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 AUGUST 24, 2022, REMOTE HEARING BEFORE HONORABLE MICHAEL A. MELLOY, SPECIAL MASTER, UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE, 111 SEVENTH AVENUE, SE, CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA 52401, beginning at 11:02 a.m.

1	REMOTE APPEARANCES
2	
	FOR THE STATE OF TEXAS:
3	
	Mr. Stuart L. Somach
4	Ms. Theresa C. Barfield
	Mr. Robert B. Hoffman
5	Mr. Francis Goldsberry II
<i>c</i>	SOMACH SIMMONS & DUNN
6	500 Capitol Mall, Suite 1000
7	Sacramento, California 95814
/	(916) 446-7979 ssomach@somachlaw.com
8	tbarfield@somachlaw.com
	rhoffman@somachlaw.com
9	mgoldsberry@somachlaw.com
10	-and-
11	Ms. Sarah A. Klahn
1.0	SOMACH SIMMONS & DUNN
12	2701 Lawrence Street, Suite 113
13	Denver, Colorado 80205 (720) 279-7868
10	sklahn@somachlaw.com
14	
	-and-
15	
	Ms. Priscilla M. Hubenak
16	Mr. Grant Dorfman
17	STATE OF TEXAS ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE
⊥/	Post Office Box 12548
18	Austin, Texas 78711 (512) 463-2012
±0	priscilla.hubenak@oag.texas.gov
19	
20	FOR THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO:
21	Mr. Jeffrey Wechsler
	Ms. Shelly Dalyrmple
22	MONTGOMERY & ANDREWS
23	325 Paseo De Peralta
40	Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501 (505) 986-2637
24	jwechsler@montand.com
25	-and-

Г

```
1
         Ms. Lisa M. Thompson
         Mr. Michael A. Kopp
 2
         TROUT RALEY
         1120 Lincoln Street, Suite 1600
 3
         Denver, Colorado 80203
         (303) 861-1963
 4
         lthompson@troutlaw.com
         mkopp@troutlaw.com
5
         -and-
 6
         Mr. Marcus Rael
 7
         ROBLES, RAEL & ANAYA, P.C.
         500 Marquette Avenue NW, Suite 700
 8
         Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102
         (505) 242-2228
9
         marcus@roblesrael.com
10
         -and-
11
         Mr. John Draper
         DRAPER & DRAPER, LLC
12
         325 Paseo De Peralta
         Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501
13
         (505) 570-4591
         john.draper@draperllc.com
14
         -and-
15
         Ms. Cholla Khoury
16
         Mr. Zachary E. Ogaz
         NEW MEXICO ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE
17
         Post Office Drawer 1508
         Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501
18
         (505) 329-4672
         ckhoury@nmag.gov
19
         zogaz@nmag.gov
20
     FOR THE STATE OF COLORADO:
21
         Mr. Chad Wallace
22
         Mr. Preston V. Hartman
         COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF LAW
23
         1300 Broadway, 7th Floor
         Denver, Colorado 80203
24
         (720) 508-6281
         chad.wallace@coaq.gov
25
         preston.hartman@coag.gov
```

```
1
     FOR THE UNITED STATES:
 2
         Mr. R. Lee Leininger
         U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
 3
         999 18th Street, Suite 370
         Denver, Colorado 80202
 4
         (303) 844-1375
         lee.leininger@usdoj.gov
 5
         -and-
 6
         Ms. Judith E. Coleman
7
         Ms. Jennifer A. Najjar
         U.S. Department of Justice
 8
         Post Office Box 7611
         Washington, DC 20044
 9
         (202) 514-3553
         judith.coleman@usdoj.gov
10
         jennifer.najjar@usdoj.gov
11
         -and-
12
         Ms. Shelly Randel
         U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
13
         1849 C Street NW
         Washington, DC 20240
14
         (202) 208-5432
         shelly.randel@sol.doi.gov
15
         -and-
16
         Mr. Christopher B. Rich
17
         U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
         125 South State Street, Suite 6201
18
         Salt Lake City, Utah 84138
         (801) 524-5677
19
20
     FOR THE EL PASO COUNTY WATER AND IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT
     NO. 1:
21
         Ms. Maria O'Brien
22
         MODRALL SPERLING ROEHL HARRIS & SISK, P.A.
         500 Fourth Street N.W.
23
         Albuquerque, New Mexico 87103
         (505) 848-1800
24
         mobrien@modrall.com
25
         -and-
```

```
1
         Mr. Renea Hicks
         LAW OFFICE OF MAX RENEA HICKS
 2
         Post Office Box 303187
         Austin, Texas 78703
 3
         (512) 480-8231
         rhicks@renea-hicks.com
 4
 5
     FOR THE ELEPHANT BUTTE IRRIGATION DISTRICT:
 6
         Ms. Samantha R. Barncastle
         BARNCASTLE LAW FIRM, LLC
 7
         1100 South Main, Suite 20
         Las Cruces, New Mexico 88005
 8
         (575) 636-2377
         samantha@h2o-legal.com
9
10
     FOR THE ALBUQUERQUE BERNALILLO COUNTY WATER UTILITY
     AUTHORITY AND THE CITY OF LAS CRUCES:
11
         Mr. James C. Brockmann
12
         STEIN & BROCKMANN, P.A.
         Post Office Box 2067
13
         Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504
         (505) 983-3880
14
         jcbrockmann@newmexicowaterlaw.com
15
     FOR THE CITY OF EL PASO:
16
         Mr. Douglas G. Caroom
17
         BICKERSTAFF HEATH DELGADO ACOSTA, LLP
         3711 S. MoPac Expressway Building One, Suite 300
18
         Austin, Texas 78746
         (512) 472-8021
19
         dcaroom@bickerstaff.com
20
     FOR THE CITY OF LAS CRUCES:
21
         Mr. Jay F. Stein
22
         STEIN & BROCKMAN, P.A.
         Post Office Box 2067
23
         Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504
         (505) 983-3880
24
         jfstein@newmexicowaterlaw.com
25
```

```
1
     FOR THE NEW MEXICO PECAN GROWERS:
 2
         Ms. Tessa T. Davidson
         DAVIDSON LAW FIRM, LLC
 3
         4206 Corrales Road
         Post Office Box 2240
 4
         Corrales, New Mexico 87048
         (505) 792-3636
 5
         ttd@tessadavidson.com
 6
     FOR THE NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY:
 7
         Mr. John W. Utton
 8
         UTTON & KERY, P.A.
         Post Office Box 2386
 9
         Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504
         (505) 699-1445
10
         john@uttonkery.com
11
     FOR HUDSPETH COUNTY CONSERVATION AND RECLAMATION
12
     DISTRICT:
13
         Mr. Andrew S. "Drew" Miller
         KEMP SMITH, LLP
14
         816 Congress Avenue, Suite 1260
         Austin, Texas 78701
15
         (512) 320-5466
         dmiller@kempsmith.com
16
17
     FOR THE SOUTHERN RIO GRANDE DIVERSIFIED CROP FARMERS
     ASSOCIATION AND THE NEW MEXICO PECAN GROWERS:
18
         Mr. A.J. Olsen
19
         HENNIGHAUSEN OLSEN & MCREA
         604 North Richardson Avenue
20
         Roswell, New Mexico 88202
         (575) 624-2463
21
         ajolsen@h2olawyers.com
22
23
24
25
```

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 JUDGE MELLOY: All right. This is in 3 Original No. 141, State of Texas versus State of New 4 Mexico and State of Colorado and the United States. 5 Let me start by -- well, first of all, let me mention, б I think we had some people who had not muted. Other 7 than -- unless you're speaking, be sure to put your 8 speaker on mute, if you would, please. 9 We'll start with the State of Texas. 10 Mr. Somach? 11 Yes, Your Honor. MR. SOMACH: This is Stuart Somach for the State of Texas. With me from my 12 13 office are Theresa Barfield, Sarah Klahn, Francis 14 Goldsberry, Robert Hoffman, and from the Texas 15 Attorney General's Office, Priscilla Hubenak, and 16 Mr. Bobby Skov, the Rio Grande Commissioner for the 17 State of Texas, is also on. 18 JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. And for State of 19 New Mexico? 20 MR. WECHSLER: Good morning, Your Honor. 21 Jeff Wechsler from Montgomery & Andrews. Also from 22 our office, we have Shelly Dalrymple; Cholla Khoury, 23 the chief deputy attorney general; and Zach Ogaz from 24 the New Mexico Attorney General's Office; Marcus Rael 25 from Robles Rael & Anaya; Lisa Thompson and Michael

1 Kopp from Trout Raley; John Draper from Draper & 2 Draper; and we expect to have Mike Hamman, the state 3 engineer and Rio Grande Compact Commissioner; Rolf 4 Schmidt-Petersen, the director of the interstate 5 stream commission; and Nat Chakeres, the general б counsel for the Office of the State Engineer. 7 JUDGE MELLOY: For the State of 8 Colorado? I saw Mr. Wallace on. Anyone else? 9 MR. WALLACE: Yes. Good morning, Your 10 Chad Wallace for the State of Colorado. Honor. Also 11 for the Attorney General's Office is Preston Hartman. 12 We also have joining us today the deputy state 13 engineer, Mike Sullivan; Colorado's engineer advisor 14 to the Compact, Craig Cotten. 15 JUDGE MELLOY: And then for the United 16 States, I saw Mr. Leininger. 17 MR. LEININGER: Yes, good morning, Your 18 And joining me today from the Department of Honor. 19 Justice is Judy Coleman and Jennifer Najjar; from the 20 Department of Interior Solicitor's Office, Chris Rich, 21 Shelly Randel; and from the Bureau of Reclamation, 22 Jennifer Faler, Michelle Estrada-Lopez, and Ian 23 Ferguson. 24 JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Then for the 25 Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority,

1 who do we have, if anyone? 2 MR. BROCKMANN: Good morning, Your 3 Honor. This is Jim Brockmann for the Albuquerque 4 Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority. 5 JUDGE MELLOY: City of El Paso? б MR. CAROOM: Doug Caroom for the City of 7 El Paso, Your Honor. 8 City of Las Cruces? JUDGE MELLOY: 9 MR. STEIN: Good morning, Your Honor. 10 This is Jay Stein for the City of Las Cruces. Ι 11 expect to be joined by Delila Walsh, the director of 12 Las Cruces utilities, and Adrienne Widmer, the 13 assistant director. 14 JUDGE MELLOY: El Paso County Water 15 Improvement District No. 1? 16 MS. O'BRIEN: Yes, good morning, Your 17 Maria O'Brien for El Paso County Water Honor. 18 Improvement District No. 1. Counsel Renea Hicks is 19 also on, district manager, Jesus Reyes, and district 20 engineer, Dr. Al Blair. 21 **JUDGE MELLOY:** Elephant Butte Irrigation 22 District? 23 MS. BARNCASTLE: Good morning, Your 24 Honor. Samantha Barncastle for EBID. I apologize. Ι 25 don't have video today due to bandwidth issues related

to the weather, but with me today is my client, the 1 manager and treasurer of the irrigation district, 2 3 Dr. Patrick Sullivan, and the central advisor to the 4 board of directors, Gary Esslinger. 5 JUDGE MELLOY: I might ask you, б Ms. Barncastle. You mentioned weather. One of the 7 things I'm a little curious about is I've been reading 8 about all the monsoons in the southwest. Has all the 9 rain materially affected the water levels in -- in the 10 reservoirs? 11 MS. BARNCASTLE: No, Your Honor. 12 Unfortunately, this rain comes in, for us, below the 13 reservoir, and it affects farmers' fields at this 14 point. So we have farmers' crops drowning in water 15 that we can't evacuate. It's just a matter of timing 16 and -- and location. But we're hoping that those 17 rains will materialize north of the reservoir and 18 start to help reservoir levels soon. 19 JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Thank you. 20 Who do we have on for Hudspeth County 21 Conservation and Reclamation District No. 1? 22 MR. MILLER: Good morning, Your Honor. 23 This is Drew Miller on behalf of Hudspeth County 24 Conservation and Reclamation District No. 1. 25 JUDGE MELLOY: New Mexico pecan growers?

1	MS. DAVIDSON: Good morning, Your Honor.
2	Tessa Davidson for New Mexico Pecan Growers.
3	JUDGE MELLOY: Anyone on for New Mexico
4	State University?
5	MR. UTTON: Yes, Your Honor, good
6	morning. This is John Utton for NMSU.
7	JUDGE MELLOY: Southern Rio Grande
8	Diversified Crop Farmers Association? Anyone on?
9	(No response.)
10	JUDGE MELLOY: I assume nobody is on for
11	State of Kansas. And I did see the special our
12	mediator, Mr. Boylan is on. Did I miss anyone?
13	MS. DAVIDSON: Your Honor, I believe
14	A.J. Olsen with the diverse growers is trying to
15	appear, but he appears to have a problem with his mic.
16	JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. I'll show
17	Mr. Olsen appearing. I would mention, I had three or
18	four requests from various members of the news media
19	to listen in to the status conference this morning,
20	which I have granted, so there are some news media
21	listening to the to the presentation, as well.
22	All right. Basically we 're here this
23	morning to get an update on where we are with the
24	settlement drafting process and so I think I'll
25	probably let Mr. Leininger speak first. You've sort

Г

1 of taken the lead on this so what -- where are we, 2 Mr. Leininger?

3 MR. LEININGER: Yes, Your Honor, thank 4 you. So the parties continue to meet. We've been 5 meeting regularly, making progress. We've had б in-person meeting a couple weeks ago in Denver. That 7 was a very helpful, productive meeting. So we've 8 continued to make progress. There's -- there's choppy 9 waters, though, with continuing the course here. We 10 still expect the September 23 deadline for purposes of 11 final draft settlement agreement, which would then be 12 available for our respective approvers to review. We 13 are scheduling -- and Judge Boylan, I believe, is 14 going to be attending this, too. We are scheduling 15 another meeting in Santa Fe next week, in-person 16 conference, with New Mexico, United States, and New 17 Mexico amici for purposes of addressing the other part 18 of this case that we had discussed last status 19 conference, which is the -- the project --20 interference project use within New Mexico. So we're 21 continuing to make -- make progress, Your Honor. 22 JUDGE MELLOY: Well, I'll let Mr. Somach 23 speak in a moment, but the last time we were together, 24 if I understood what he was saying correctly, he 25 didn't feel there was any real reason why you couldn't

1 go ahead and finalize the Texas part of the agreement.
2 Most of your discussions, as I understand at this
3 point, are intra New Mexico concerns. Where are you
4 on that?

5 MR. LEININGER: There has been б discussion about completing that draft, and also, I 7 think you'll hear from the other parties on this, 8 putting it in a final enough form that we can then 9 share with amici, and so we understood that the draft 10 was still -- and I think all the parties would agree 11 -- still subject to amendment, still subject to 12 editing. We were concerned that we didn't have a form 13 of this in sufficient form for purposes of 14 distribution. We understand that there's a need to 15 have this distributed and get the response from amici 16 with regard to the Texas portion of it.

17 The proposal right now, I think, is that 18 we would -- anyone that this document is shared with 19 needs to sign a confidentiality agreement. So one of 20 the things we have discussed is taking the existing 21 confidentiality agreement amongst the parties and 22 providing basically that form for purposes of amici 23 counsel signature, and we intend to be working on that 24 this week, having that complete, and then I know 25 there's a desire to get the draft decree out as soon

1 as possible so upon confidentiality signatures, and 2 with the understanding that the distribution would be 3 limited to amici counsel, I believe we'll be in a 4 position to do that next week. 5 **JUDGE MELLOY:** I -- I assume, however, б you've been sharing the outlines and the significant 7 points of the agreement with amici or have you not? 8 MR. LEININGER: We have. We're -- we're 9 absolutely talking, you know, within -- about these 10 concepts because we don't want any surprises here at 11 this late stage. So I think that the -- the concept 12 here is understood amongst all the parties and the 13 amici. So the actual language itself, however, 14 appearing in that -- in that draft is -- you know, we 15 -- we expect we will have some substantive comments so 16 it is that form document that we feel has to be in 17 better shape before it's distributed. 18 JUDGE MELLOY: Do you anticipate that if 19 you make your September 23 deadline and you have a 20 final document ready to be submitted to the parties 21 for approval, that you will be able to make it public 22 at that point? 23 MR. LEININGER: No, Your Honor. 24 JUDGE MELLOY: Why not? 25 Well, because it is MR. LEININGER:

Page 16

1 still subject to review for purposes of approval. So 2 in our case, it has to be approved by the Solicitor 3 General and by the Assistant Attorney General for the Environment Division. So it is -- it would be subject 4 5 potentially to some changes. Again, we've been in б close contact, close communication, with both 7 branches, and we don't expect that there's going to be 8 any rejection of this; but because it is still subject 9 to approval, Your Honor, we don't think it should be 10 made public.

