1	No. 141 Original		
2	No. III orrginar		
3	In The		
4	SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES		
5	SOURDING COOK! OF THE ONTING STATES		
6	STATE OF TEXAS		
7			
8	STATE OF NEW MEXICO and STATE OF COLORADO		
9			
10			
11			
12	,		
13	SPECIAL MASTER, UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE, 111 SEVENTH AVENUE, SE, CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA 52401, beginning		
14	at 3:00 p.m.		
15			
16	APPEARANCES:		
17	For the State of Texas: Somach Simmons & Dunn, P.C. BY: STUART L. SOMACH, ESQ.		
18	ROBERT B. HOFFMAN, ESQ.		
19	FRANCIS GOLDSBERRY II, ESQ. THERESA C. BARFIELD, ESQ. BRITTANY K. JOHNSON, ESQ.		
20	500 Capitol Mall, Suite 1000 Sacramento, California 95814		
21			
22	For the State of State of New Mexico  New Mexico: Office of the Attorney General  BY: TANIA MARSTAS ESO		
23	BY: TANIA MAESTAS, ESQ.  Post Office Drawer 1508		
24	Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504		
25			

1	1 APPEARANCES:	
2	New Mexico: BY: 500	es Rael & Anaya, P.C. MARCUS J. RAEL JR., ESQ. Marquette Avenue NW, e 700
4	4 Albu	querque, New Mexico 87102
5		t Raley Montano Freeman r Thompson, P.C.
6	BY:	MICHAEL A. KOPP, ESQ. Lincoln Street,
7	7 Suit	e 1600 er, Colorado 80203
8	8	·
9	9 Colorado: BY:	rado Department of Law CHAD M. WALLACE, ESQ. Broadway
10		er, Colorado 80203
11		Department of Justice JAMES J. DUBOIS, ESQ.
12	2	R. LEE LEININGER, ESQ. 18th Street
13	Sout:	h Terrace - Suite 370 er, Colorado 80202
14		Department of Justice
15	BY:	STEPHEN M. MACFARLANE I Street, Suite 9-700
16	Sacr	amento, California 95814
17		Department of the rior, Office of the
18	8 Soli	citor SHELLY RANDEL
19	9 1849	C. Street NW ington, DC 20240
20	0	Department of Justice
21	BY:	JUDITH COLEMAN ronment & Natural
22	Reso	urces Division  Box 7611
23		ington, D.C. 20044-7611
24	4	
25	5	

Г

1	For Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility	Stein & Brockmann, P.A. BY: JAMES C. BROCKMANN ESQ Post Office Box 2067
2	Authority:	Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504
3	For the City of	Bickerstaff Heath Delgado
4	of El Paso:	Acosta, LLP BY: DOUGLAS G. CAROOM ESQ
5		SUSAN M. MAXWELL ESQ
6		3711 S. MoPac Expressway Building One, Suite 300
7		Austin, Texas 78746
	For the City of	Stein & Brockmann, P.A.
8	Las Cruces:	BY: JAY F. STEIN ESQ Post Office Box 2067
9		Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504
10	For Elephant Butte	Barncastle Law Firm, LLC
11	Irrigation District:	BY: SAMANTHA R. BARNCASTLE ESQ Post Office Box 1556
12		Las Cruces, New Mexico 88004
	For El Paso County	Modrall Sperling Roehl Harris
13	Water Improvement District No. 1:	& Sisk, P.A. BY: MARIA O'BRIEN ESQ
14		Post Office Box 2168 Albuquerque, New Mexico 87103
15		
16	For New Mexico Pecan Growers:	Davidson Law Firm, LLC BY: TESSA T. DAVIDSON ESQ Post Office Box 2240
17		Corrales, New Mexico 87048
18	Hudspeth County Conservation &	Kemp Smith, LLP BY: ANDREW MILLER ESQ
19	Reclamation	919 Congress Avenue
20	District No. 1	Suite 1305 Austin, Texas 78701
21	For New Mexico State	Utton & Kery, P.A.
22	University:	BY: JOHN W. UTTON ESQ Post Office Box 2386 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504
23		·
24	Official Court Reporter:	Shannon Moine (319) 480-0908 benter.moine@gmail.com
25		

Г

## 1 PROCEEDINGS 2 (April 23, 2018) 3 JUDGE MELLOY: This, of course, is in the matter of the State of Texas vs. the State of New 4 5 Mexico and the State of Colorado, Supreme Court 6 Original No. 141. 7 Let me just start with the named parties 8 including the United States. Who is on for the 9 State of Texas? 10 MR. SOMACH: Yes, Your Honor. This is 11 Stuart Somach. I'm the counsel of record for the 12 State of Texas. With me is Francis Goldsberry, Robert Hoffman, Theresa Barfield and Brittany 13 14 Johnson. All of those folks are on the service 15 list. 16 JUDGE MELLOY: Who was the second name 17 you mentioned? 18 MR. SOMACH: Robert Hoffman. 19 JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. And Theresa 20 Barfield, Brittany Johnson. Is there anybody else besides you, Mr. Somach? 21 22 MR. SOMACH: No. And then myself. 23 JUDGE MELLOY: And then who is on for 2.4 the --25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Goldsberry. You

