45:14 48:17	720 2:10 3:10		
56:2	745-1101 5:20		
24 1:14	7611 3:18		
25 10:15 20:18	77027 5:20		
21:22	62:24		
2701 2:9	78703 4:13		
279-7868 2:10	78711 2:14		
29th 60:20	78746 5:3		
	792-3636 5:15		
3	7th 3:9 62:17		
300 5:3			
3000 5:19 62:24	8		
303 2:24 3:15	800 5:20		
303187 4:12	800-745-1101		
30th 13:6,10	62:25		
325 2:19	801 4:4		
329-4672 3:4	80202 3:14		
35 31:5,14	80203 2:24 3:9		
370 3:14	80205 2:10		
3711 5:3	8262 62:20		
3rd 16:4 21:24	84138 4:3		
29:19 41:11	844-1375 3:15		
42:13,22 44:1	848-1800 4:9		
45:20	861-1963 2:24		
4	87048 5:15		
4206 5:14	87103 4:8		
446-7979 2:5	87501 2:19 3:4		
463-2012 2:15	87504 4:23 5:8		
472-8021 5:4	88005 4:18		
480-8231 4:13	9		
	9:00 1:16		
5	916 2:5		
500 2:4 4:8	910 2.5 95814 2:5		
505 2:20 3:4 4:9	983-3880 4:24		
4:24 5:9,15	5:9		
508-6281 3:10	986-2637 2:20		
512 2:15 4:13	999 3:14		
5:4	<i>,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,</i>		
514-3553 3:19			
524-5677 4:4			
575 4:18			
6			
6201 4:3			
636-2377 4:18			