JUDGE MELLOY: Mr. Somach, what's your view of all this?

13 MR. SOMACH: Well, Your Honor, as I 14 indicated last time, you know, we had said that we 15 were going to kind of be done with our part by August 16 8th. At the request of the mediator, we -- because he 17 had requested us to wait until he got back from his 18 vacation, we did meet around August 10th, I believe, 19 and by that time, we had fulfilled everything that we 20 could fulfill. We had finished everything that we 21 could finish at that point. After the discussion on 22 the 10th, we -- at the request of -- after we had 23 discussion among the parties, we provided a -- what we 24 call a draft final of what we think would be the 25 decree. We, last week, provided a copy of that to all

1 the parties. I had first met with Mr. Wechsler, and 2 the two of us had agreed on a draft final to provide 3 to all of the parties. We did that last week, and at 4 this point, other than being on call, we're done. 5 There's nothing more we can do. We -- we've exhausted what we can do. We haven't gotten any feedback yet б 7 from United States, although United States keeps 8 saying there are holes in what we provided. There are 9 some issues that Colorado has raised and -- and we'll 10 be certainly willing to talk to them about them, but 11 there's -- there's not much that Texas can do. Based 12 upon your prior determination, we'll wait until 13 September 23rd. We have -- we certainly hope that 14 everybody reaches a final agreement on what I think 15 last time were called ancillary issues to the -- to 16 the Compact issues that are in the decree. T -- T 17 will say this, that we think the decree -- the draft 18 we have is sufficient -- in sufficient form to provide 19 to amici and would have -- and have been advocating 20 providing it to the amici. I note that this is the 21 24th. September 23rd is now less than a month away, 22 and waiting another week, two weeks, to provide amici 23 with documents, I think, you know, telegraphs an 24 impossibility of being done by -- by the 23rd. 25 But, again, we're -- we're -- we're at

1 the end of what we can do. We'll be on call, you 2 know, to talk to -- to folks and to discuss issues, 3 but there's not much we can do. I -- I would say that 4 if we reach agreement, and I -- I'm a little bit 5 concerned about the notion of a lot of changes and б edits after the 23rd because that means the 23rd isn't 7 really a date of agreement because all that does is 8 kick the ball down the road, and if the Solicitor 9 General's Office doesn't get back to us until 10 December, we'll be negotiating into 2023 based on what 11 I just heard. So that -- that does give us some 12 trouble. We -- we would suggest, actually -- and I 13 think you have mentioned the concurrency of approvals 14 with an evidentiary hearing to prove up the decree. 15 We certainly believe that that's appropriate and would 16 advocate your setting a date in November, assuming an 17 agreement is reached, to begin some evidentiary 18 hearings.

But -- but more fundamental or as fundamental of that is if -- if this doesn't come together on the 23rd, while we're hopeful, I think we're also a little skeptical. At this point in time, we really do believe and urge you to set a trial date and -- and would -- would urge you to set a trial date. You'd indicated November was -- was too

1 aggressive, but we believe that a trial date in 2 December that we could get two -- two weeks of trial 3 in December and maybe then get this thing done by the 4 end of January, but we really urge that as an 5 important backup, that -- that everything I've heard, б everything we see is this thing keeps rolling. Ιt 7 just keeps moving forward. If we don't have agreement 8 by September 23rd, I will say this, you know, we're --9 we're hanging in there until September 23rd, but if 10 there's no agreement by 23rd -- September 23rd, Texas 11 is going to walk away from the negotiation table, and it's our intention to -- to trial. We need to get 12 13 this resolved. It's in nobody's interest to keep this 14 continuing indefinitely. I hate to say that, and I 15 don't know that you can resolve this case through a 16 settlement without the State of Texas being on board, 17 and so, again, we urge you to schedule a trial date as 18 early as December so that we can -- we can resolve 19 this and move this on to the -- to the Court for final 20 resolution. 21 JUDGE MELLOY: What's your view of 22 keeping the agreement confidential after the 23rd?

23MR. SOMACH:I don't see any reason to24keep it confidential.

25

JUDGE MELLOY: Why would it need to

1 remain confidential, Mr. Leininger?

2 MR. LEININGER: Your Honor, beyond the 3 fact that it is still subject to approval, and 4 although we produced -- we, the attorneys have been 5 working this for years, produced our recommendation, б it's ultimately the SGA and the AAG's decision. So if 7 there is anything -- again, we are in constant 8 communication with our superiors so we don't 9 anticipate anything, but that said, it is still a 10 document subject to final approval so it's still a 11 document that we think should be kept under 12 confidentiality until there is final approval. That 13 goes to the concept of having a prove-up hearing, 14 also, while the -- while the approval is being sought. 15 We -- we -- the evidentiary hearing to prove up the 16 settlement agreement, which we understand, Your Honor, 17 is requested, and we think is a good idea, we have a 18 lot of technical data to present, but all this has 19 been subject to confidentiality and it's all 20 consistent with our settlement principles. So we 21 don't feel that disclosure of -- of any of the 22 information that has been exchanged under 408 in 23 confidence prior to final approval of this document is 24 required. 25 All right. Well, let me JUDGE MELLOY:

1	ask, I guess, both Mr. Somach and Mr. Leininger.
2	Mr. Somach, you indicated that as far as
3	you're concerned, everything Texas can do, you've
4	done, and you have an agreement that's, as I
5	understand it, is in final form. Do you think you can
б	carve out the dispute between Texas, New Mexico,
7	Colorado, and United States, resolve the Original
8	Action, while still leaving the intra-New Mexico
9	disputes for resolution in some other form?
10	MR. SOMACH: Yes.
11	JUDGE MELLOY: What's your view of that,
12	Mr. Leininger, and I'll give Mr. Wechsler a chance to
13	respond?
14	MR. LEININGER: And, Your Honor, that
15	we are having these discussions almost daily now with
16	New Mexico for that for that very purpose, but
17	carving carving out the eventual settlement terms
18	from a final decree is problematic. We think that
19	this resolution of of Compact issues are all
20	integrated, and they should be in an integrated final
21	decree. So we are continuing these discussions for
22	that purpose. We are meeting regularly with New
23	Mexico. We'll be meeting with the New Mexico amici.
24	We are hopeful that we will arrive at these settlement
25	terms, which would then be incorporated into a final

1 decree.

JUDGE MELLOY: But what I understand you not to say, though, Mr. Leininger, is you don't a hundred percent disagree with Mr. Somach? If you can't get these resolved, I don't hear you saying that it's impossible to have a carve out?

7 MR. LEININGER: No. We -- and let me be 8 clear, Your Honor. We -- for purposes of settling 9 this case -- settling our claims with regard to the 10 Compact and Compact issues intrastate, which we 11 believe is all subject to the Compact, they cannot be 12 carved out. There are issues which we are talking 13 about which really go more to implementation that we 14 think perhaps would be more appropriate in a reform in 15 one of the other federal cases. For example, there 16 are pending lawsuits against the operating agreement. 17 There is the pending lawsuit for the title -- title 18 action that we brought. So there are elements of this 19 that may be more appropriate for those cases, but as 20 far as the Compact issues themselves, no, it should be 21 integrated complete decree.

JUDGE MELLOY: Well, I -- I hear what Mr. Somach is saying is that if the amici don't get this for at least another week, now we're down to about three weeks before your drop-dead date. You

1 have issues to resolve. I mean, you really need to 2 kind of pretty much have these issues resolved within 3 the next, say, ten days, to give you enough time to 4 reduce them to writing. Do you think -- I mean, do 5 you think realistically you'll know after next week? б MR. LEININGER: Yes. 7 JUDGE MELLOY: Mr. Wechsler, what's your 8 -- what's your view of all this? 9 MR. WECHSLER: Yeah, Your Honor, I'll 10 comment on the issues that you've been asking the 11 parties about or fill in some of the gaps. I'll start 12 with that carve-out issue. New Mexico is positive 13 about the whole settlement as -- as a holistic part, but the calculus changes if we're talking about only 14 15 parts of the settlement, as we would in any overall 16 agreement. So I'm not sure that New Mexico would 17 agree the Compact provisions without the agreement on 18 the other provisions. That -- that's something that 19 we would have to think about. So to your question to 20 Mr. Leininger, I'm not saying it's impossible. I'm 21 not saying it's impossible because New Mexico hasn't 22 evaluated that because that's not the way we've been 23 looking at the settlement. 24 On the -- the negotiations, I agree with 25 Mr. Leininger. I mean, we're in contact with one or

1 more of the parties every day. You asked about the 2 We have tried very hard to keep the amici amici. 3 informed throughout this entire process. In the last 4 month, that included two full-day, in-person meetings 5 with our amici, and we're trying to give them as much б information as we can within the bounds of what we've 7 been allowed thus far to disclose, but we are a very 8 strong proponent. We have been for the last several 9 months for sharing the settlement documents with the 10 amici so that they can have a meaningful opportunity 11 to comment on that. You asked Mr. Leininger do we 12 think it's realistic to get these documents done, say, 13 in the next ten days. I think the answer to that 14 question is yes. It's not that we're starting from 15 scratch. We have very strong drafts of settlement 16 documents, including a decree for all of the 17 provisions that we're talking about. Now, there's 18 still a few outstanding issues that we're working on, 19 but we have meetings set up to resolve those -- or to 20 attempt to resolve those, and we see a path forward. 21 We're confident that we will be able to reach a 22 settlement by September 23rd.

I want to fill in the gap on one other thing that is still going on, on the -- what I'll call the Compact portion, and that is there's still some

1 technical meetings and technical issues that are 2 outstanding. It's contemplated there will be a number 3 of appendices that include a number of technical 4 descriptions and the nature of those are still being 5 worked out. I think we have agreement on the б concepts, but there's still significant work going on 7 there. And we -- as Mr. Leininger indicated, we --8 we're -- we're heavy into bilateral discussions, 9 including this full in-person meeting next week with 10 Judge Boylan that our -- our hope there is to be 11 resolving some of the other outstanding issues that we 12 think that this provides an opportunity to do. 13 You know, I've heard some of the 14 discussion about the -- the timing. I mean, what we 15 would support is a procedure in which you set a 16 deadline or series of deadlines, one deadline for the 17 parties to obtain the necessary signatures, another 18 deadline to submit a motion related to the settlement 19 documents, and -- and perhaps at the same deadline or 20 -- or slightly later of -- of proposed procedure to 21 you for the hearing on the settlement and then the

hearing date. We -- we take Mr. Leininger's point

about until these settlement documents are actually

signed, they remain confidential settlement

²⁵ discussions and negotiations and -- and, therefore,

1	it's hard for us to see how they could be made public;
2	but that being said, we're also mindful of Texas'
3	concerns expressed by Mr. Somach that they're anxious
4	to get this done as quickly as possible, as are we,
5	and we certainly could obtain those signatures and
6	and proceed with that process relatively quickly.
7	I believe that's all of the questions
8	that you asked, but I'm happy to stand for other
9	questions or or answer any issues you have.
10	JUDGE MELLOY: Well, I guess I'll ask
11	you and Mr. Wallace the same question. You said you
12	could get a signature fairly quickly. I mean, what's
13	what assuming there's a final agreement on
14	September 23, what are the steps that have to be gone
15	through within the State of New Mexico to sign off on
16	an agreement?
17	MR. WECHSLER: Within the State of New
18	Mexico, ultimately the settlement will be signed by
19	the New Mexico attorney general, and the New Mexico
20	attorney general has full authority to enter into that
21	settlement. Prior to that happening, I anticipate
22	that the attorney general will be consulting with some
23	of the other state leaders, the governor, the
24	governor's you know, the state engineer, and and
25	ultimately, likely others that will need to be

1 consulted, but only the attorney general will need to 2 sign off. We have started that process many weeks ago 3 and so our anticipation is that would take a matter of 4 weeks, not months, for New Mexico to get 5 authorization. б JUDGE MELLOY: And I assume that you 7 have been -- well, you have two assistant attorney 8 generals on the phone here today and have been 9 participating all along, but so -- I assume the 10 attorney general's office has been very intimately 11 involved in the negotiations and knows what's going 12 on? 13 MR. WECHSLER: Yes, Your Honor. Ms. 14 Khoury is the chief deputy attorney general, and she 15 has led our negotiating teams throughout this process. 16 JUDGE MELLOY: Let me ask this: At this 17 point, are you aware of any amici or other interested 18 party that would object to what you're proposing to do 19 here in this settlement? 20 MR. WECHSLER: I'm not aware of any that 21 would object. I think there are some who are anxious 22 to see the specific provisions of the settlement 23 documents, which we, as I said, are anxious to share 24 with them; but as I said, we have tried to share 25 without the specific written documents all of the

1	operative provisions of the settlement with them on a
2	number of occasions, and and I'm not aware of any
3	that I that are opposing those.
4	JUDGE MELLOY: Well, I don't want to
5	speak for Ms. Barncastle or any of the other parties,
б	but I assume, I mean, the I guess if I were in
7	their position, I would want to know bottom line,
8	what's it going to do to my district, and I assume
9	you've been telling them that all along, this is
10	what's going to happen going forward if we approve
11	this; is that correct?
12	MR. WECHSLER: That's correct, Your
13	Honor. We've been talking with each of the amici
14	about specifically how it would impact them. We've
15	also been trying to present a a picture of what we
16	think water use and water regulation would look like
17	below the reservoir following a settlement in the
18	in the many years following that so that would include
19	potential regulations, changes, and all of those
20	important details.
21	JUDGE MELLOY: How about above the
22	reservoir? Have there been any concerns raised? I
23	know, you know, Albuquerque is a party to the not a
24	party, but an amici of this case. Have there been any
25	concerns raised about how this would affect water use

1 above the reservoir? 2 MR. WECHSLER: Well, certainly that's an 3 issue that I understand the ABCWUA has expressed. 4 We've had discussions with them to try and allay any 5 There have been some discussions within the concerns. б context of the mediation about that issue, but we're 7 confident that -- that ultimately the settlement is not going to concern our amici -- current amici or any 8 9 of our water users above the reservoir. 10 JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Thank you. 11 Mr. Wallace, Mr. Somach indicated you've 12 raised a couple issues. Anything that you think is a 13 deal breaker or where do you feel we're at on this 14 whole process? 15 MR. WALLACE: Your Honor, Colorado's 16 position is that we have no concern with the current 17 proposal for water distribution between the two 18 states, New Mexico and Texas, so -- so that physical 19 aspect is not something that's standing in the way. 20 Colorado does have some continued concerns with the 21 language in a proposed draft decree regarding the 22 parameters of the Compact and how we describe the 23 legal obligations in the settlement. So that's --24 that's not so much a physical structural issue but is 25 a -- a legal description issue that we continue to

1 work through. Hopefully we -- we can continue to --2 to work with that and get that done by the end of 3 September. Along with Texas, we -- we agree with them 4 that carving out the issues of distribution between 5 those two states, Texas and New Mexico, from internal б New Mexico state issues is -- is acceptable and might 7 make this go forward more quickly. It also might 8 resolve some of the legal obligation descriptions that 9 Colorado has a concern with in -- in the totality of 10 those settlement documents.