1 forgot Goldsberry. 2 MR. SOMACH: No. I thought I started 3 with him. JUDGE MELLOY: I missed him. Okay. 4 Then for the State of New Mexico who do we 5 have? 6 7 MR. RAEL: Your Honor, Ms. Marcus Rael, 8 counsel of record for the State of New Mexico. 9 With me I have Deputy Attorney General Tania 10 Maestas, I have David Roman and I have Lisa 11 Thompson and Michael Kopp. 12 JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. For the State of Colorado who do we have? 13 14 MR. WALLACE: Yes. Good afternoon, Your 15 Honor. This is Chad Wallace for the State of 16 Colorado. 17 JUDGE MELLOY: All right. And then for 18 the United States? 19 MR. DUBOIS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. This is Jim Dubois for the United States and also 20 21 on the phone are Steve Macfarlane, Lee Leininger, 22 Judy Coleman and I believe Shelly Randel from 23 Interior. 2.4 JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. And then 25 Albuquerque County Water Utility, who do we have on -Shannon N. Benter-Moine, CSR-

1	for that entity or are you on?
2	MR. BROCKMANN: Yes, Special Master.
3	This is Jim Brockmann on behalf of the Albuquerque
4	Bernalillo Water Utility Authority, counsel of
5	record.
6	JUDGE MELLOY: And then the City of
7	El Paso?
8	MR. CAROOM: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
9	This is Doug Caroom for the City of El Paso and
10	Susan Maxwell is with me.
11	JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. Do we have the City
12	of Las Cruces?
13	MR. STEIN: Yes, Your Honor. This is Jay
14	Stein for amicus curiae City of Las Cruces, New
15	Mexico.
16	JUDGE MELLOY: And then El Paso County
17	Water Improvement District No. 1?
18	MS. O'BRIEN: Yes, Your Honor. This is
19	Maria O'Brien for El Paso County Water Improvement
20	District No. 1.
21	JUDGE MELLOY: And then what about
22	Elephant Butte Irrigation District?
23	MS. BARNCASTLE: Good afternoon, Your
24	Honor. This is Samantha Barncastle for Elephant
25	Butte Irrigation District.
	Shannon N. Benter-Moine, CSR-

1	JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. And then we have
2	Hudspeth County Water Control. Anyone on for them?
3	MR. MILLER: Yes, Your Honor. This is
4	Drew Miller, counsel of record for Hudspeth County
5	Conservation and Reclamation District No. 1.
6	JUDGE MELLOY: And then what about the
7	New Mexico Pecan Growers?
8	MS. DAVIDSON: Good afternoon, Your
9	Honor. This is Tessa Davidson for New Mexico Pecan
10	Growers.
11	JUDGE MELLOY: And how about New Mexico
12	State University?
13	MR. UTTON: Yes, Your Honor. This is
14	John Utton on behalf of New Mexico State
15	University.
16	JUDGE MELLOY: Is anyone on for the State
17	of Kansas?
18	(Silence.)
19	JUDGE MELLOY: All right. No one for
20	State of Kansas.
21	MR. SOMACH: This is Stuart Somach, Your
22	Honor. I did talk to them and I don't believe that
23	they will be on the telephone call.
24	JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. And then I should
25	just advise we do have, of course, a court reporter
_	Shannon N. Benter-Moine, CSR-

here and I have -- two of my law clerks are sitting and listening. I've also asked Michael Gans and a couple of the people from his IT staff to join us. Michael, are you on?

MR. GANS: Good afternoon, Judge Melloy.

Yes, I'm here with Christine Werner and John Elser

from our automation staff.

JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. All right. Is there anybody I've missed who we haven't gone through?

(Silence.)

JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Well, I'd like to start today by just talking about some of the mechanics of the case before we get to some of the issues that we have to talk about. I've been working with Michael Gans' office and the best way to set up the service list and how to handle the service and filing and so on. With the prior Special Master -- of course, he handled both the service, he handled the filing and he handled the maintenance of the record. Of course, in this case I'm going to be handling the case and Michael's office will be handling keeping the record and maintaining that for the Supreme Court and so on.

I just want to go through a couple of the mechanics

of how we're going to handle that and do that and make a few changes from the way things have been handled previously.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

First of all -- and we'll include this in the written order so you'll have this to refer to. As you know, Mr. Gans has set up a place right on the Eighth Circuit website. If you haven't checked, you can go to the Eighth Circuit website and it's on the first page that shows the docket for this case. Any pleading or other matter that you want to have filed in the case, as is indicated in Mr. Gans' letter of April 6th, should be sent to that txvnm141@ca8uscourts.gov email address. going to eliminate the requirement that you send a courtesy copy by email to me. We have set it up through Mr. Gans' office that whatever you send to that email will automatically be forwarded to me. We'll just have one email address for any filings or pleadings and they go to that address and then I'll automatically receive a copy. As I say, I'll confirm this in the written order.

It 's my understanding that under the first and second case management orders that had been filed by Mr. Grimsal that you were serving four copies of each document. I shouldn't say serving.

You were filing four hard copies of each document. I don't think we need quite that many. going to ask that you do is send one hard copy to Mr. Gans and one hard copy to me. In the order that will be coming out I will give you -- it will include the mailing address for each of us on that. Now, we have been told by the Supreme Court that they will require a hard copy record of all the proceedings and so the copy that you will be sending to Mr. Gans will be the hard copy that will eventually be sent to the Supreme Court at the end Again, just one copy to him and one of the case. copy to me, which leads me to a question I have. As I understand the prior case management orders, the parties have been serving hard copies on each Am I understanding that correctly? other. want to continue to do that? Maybe I'll start with --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. RAEL: This is Marcus Rael, State of New Mexico. We had a meeting on April 4th in Denver and I think we basically agreed -- the four parties did -- named parties -- and I think we basically agreed to do it by electronic service from this point forward.

JUDGE MELLOY: So electronic service

only?

2.4

MR. RAEL: Unless somebody remembers differently than I do, Your Honor.

MR. SOMACH: Your Honor, this is Stuart

Somach for Texas. I actually paused because I

couldn't remember if we were serving hard copies or

not. We're certainly fine with just electronic

service and I think Mr. Rael is correct that we did

agree -- particularly as we move into discovery -
that service can all be done electronically.

JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. And then have you been serving the amici everything that is filed or -- I guess, what has been the practice and what do you understand the -- what do you believe will be the practice going forward in that regard?

MR. SOMACH: Your Honor, this, again, is

Stuart Somach for Texas. We have been serving

everybody that's been on the service list and I

think our intention was to continue to do that with

whatever it is that we are filing.

JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. Fine. I want to talk a little bit more further as we get into the call about the status of the amici, but at least as of right now they will be served with everything that anyone else gets served with.

What about things that aren't filed such as discovery? Is it your present intention to serve all the amici with all discovery?

MR. SOMACH: I think that that was our intention. Anybody can disagree, but we were going to serve whomever was on the service list, which included all of the amici. One of the things we didn't do is separate out I think -- as I read one of the letters, they were talking about stakeholder amici. We were just talking about serving anybody that was amici that was on the list equally and that we would serve them with whatever got served among the parties. Again, someone could correct me on that.

MR. DUBOIS: This is Jim Dubois for the United States. I'm not sure that we agreed that we were going to send all of the discovery responses and documents to everyone.

JUDGE MELLOY: This is Judge Melloy.

I noticed in one of the letters -- or maybe more than one -- that there was some reference to maybe doing some type of discovery depository for the amici as opposed to serving the discovery responses on each of them, but -- well, let's kind of table that for a moment and we'll talk about that in a

minute when we talk about the amici.

issues with Michael Gans' office. I know there is reference to sealed documents and privileged documents in the proposed scheduling order.

First of all, do you think there are going to be a lot of those types of documents? Given the fact we're dealing with mainly public entities here, I would imagine most of what we're talking about is probably going to be public already, isn't it, or do you think we'll have a lot of that type of material or has anybody thought about that?

MR. SOMACH: This is Stuart Somach again and I would concur with you. I'm not aware at this point in time what would be confidential other than there had been some early exchanges of material under a confidentiality agreement and I believe that the intention is to maintain that confidentiality. Beyond that, I'm not certain certainly from Texas' perspective that this is a giant issue, but, then again, I'll allow other parties to speak from their perspective.

MR. WALLACE: Your Honor, this is Chad Wallace. I think one of the potential items that may come up for filing under seal might have to

1

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

deal with infrastructure and security issues. For example, dam schematics. The parties may work

together if anything like that needs to be filed.

JUDGE MELLOY: I'll have Mr. Gans weigh in here if I'm misstating anything, but as I understand it from our perspective when you do want to file something, of course, the proposed order includes a requirement that there be a motion and then once it's filed under seal we will ask that you not electronically transmit it because -- well, I don't know. Michael, should they electronically transmit it or not? At the end of the day we'll keep a physical copy separate from the rest of the file. Is that how we're going to do it? talk about this last week a little bit. sure how we exactly resolved the sealed documents.

MR. GANS: Well, Judge, I think there's a couple questions. First of all, a motion to seal could be filed electronically or it could be filed just in paper format. It depends on whether or not the motion contains anything that the partes would believe should be confidential as well as the related documents. We would accept it in either Any materials you propose to file to seal should be sent to me in paper for me to hold. Ι

guess the question is whether we also want to set up some sort of offline way for parties to submit that to me so that you might have electronic versions of that and that depends on whether or not some of these documents even exist in an electronic version. I think the best way to handle that is when someone gets ready to submit something under seal, probably call me and talk to me about it in advance.

be a bridge we'll have to cross when we get to it as to the mechanics of exactly how to get those documents to both Mr. Gans and myself. I don't necessarily need an electronic version. Probably the easiest will be to have them sent in hard copy both to Mr. Gans to keep offline in a separate file and a hard copy to me. When we get to that point, we can talk about that a little further.

A couple more just sort of mechanical issues.

I think one of the reasons the Supreme Court has asked that I take over this case -- and it's certainly no reflection on Mr. Grimsal as he did a wonderful job -- but it's pretty obvious that as this case goes forward it's going to get pretty expensive in terms of attorney fees for a private

special master and I quess for want of a better I don't think there will be term I'm free help. any expenses for the parties. I haven't gotten a completely definitive answer from the Supreme Court as to whether at the end of the case they will charge back out-of-pocket expenses. I think that's still somewhat up in the air, but certainly they will be very minimal relative to what would have been spent in terms of private attorney fees. As I mentioned earlier, we do have a court reporter She will make a transcript of the present. The reporting fee will be paid by the Supreme Court as I understand it, but if you want a copy of this hearing transcript, you'll have to order that from her directly and each party will be responsible for paying for their own copy. than that, I don't see any expenses immediately that the parties would be responsible for. Like I say, at the end of the case if we have a long trial and they want to charge back the court reporting fee or any other -- or my travel expenses or whatever else might be involved, that is something the Supreme Court will have to decide down the Any questions about that? road. (No questions.)