11 To address some of your other questions, 12 if -- if and when we reach a settlement, Colorado will 13 have its attorney general sign that, likely in 14 consultation with the state's governor and state 15 engineer. The AG has been informed of progress and 16 knows where we are in settlement at this point. Ιf 17 we, in fact, do reach a settlement by September 23rd, 18 we think that we can get a hearing done on that this 19 year, if, in fact, it is finalized. We do have some 20 concerns, however, with what the U.S. has expressed in 21 that, if we reach a final settlement, the U.S. is 22 reserving, it seems, the right to change the language 23 of that settlement. Now, we don't know what that 24 might be, but that does raise some concerns on our 25 end, if it's final, how much of it is being changed.

1 JUDGE MELLOY: And how long -- are we 2 talking a matter of weeks to get your attorney general 3 to sign off? 4 MR. WALLACE: Yes, we are. 5 JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. And I know early б on, Mr. Wallace, you had expressed a concern that one 7 of your major interests in this litigation is that we 8 not set precedents, so to speak, in connection with 9 this Compact that might spill over to other Compacts. 10 I think probably maybe fair to say Colorado may be 11 party to more Compacts than any other state in the 12 union. But I assume those concerns have been allayed? 13 MR. WALLACE: That's what we're 14 currently working on. When I said we're trying to 15 address the parameters of the Compact obligations in 16 the settlement, it -- it's that sort of putting the 17 side walls on that so that we're confident how we're 18 describing this Compact settlement as being consistent 19 with the 1938 Compact and keeping it penned into that 20 so it's not novel and we're not creating something new 21 and everyone is comfortable with our -- our 22 interpretation of the '38 Compact in that it is 23 limited, in fact, to the resolution of this dispute 24 and will carry over into our other Compacts. 25 Judge Boylan, do you have JUDGE MELLOY:

1 anything you want to add to this discussion or any 2 comments?

3 Thank you, Judge. JUDGE BOYLAN: Well, 4 first of all, I do believe these issues that 5 Mr. Wallace and Mr. Somach have raised are important б ones, but I do think that they are resolvable and 7 resolvable between now and September 23rd. I have every confidence that that will, in fact, be true. 8 In 9 reference to the intrastate New Mexico disputes, I 10 have been pursuing my duties as mediator pursuant to 11 your order consistent with the view that it is 12 important that those matters be addressed and be part 13 of the overall settlement, and on occasion, that's led 14 me to meet directly with New Mexico and amici. 15 Sometimes amici, sometimes the U.S., New Mexico, and 16 amici, and I believe that while it does make it more 17 complex, I view that as being important issues that 18 overall must be resolved if we're going to reach a 19 settlement.

In reference to the sharing of the settlement documents with amici, we had a telephone conversation with the parties yesterday. I informed them that it was my intention to at least alert you that it was my view that my role as a mediator would include an ability to direct the parties to share the

1 documents with amici since they have been part and 2 parcel of the settlement discussions, albeit with the 3 understanding that the people that would see the 4 documents would have to send a confidentiality 5 agreement in provisions that Mr. Leininger mentioned. б And so I would either hope that you would order it or 7 if you don't wish to get that deep into the settlement discussions itself, at least if I hear no objections 8 9 from the Court, it would -- my intention is to direct 10 the parties to indeed proceed in that fashion and do 11 so immediately because I do believe that time is of 12 the essence and that they're deserving of seeing those 13 documents.

JUDGE MELLOY: Do you have a form of disclosure agreement that you could send out on fairly short notice or any of the parties --

JUDGE BOYLAN: I do believe that Mr. Leininger has the confidentiality provisions that were signed by each of the parties and it just needs to be amended in some respects so that amici would be identified and I could ask him to talk about that, but it's my understanding that's ready to go almost immediately.

JUDGE MELLOY: Anything else? Looks
like you're sitting in our same courthouse.

JUDGE BOYLAN: I'm sitting in one of the law offices in downtown Minneapolis, but I like the background better.

4 The other thing I think I would like to 5 comment on is whether or not the Court can convene a б hearing on the -- on the settlement document prior to 7 the completion of a review by the federal authorities 8 identified by Mr. Leininger. I think that there is a 9 way of doing that, and perhaps that's by directing the 10 parties to file the papers under -- under seal and to 11 at least schedule an in-camera review of those pending 12 the approval of -- the final approval, but I think 13 that there's a way of shortening the time frame for 14 the finality rather than waiting until 2023 to do 15 that. I -- I liked your comments last time we met, 16 Judge, that perhaps there are ways of shortening that 17 up as opposed to continuing the -- the process kicking 18 the can down the road by some months.

JUDGE MELLOY: I think the problem with an in-camera review would be, I guess, twofold. One is my -- my vision of a hearing would be that there would be fairly wide dissemination notice, probably the -- I'm just thinking out loud here. We'd probably have some published notice. We'd probably direct each of the water districts to maybe notify every one of

1 their -- their members, and -- I don't know. But I 2 would anticipate it'd be fairly widespread so that 3 anybody who had a problem, even if they weren't a 4 named party or an amici, who wanted to be heard or at 5 least be given a notice of a hearing. And then the б other thing is I don't know that I would understand 7 what the agreement means in camera without -- without 8 a hearing where people could explain it. Now -- and I 9 -- and I'm just thinking out loud about the hearing. 10 You know, I don't know how technical the hearing has 11 to be, and in part, it may depend on whether there's 12 objections. If everybody is happy with it, it's not 13 likely I'm going to say, well, you know, Texas, New 14 Mexico, water users, Colorado, United States, you're 15 all on board, and I'm going to throw a monkey wrench 16 in the works. I would think that would be highly 17 unlikely. I think a lot of -- you know, I think some 18 evidence is probably going to be required, but I don't 19 know how technical it has to be unless there are 20 specific objections that have to be addressed. But 21 anyway, I'm just thinking out loud about that at this 22 point.

JUDGE BOYLAN: I do think that the parties are envisioning that some technical testimony will be important to assist the court in understanding

1 the proposed agreement that they're asking you to 2 consider for approval. 3 JUDGE MELLOY: Let me circle back to 4 you, Mr. Leininger. How quickly do you think you can 5 get that confidentiality agreement in form that you б can get it out to the amici? 7 MR. LEININGER: That's on the top of my 8 We're actually meeting with New Mexico this list. 9 afternoon for continuing settlement negotiations. 10 That's on the top of my list so, Your Honor, over the 11 next couple of days. 12 JUDGE MELLOY: So when you say the 13 existing confidentiality agreement, are you talking 14 about one that was prepared specifically for 15 settlement purposes? 16 MR. LEININGER: Yes. 17 JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. So that's not --18 that's not one that I was party to? 19 MR. LEININGER: I believe --20 JUDGE MELLOY: It's not in the decree or 21 anything -- or not the decree, but not in the 22 scheduling order, right? 23 MR. LEININGER: I believe when we 24 continued negotiations approximately a year ago, one 25 of your orders did actually order the confidentiality
1 agreement be imposed upon the parties so, yes, it is 2 subject, I think, I believe, to your -- to your court 3 order, and we would take that document, for purposes 4 of disclosure, to the amici counsel. And -- and, Your 5 Honor, again, our concern is that these documents are б not public documents. These are settlement documents, 7 and they have to be subject to strict confidentiality. 8 They should be limited in their disclosure so that is 9 why we would also ask that -- that the -- the drafts 10 be limited to disbursal among the amici counsel that 11 have signed off on the confidentiality.

12 JUDGE MELLOY: Well, I -- I understood 13 that the technical advisors have been intimately 14 involved in the negotiations. Would they be included 15 within that circle of people who could look at the 16 documents or at least have them discussed? There may 17 be a difference between discussing them and looking at 18 them, but, you know, as a practical matter, I'm not 19 sure it makes a lot of difference.

20 MR. LEININGER: Right. As a practical 21 matter, I would agree with Your Honor, but, you know, 22 with regard to what has been written, the language, 23 and as Mr. Wallace said, there's some question as to 24 how certain of these -- of these settlement concepts 25 are phrased, no. This is a matter for counsel to

1 resolve so, no, it should not be expanded beyond 2 distribution of the draft amongst counsel under 3 confidentiality. 4 JUDGE MELLOY: But they could discuss it 5 with their technical folks and their water managers б or, you know, City of El Paso can talk to the director 7 of the water distribution system -- I can't remember the technical name in El Paso, but -- but in any 8 9 event, you can -- you can talk to the relevant people 10 about what this is going to impose upon them and what 11 they're going to get out of them, can't they? 12 MR. LEININGER: Sure. Yes, Your Honor. 13 It's the document, the draft document, that we were 14 discussing for purposes of distribution. 15 JUDGE MELLOY: Do you feel you need any 16 order from me at this point to effectuate this? 17 **MR. LEININGER:** I would have to go back 18 and review your previous order. What I understand is 19 you did order confidentiality in these settlement 20 negotiations so whether that has to be expanded, a 21 potential of that order, and it was -- it was short 22 order, so whether that has to be expanded or not, I 23 would have to go back and look at the language and 24 perhaps consult with the other counsel here as to 25 what's necessary.

1	JUDGE MELLOY: I'll take a look at that,
2	as well.
3	All right. Anything further from the
4	any of the parties? In a minute, I'll give the amici
5	a chance to weigh in if they have anything they want
6	to say, but anything else from any of the parties?
7	MR. SOMACH: Your Honor, this is Stuart
8	Somach again. I just want to briefly say, and I I
9	don't want to be the the the only I hate
10	being the one that that rains on the parade so to
11	speak, but I do urge you to consider scheduling a
12	trial date if by September 23rd, this this is not
13	completed. There's I'm you know, I'm hopeful
14	but very skeptical at this point in time. I certainly
15	hope I'm wrong, but if I am wrong, then we really do
16	need that trial date and I I think it needs to be
17	scheduled as a hard date as early as possible. And
18	and I know I've said this before, but but I think
19	it's important for me to at least, on the record, say
20	it again.
21	JUDGE MELLOY: Well, let me think about
22	that, Mr. Somach. If I did schedule two weeks in
23	December and I will say this mainly for the benefit
24	of New Mexico, I guess I would not expect anybody,
25	other than Texas, to present evidence. That still

1 means they'd have to cross-examine, but we would use 2 that strictly for Texas' case, but let me think about 3 that a little bit. 4 JUDGE BOYLAN: Can I suggest that while 5 you're speaking of scheduling, that it may make a lot of sense to schedule an in-person status conference б 7 with you for September 23rd or perhaps the day prior

to the September 23rd deadline. I think sometimes the 9 in-person deadlines have a great deal of leverage with 10 helping people get things moving, at least have that 11 to consider that at least.

8

12 JUDGE MELLOY: When you say "in-person," 13 as opposed to Zoom? 14 JUDGE BOYLAN: Correct. 15

JUDGE MELLOY: How do the other people 16 feel about that?

17 MR. SOMACH: Certainly it's fine with 18 Texas, Your Honor.

19 Well, it so happens, I JUDGE MELLOY: 20 was actually thinking we'd probably do one the week 21 after the 23rd, but I'd already kind of -- what -- and 22 the -- and why do you think we should do it the day 23 before, Judge, or the day of?

24 JUDGE BOYLAN: The week after sounds 25 even like a better idea to me, Judge. I just think

1 that it's important that since September 23rd has been 2 identified by the -- by the U.S. and New Mexico and 3 others as a deadline that they believe is appropriate 4 for a presentation of completed deal, that we see 5 where exactly we are as that date arrives. б JUDGE MELLOY: All right. I was 7 thinking we'd probably do it by Zoom, but, you know, 8 the -- I think your suggestion of in person might not 9 be a bad one. Let me think about that, and if I do, 10 I'll check with the Supreme Court. I assume they 11 won't have any objection to this, but maybe I'll 12 schedule it for Denver. That seems to be a pretty 13 convenient location for everybody. But let me think 14 about that. 15 MR. WECHSLER: Your Honor, we're -- we 16 support an in-person meeting status conference that 17 week after. I do have a commitment that simply can't 18 be moved on that Thursday so apologize for the 19 inconvenience. 20 JUDGE MELLOY: Well, I was thinking 21 earlier in the week in any event so that's not a 22 problem. I was thinking the 27th or 28th or could 23 even do it on Monday, the 26th. Let's just say the 24 27th. We'll plan on that and it'll probably be in 25 person and it'll probably be in Denver. Any objection

1	to that from anyone?
2	MR. SOMACH: No, Your Honor, except I
3	just want to reiterate the fact that we're looking at
4	September 23rd as I just I just don't want I
5	don't want Texas to be misleading anybody. If if
6	the purpose of the 27th is to say we need more time,
7	we're we're not going to agree to that, and so I
8	just I just want to make certain that that's clear.
9	We we understood that you disagreed with us about
10	the timing on this and so we're we're hanging in
11	there until the 23rd because there's there's no
12	option to do anything else but hang in there until the
13	23rd, but but we will not agree to continue
14	negotiations beyond the 23rd. I I don't want to be
15	misunderstood about that. So the 27th is fine. We'll
16	I'll be there.
17	JUDGE MELLOY: Well, I I would
18	anticipate, Mr. Somach, that on the 27th, we'll do one
19	of two things, we'll either talk about how we're going
20	to get the settlement approved and to the Supreme
21	Court or we're going to talk about trial mechanics.
22	MR. SOMACH: Just to finish the thought
23	you started, we're more than happy to start presenting
24	testimony in those two weeks in December. We're up
25	first anyway, and we're ready to go.

1	JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Anything else
2	from the parties or or Judge Boylan before I let
3	amici have anything to say if they want to weigh in?
4	(No response.)
5	JUDGE MELLOY: All right. If not, do
6	any of the amici want to be heard?
7	MS. O'BRIEN: Your Honor, Maria O'Brien
8	on behalf of El Paso County Water Improvement District
9	No. 1. If I may just make a few comments. First, I
10	just want to be clear that EP1 supports fully a
11	legally and technically sound settlement agreement and
12	certainly sooner rather than later. We do not believe
13	that, as we understand the settlement is being
14	structured by the parties, that we can arrive at a
15	legally and technically sound settlement agreement
16	without the assent of EP1. We emphasize, I think,
17	some of what's been articulated by at least some of
18	the parties and Judge Boylan that immediate inclusion,
19	certainly at least the district amici, and full
20	full integration of the districts into settlement
21	discussions and review of current drafts regardless of
22	the state of those drafts.
23	I want to be clear, based on some of
24	your comments, Your Honor, as well as comments from
25	others, while EP1 is aware of the general concepts in

1 the settlement, our technical advisor has -- has not been intimately involved in those discussions, some 2 3 but not all, and I will -- I will say that, you know, 4 words matter. We have not seen an outline. We have 5 not seen a draft. We do not know how the different б pieces, even all of which we do not know what all 7 those pieces are, fit together. So we, again, implore 8 you to allow immediate inclusion of EP1 in -- in these 9 discussions that are significant import, you know, to 10 the parties, and certainly to the districts. And this 11 is because the Special Master is fully aware of the 12 relationship of the project and the Compact and that 13 the water supply at issue in this case is dedicated to 14 the project, the districts are the beneficiaries of 15 the project and that water supply and have contractual 16 rights and obligations with regard to that water 17 supply. For this reason, we also do not agree that 18 the so-called Texas portion and the U.S., which is sometimes also referred to as the intrastate portion, 19 20 can be separated for purposes of settlement. Aqain, 21 as we understand it from the bit that we do know, the 22 settlement will address some significant and important 23 project operations issues that are related to 24 settlement of the so-called Texas portion, and we 25 don't see how that portion can be finalized and/or

1	separated out from the issues that relate to the
2	project overall, which the U.S. continues to work on.
3	But regardless, we understand that there are
4	significant pieces of the so-called Texas portion that
5	impact, address, even modify project operations, and,
б	again, while we've been included in some aspects over
7	those discussions, we have not been included in all.
8	We do not know how all the pieces fit together, and we
9	are very anxious, again, to be fully integrated, so,
10	again, that we can support a technically and legally
11	sound settlement.
12	With that, Your Honor, I'll take any
13	questions but felt it necessary to articulate where we
14	believe things stand.
15	JUDGE MELLOY: I assume you have no
16	objection to signing some type of confidentiality
17	agreement?
18	MS. O'BRIEN: Absolutely not, Your
19	Honor. We've made that clear to the mediator and the
20	other parties, and we've from the beginning, we've
21	stood ready to sign whatever is necessary with regard
22	to confidentiality.
23	JUDGE MELLOY: Subject to seeing the
24	language, and like you say, words matter, from what
25	you know about the broader concepts, are there any

1 deal breakers that you think at this point? 2 MS. O'BRIEN: Your Honor, I don't want 3 to equivocate, other than, you know, how the pieces 4 fit together. Again, the pieces that we are aware of 5 is very important because there's -- there's an б interface between some of the project operation 7 changes and have under and overdeliveries will be 8 addressed, and until we understand how those issues 9 all work together, I don't believe I can, you know, 10 unequivocally say that there's a deal breaker. 11 To the extent we understand where things 12 stand to date, I don't believe we believe there is a 13 deal breaker, although I believe there was some 14 articulation by a few of the parties' counsel that 15 there are some technical issues regarding 16 implementation that are still at play, and we are --17 those pieces are very important to us. So we have 18 seen no deal breaker to date, but there still appear 19 to be some moving parts that are of critical 20 importance, and, you know, we hope to be proactive and 21 a positive participant in bringing those things to 22 closure in a way that we can fully support the 23 settlement. 24 JUDGE MELLOY: Let me ask Mr. Wechsler 25 something. If a settlement is reached and approved,

1 will this -- will that result in dismissal of all the 2 other pending litigation?