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JUDGE MELLOY: Then one other thing I did want to talk about. I feel like today I'm probably going to have a lot more questions for you than answers and a lot of the questions you may not be prepared to really answer or discuss today. I'm strongly inclined at this point to schedule an in-person conference where we can maybe hash out these issues in a little more detail at some point in the next 60 to 90 days. I'm sure one of the questions on the top of your mind is where we'd have such a conference. My current inclination is at least for something like that that I would probably come to a location that would hopefully be convenient to you. As a circuit judge it would probably be easier for me to impose upon my fellow circuit judges for a courtroom and I'm sort of leaning probably towards Denver as a place that might be convenient. I'll let you know hopefully in the not too distant future as to when and where we might have such a conference. I do think there's a lot of things to be discussed here that I'm not sure is very convenient to do by telephone and, quite frankly, I feel like I've only -although I've spent a lot of time on this case already, I'm only scratching the surface of what I

need to know about what's ahead of us. That's sort of my current thinking.

2.4

All right. Unless there's anything else anybody wants to say about the mechanics -Michael, if you want to stay on, that's fine. If you want to drop off, I think -- Is there anything else you can think of that we should be talking about?

MR. GANS: No. Just if anyone had any questions for me and I also want to encourage anyone to feel free to call me. I can give you my direct line so that you can call me if you have a question or concern. Again, that's Michael Gans, G-A-N-S, (314) 244-2424.

JUDGE MELLOY: Don't hesitate to call him. He doesn't take a lot of time off. He's usually there and he's always willing to answer questions.

MR. GANS: Thank you, Judge.

JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. If you want to drop off, Michael, feel free to do so. Otherwise, I'm going to go on and start talking about the case management plan a little bit.

MR. GANS: All right. I'm going to hang up. Thanks, Judge.

JUDGE MELLOY: Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

Det me start by a couple sort of preliminary observations that may or may not be accurate based upon what I've read about this case so far. The case is a little unusual in the sense that while there's a lot of data out there and there's a lot of information, you have also been at it for four years and there's been quite a bit of litigation in other forms that have already I'm sure fleshed out some of these issues. You've had the litigation in New Mexico State Court, you've had the litigation in the United States District Court over the 2006 -- Is it 2006 or 2008 agreement? I've seen both dates.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 2008.

JUDGE MELLOY: Yeah. Someplace I saw I thought that was a typo. The 2008 It isn't like we're starting at ground agreement. zero here, but because there's been so much litigation that also means there's an awful lot of material out there as well. It's certainly a two-way sword. One of the things I think the Supreme Court would like is for me to be somewhat of a hands-on case manager in this case and to try to keep the case moving to the extent we can. Ι

1 understand it's very complicated. There's going to 2 be a lot of material. Sort of as an initial 3 observation, one of the things that you have 4 indicated in your case management order is the --5 what's the term -- your initial start date for all 6 proceedings. I wonder why we can't start that 7 earlier. Once New Mexico files its response, which 8 I believe is due May 22nd, and files its 9 counterclaims, I think we'll know at that point 10 pretty much what the issues are. I don't think we 11 need to wait until Texas and the United States file 12 answers to those counterclaims. I think at that 13 point we're going to know what the issues are. 14 I would propose that we start the clock running, so 15 to speak, on June 1 as opposed to waiting until 16 after Texas and the United States file their 17 response. I have to say that from that point 18 forward I'm not prepared today to make a lot of definitive decisions about dates. I think the 19 20 proposal that you both have set forth, I think one 21 version has -- I guess both versions you are in 22 agreement that initial disclosures be 90 days from 23 the at issue date which, as I said, I would like to 24 set at June 1, and so certainly we'll keep that 25 date in place, but I'm going to reserve ruling on

1 some of these other dates -- particularly the 2 sequencing of experts -- until I've had a chance to study this a little bit more and we can have, as I 3 4 say, an in-person conference and maybe discuss 5 these issues in a little more detail. 6 Any questions or problems with that? 7 MR. SOMACH: This is Stuart Somach from 8 the State of Texas. Texas has no problem with 9 I think you're correct. We'll know on that. 10 June 1 what the issues are. My assumption, then, 11 is that we should at least think about the 12 discovery commencing 90 days after that. 13 Well, the plan that you JUDGE MELLOY: 14 submitted has -- that's the date for the initial 15 disclosures. That's your Rule 26 disclosure date. 16 MR. SOMACH: Rule 26. Not the expert. 17 JUDGE MELLOY: Right. And then the 18 discovery starts at that point. 19 MR. SOMACH: Yes. That's correct. 20 There is one other issue JUDGE MELLOY: 21 about discovery. I should have actually mentioned 22 this before Michael got off the line. 23 One of the -- well, let me just go -- I'm kind 24 of jumping around here.

Let me go through the proposed case management

-Shannon N. Benter-Moine, CSR-

25

plan, which I appreciate how thorough it is and I think it covers most of the issues and I don't have a lot of problems with it, but let me just take the draft case management plan. If you have it in front of you, starting with 2.2 I'm eliminating the requirement that you send a copy of documents to me. If you send them to that TX email address, that will get to me. As I said, we'll have one hard copy sent to the clerk and one hard copy sent to me. We'll give you the addresses when we send you the written order.

I think the question I had about 2.3 I think has been answered. At the current time the plan is to only email documents, responses to

Interrogatories and so on to each other. You're not going to send hard copies. On point 3 -- at least as of the current time -- the amicus curiae are going to receive copies of everything.