3 MR. WECHSLER: If we were able to have a 4 full resolution of all of the issues, it would 5 resolve, I think, the outstanding issues in the lower б Rio Grande. You asked earlier, are there some issues. 7 I know you were talking specifically about all of the New Mexico intrastate issues, could those be carved 8 9 out from the Compact issues, and my answer was we 10 don't think so. I do, however, think there are a 11 number of issues within the intrastate issues that 12 could be carved out. So our hope is to resolve as 13 many of those as possible. There's -- we observe a 14 spirit of -- maybe cooperation is too strong a word, 15 but there's a real sense that -- of opportunity right 16 now to resolve a lot of issues that have been 17 separating a number of parties for decades, and we're 18 hopeful that we can resolve as many of those as 19 possible, but I don't think that all of those would 20 need to be resolved in order to resolve the so-called 21 New Mexico intrastate portion of the settlement. So 22 we're -- we're taking our best shot at resolving all 23 of those. I'm very confident that we can resolve 24 some, and I'm very confident that we can resolve the 25 intrastate issues that separate the State of New

1 Mexico and the United States in such a way that would 2 result in a settlement by September 23rd. 3 JUDGE MELLOY: And you feel that 4 September 23rd is still realistic under a month now? 5 MR. WECHSLER: I do. б JUDGE MELLOY: With this, specifically 7 would the litigation filed by New Mexico challenging 8 the operating agreement be dismissed? 9 MR. WECHSLER: Yes. 10 JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. All right. 11 Anybody else want to be heard, either parties or amici 12 at this point? 13 **MR. STEIN:** Your Honor, this is Jay 14 I do want to make one brief comment. Stein. 15 JUDGE MELLOY: Go ahead. 16 **MR. STEIN:** The City is equally 17 interested in having the settlement documents provided 18 as soon as possible. Of course we will sign any 19 confidentiality agreement in that respect, but going 20 forward, the implementation of this agreement with 21 respect to the City's ability to provide municipal 22 water supply in the future through the implementation 23 of this arrangement is key and therefore we need to 24 see those documents as soon as possible and to have 25 our water managers weigh in on them. Thank you, Your

1 Honor.

JUDGE MELLOY: Was that Ms. Barncastle wanting to be heard? I think I heard her say something.

5 MS. BARNCASTLE: Yes, it was, Your б Honor. Thank you. So three very quick points. 7 First, thank you to Ms. O'Brien for aptly stating 8 again what I stated last time. EBID stands by EP No. 9 1's comments there. These issues just can't simply be 10 split up. They are too interwoven. The second issue 11 is really the most important by far and that is the 12 United States' requests for confidentiality being 13 extended only to counsel is incredibly important. 14 Drafts of documents like this can be inflammatory if 15 they reach the streets of the lower Rio Grande. For 16 example, I have been the subject personally of 17 multiple physical threats of violence, one of which 18 occurred during trial in this case in which you were 19 aware of. So if we see drafts leaking out, I worry 20 that certain people might take certain actions related to those drafts because drafts simply can't be 21 22 understood by the general public while the lawyers are 23 doing lawyer machinations, and so we need the ability 24 to work unconstrained and not have drafts leaking out 25 well before they are actually final. And I have a lot

1 of respect for the United States colleagues. I know 2 they've been subject to some of these attacks, as 3 Same as New Mexico. And so it's not just a well. 4 matter of worrying about somebody hanging their hat on 5 particular language. It's a matter of presenting this б appropriately to the public at the right time, and we 7 just simply can't afford a misstep in that arena. 8 And then third, I would like to 9 encourage you to just stay mediation and settlement 10 focused and avoid setting trial at this point, 11 especially for this year. If trial needs to be set, 12 the parties -- it's not just as simple as saying the 13 State of Texas will present evidence. The United 14 States has obligations that are interwoven with the 15 Texas case, which means the districts do, too. New 16 Mexico simply having to cross-examine some of the most 17 important witnesses in this case is not actually 18 So I would encourage you to just stay simple. 19 mediation focused and settlement focused for the time 20 being. 21 With that, Your Honor, I have no further 22 comments left. 23 JUDGE MELLOY: All right. I want to ask Ms. Barncastle one thing. To what extent do you need 24 25 to discuss the settlement documents with your

1 technical advisors, chairmen of your board, 2 presidents, what -- you know, the people who are the 3 decision makers and the people who are advising you? 4 MS. BARNCASTLE: At this point, Your 5 Honor, even without documents, I am in daily б conversations with all of those people, my client, my 7 board of directors, our technical advisors, as well as 8 the State of New Mexico, New Mexico amici, and the 9 United States. So I do need free ability to discuss 10 these issues. It's certainly going to be nice to be 11 able to share documents at certain points in time, but 12 one of EBID's regular practices is actually not to 13 disseminate documents for the client to take home with 14 So for the reasons I exactly expressed to you them. 15 just before. So showing them a document versus 16 handing it to them to walk out the door is something 17 entirely different for EBID because of our history 18 with some of these violent threats. You know, water 19 wars is a term that was coined because people used to 20 kill each other, and these threats actually are still 21 live and well so we -- we have implemented certain 22 safeguards within the EBID process. Being able to 23 discuss is incredibly important. Being able to hand a 24 copy to somebody, not so much from my perspective. 25 Well, let me ask this: JUDGE MELLOY:

1 Does anyone object, among the amici, to what I 2 understand to be Mr. Leininger's proposal is that you 3 sign a confidentiality agreement that the document 4 itself not be disseminated beyond the attorneys who 5 are parties to the confidentiality agreement but that б you would be able to discuss the contents of the 7 settlement agreement with technical advisors and 8 decision makers? If I'm summarizing you correctly, 9 Mr. Leininger -- correct me if I'm wrong, but does 10 anybody object to any -- to those restrictions?

11 MR. BROCKMANN: Your Honor, this is Jim 12 Brockmann to the Water Authority. I think part of the 13 answer and what I wanted to indicate earlier, part of 14 that depends on the timing of it. If we're looking at 15 some additional drafts and we're trying to understand 16 a settlement and can ask questions where we'll work 17 back and forth with New Mexico to understand it, I 18 think counsel's participation at that point is 19 probably adequate, but, for example, with the Water 20 Authority, they have a general counsel. They have an 21 executive director. They have a chief planning 22 officer, and my anticipation is that they will, at 23 some point, request copies of the draft to -- to read 24 through themselves, and if we've got a -- a 30- or a 25 50- or a 75- or 100-page draft, they will want to sit

1 in their office and look at it and have conversations 2 about it. So at some point, and it might be before 3 it's final, to have my best communication with the 4 client, but they will have to read the document and be 5 able to ask questions. It's hard for me to -- to try б to summarize it to them in an hour or a day-long 7 conversation. So it might depend on the timing, but I 8 believe we can work with the State of New Mexico and 9 the parties to find that appropriate time. 10 JUDGE MELLOY: But for the -- for the 11 immediate future, though, the documents would not be 12 disseminated beyond the attorneys who signed the 13 confidentiality agreement? Is that the understanding? 14 MR. BROCKMANN: Yes. And the Water 15 Authority --16 JUDGE MELLOY: That may change at some 17 point, but at least as of right now, that's what's on 18 the table? 19 MR. BROCKMANN: We can work with those 20 parameters initially, but, again, eventually, we might 21 press the parties to be able to disseminate those to a 22 few limited number of decision makers as part of our 23 client groups. 24 MR. STEIN: Your Honor, this is Jay 25 Stein. That arrangement will be a hardship for Las

1 We are going to need to show these documents Cruces. 2 to our expert, our hydrologist Lee Wilson, as well as 3 our water managers in Las Cruces Utilities, 4 principally Delila Walsh and Adrienne Widmer. 5 MS. O'BRIEN: Your Honor, I -- our б understanding -- and I thought this is what 7 Mr. Leininger responded earlier when you pressed him 8 on this issue, was that, you know, normally 9 confidentiality agreements are structured so that 10 counsel signs, you know, on behalf of, you know, 11 themselves, obviously, and the client that they 12 represent, but that the -- and the -- anyone within 13 the client that it's disseminated to is bound by that 14 confidentiality and -- and counsel is responsible for 15 ensuring that, and that's how we've proceeded, well, 16 in a variety of cases and other kinds of 17 confidentiality agreements, and in this particular 18 EP1 does have a need to share and work with case. 19 district engineer and general manager regarding 20 drafts. There's -- as parties have referenced to do, 21 there are appendices that support, clarify, implement 22 provisions of the draft that are technical in nature 23 and so there's this, you know, again, an interplay. 24 What I would suggest is that each amici party that 25 signs the confidentiality agreement lists the universe

1 of people that would be entitled to and be shared the 2 document, and I think that, again, that appears from 3 what people are saying to date is going to be an 4 individual entity, individual counsel determination, 5 and I think that should address what -- some of the б concerns that are expressed, but I think individual 7 entities are perhaps in different places. You know, 8 if EBID has certain parameters of how they want to 9 share, that's fine, but I -- I do think that each 10 entity needs to be able to share the document with 11 relevant people within that entity, and I -- if we 12 list those and limit it, I think that should address 13 the concerns of broader dissemination. 14 MR. BROCKMANN: This is Jim Brockmann. 15 I would support that kind of an approach because I 16 think that will define the folks, our specific client 17 representatives, that would get the document and --18 and we would know specifically who it would be without 19 dissemination beyond probably just a -- a small

20 handful of people within each organization.

25

21 MR. LEININGER: Your Honor, it 's 22 Mr. Leininger. May I respond?

23JUDGE MELLOY:You may.Well, I have a24comment, but go ahead.

```
MR. LEININGER: Thank you, Your Honor.
```

1 So these are nonparties, and it's highly unusual to 2 disseminate these draft settlement documents amongst 3 nonparties, and this is the exception to remain the 4 I think initially, we are seeking that exception. 5 counsel be the signatories to the confidentiality б agreement, that the dissemination be limited to them, 7 and if they were to come back to us, the parties, for purposes of broader dissemination, that would be the 8 9 appropriate time to perhaps expand this disclosure.

10 Well, you pretty much JUDGE MELLOY: 11 articulated what I was going to say, Mr. Leininger. 12 At this point, with less than a month to get this 13 done, I don't think we want to spend two weeks 14 negotiating the confidentiality agreement and 15 negotiating who is going to get to see it and who 16 isn't. There may come a point when it gets closer to 17 September 23rd, and it's 98 percent final that -- that 18 we expand the universe, but at this point, I think the 19 -- the request that it be limited only to counsel is 20 not an unreasonable one. I understand Mr. Brockmann's 21 original suggestion to be that there may come a point 22 where they may request expansion, and that's fine, but 23 I don't want to spend the next week and a half doing 24 nothing but negotiating the confidentiality agreement 25 with the amici. I think that time is better spent

1 dealing with the substance of the -- of the -- of the 2 negotiations and the -- and the -- and the disputes. 3 So let's limit it to counsel, but we'll -- we can come 4 back and revisit that issue if necessary in a couple 5 weeks, but I think at this point, we'll limit it to б They can certainly discuss it with their counsel. 7 respective clients and, you know, I think -- I think 8 they can be pretty thorough with their clients without 9 necessarily going over it line by line. So can you 10 get that out by tomorrow, Mr. Leininger? 11 MR. LEININGER: Yes, Your Honor. 12 JUDGE MELLOY: And as soon as -- so as 13 soon as the counsel sign it, what are they going to 14 get at that point? Are they going to get the 15 agreement that Texas has sent to you? 16 Yes. I believe that we MR. LEININGER: 17 have a draft, which had been disseminated fairly 18 recently. So I -- I hesitate to say they will get 19 that because there are a few provisions in there that 20 the parties have been discussing and perhaps we have 21 to reach a resolution on those before it's more widely 22 disseminated, but I can certainly anticipate that 23 we're going to have confidentiality agreement out 24 tomorrow, by close of business tomorrow, and then 25 we'll be able to address some of these more critical

1 remaining issues in that draft, I think, before -- and 2 I think this would be supported by all counsel, before 3 it has been -- it is distributed to the amici counsel. 4 JUDGE MELLOY: And when would that be? 5 I mean, when -- when can Ms. O'Brien or Mr. Brockmann б or any -- Mr. Stein, any of them expect to actually 7 see something? 8 Right. I had suggested MR. LEININGER: 9 next week, Your Honor. So early next week. 10 JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. And they would get 11 the Texas proposed agreement and what you have -- and 12 what you have negotiated to date with -- with the --13 keep referring to them as the intra-New Mexico issues? 14 MR. LEININGER: Not yet, on that latter, 15 I think. Again, we're meeting with the amici on 16 Tuesday, and I think that is going to be critical for 17 some of these drafting purposes on that portion of the 18 more broader resolution of these Compact issues. So 19 there -- there is the draft that, as Mr. Somach said, 20 has been distributed with regard to all the -- the 21 Texas portion of this decree. That should be ready 22 early next week. 23 JUDGE MELLOY: All right. 24 MS. O'BRIEN: Your Honor, if I may, I am 25 frankly concerned by Mr. Leininger's comments. Ιt

1 seems that the United States is putting itself in a 2 position, perhaps with other parties, of, you know, 3 what the amici get to see and when. You know, we've 4 been hearing for weeks, if not months, that, you know, 5 a draft could not be shared primarily because there б are issues to be resolved, and that's continuing to be 7 what we hear just now. So we're -- I think we're 8 sophisticated enough, have a sufficient critical 9 interest in this matter, that we should see the draft 10 in its current form. The parties can, you know, 11 caveat it as to what issues are not fully resolved. 12 We understand the -- none of the issues are fully 13 resolved, but, I mean, part of my imploring you today 14 that we see a draft immediately is because we don't 15 believe all the issues can be resolved without the, 16 you know, ultimate assent of EP1. We want, again, to 17 be a proactive and positive supporter of settlement. 18 So I'm very concerned that, you know, we're going --19 we hear what Mr. Leininger is saying, that there's --20 we won't see it because issues are to be resolved, 21 what will we hear next week? I think we need to -- to 22 move beyond this and get released what the current 23 draft is with the appropriate caveats, understanding, 24 you know, again, it's -- it's a confidential document. 25 We understand -- and/or documents. We understand it's

a work in progress. We believe we need to be involved 1 2 in that work in progress. 3 Well, I understand JUDGE MELLOY: Mr. Leininger to say -- and let me -- let me circle 4 5 back to him. So on Tuesday, you would disclose and б make available to the amici the agreement that 7 Mr. Somach has sent to you, even if there are some 8 unresolved issues; is that right? 9 MR. LEININGER: That's correct. Т 10 believe counsel interpret -- Ms. O'Brien may have 11 misunderstood. 12 JUDGE MELLOY: And by -- after -- after 13 you meet with the amici on Tuesday, how soon would you 14 make the other agreement, the intra-New Mexico 15 agreement, available? 16 MR. LEININGER: That's difficult to say 17 pending resolution of some of these very important 18 intra -- intrastate issues. 19 JUDGE MELLOY: Why can't you do what 20 Ms. O'Brien has said, here's the agreement on what we 21 have resolved? We all know that these are the --22 they're going to know, I assume, after Tuesday what 23 the outstanding issues are. 24 MR. LEININGER: Sure. Sure. And I --25 you know, it will be in a form that may be appropriate

1 for dissemination at that point, Your Honor. I -- I 2 hesitate to say yes because New Mexico and certainly 3 the other parties will have some opinion as to dissemination of that document, too. I mean, we will 4 5 -- as we are working on this, we have resolved general б It's sort of filling in the underlying principles. 7 values, if you would, that, you know, may take some 8 negotiation beyond Tuesday. So I hesitate to say 9 exactly when that would be. I -- but I certainly 10 understand how we are under a crunch right now and we 11 need to get this done and we do need to get the drafts 12 out and reviewed.