One of the issues I want to get into in more detail when we do have an in-person conference is the role of the amici. In the draft plan it's a pretty limited role. I have now received the letters from the various parties of Elephant Butte, El Paso Water Improvement District, Hudspeth and others who want a more expanded role. I don't want

to delve into this too deeply today, but let me
just ask this first question about that. Do you
feel that -- and maybe I should be asking the amici
this -- that all of you are -- for want of a better
term -- created equal in all of this? It seems to
me that El Paso Water Improvement District and
Elephant Butte Irrigation District have a somewhat
different and maybe -- I don't know if I want to
use the word enhanced, but you're in a little
different position than some of the other amici.
Is there any thought that some should be treated
differently than others?

2.4

MS. O'BRIEN: Your Honor, I was unclear whether you're seeking input from amici or from the parties?

JUDGE MELLOY: Either one.

MS. O'BRIEN: This is Maria O'Brien on behalf of El Paso County Water Improvement District No. 1.

Your Honor, without belaboring I think we did set out in the joint letter we sent with our sister irrigation district, EBID, Elephant Butte
Irrigation District, that we do feel that the two
Rio Grande Project districts do have a different -are situated differently than the other amici in

the context of this case and we believe that there absolutely needs to be a role for these two entities in the case. That said, we are not arguing for exclusion of other amici, but we think it's essential -- it's a role of amici -- if traditional amici were to be limited, that perhaps some of those restrictions are not properly applied to Elephant Butte Irrigation District and what we call EP No. 1.

2.4

MR. STEIN: Your Honor, this is Jay Stein representing the City of Las Cruces, New Mexico.

We would take the view that all amici are created equal and I would do so on the basis of the Supreme Court jurisprudence. The case that we're dealing with is to construe an equitable apportionment, which is an equitable division of water amongst states. That is based upon water use and water claims of the equities which are the water users within the states for the directly affected parties and, therefore, I would argue that all have an equal interest in and an equal participation.

MR. DUBOIS: Your Honor, this is Jim

Dubois for the United States. I disagree with

Mr. Stein in the sense that this is not an

equitable apportionment. This is interpretation

and application of a Compact with the states operating as transpatriate. I think that the traditional role of the amici is appropriate and I will agree with Mr. Stein that it does seem that there's no sort of legal distinction among amici and so they may end up being treated equally, but this is not an equitable case. This is a case about the Compact.

2.4

MR. STEIN: But it is a construction of the equitable apportionment that was created by the Rio Grande Compact and in that sense it is a construction and an evaluation of the equities upon which the Compact was based on.

MS. BARNCASTLE: Your Honor, this is

Samantha Barncastle for Elephant Butte Irrigation

District.

First of all, I agree with the comments made by Ms. O'Brien, counsel for our sister district, but, as an example, one way that the two districts will be different than the rest of the amici are through the discovery procedures. We will be the ones responding to discovery about how the Rio Grande Project works in conjunction with the United States. No other party will play that role in this process. That's just one example of how we will be

different.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

Maria O'Brien for El Paso MS. O'BRIEN: County Water Improvement District 1. I would respectfully disagree with Mr. Dubois with regard to his comments as well as on Mr. Stein in terms of all amici being equal. I think Your Honor recognized at the beginning of the call that this is a complex and unique case. We have some quidance from the Supreme Court with regard to the case and that is that we have a unique situation where a reclamation project that we have our own project is, as the Court stated, inextricably intertwined with the Compact. The interest in the project and interest in the Compact are difficult, if not impossible, to sever or to separate and that was in large part the basis for granting a full intervention of the United States. At this point it appears that there will be numerous contracts which the districts that are a party -- the districts being EBID and EP No. 1 -- will be put at issue and that is not the case with the other amici. Again, I think that there is already a record which demonstrates unique status of these two current amici that should be taken into consideration as Your Honor fashions the

appropriate role for amici going forward.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

To be clear, we're not arguing for preclusion of other amici participating. We think it important -- and again, the record already reflects that these two amici, the two districts of the Rio Grande Project, have a very unique interest as stated.

MR. BROCKMANN: Your Honor, this is Jim Brockmann for the Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority. A couple observations. Obviously we signed the letter supporting equal participation by all amici and believe that's appropriate. I guess an observation is that if you do intend to take this matter up in more detail at an in-person status conference, perhaps it will become more apparent when we talk about each of the specific issues about where amici participation is limited or more broadly construed; whether we're talking about discovery depositions or attendance at hearings and status conferences. I might note that as set forth in our letter, our firm was counsel of record for Nebraska in the Nebraska/Wyoming case and in that instance Special Master Owen Olpin definitely treated all of the amici equally there. They were allowed to brief

issues including reply briefs, which I don't know that any of the parties have proposed here or any of the amici have proposed here, and they attended hearings and made arguments where the Special Master there thought it was useful. With more limited time, but they also received copies of discovery and so forth. I think it worked out well there because it kept the stakeholders very well-informed and sort of on the same page with the I think that's an example to me going States. forward of how the amici can be treated equally. In that case the interests were quite different from downstream environmental interest to irrigation districts and public power irrigation districts that were involved.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JUDGE MELLOY: This is Judge Melloy.