13 MR. WECHSLER: Your Honor, if I may --14 JUDGE MELLOY: I was just going to ask. 15 MR. WECHSLER: Yeah. Your Honor, I 16 mean, we are -- we want to be a good negotiating 17 partner with the U.S., and I understand they have some 18 legitimate concerns. That being said, we support 19 broad dissemination of -- of the documents. I think 20 an approach along the lines of what Ms. O'Brien is 21 suggesting is something that would -- that could work, 22 and I would also -- I want to be explicit that we 23 would also like to share with the -- with the amici 24 the technical documents that have been worked on that 25 are contemplated to be appendices to the -- the decree

1 or settlement documents because we think those are 2 also very important for the amici to understand. 3 Well, let me ask you JUDGE MELLOY: this, Mr. Wechsler, and anybody else can chime in if 4 5 they want. Do you think it's unrealistic to say б Tuesday they disclose -- by no later than Tuesday when 7 they meet with the amici, disclose the draft agreement 8 Texas has prepared, and by no later than the end of 9 next week, all the other documents be shared? 10 MR. WECHSLER: Yes. I think that that's 11 realistic. I think that's a good balance. 12 JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Well -- all 13 right. That'll be the -- that'll be the order then. 14 And if for some reason you feel, Mr. Leininger, that 15 as you go through the week next week that that's not 16 going to work or you have some serious problems with 17 it, you need to file something, and we'll take it up 18 then. 19 MR. LEININGER: Yes, Your Honor. 20 JUDGE MELLOY: Anybody else have 21 anything they want to say or anything else we need to 22 take up today? 23 Judge, do I understand JUDGE BOYLAN: 24 your order to be on or before so that the parties can 25 release those prior to the end of next week if --

1	JUDGE MELLOY: Oh, correct, definitely.
2	On or before, yeah.
3	JUDGE BOYLAN: Thank you.
4	JUDGE MELLOY: And it doesn't have to be
5	all on one document. If you have some technical
6	documents ready to go now, you can do it as soon as
7	they sign the confidentiality agreement, but yeah.
8	But, of course, it's also subject to signing the
9	confidentiality agreement. So any attorney who for
10	some reason doesn't want to sign it or hasn't signed
11	it, they won't get it, but it's subject to signing the
12	agreement.
13	All right. Well, let me just say this:
14	I'm generally available any time over the next several
15	weeks. If we have something come up, we can set a
16	hearing on short notice; otherwise, we'll plan to get
17	together on the 27th of of September. I I do
18	want to say, I just I may have one problem with
19	that date, but I'll double-check that, but I don't
20	think so. But let's plan on the 27th of September,
21	and that'll be in person and to either discuss
22	getting a settlement notice approved and finalized or
23	talk about what we're going to do at trial.
24	Anything else from anybody want to be
25	heard?

	rage 0
1	(No response.)
2	JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Thank you,
3	everybody. I appreciate your participation. Don't
4	hesitate if issues come up, don't hesitate to let
5	me know because, as I say, we can we can schedule
6	something on short notice if we need to.
7	All right. Thank you, everyone.
8	(The proceedings adjourned at 12:24 p.m.)
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	Worldwide Court Pepertarg Ing

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
17	on this, the 7th day of November, 2022.
18	Techowie Standard Standard
19	Hatnerst. Starter 310000
	HEATHER L. GARZA, CSR, RPR, CRR
20	Certification No.: 8262
	Expiration Date: 04-30-24
21	
22	
23	Worldwide Court Reporters, Inc.
0.4	Firm Registration No. 223
24	3000 Weslayan, Suite 235
25	Houston, TX 77027
25	800-745-1101

Г

A	AG 30:15	amici 13:17 14:9	46:18	59:16
$\overline{\mathbf{A.J}6:1812:14}$	aggressive 19:1	14:15.22 15:3	appearing 12:17	assist 35:25
a.m 1:16	ago 13:6 27:2	15:7,13 17:19	15:14	assistant 10:13
AAG's 20:6	36:24	17:20,22 21:23	appears 12:15	16:3 27:7
ABCWUA 29:3	agree 14:10	22:23 24:2,2,5	55:2	Association 6:17
ability 32:25	23:17,24 30:3	24:10 27:17	appendices 25:3	12:8
48:21 49:23	37:21 42:7,13	28:13,24 29:8	54:21 61:25	assume 12:10
51:9	44:17	29:8 32:14,15	appreciate 64:3	15:5 27:6,9
able 15:21 24:21	agreed 17:2	32:16,21 33:1	approach 55:15	28:6,8 31:12
47:3 51:11,22	agreement 13:11	33:20 35:4	61:20	41:10 45:15
51:23 52:6	14:1,19,21	36:6 37:4,10	appropriate	60:22
53:5,21 55:10	15:7 17:14	39:4 43:3,6,19	18:15 22:14,19	assuming 18:16
57:25	18:4,7,17 19:7	48:11 51:8	41:3 53:9 56:9	26:13
absolutely 15:9	19:10,22 20:16	52:1 54:24	59:23 60:25	attacks 50:2
45:18	21:4 22:16	56:25 58:3,15	appropriately	attempt 24:20
acceptable 30:6	23:16,17 25:5	59:3 60:6,13	50:6	attending 13:14
ACOSTA 5:17	26:13,16 33:5	61:23 62:2,7	approval 15:21	attorney 2:16
action 21:8	33:15 35:7	Anaya 3:7 8:25	16:1,9 20:3,10	3:16 8:15,23
22:18	36:1,5,13 37:1	ancillary 17:15	20:12,14,23	8:24 9:11 16:3
actions 49:20	43:11,15 45:17	and- 2:10,14,25	34:12,12 36:2	26:19,20,22
actual 15:13	48:8,19,20	3:5,10,14 4:5	approvals 18:13	27:1,7,10,14
add 32:1	52:3,5,7 53:13	4:11,15,25	approve 28:10	30:13 31:2
additional 52:15	54:25 56:6,14	and/or 44:25	approved 16:2	63:9
address 30:11	56:24 57:15,23	59:25	42:20 46:25	attorneys 20:4
31:15 44:22	58:11 60:6,14	Andrew 6:13	63:22	52:4 53:12
45:5 55:5,12	60:15,20 62:7	Andrews 2:22	approvers 13:12	65:12
57:25	63:7,9,12	8:21	approximately	August 1:14
addressed 32:12	agreements 54:9	answer 24:13	36:24	16:15,18
35:20 46:8	54:17	26:9 47:9	aptly 49:7	Austin 2:17 5:2
addressing	ahead 14:1	52:13	arena 50:7	5:18 6:14
13:17	48:15 55:24	anticipate 15:18	arrangement	authorities 34:7
adequate 52:19	ajolsen@h2ol	20:9 26:21	48:23 53:25	authority 5:10
adjourned 64:8	6:21	35:2 42:18	arrive 21:24	9:25 10:4
Adrienne 10:12	Al 10:20	57:22	43:14	26:20 52:12,20
54:4	albeit 33:2	anticipation	arrives 41:5	53:15
advising 51:3	Albuquerque	27:3 52:22	articulate 45:13	authorization
advisor 9:13	3:8 4:23 5:10	anxious 26:3	articulated	27:5
11:3 44:1	9:25 10:3	27:21,23 45:9	43:17 56:11	available 13:12
advisors 37:13	28:23	anybody 35:3	articulation	60:6,15 63:14
51:1,7 52:7	alert 32:23	39:24 42:5	46:14	Avenue 1:16 3:7
advocate 18:16	allay 29:4	48:11 52:10	asked 24:1,11	6:14,19
advocating	allayed 31:12	62:4,20 63:24	26:8 47:6	avoid 50:10
17:19	allow 44:8	anyway 35:21	asking 23:10	aware 27:17,20
affect 28:25	allowed 24:7	42:25	36:1	28:2 43:25
afford 50:7	amended 33:20	apologize 10:24	aspect 29:19	44:11 46:4
afternoon 36:9	amendment	41:18	aspects 45:6	49:19
	14:11	appear 12:15	assent 43:16	

Г

	9:25 10:4	5:11,12 10:2,3	51:11,21 55:8	claims 22:9
B	best 47:22 53:3	52:11,12 53:14	certainly 17:10	clarify 54:21
B 2:4 4:16	better 15:17	53:19 55:14,14	17:13 18:15	clear 22:8 42:8
back 16:17 18:9	34:3 40:25	58:5	26:5 29:2	43:10,23 45:19
36:3 38:17,23				· ·
52:17 56:7	56:25	Brockmann's	39:14 40:17	client 11:1 51:6
57:4 60:5	beyond 20:2	56:20	43:12,19 44:10	51:13 53:4,23
background	38:1 42:14	brought 22:18	51:10 57:6,22	54:11,13 55:16
34:3	52:4 53:12	Building 5:17	61:2,9	clients 57:7,8
backup 19:5	55:19 59:22	Bureau 9:21	CERTIFICATE	close 16:6,6
bad 41:9	61:8	business 57:24	65:1	57:24
balance 62:11	BICKERSTA	Butte 5:5 10:21	Certification	closer 56:16
ball 18:8	5:17	<u> </u>	65:20	closure 46:22
bandwidth	bilateral 25:8	C 2:1,4 4:13	Certified 65:3	coined 51:19
10:25	bit 18:4 40:3	5:11 8:1	certify 65:5,9,12	Coleman 4:6
Barfield 2:4	44:21		Chad 3:21 9:10	9:19
8:13	Blair 10:20	calculus 23:14	chad.wallace	colleagues 50:1
Barncastle 5:6,6	board 11:4	California 2:6	3:24	Colorado 1:11
10:23,24 11:6	19:16 35:15	call 16:24 17:4	chairmen 51:1	2:12 3:3,20,22
11:11 28:5	51:1,7	18:1 24:24	Chakeres 9:5	3:23 4:3 8:4
49:2,5 50:24	Bobby 8:16	called 17:15	challenging 48:7	9:8,10 17:9
51:4	bottom 28:7	camera 35:7	chance 21:12	21:7 29:20
based 17:11	bound 54:13	capacity 65:10	39:5	30:9,12 31:10
18:10 43:23	bounds 24:6	Capitol 2:6	change 30:22	35:14
basically 12:22	Box 2:17 4:8 5:2	caption 65:6	53:16	Colorado's 9:13
14:22	5:12,22 6:3,8	Caroom 5:16	changed 30:25	29:15
beginning 1:16	Boylan 12:12	10:6,6	changes 16:5	come 18:20 56:7
45:20	13:13 25:10	carry 31:24	18:5 23:14	56:16,21 57:3
behalf 11:23	31:25 32:3	carve 21:6 22:6	28:19 46:7	63:15 64:4
43:8 54:10	33:17 34:1	carve-out 23:12	check 41:10	comes 11:12
65:11	35:23 40:4,14	carved 22:12	chief 8:23 27:14	comfortable
believe 12:13	40:24 43:2,18	47:8,12	52:21	31:21
13:13 15:3	62:23 63:3	carving 21:17,17	chime 62:4	comment 23:10
16:18 18:15,23	branches 16:7	30:4	Cholla 3:15 8:22	24:11 34:5
19:1 22:11	breaker 29:13	case 13:18 16:2	choppy 13:8	48:14 55:24
26:7 32:4,16	46:10,13,18	19:15 22:9	Chris 9:20	comments 15:15
33:11,17 36:19	breakers 46:1	28:24 40:2	Christopher	32:2 34:15
36:23 37:2	brief 48:14	44:13 49:18	4:16	43:9,24,24
41:3 43:12	briefly 39:8	50:15,17 54:18	circle 36:3 37:15	49:9 50:22
45:14 46:9,12	bringing 46:21	cases 22:15,19	60:4	58:25
46:12,13 53:8	broad 61:19	54:16	CIRCUIT 1:15	commission 9:5
57:16 59:15	broader 45:25	cause 65:13	City 4:18 5:10	Commissioner
60:1,10	55:13 56:8	caveat 59:11	5:15,20 10:5,6	8:16 9:3
beneficiaries	58:18	caveats 59:23	10:8,10 38:6	commitment
44:14	Broadway 3:23	CEDAR 1:16	48:16	41:17
benefit 39:23	BROCKMAN	central 11:3	City's 48:21	communication
Bernalillo 5:10	5:22	certain 37:24	ckhoury@nm	16:6 20:8 53:3
	Brockmann	42:8 49:20,20	3:18	Compact 9:3,14
	l	l	-	

	ng 57:1
	les 47:17
	mber 18:10
29:22 31:9,15 38:3,19 45:16 47:14 CRR 65:19 19:2	2,3,18
31:18,19,22 45:22 48:19 copies 52:23 Cruces 5:7,10 39:2	23 42:24
44:12 47:9 49:12 52:3,5 copy 16:25 5:20 10:8,10 decise	i on 20:6
58:18 53:13 54:9,14 51:24 10:12 54:1,3 51::	3 52:8
Compacts 31:9 54:17,25 56:5 Corrales 6:3,4 crunch 61:10 53:2	22
31:11,24 56:14,24 57:23 correct 28:11,12 CSR 65:19 decree	e 14:25
	25 17:16,17
22:21 65:7 Congress 6:14 60:9 63:1 65:7 current 29:8,16 18:	14 21:18,21
completed 39:13 connection 31:8 correctly 13:24 43:21 59:10,22 22:	1,21 24:16
41:4 Conservation 52:8 currently 31:14 29:2	21 36:20,21
completing 14:6 6:11 11:21,24 Cotten 9:14 58:2	21 61:25
	ated 44:13
complex 32:17 39:11 40:11 10:18 14:23 D 8:1 deep	
\mathbf{r} as the second s	e 55:16
concept 15:11 31:18 32:11 37:25 38:2,24 Dalrymple 8:22 defin	itely 63:1
	GADO
concepts 15:10 consult 38:24 52:20 54:10,14 data 20:18 5:17	7
	a 10:11
43:25 45:25 30:14 57:3,6,13 58:2 18:25 19:1,17 54:4	
	er 2:12 3:3
	3 4:3 13:6
	12,25
	rtment
	2 4:2,7,12
	7 9:18,20
	nd 35:11
29:5,20 30:20 context 29:6 couple 13:6 day 24:1 40:7,22 53:4	
	nds 52:14
	ty 8:23
	2 27:14
	ibe 29:22
	ibing 31:18
	iption
40:6 41:16 continuing 13:9 34:5 35:25 5:19 29:3	
	iptions
	4 30:8
35 10 10 10 0	ving 33:12
	e 14:25
	ls 28:20
8	mination
	12 55:4
	ence 37:17
confidentiality conversation 59:8 41:4 46:1,10 37:	10
	19 ent 44:5

51:17 55:7	dissemination	doing 34:9 49:23	EBID's 51:12	event 38:9 41:21
difficult 60:16	34:22 55:13,19	56:23	editing 14:12	event 38.9 41.21 eventual 21:17
direct 32:25	,	door 51:16	edits 18:6	
33:9 34:24	56:6,8 61:1,4 61:19	Dorfman 2:16	effectuate 38:16	eventually 53:20
				everybody 17:14 35:12 41:13
directing 34:9	distributed	double-check	either 33:6	· · -
directly 32:14	14:15 15:17	63:19	42:19 48:11	64:3
director 9:4	58:3,20	Doug 10:6	63:21	evidence 35:18
10:11,13 38:6	distribution	Douglas 5:16	El 4:20 5:15	39:25 50:13
52:21	14:14 15:2	downtown 34:2	10:5,7,14,17	evidentiary
directors 11:4	29:17 30:4	Dr 10:20 11:3	38:6,8 43:8	18:14,17 20:15
51:7	38:2,7,14	draft 13:11 14:6	elements 22:18	exactly 41:5
disagree 22:4	district 4:20 5:5	14:9,25 15:14	Elephant 5:5	51:14 61:9
disagreed 42:9	6:12 10:15,18	16:24 17:2,17	10:21	example 22:15
disbursal 37:10	10:19,19,22	29:21 38:2,13	emphasize 43:16	49:16 52:19
disclose 24:7	11:2,21,24	44:5 52:23,25	employ 65:12	exception 56:3,4
60:5 62:6,7	28:8 43:8,19	54:22 56:2	employee 65:10	exchanged
disclosure 20:21	54:19	57:17 58:1,19	encourage 50:9	20:22
33:15 37:4,8	districts 34:25	59:5,9,14,23	50:18	executive 52:21
56:9	43:20 44:10,14	62:7	engineer 9:3,6	exhausted 17:5
discuss 18:2	50:15	drafting 12:24	9:13,13 10:20	existing 14:20
38:4 50:25	diverse 12:14	58:17	26:24 30:15	36:13
51:9,23 52:6	Diversified 6:17	drafts 24:15	54:19	expand 56:9,18
57:6 63:21	12:8	37:9 43:21,22	ensuring 54:15	expanded 38:1
discussed 13:18	Division 16:4	49:14,19,21,21	enter 26:20	38:20,22
14:20 37:16	dmiller@kem	49:24 52:15	entire 24:3	expansion 56:22
discussing 37:17	6:15	54:20 61:11	entirely 51:17	expect 9:2 10:11
38:14 57:20	document 14:18	Draper 3:11,11	entities 55:7	13:10 15:15
discussion 14:6	15:16,20 20:10	3:11 9:1,1,2	entitled 55:1	16:7 39:24
16:21,23 25:14	20:11,23 34:6	Drawer 3:17	entity 55:4,10	58:6
32:1	37:3 38:13,13	Drew 6:13 11:23	55:11	expert 54:2
discussions 14:2	51:15 52:3	drop-dead 22:25	Environment	Expiration
21:15,21 25:8	53:4 55:2,10	drowning 11:14	16:4	65:20
25:25 29:4,5	55:17 59:24	due 10:25	envisioning	explain 35:8
33:2,8 43:21	61:4 63:5	DUNN 2:5,11	35:24	explicit 61:22
44:2,9 45:7	documents	duties 32:10	EP 49:8	expressed 26:3
dismissal 47:1	17:23 24:9,12		EP1 43:10,16,25	29:3 30:20
dismissed 48:8	24:16 25:19,23	E	44:8 54:18	31:6 51:14
dispute 21:6	27:23,25 30:10	E 2:1,1,1,1 3:16	59:16	55:6
31:23	32:21 33:1,4	4:6 8:1,1	equally 48:16	Expressway
disputes 21:9	33:13 37:5,6,6	earlier 41:21	equivocate 46:3	5:17
32:9 57:2	37:16 48:17,24	47:6 52:13	especially 50:11	extended 49:13
disseminate	49:14 50:25	54:7	essence 33:12	extent 46:11
51:13 53:21	51:5,11,13	early 19:18 31:5	Esslinger 11:4	50:24
56:2	53:11 54:1	39:17 58:9,22	Estrada-Lopez	
disseminated	56:2 59:25	EBID 10:24	9:22	F
52:4 53:12	61:19,24 62:1	49:8 51:17,22	evacuate 11:15	F 5:21
54:13 57:17,22	62:9 63:6	55:8	evaluated 23:22	fact 20:3 30:17
		I		l

Г

30:19 31:23	finish 16:21	53:11	Goldsberry 2:5	hat 50:4
32:8 42:3	42:22		8:14	hate 19:14 39:9
facts 65:5	finished 16:20	G	good 8:20 9:9,17	hear 14:7 22:5
fair 31:10	Firm 5:6 6:2	G 5:16 8:1	10:2,9,16,23	22:22 33:8
fairly 26:12	65:23	gap 24:23	11:22 12:1,5	59:7,19,21
33:15 34:22	first 8:5 12:25	gaps 23:11	20:17 61:16	heard 18:11
35:2 57:17	17:1 32:4	Gary 11:4	62:11	19:5 25:13
Faler 9:22	42:25 43:9	Garza 7:2 65:3	gotten 17:6	35:4 43:6
far 21:2 22:20	49:7	65:19	governor 26:23	48:11 49:3,3
24:7 49:11	fit 44:7 45:8	general 8:23 9:5	30:14	63:25
Farmers 6:17	46:4	16:3,3 26:19	governor's	hearing 1:15
12:8	Floor 3:23	26:20,22 27:1	26:24	18:14 20:13,15
farmers' 11:13	focused 50:10,19	27:14 30:13	Grande 6:17	25:21,22 30:18
11:14	50:19	31:2 43:25	8:16 9:3 12:7	34:6,21 35:5,8
fashion 33:10	folks 18:2 38:5	49:22 52:20	47:6 49:15	35:9,10 59:4
Fe 2:23 3:12,17	55:16	54:19 61:5	Grant 2:16	63:16 65:8,11
5:13,23 6:9	following 28:17	general's 2:16	granted 12:20	hearings 18:18
13:15	28:18	3:16 8:15,24	great 40:9	HEATH 5:17
federal 22:15	foregoing 65:6	9:11 18:9	groups 53:23	Heather 7:2
34:7	form 14:8,12,13	27:10	growers 6:1,17	65:3,19
feedback 17:6	14:22 15:16	generally 63:14	11:25 12:2,14	heather_garza
feel 13:25 15:16	17:18 21:5,9	generals 27:8	guess 21:1 26:10	7:4
20:21 29:13	33:14 36:5	getting 63:22	28:6 34:20	heavy 25:8
38:15 40:16	59:10 60:25	give 18:11 21:12	39:24	help 11:18
48:3 62:14	forth 52:17	23:3 24:5 39:4		helpful 13:7
felt 45:13	forward 19:7	given 35:5 65:16	H	helping 40:10
Ferguson 9:23	24:20 28:10	go 14:1 22:13	half 56:23	HENNIGHA
fields 11:13	30:7 48:20	30:7 33:22	Hamman 9:2	6:19
file 34:10 62:17	four 12:18	38:17,23 42:25	hand 51:23	hereto 65:6
filed 48:7	Fourth 4:22	48:15 55:24	65:16	hesitate 57:18
fill 23:11 24:23	frame 34:13	62:15 63:6	handful 55:20	61:2,8 64:4,4
filling 61:6	Francis 2:5 8:13	goes 20:13	handing 51:16	Hicks 5:1,1
final 13:11 14:8	frankly 58:25	going 13:14 16:7	hang 42:12	10:18
15:20 16:24	free 51:9	16:15 19:11	hanging 19:9	highly 35:16
17:2,14 19:19	fulfill 16:20	24:24 25:6	42:10 50:4	56:1
20:10,12,23	fulfilled 16:19	27:11 28:8,10	happen 28:10	history 51:17
21:5,18,20,25	full 25:9 26:20	28:10 29:8	happening	Hoffman 2:4
26:13 30:21,25	43:19,20 47:4	32:18 35:13,15	26:21	8:14
34:12 49:25	full-day 24:4	35:18 38:10,11	happens 40:19	holes 17:8
53:3 56:17	fully 43:10 44:11	42:7,19,21	happy 26:8	holistic 23:13
finality 34:14	45:9 46:22	48:19 51:10	35:12 42:23	home 51:13
finalize 14:1	59:11,12	54:1 55:3	hard 24:2 26:1	Honor 8:11,20
finalized 30:19	fundamental	56:11,15 57:9	39:17 53:5	9:10,18 10:3,7
44:25 63:22	18:19,20	57:13,14,23	hardship 53:25	10:9,17,24
find 53:9	further 39:3	58:16 59:18	HARRIS 4:22	11:11,22 12:1
fine 40:17 42:15	50:21 65:9	60:22 61:14 62:16 63:23	Hartman 3:22 9:11	12:5,13 13:3
55:9 56:22	future 48:22			13:21 15:23

				Fage /I
16:9,13 20:2	immediately	inconvenience	49:10 50:14	Jeffrey 2:21
20:16 21:14	33:11,23 59:14	41:19	intimately 27:10	Jennifer 4:7
22:8 23:9	impact 28:14	incorporated	37:13 44:2	9:19,22
27:13 28:13	45:5	21:25	intra 14:3 60:18	jennifer.najja
29:15 36:10	implement	incredibly 49:13	intra-New 21:8	4:10
37:5,21 38:12	54:21	51:23	58:13 60:14	Jesus 10:19
39:7 40:18	implementation	indefinitely	intrastate 22:10	jfstein@newm
41:15 42:2	22:13 46:16	19:14	32:9 44:19	5:24
43:7,24 45:12	48:20,22	indicate 52:13	47:8,11,21,25	Jim 10:3 52:11
45:19 46:2	implemented	indicated 16:14	60:18	55:14
48:13 49:1,6	51:21	18:25 21:2	involved 27:11	John 3:11 6:7
50:21 51:5	implore 44:7	25:7 29:11	37:14 44:2	9:1 12:6
52:11 53:24	imploring 59:13	individual 55:4	60:1	
54:5 55:21,25			IOWA 1:16	john.draper@ 3:13
,	import 44:9	55:4,6		
57:11 58:9,24	importance 46:20	inflammatory 49:14	irrigation 5:5 10:21 11:2	john@uttonk 6:10
61:1,13,15 62:19		49:14 information	issue 23:12 29:3	0.1 - 0
	important 19:5			joined 10:11
HONORABLE	28:20 32:5,12	20:22 24:6	29:6,24,25	joining 9:12,18
1:15	32:17 35:25	informed 24:3	44:13 49:10	Judge 1:15 8:2
hope 17:13	39:19 41:1	30:15 32:22	54:8 57:4	8:18 9:7,15,24
25:10 33:6	44:22 46:5,17	initially 53:20	issues 10:25 17:9	10:5,8,14,21
39:15 46:20	49:11,13 50:17	56:4	17:15,16 18:2	11:5,19,25
47:12	51:23 60:17	integrated 21:20	21:19 22:10,12	12:3,7,10,16
hopeful 18:21	62:2	21:20 22:21	22:20 23:1,2	13:13,22 15:5
21:24 39:13	impose 38:10	45:9	23:10 24:18	15:18,24 16:11
47:18	imposed 37:1	integration	25:1,11 26:9	19:21,25 20:25
Hopefully 30:1	impossibility	43:20	29:12 30:4,6	21:11 22:2,22
hoping 11:16	17:24	intend 14:23	32:4,17 44:23	23:7 25:10
hour 53:6	impossible 22:6	intention 19:12	45:1 46:8,15	26:10 27:6,16
Houston 7:3	_ 23:20,21	32:23 33:9	47:4,5,6,8,9,11	28:4,21 29:10
65:24	Improvement	interest 19:13	47:11,16,25	31:1,5,25,25
Hubenak 2:15	4:20 10:15,18	59:9	49:9 51:10	32:3,3 33:14
8:15	43:8	interested 27:17	58:1,13,18	33:17,24 34:1
Hudspeth 6:11	in-camera 34:11	48:17 65:13	59:6,11,12,15	34:16,19 35:23
11:20,23	34:20	interests 31:7	59:20 60:8,18	36:3,12,17,20
hundred 22:4	in-person 13:6	interface 46:6	60:23 64:4	37:12 38:4,15
hydrologist 54:2	13:15 24:4	interference	it'd 35:2	39:1,21 40:4
T	25:9 40:6,9,12	13:20	it'll 41:24,25	40:12,14,15,19
$\left \frac{\mathbf{I}}{\mathbf{I}_{\text{res}} + 0.22} \right $	41:16	Interior 4:12,17	T	40:23,24,25
Ian 9:22	include 25:3	9:20	$\frac{J}{J}$	41:6,20 42:17
idea 20:17 40:25	28:18 32:25	internal 30:5	James 5:11	43:1,2,5,18
identified 33:21	included 24:4	interplay 54:23	January 19:4	45:15,23 46:24
34:8 41:2	37:14 45:6,7	interpret 60:10	Jay 5:21 10:10	48:3,6,10,15
II 2:5	including 24:16	interpretation	48:13 53:24	49:2 50:23
immediate	25:9	31:22	jcbrockmann	51:25 53:10,16
43:18 44:8	inclusion 43:18	interstate 9:4	5:14	55:23 56:10
53:11	44:8	interwoven	Jeff 8:21	57:12 58:4,10
	I	I	I	I

58:23 60:3,12	44:3,5,6,9,21	Leininger 4:2	LLP 5:17 6:13	27:3 31:2
60:19 61:14	45:8,25 46:3,9	9:16,17 12:25	location 11:16	37:18,21,25
62:3,12,20,23	46:20 47:7	13:2,3 14:5	41:13	44:4 45:24
62:23 63:1,3,4	50:1 51:2,18	15:8,23,25	long 31:1	50:4,5 59:9
64:2	54:8,10,10,23	20:1,2 21:1,12	look 28:16 37:15	matters 32:12
Judith 4:6	55:7,18 57:7	21:14 22:3,7	38:23 39:1	MAX 5:1
judith.colema	59:2,3,4,10,16	23:6,20,25	53:1	MCREA 6:19
4:9	59:18,24 60:21	24:11 25:7	looking 23:23	mean 23:1,4,25
Judy 9:19	60:22,25 61:7	33:5,18 34:8	37:17 42:3	25:14 26:12
Justice 4:2,7	64:5	36:4,7,16,19	52:14	28:6 58:5
9:19	knows 27:11	36:23 37:20	Looks 33:24	59:13 61:4,16
jwechsler@m	30:16	38:12,17 52:9	lot 18:5 20:18	meaningful
2:24	Корр 3:1 9:1	54:7 55:21,22	35:17 37:19	24:10
		55:25 56:11	40:5 47:16	means 18:6 35:7
K W 12.11	$\frac{L}{L}$	57:10,11,16	49:25	40:1 50:15
Kansas 12:11	L 2:3 7:2 65:3	58:8,14 59:19	loud 34:23 35:9	mechanics 42:21
keep 19:13,24	65:19	60:4,9,16,24	35:21	media 12:18,20
24:2 58:13	Lake 4:18	62:14,19	lower 47:5 49:15	mediation 29:6
keeping 19:22	language 15:13	Leininger's	lthompson@t	50:9,19
31:19	29:21 30:22	25:22 52:2	3:4	mediator 12:12
keeps 17:7 19:6	37:22 38:23	58:25		16:16 32:10,24
19:7	45:24 50:5	let's 41:23 57:3	<u>M</u>	45:19
KEMP 6:13	Las 5:7,10,20	63:20	M 2:1,15 3:1	meet 13:4 16:18
kept 20:11	10:8,10,12	levels 11:9,18	machinations	32:14 60:13
KERY 6:8	53:25 54:3	leverage 40:9	49:23	62:7
key 48:23	late 15:11	liked 34:15	Main 5:7	meeting 13:5,6,7
Khoury 3:15	law 3:22 5:1,6	limit 55:12 57:3	major 31:7	13:15 21:22,23
8:22 27:14	6:2 34:2	57:5	makers 51:3	25:9 36:8
kick 18:8	Lawrence 2:12	limited 15:3	52:8 53:22	41:16 58:15
kicking 34:17	lawsuit 22:17	31:23 37:8,10	making 13:5	meetings 24:4
kill 51:20	lawsuits 22:16	53:22 56:6,19	Mall 2:6	24:19 25:1
kin 65:13	lawyer 49:23	Lincoln 3:2	manager 10:19	MELLOY 1:15
kind 16:15 23:2	lawyers 49:22	line 28:7 57:9,9	11:2 54:19	8:2,18 9:7,15
40:21 55:15	lead 13:1	lines 61:20	managers 38:5	9:24 10:5,8,14
kinds 54:16	leaders 26:23	Lisa 3:1 8:25	48:25 54:3	10:21 11:5,19
Klahn 2:11 8:13	leaking 49:19,24	list 36:8,10	Marcus 3:6 8:24	11:25 12:3,7
know 14:24 15:9	leaving 21:8	55:12	marcus@robl	12:10,16 13:22
15:14 16:14	led 27:15 32:13	listen 12:19	3:9	15:5,18,24
17:23 18:2	Lee 4:2 54:2	listening 12:21	Maria 4:21	16:11 19:21,25
19:8,15 23:5	lee.leininger@	lists 54:25	10:17 43:7	20:25 21:11
25:13 26:24	4:4	litigation 31:7	Marquette 3:7	22:2,22 23:7
28:7,23,23	left 50:22	47:2 48:7	Master 1:15	26:10 27:6,16
30:23 31:5	legal 29:23,25	little 11:7 18:4	44:11	28:4,21 29:10
35:1,6,10,10	30:8	18:22 40:3	materialize	31:1,5,25
35:13,17,19	legally 43:11,15	live 51:21	11:17	33:14,24 34:19
37:18,21 38:6	45:10	LLC 3:11 5:6	materially 11:9	36:3,12,17,20
39:13,18 41:7	legitimate 61:18	6:2	matter 11:15	37:12 38:4,15
	I	I		I