I think one of the issues about the amici is their role in discovery. If they are going to have an active role, I'm just concerned that just, for instance, scheduling a deposition will become a nightmare if you have to work with 20 different people's schedules. I'm less concerned about serving discovery responses, particularly since it's going to be done electronically, but I want to think a lot more and I'll be asking for more input

on what, if any, role they should have in the discovery process in particular. Like I said, I'm not quite as concerned about even briefing, but if we get to -- if and when we ever get to a trial in this case, I would be loath to have 20 parties examining witnesses. And I should say -- maybe I should have said this at the outset -- whatever we decide today or whatever we decide six weeks or two months, three months from now isn't set in stone. As this case goes along I'm sure the discovery schedule will to some extent evolve, the participation of amici and other issues will hopefully be narrowed. They may expand, but I hope they are narrowed. Whatever we decide today on something like discovery or amici doesn't mean that's going to be the way it's going to be for the next two or three years.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SOMACH: Your Honor, this is Stuart Somach. I want to throw out a practical concern about depositions. The proposal that I saw a lot of folks doting would be that a lawyer and an expert would be at each one of the depositions or could be. Just the math with respect to the current people would mean you'd have 16 expert people, plus -- I'll just throw this figure out.

When just the parties met to talk about the case management plan, we had about 13 people there and no experts. I'm thinking all of a sudden you're looking at having to accommodate -- not just schedule. The schedule I think is an issue, but I think more importantly is I'm not sure -- I mean, when you get numbers in the 30's attending depositions, just finding a place to accommodate that becomes quite a practical problem and so I just want to throw that in as you're considering these issues.

2.4

JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Well, like I said, we can talk about that a little bit more.

Going back to the scheduling order itself, I'd like to turn to paragraph 4 for a minute. I don't see a need to have Certificates of Service for all discovery materials filed. I don't need to know every time you schedule a deposition. I don't think it needs to be in the record as to New Mexico sent a set of Interrogatories to Texas. I don't know that we need to know that necessarily. I think obviously if there's disputes, there's provisions for how to handle those disputes and file those materials. I'm going to eliminate that requirement. I would say also that another reason

I don't think it's necessary is that in the next section, Section 5, you have a requirement which I think is very useful, that the parties file a progress report once a month. Certainly in that progress report on discovery you can set out that Texas sent Interrogatories or requests for production of documents were served on non-party X. That information will be, I presume, in that monthly status report anyway. I don't think it's necessary to -- I don't want to use the word clutter up, but to have the docket reflect all the Certificates of Service, so I'm going to eliminate that unless somebody thinks there's a compelling reason to keep it in.

MR. DUBOIS: Your Honor, this is Jim

Dubois for the United States. The status reports

are every other month as we've got it structured.

Were you wanting to --

JUDGE MELLOY: Oh. Every other month.

That's fine. I misread that. I'm sorry.

All right. Then going on I think -- on 6.2.1.1, as I said, we'll change the at issue date to June 1, 2018.

Jumping forward a couple pages, 6.2.7, what's the thought of eliminating that section or should

we just change it to except as maybe ordered by the Court? I can certainly see in a case with this complexity and that's going to go on as long as it's going to take that there may be a desire to perpetuate testimony.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We may need something to perpetuate lawyers.

JUDGE MELLOY: How about if I just change that to except as maybe ordered by the Court. So Rule 27 will not apply, except, maybe as ordered by the Court because I do think that there may be that necessity at some point.

In Section 7 I think it's New Mexico indicated in their letter that in the Georgia vs. Florida litigation that there were over 2 million documents by each side. Hopefully we will be significantly less than that. I still anticipate it will be voluminous. Have you given any thought to an index of documents? Serving 100,000 documents on somebody without an index is going to be difficult to deal with. I will be the first to confess I'm not an expert on e-discovery. Will documents be searchable? Will there be an index? Have you thought about that at all?

A. Your Honor, this is Marcus Rael on behalf of the

City of New Mexico. I think the State of New Mexico supports that. We think it would be a really good idea to have documents indexed and, if possible, to make them searchable. I think it will make the case go much smoother than otherwise.

MR. SOMACH: Your Honor, this is Stuart Somach. I think this is part of what the parties were going to sit down and talk a little bit about in terms of -- I mean, I think we all recognize the amount of documents that will be involved and it doesn't do anybody any good to exchange them in any way that just creates more problems, so I do think we intended to sit down and have a conversation how best to do this so that what we provide is useful and that everybody can either search them or similarly make them available.

I wanted to add, interestingly enough, that in the Florida/Georgia example that you used from beginning to end was 18 months to trial with all of those documents. I'm not sure that's something anybody here wants to replicate. In addition to the number of documents, they were doing that in a very compressed period of time.

JUDGE MELLOY: Well, I do think that 18 months may be a little aggressive, but certainly I

think one of the goals is to try to get this case to trial as quickly as possible. I know that in New Mexico's letter you talked about sequencing and referred to a couple of other examples where that was used, but I also noticed in looking at those orders we were talking about that they used 30 and 60 days to respond to have expert designations.

300 days may be a little aggressive in terms of the amount of time that I'm going to allow even assuming I do agree with your argument about a sequencing of experts. As I say, I'll certainly be happy to hear further argument about that when we get together in-person.

As far as I'm concerned, I don't have any problems with the section on privilege. As a matter of fact, I think the rest of it -- I think the rest of it I don't have a problem with. As I mentioned when Mr. Gans was still on the phone, we'll have to work out a procedure under 11.2 of filing confidential documents, but I think -- again, don't hesitate to call him and he'll certainly confer with me about any issues having to do with getting confidential documents filed.

Under 12.1.2.1 I want to think about that procedure a little bit more as to exactly how we're

going to handle discovery disputes. Is it your thought under that section that we would try to do an informal resolution without ever actually filing anything? Is that the reason for the direct email? I don't know if you have given a lot of thought to that particular section.

MR. RAEL: Your Honor, this is Marcus
Rael for the State of New Mexico. I think that is
the thought, that we would try to resolve it
informally and we would try to do that with a
telephone call with you, if necessary. And then if
that doesn't work, then we can try and do a formal
filing with Your Honor.

JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. All right. Well, I don't have a problem with that and I think it probably hopefully will be more efficient and I certainly don't have a problem with calling. If I'm available, I'll be more than happy to try to rule on any disputes in depositions as you've provided for in 12.2. I may tweak that provision under 12.1.2.1, but as a general proposition I don't have any problem with it.

At the current time the thought is we would leave both 14 and 15 blank. Is that what you're -- Is that your thinking?

MR. RAEL: Yes, Your Honor. This is

Marcus Rael on behalf of New Mexico again. I think

until we get further down the road and Your Honor

makes a decision, I think we'd leave them blank.

JUDGE MELLOY: Yeah. Well, let me just tell you this. This may be unrealistic, but I certainly would like to see us try to shoot for having this case at issue and ready for trial in two years. I'd like to be trying this in spring of 2020, which sort of sounds like a long way away. It is, but I would certainly be hoping that we could maybe -- I may be unrealistic with that goal, but that's sort of my hope if we can get this case at issue and tried --

MR. SOMACH: Your Honor, this is Stuart Somach for Texas. I think that's consistent with what we would like to see happen certainly. I actually have a -- I just want to make sure. I didn't want to do this out of sequence. I wasn't sure the right place to insert this, so if you want to talk about this later or not at all, just let me know.

You indicated that you wanted to have a face-to-face conference and I think that is a very good idea. I have a significant surgery scheduled

and I wanted to make sure -- and I need to be at the conference you want to have and so I wanted to provide you with those dates, if those could be accommodated. I didn't know if this was a good place to insert that, but I just wanted to indicate that.

2.4

JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. Well, why don't

I -- Let me see. When are you not available?

MR. SOMACH: I go in for surgery on my

back. The surgery is scheduled for June 8th.

They tell me that it will be six weeks before I can travel.

JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. So that takes you to about the middle of July.

MR. SOMACH: Yes. I apologize. I had actually scheduled that when -- we're going to be at issue a little sooner than I had been thinking and, of course, I didn't know if you were going to have a conference. I do apologize, but unfortunately it took me forever to schedule those dates and unfortunately I need the surgery, so --

JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. Well, let me look at my schedule and I'll send out a couple dates and see what works for everybody and hopefully try to get something scheduled and work around your

schedule if we can.

All right. Going back to the scheduling order, your Appendix C I think is certainly commendable and hopefully we can work with that.

Let me turn now if I can -- Are there any questions or comments about the scheduling order at this point?

(Silence.)

Out some issues or concerns I have based on my preliminary review. As I say, I feel like I've only scratched the surface so far. One of the issues, of course, that we talked about already is the role of amici. I think we have at least -- at least it's clear until we can actually have a conference meeting and maybe refine this a little further that at a minimum they will be receiving notices of all pleadings that are filed up to this point.

One of the questions I had in just going through the letters and so on is can you tell me the status of the 2008 operating agreement? Is the United States and the two irrigation districts working under that agreement? Is it suspended? Is it gone? What is the status of that agreement at

-Shannon N. Benter-Moine, CSR-

this point?

2.4

MR. DUBOIS: Your Honor, this is Jim

Dubois for the United States. The 2000 operating

agreement is what the United States and the

districts are currently operating under, so it is

in place and it is in operation.

MS. O'BRIEN: Okay. Your Honor, this is Maria O'Brien for EP No. 1. Either I misheard or Mr. Dubois misspoke. It's the 2008 operating agreement. Yes, it's fully in place, enforceable and functioning quite well.

Q. Okay. And as I understand it, that agreement was only between the two irrigation districts and the United States. New Mexico is not a party and objects to it. Texas is not a party and I'm not sure where they exactly come down on it, if they are -- What is Texas' position about that operating agreement? Were you willing to live with it? Is that sort of your position?

MR. SOMACH: We were willing to live with it, but more needed to occur besides just the operating agreement and so -- the operating agreement only covers a small universe of the issues that we've raised within the litigation.

We think that it is a good tool to address some of

the problems, but it doesn't address the whole of the problem that we've raised in our complaint.

2.4

MR. WALLACE: Your Honor, if I can -This is Chad Wallace for the State of Colorado.

Just to make it clear for the record, Colorado,
likewise, is not a party to the agreement and is
also, likewise, not privy to a lot of the decisions
made in day-to-day operations, so we cannot form an
opinion on the operating agreement at this time.

MR. STEIN: Your Honor, this is Jay Stein representing the City of Las Cruces. The City of Las Cruces intervened in the lawsuit that was brought by the State of New Mexico to set aside the operating agreement. The City intervened on one count only and that was to ascertain the effect of the operating agreement on groundwater and storage.

JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. It's my understanding that New Mexico objects to the operating agreement. Is that still your position?

MR. RAEL: Yes, Your Honor. The State of New Mexico objects to the operating agreement and does not think that it's functioning well or we wouldn't be here right now.

JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. As I understand it, that operating agreement did nothing to resolve any

of Texas' issues -- or New Mexico's for that matter -- about entitlement to back water or damages; correct?

2.4

MR. SOMACH: This is Stuart Somach again,
Your Honor. That's correct from Texas'
perspective.