				rage /J
39:1,21 40:12	Michelle 9:22	N	21:6,16,22,23	35:12,20
40:15,19 41:6	Mike 9:2,13	$\frac{1}{N 2:1 8:1}$	23:12,16,21	obligation 30:8
41:20 42:17	Miller 6:13	N.W 4:22	26:15,17,19,19	obligations
43:1,5 45:15	11:22,23	Najjar 4:7 9:19	27:4 29:18	29:23 31:15
45:23 46:24	mindful 26:2	00	30:5,6 31:20	44:16 50:14
48:3,6,10,15	Minneapolis	name 38:8 named 35:4	32:9,14,15	observe 47:13
49:2 50:23	34:2		35:13 36:8	obtain 25:17
51:25 53:10,16	minute 39:4	Nat 9:5 nature 25:4	39:24 41:2	26:5
55:23 56:10	misleading 42:5	54:22	47:8,21,25	obviously 54:11
57:12 58:4,10	misstep 50:7		48:7 50:3,15	occasion 32:13
58:23 60:3,12	misunderstood	necessarily 57:9	51:8,8 52:17	occasions 28:2
60:19 61:14	42:15 60:11	necessary 25:17	53:8 61:2	occurred 49:18
62:3,12,20	mkopp@trout	38:25 45:13,21	news 12:18,20	office 2:16,17
63:1,4 64:2	3:4	57:4	nice 51:10	3:16,17 4:8 5:1
members 12:18	mobrien@mo	need 14:14	NMSU 12:6	5:2,12,22 6:3,8
35:1	4:24	19:12,25 23:1	nobody's 19:13	8:13,15,22,24
mention 8:5	modify 45:5	26:25 27:1	nonparties 56:1	9:6,11,20 18:9
12:17	MODRALL	38:15 39:16	56:3	27:10 53:1
mentioned 11:6	4:22	42:6 47:20	normally 54:8	65:16
18:13 33:5	moment 13:23	48:23 49:23	north 6:19 11:17	officer 52:22
met 17:1 34:15	Monday 41:23	50:24 51:9	note 17:20	offices 34:2
Mexico 1:11	monkey 35:15	54:1,18 59:21	notice 33:16	Ogaz 3:16 8:23
2:20,23 3:8,12	monsoons 11:8	60:1 61:11,11	34:22,24 35:5	Ogaz 5.10 8.23 Oh 63:1
3:16,17 4:23	Montgomery	62:17,21 64:6	63:16,22 64:6	Okay 8:18 12:16
5:7,13,23 6:1,4	2:22 8:21	needs 14:19	notify 34:25	31:5 36:17
6:6,9,17,20 8:4	month 17:21	33:19 39:16	notion 18:5	48:10 58:10
8:19,24 11:25	24:4 48:4	50:11 55:10	novel 31:20	Olsen 6:18,19
12:2,3 13:16	56:12	negotiated 58:12	November 18:16	12:14,17
13:17,20 14:3	months 24:9	negotiating	18:25 65:17	ones 32:6
21:6,8,16,23	27:4 34:18	18:10 27:15	number 25:2,3	operating 22:16
21:23 23:12,16	59:4	56:14,15,24	28:2 47:11,17	48:8
23:21 26:15,18		61:16	53:22	operation 46:6
26:19,19 27:4	morning 8:20	negotiation	NW 3:7 4:13	operations
29:18 30:5,6	9:9,17 10:2,9	19:11 61:8	14 4.15	44:23 45:5
32:9,14,15	10:16,23 11:22	negotiations	0	operative 28:1
35:14 36:8	12:1,6,19,23	23:24 25:25	O 2:1 8:1	opinion 61:3
39:24 41:2	motion 25:18	27:11 36:9,24	O'Brien 4:21	opportunity
47:8,21 48:1,7	move 19:19	37:14 38:20	10:16,17 43:7	24:10 25:12
50:3,16 51:8,8	59:22	42:14 57:2	43:7 45:18	47:15
52:17 53:8	moved 41:18	new 1:11 2:20	46:2 49:7 54:5	opposed 34:17
58:13 60:14	moving 19:7	2:23 3:8,12,16	58:5,24 60:10	40:13
61:2	40:10 46:19	3:17 4:23 5:7	60:20 61:20	opposing 28:3
mgoldsberry	multiple 49:17	5:13,23 6:1,4,6	object 27:18,21	option 42:12
2:9	municipal 48:21	6:9,17,20 8:3	52:1,10	order 32:11 33:6
mic 12:15	mulicipal 48.21 mute 8:8	8:19,24 11:25	objection 41:11	36:22,25 37:3
Michael 1:15	muted 8:6	12:2,3 13:16	41:25 45:16	38:16,18,19,21
3:1 8:25	mutu 0.0	13:16,20 14:3	objections 33:8	38:22 47:20
5.1 0.25				30.22 47.20
L				

62:13,24	28:5 32:22,25	phone 27:8	practical 37:18	problematic
orders 36:25	33:10,16,19	phone 27.8 phrased 37:25	37:20	21:18
organization	34:10 35:24	physical 29:18	practices 51:12	problems 62:16
55:20	37:1 39:4,6	29:24 49:17	precedents 31:8	procedure 25:15
original 1:3 8:3	43:2,14,18	picture 28:15	prepared 36:14	25:20
21:7 56:21	44:10 45:20	pieces 44:6,7	62:8	proceed 26:6
outline 44:4	47:17 48:11	45:4,8 46:3,4	present 20:18	33:10
outlines 15:6	50:12 52:5	46:17	28:15 39:25	proceeded 54:15
outstanding	53:9,21 54:20	places 55:7	50:13	proceedings
24:18 25:2,11	56:7 57:20	plan 41:24 63:16	presentation	64:8 65:8
47:5 60:23	59:2,10 61:3	63:20	12:21 41:4	process 12:24
overall 23:15	62:24 65:10,14	planning 52:21	presenting	24:3 26:6 27:2
32:13,18 45:2	parties' 46:14	play 46:16	42:23 50:5	24.3 20.0 27.2 27:15 29:14
overdeliveries	partner 61:17	please 8:8	presidents 51:2	34:17 51:22
46:7	parts 23:15	point 11:14 14:3	press 53:21	produced 20:4,5
40.7	46:19	15:22 16:21	pressed 54:7	productive 13:7
P	party 27:18	17:4 18:22	Preston 3:22	productive 13:7 progress 13:5,8
P 2:1,1 8:1	28:23,24 31:11	25:22 27:17	9:11	13:21 30:15
P.A 4:22 5:12,22	35:4 36:18	30:16 35:22		60:1,2
6:8	54:24		preston.hartm 3:25	
P.C 3:7	Paseo 2:22 3:12	38:16 39:14 46:1 48:12	- · -	project 13:19,20
p.m 64:8	Paso 4:20 5:15		pretty 23:2 41:12 56:10	44:12,14,15,23
pages 65:6		50:10 51:4	57:8	45:2,5 46:6
pages 03:0 papers 34:10	10:5,7,14,17	52:18,23 53:2		proponent 24:8
parade 39:10	38:6,8 43:8 path 24:20	53:17 56:12,16 56:18,21 57:5	previous 38:18 primarily 59:5	proposal 14:17 29:17 52:2
parameters	Patrick 11:3	57:14 61:1	- •	
29:22 31:15	pecan 6:1,17		principally 54:4	proposed 25:20 29:21 36:1
53:20 55:8	11:25 12:2	points 15:7 49:6 51:11	principles 20:20 61:6	58:11
parcel 33:2				
part 13:17 14:1	pending 22:16 22:17 34:11	portion 14:16 24:25 44:18,19	prior 17:12 20:23 26:21	proposing 27:18
16:15 23:13	47:2 60:17	44:24,25 45:4	34:6 40:7	prove 18:14 20:15
32:12 33:1		47:21 58:17,21	62:25	
35:11 52:12,13	penned 31:19	/	Priscilla 2:15	prove-up 20:13
53:22 59:13	people 8:6 33:3 35:8 37:15	position 15:4 28:7 29:16	8:15	provide 17:2,18 17:22 48:21
participant	38:9 40:10,15	59:2	- · -	
46:21	49:20 51:2,3,6		priscilla.hube 2:18	provided 16:23 16:25 17:8
participating	49:20 51:2,5,6 51:19 55:1,3	positive 23:12 46:21 59:17	proactive 46:20	48:17
27:9	· · ·		59:17	
participation	55:11,20 Peralta 2:22	possible 15:1 26:4 39:17		provides 25:12
52:18 64:3	3:12	47:13,19 48:18	probably 12:25 31:10 34:22,23	providing 14:22 17:20
particular 50:5	percent 22:4	48:24	34:24 35:18	provisions 23:17
54:17	56:17	Post 2:17 3:17	40:20 41:7,24	23:18 24:17
parties 13:4 14:7	person 41:8,25	4:8 5:2,12,22	41:25 52:19	27:22 28:1
14:10,21 15:12	63:21	6:3,8	55:19	33:5,18 54:22
15:20 16:23	personally 49:16	potential 28:19	problem 12:15	57:19
17:1,3 23:11	perspective	38:21	34:19 35:3	public 15:21
24:1 25:17	51:24	potentially 16:5	41:22 63:18	16:10 26:1
	51.27	Potentiany 10.5	T1.22 03.10	10.10 20.1

Г

37:6 49:22	32:18 49:15	regular 51:12	resolution 19:20	Rich 4:16 9:20
50:6	57:21	65:10,12	21:9,19 31:23	Richardson 6:19
published 34:24	reached 18:17	regularly 13:5	47:4 57:21	right 8:2 9:24
purpose 21:16	46:25	21:22	58:18 60:17	11:19 12:22
21:22 42:6	reaches 17:14	regulation 28:16	resolvable 32:6	14:17 20:25
purposes 13:10	read 52:23 53:4	regulations	32:7	29:10 30:22
13:17 14:13,22	reading 11:7	28:19	resolve 19:15,18	36:22 37:20
16:1 22:8	ready 15:20	reiterate 42:3	21:7 23:1	39:3 41:6 43:1
36:15 37:3	33:22 42:25	rejection 16:8	24:19,20 30:8	43:5 47:15
38:14 44:20	45:21 58:21	relate 45:1	38:1 47:5,12	48:10 50:6,23
56:8 58:17	63:6	related 10:25	47:16,18,20,23	53:17 58:8,23
pursuant 32:10	real 13:25 47:15	25:18 44:23	47:24	60:8 61:10
pursuing 32:10	realistic 24:12	49:20	resolved 19:13	62:12,13 63:13
put 8:7	48:4 62:11	relationship	22:5 23:2	64:2,7
putting 14:8	realistically 23:5	44:12	32:18 47:20	rights 44:16
31:16 59:1	really 18:7,23	relatively 26:6	59:6,11,13,15	Rio 6:17 8:16
	19:4 22:13	release 62:25	59:20 60:21	9:3 12:7 47:6
Q	23:1 39:15	released 59:22	61:5	49:15
question 23:19	49:11	relevant 38:9	resolving 25:11	road 6:3 18:8
24:14 26:11	reason 13:25	55:11	47:22	34:18
37:23	19:23 44:17	remain 20:1	respect 48:19,21	Robert 2:4 8:14
questions 26:7,9	62:14 63:10	25:24 56:3	50:1	Robles 3:7 8:25
30:11 45:13	reasons 51:14	remaining 58:1	respective 13:12	ROEHL 4:22
52:16 53:5	Reclamation	remember 38:7	57:7	role 32:24
quick 49:6	6:11 9:21	REMOTE 1:14	respects 33:20	Rolf 9:3
quickly 26:4,6	11:21,24	Renea 5:1,1	respond 21:13	rolling 19:6
26:12 30:7	recommendati	10:18	55:22	Roswell 6:20
36:4	20:5	Reporter 7:1	responded 54:7	RPR 65:19
	record 39:19	65:4	response 12:9	
R	reduce 23:4	Reporters 7:2	14:15 43:4	S
R 2:1,1 4:2 5:6	reference 32:9	65:23	64:1	s 2:1 5:17 6:13
8:1	32:20	represent 54:12	responsible	8:1 55:21
Rael 3:6,7 8:24	referenced	representatives	54:14	Sacramento 2:6
8:25	54:20	55:17	restrictions	safeguards
rain 11:9,12	referred 44:19	request 16:16,22	52:10	51:22
rains 11:17	referring 58:13	52:23 56:19,22	result 47:1 48:2	Salt 4:18
39:10	reform 22:14	requested 16:17	review 13:12	Samantha 5:6
raise 30:24	regard 14:16	20:17	16:1 34:7,11	10:24
raised 17:9	22:9 37:22	requests 12:18	34:20 38:18	samantha@h
28:22,25 29:12	44:16 45:21	49:12	43:21	5:8
32:5	58:20	required 20:24	reviewed 61:12	Santa 2:23 3:12
Raley 3:2 9:1	regarding 29:21	35:18	revisit 57:4	3:17 5:13,23
Randel 4:12	46:15 54:19	reserving 30:22	Reyes 10:19	6:9 13:15
9:21	regardless 43:21	reservoir 11:13	rhicks@renea	Sarah 2:11 8:13
RAPIDS 1:16	45:3	11:17,18 28:17	5:3	saw 9:8,16
reach 18:4 24:21	Registration	28:22 29:1,9	rhoffman@so	saying 13:24
30:12,17,21	65:23	reservoirs 11:10	2:8	17:8 22:5,23
	00.20		2.0	Í Í

Г

23:20,21 50:12	serious 62:16	short 33:16	SMITH 6:13	28:14 36:14
55:3 59:19	set 18:23,24	38:21 63:16	so-called 44:18	47:7 48:6
schedule 19:17	24:19 25:15	64:6	44:24 45:4	55:18
34:11 39:22	31:8 50:11	shortening	47:20	spend 56:13,23
40:6 41:12	63:15	34:13,16	Solicitor 16:2	spent 56:25
64:5	setting 18:16	Shorthand 65:4	18:8	SPERLING
scheduled 39:17	50:10	shot 47:22	Solicitor's 9:20	4:22
scheduling	settlement 12:24	show 12:16 54:1	Somach 2:3,5,11	spill 31:9
13:13,14 36:22	13:11 19:16	showing 51:15	8:10,11,12	spirit 47:14
39:11 40:5	20:16,20 21:17	side 31:17	13:22 16:11,13	split 49:10
Schmidt-Peter	21:24 23:13,15	sign 14:19 26:15	19:23 21:1,2	ssomach@so
9:4	23:23 24:9,15	27:2 30:13	21:10 22:4,23	2:7
scratch 24:15	24:22 25:18,21	31:3 45:21	26:3 29:11	stage 15:11
SE 1:16	25:23,24 26:18	48:18 52:3	32:5 39:7,8,22	stand 26:8 45:14
seal 34:10 65:16	26:21 27:19,22	57:13 63:7,10	40:17 42:2,18	46:12
second 49:10	28:1,17 29:7	signatories 56:5	42:22 58:19	standing 29:19
see 12:11 19:6	29:23 30:10,12	signature 14:23	60:7	stands 49:8
19:23 24:20	30:16,17,21,23	26:12	somebody 50:4	start 8:5,9 11:18
26:1 27:22	31:16,18 32:13	signatures 15:1	51:24	23:11 42:23
33:3 41:4	32:19,21 33:2	25:17 26:5	soon 11:18	started 27:2
44:25 48:24	33:7 34:6 36:9	signed 25:24	14:25 48:18,24	42:23
49:19 56:15	36:15 37:6,24	26:18 33:19	57:12,13 60:13	starting 24:14
58:7 59:3,9,14	38:19 42:20	37:11 53:12	63:6	state 1:9,11,11
59:20	43:11,13,15,20	63:10	sooner 43:12	2:2,16,20 3:20
seeing 33:12	44:1,20,22,24	significant 15:6	sophisticated	4:17 6:6 8:3,3
45:23	45:11 46:23,25	25:6 44:9,22	59:8	8:4,9,12,17,18
seeking 56:4	47:21 48:2,17	45:4	sort 12:25 31:16	9:2,6,7,10,12
seen 44:4,5	50:9,19,25	signing 45:16	61:6	12:4,11 19:16
46:18	52:7,16 56:2	63:8,11	sought 20:14	26:15,17,23,24
send 33:4,15	59:17 62:1	signs 54:10,25	sound 43:11,15	30:6,14 31:11
sense 40:6 47:15	63:22	SIMMONS 2:5	45:11	43:22 47:25
sent 57:15 60:7	settling 22:8,9	2:11	sounds 40:24	50:13 51:8
separate 47:25	SEVENTH 1:15	simple 50:12,18	South 4:17 5:7	53:8 65:4
separated 44:20	SGA 20:6	simply 41:17	Southern 6:17	state's 30:14
45:1	shape 15:17	49:9,21 50:7	12:7	stated 49:8 65:5
separating 47:17	share 14:9 27:23	50:16	southwest 11:8	states 1:6,15 4:1
	27:24 32:25	SISK 4:22	speak 12:25	8:4 9:16 13:16
September 13:10 15:19	51:11 54:18	sit 52:25	13:23 28:5 31:8 39:11	17:7,7 21:7
17:13,21 19:8	55:9,10 61:23 shared 14:18	sitting 33:25 34:1	speaker 8:8	29:18 30:5 35:14 48:1
19:9,10 24:22	55:1 59:5 62:9	skeptical 18:22	speaking 8:7	50:1,14 51:9
26:14 30:3,17	sharing 15:6	39:14	40:5	59:1
32:7 39:12	24:9 32:20	sklahn@soma	special 1:15	States' 49:12
40:7,8 41:1	Shelly 2:21 4:12	2:13	12:11 44:11	stating 49:7
42:4 48:2,4	8:22 9:21	Skov 8:16	specific 27:22,25	status 12:19
56:17 63:17,20	shelly.randel	slightly 25:20	35:20 55:16	13:18 40:6
series 25:16	4:14	small 55:19	specifically	41:16 65:8,11
201100 20110			-pecifically	

Г

			•	•
stay 50:9,18	summarizing	61:24 63:5	23:19 24:12,13	52:14 53:7
Stein 5:12,21,22	52:8	technically	25:5,12 27:21	title 22:17,17
10:9,10 48:13	superiors 20:8	43:11,15 45:10	28:16 29:12	today 9:12,18
48:14,16 53:24	supply 44:13,15	telegraphs 17:23	30:18 31:10	10:25 11:1
53:25 58:6	44:17 48:22	telephone 32:21	32:6 34:4,8,12	27:8 59:13
steps 26:14	support 25:15	telling 28:9	34:19 35:16,17	62:22
stood 45:21	41:16 45:10	ten 23:3 24:13	35:17,23 36:4	tomorrow 57:10
stream 9:5	46:22 54:21	term 51:19	37:2 39:16,18	57:24,24
Street 2:12 3:2	55:15 61:18	terms 21:17,25	39:21 40:2,8	top 36:7,10
4:3,13,17,22	supported 58:2	Tessa 6:2 12:2	40:22,25 41:8	totality 30:9
7:3	supporter 59:17	testimony 35:24	41:9,13 43:16	transcript 1:14
streets 49:15	supports 43:10	42:24	46:1 47:5,10	65:7 •
strict 37:7	Supreme 1:6	Texas 1:9 2:2,16	47:10,19 49:3	treasurer 11:2
strictly 40:2	41:10 42:20	2:17 5:2,18	52:12,18 55:2	trial 18:23,24
strong 24:8,15	sure 8:7 23:16	6:14 7:3 8:3,9	55:5,6,9,12,16	19:1,2,12,17
47:14	37:19 38:12	8:12,14,17	56:4,13,18,25	39:12,16 42:21
structural 29:24	60:24,24	14:1,16 17:11	57:5,7,7 58:1,2	49:18 50:10,11
structured 43:14	surprises 15:10	19:10,16 21:3	58:15,16 59:7	63:23
54:9	system 38:7	21:6 29:18	59:21 61:19	tried 24:2 27:24
Stuart 2:3 8:12		30:3,5 35:13	62:1,5,10,11	trouble 18:12
39:7	T	39:25 40:18	63:20	Trout 3:2 9:1
subject 14:11,11	T 2:1 6:2	42:5 44:18,24	thinking 34:23	true 32:8 65:6,7
16:1,4,8 20:3	table 19:11	45:4 50:13,15	35:9,21 40:20	try 29:4 53:5
20:10,19 22:11	53:18	57:15 58:11,21	41:7,20,22	trying 12:14
37:2,7 45:23	take 25:22 27:3	62:8 65:4	third 50:8	24:5 28:15
49:16 50:2	37:3 39:1	Texas' 26:2 40:2	Thompson 3:1	31:14 52:15
63:8,11	45:12 49:20	thank 11:19	8:25	ttd@tessadavi
submit 25:18	51:13 61:7	13:3 29:10	thorough 57:8	6:5
submitted 15:20	62:17,22	32:3 48:25	thought 42:22	Tuesday 58:16
substance 57:1	taken 13:1 65:11	49:6,7 55:25	54:6	60:5,13,22
substantive	talk 17:10 18:2	63:3 64:2,7	threats 49:17	61:8 62:6,6
15:15	33:21 38:6,9	Theresa 2:4 8:13	51:18,20	two 17:2,22 19:2
sufficient 14:13	42:19,21 63:23	they'd 40:1	three 12:17	19:2 24:4 27:7
17:18,18 59:8	talking 15:9	thing 19:3,6	22:25 49:6	29:17 30:5
suggest 18:12	22:12 23:14	24:24 34:4	throw 35:15	39:22 42:19,24
40:4 54:24	24:17 28:13	35:6 50:24	Thursday 41:18	56:13
suggested 58:8	31:2 36:13	things 11:7	time 13:23 16:14	twofold 34:20
suggesting 61:21	47:7	14:20 40:10	16:19 17:15	TX 65:24
suggestion 41:8	tbarfield@so	42:19 45:14	18:22 23:3	type 45:16
56:21	2:8	46:11,21	33:11 34:13,15	
Suite 2:6,12 3:2	teams 27:15	think 8:6 12:24	39:14 42:6	
3:7 4:3,17 5:7	technical 20:18	14:7,10,17	49:8 50:6,19	U.S 4:2,7,12,17
5:17 6:14 7:3	25:1,1,3 35:10	15:11 16:9,24	51:11 53:9	30:20,21 32:15
65:24	35:19,24 37:13	17:14,17,23	56:9,25 63:14	41:2 44:18
Sullivan 9:13	38:5,8 44:1	18:13,21 20:11	65:8	45:2 61:17
11:3	46:15 51:1,7	20:17 21:5,18	timing 11:15	ultimate 59:16
summarize 53:6	52:7 54:22	22:14 23:4,5	25:14 42:10	ultimately 20:6
		I		I

26:18,25 29:7	use 13:20 28:16	46:2 48:11,14	42:23,24,25	54:4
unconstrained	28:25 40:1	50:23 52:25	47:17,22,22	willing 17:10
49:24	users 29:9 35:14	55:8 56:13,23	52:14,15 57:23	Wilson 54:2
underlying 61:6	Utah 4:18	59:16 61:16,22	58:15 59:7,7	wish 33:7
understand 14:2	utilities 10:12	62:5,21 63:10	59:18 63:23	witnesses 50:17
14:14 20:16	54:3	63:18,24	we've 13:4,5,7	word 47:14
21:5 22:2 29:3	Utility 5:10 9:25	wanted 35:4	16:5 17:5	words 44:4
35:6 38:18	10:4	52:13	23:22 24:6	45:24
43:13 44:21	Utton 6:7,8 12:5	wanting 49:3	28:13,14 29:4	work 25:6 30:1
	12:6	wars 51:19	,	30:2 45:2 46:9
45:3 46:8,11	12:0		45:6,19,20,20	
52:2,15,17	V	Washington 4:8	52:24 54:15	49:24 52:16
56:20 59:12,25	v 1:10 3:22	4:13 water 4:20 5:10	59:3	53:8,19 54:18
59:25 60:3	vacation 16:18	9:25 10:4,14	weather 11:1,6 Wechsler 2:21	60:1,2 61:21 62:16
61:10,17 62:2 62:23	values 61:7	9:23 10:4,14 10:17 11:9,14		worked 25:5
	variety 54:16	,	8:20,21 17:1	61:24
understanding 15:2 33:3,22	various 12:18	28:16,16,25 29:9,17 34:25	21:12 23:7,9 26:17 27:13,20	working 14:23
	versus 8:3 51:15	,		U
35:25 53:13	video 10:25	35:14 38:5,7	28:12 29:2	20:5 24:18
54:6 59:23	view 16:12	43:8 44:13,15	41:15 46:24	31:14 61:5
understood	19:21 21:11	44:16 48:22,25 51:18 52:12,19	47:3 48:5,9	works 35:16
13:24 14:9	23:8 32:11,17	,	61:13,15 62:4	Worldwide 7:2 65:23
15:12 37:12 42:9 49:22	32:24	53:14 54:3	62:10	
	violence 49:17	waters 13:9	week 13:15	worry 49:19
unequivocally	violent 51:18	way 23:22 29:19	14:24 15:4	worrying 50:4
46:10	vision 34:21	34:9,13 46:22	16:25 17:3,22	wrench 35:15
Unfortunately 11:12	VISION 57.21	48:1	22:24 23:5	writing 23:4
	W	ways 34:16 we'll 8:9 15:3	25:9 40:20,24	written 27:25 37:22
union 31:12	W 6:7		41:17,21 56:23	• • • • = =
United 1:6,15	wait 16:17 17:12	17:9,12 18:1	58:9,9,22	wrong 39:15,15
4:1 8:4 9:15	waiting 17:22	18:10 21:23	59:21 62:9,15	52:9
13:16 17:7,7	34:14	41:24 42:15,18	62:15,25	X
21:7 35:14	walk 19:11	42:19 52:16	weeks 13:6	
48:1 49:12	51:16	57:3,5,25 62:17 63:16	17:22 19:2	Y
50:1,13 51:9 59:1	Wallace 3:21 9:8	we're 11:16	22:25 27:2,4 31:2 39:22	yeah 23:9 61:15
	9:9,10 26:11			63:2,7
universe 54:25 56:18	29:11,15 31:4	13:20 15:8,8 17:4,25,25,25	42:24 56:13 57:5 59:4	year 30:19 36:24
	31:6,13 32:5		63:15	50:11
University 6:6 12:4	37:23	18:21,22 19:8 19:9 22:24	weigh 39:5 43:3	years 20:5 28:18
unrealistic 62:5	walls 31:17		48:25	vesterday 32:22
	Walsh 10:11	23:14,25 24:5 24:14,17,18,21		
unreasonable 56:20	54:4		weren't 35:3 Weslayan 7:3	Z
unresolved 60:8	want 15:10	25:8,8 26:2 29:6,13 31:13	65:24	Zach 8:23
unresolved 60:8 unusual 56:1	24:23 28:4,7	31:14,17,17,20	wide 34:22	Zachary 3:16
update 12:23	32:1 39:5,8,9	32:18 36:8	widely 57:21	zogaz@nmag
urge 18:23,24	42:3,4,5,8,14		•	3:19
uige 10.23,24	42.3,4,3,0,14	$A1 \cdot 15 A7 \cdot 277$	Widdenrood 25.7	
19:4,17 39:11	43:3,6,10,23	41:15 42:3,7,7 42:10,10,19,21	widespread 35:2 Widmer 10:12	Zoom 40:13

41:7	18:21 19:8,9	6:15	87504 5:13,23	
	19:10,10,22	514-3553 4:9	6:9	
0	24:22 30:17	524-5677 4:18	88005 5:7	
04-30-24 65:20	32:7 39:12	52401 1:16	88202 6:20	
	40:7,8,21 41:1	570-4591 3:13	8th 16:16	
1	42:4,11,13,14	575 5:8 6:20		
1 4:20 10:15,18	48:2,4 56:17		9	
11:21,24 43:9	24 1:14	6	916 2:7	
1's 49:9	242-2228 3:8	604 6:19	95814 2:6	
100-page 52:25	24th 17:21	6201 4:17	98 56:17	
1000 2:6	26th 41:23	624-2463 6:20	983-3880 5:13	
10th 16:18,22	2701 2:12	636-2377 5:8	5:23	
11:02 1:16	279-7868 2:13	699-1445 6:9	986-2637 2:23	
1100 5:7	27th 41:22,24		999 4:3	
111 1:15	42:6,15,18	7		
1120 3:2	63:17,20	700 3:7		
113 2:12	28th 41:22	720 2:13 3:24		
12:24 64:8		745-1101 7:4		
125 4:17	3	75- 52:25		
12548 2:17	30- 52:24	7611 4:8		
1260 6:14	300 5:17	77027 7:3 65:24		
1300 3:23	3000 7:3 65:24	78701 6:14		
141 1:3 8:3	303 3:3 4:4	78703 5:2		
1508 3:17	303187 5:2	78711 2:17		
1600 3:2	320-5466 6:15	78746 5:18		
1849 4:13	325 2:22 3:12	792-3636 6:4		
18th 4:3	329-4672 3:18	7th 3:23 65:17		
1938 31:19	370 4:3	8		
2	3711 5:17			
	38 31:22	800 7:4 800-745-1101		
20 5:7 20044 4:8		65:25		
20044 4.8 202 4:9,14	$\frac{4}{100000000000000000000000000000000000$	801 4:18		
2022 1:14 65:17	408 20:22	80202 4:3		
2022 1.14 05.17 2023 18:10	4206 6:3	80203 3:3,23		
34:14	446-7979 2:7	80205 2:12		
20240 4:13	463-2012 2:18	816 6:14		
20240 4.13 2067 5:12,22	472-8021 5:18	8262 65:20		
2007 5.12,22 208-5432 4:14	480-8231 5:3	84138 4:18		
200-3432 4.14 223 65:23	5	844-1375 4:4		
2240 6:3	50- 52:25	848-1800 4:23		
23 13:10 15:19	500 2:6 3:7 4:22	861-1963 3:3		
26:14	505 2:23 3:8,13	87048 6:4		
235 7:3 65:24	3:18 4:23 5:13	87102 3:8		
2386 6:8	5:23 6:4,9	87103 4:23		
23rd 17:13,21	508-6281 3:24	87501 2:23 3:12		
17:24 18:6,6	512 2:18 5:3,18	3:17		
	Į.	1	Į.	