JUDGE MELLOY: And I assume the same would be true for New Mexico to the extent they feel they have any claims?

MR. RAEL: That's correct, Your Honor.

I think it's also important to note that that suit was stayed by Federal Judge Browning in order to allow this litigation to go forward.

JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. All right. One of the things I had a question about in going through this is the status of the State of Colorado.

Mr. Wallace, you have already sort of indicated that you're involved, but somewhat of a bystander. I don't know if that's the best way to put it.

As I look at this, Colorado would not be impacted by this litigation unless somehow the other -- the Compact itself would be changed to require Colorado to deliver more water. Am I missing something or is that your position basically?

1 MR. WALLACE: No, Your Honor. I believe 2 there might be more to it than that.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Unfortunately, we're not in a position to evaluate it. The simple way to look at it is it's not a Colorado state line delivery at issue under Article 3 of the Compact. What we're looking at is the way that Elephant Butte Reservoir comes out being managed potentially differently as a result of this litigation and the amount of water in Elephant Butte Reservoir in turn does impact Colorado in regards to its credit water or forgiveness of debts under the Compact. Colorado could, in fact, face obligations different as it faces today as a result of this litigation. However, we're not really in a good position to evaluate whether that's true or That's one reason why in our letter we mentioned the non-waiver agreement. It's our intent to try and not expand this litigation if at all possible, but we don't want to waive any of our rights essentially by not bringing any and every conceivable counterclaim at this time.

JUDGE MELLOY: Well, I understand that and I guess the one thing that I would hope we can avoid is that we get a year and a half into this case and then all of a sudden Colorado realizes it

does have an interest that -- as I say, I'd like to avoid any delay to the extent we can do so. I would hope that Colorado would monitor it closely.

Do you plan to be an active participant?

MR. WALLACE: We are a party unless, of course, Your Honor, everyone else would agree to let us all go. Beyond that, I think a lot of our answers might be found in groundwater computer modeling or groundwater and surface water computer modeling. It's really a numbers issue. What happens to the amount of water in the Rio Grande Project? We do plan on examining the available data very closely and certainly don't plan on delaying once we find anything out that might, in fact, impact us. At this point we simply don't have the information to know.

in your letter that you had suggested that it would be very efficient if there was some type of a single computer model. Obviously it's way to early to even ask the parties to even comment on that I think, but certainly it would be something that I would hope the parties would at least take a look at as to whether or not that's a suggestion that might be worthwhile and useful. As I say, I'm sure

at this early stage it's way too early to even seriously discuss something like that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

This may be a very elementary question, but one of the things I'm having a little trouble understanding is the Supreme Court in Justice Gorsuch's opinion talks about the Compact basically incorporating the project and the downstream contracts. Where do I go to see the downstream I looked at the Special Master's contracts? report. Again, I may be missing something there, but I found Exhibit 12, which is a contract between Elephant Butte and El Paso Irrigation District No. 1, which is just a two-party contract, and that talks about the 57 percent/43 percent split. It references contracts between the United States and the irrigation districts, but I'm not sure where those contracts are located. Then I got the letter today from -- let me see here -- from the Hudspeth County Conservation and they reference a contract they have for water rights.

I guess what I'm asking is, is there a depository? Is there someplace one can go and look at all these contracts that Justice Gorsuch referred to? Where are they, I guess?

MR. SOMACH: This is Stuart Somach, Your

Honor. We certainly could provide you -- pull those out. They are included in the universe of materials that were part of the first Special Master's report.

JUDGE MELLOY: Well, if you can just tell me where they are in the appendix or in that disk or where they are, I'd -- I mean, just direct me to them.

MR. SOMACH: We can pull that out for you. You shouldn't have to search all of those materials. What I think Justice Gorsuch was talking about was the 1938 contract involving the two district. When they talk about downstream projects, I think what they were talking about was Elephant Butte and Caballo Reservoirs because there really is nothing further below that. We can certainly pull those contracts out. I believe that's what he was talking about. It was actually a fairly limited universe of the huge assemblage of documents.

JUDGE MELLOY: Well, I have the 1938 contract in front of me between Elephant Butte and El Paso Improvement District No. 1, but it's just a two-party contract and it doesn't involve any of the other parties to the litigation and that's

where I was wondering where the other contracts were. If you could direct me to that, I'd appreciate it.

2.4

MR. SOMACH: We will do that. I'll consult with the other parties and then we'll provide you with some materials.

MR. WALLACE: Your Honor, this is Chad Wallace. Were you interested in the entire series of contracts up to the signing of the Compact or any particular date range?

JUDGE MELLOY: Well, I'm mainly interested in the ones that you think Justice Gorsuch was referring to when he said that they are, in essence, incorporated into the Compact.

MR. WALLACE: Yeah. Those were the 38 contracts that were signed by each irrigation district in the United States.

JUDGE MELLOY: Yeah. I'd like to see those. Those are the ones I would request.

What about new contracts? How do they fit in this whole analysis or is that one of the things we have to figure out? Like, for instance, the letter from Hudspeth County Conservation and Reclamation District refers to a contract they have with the United States for water supply.

\_\_\_\_\_Shannon N. Benter-Moine, CSR-

MR. DUBOIS: Your Honor, this is Jim

Dubois. I think that that's a very different kind

of contract and I think that you're probably

getting well ahead of where we are and you're going

to end up getting into a whole new set of factual

legal issues.

JUDGE MELLOY: But is it part of this lawsuit? I guess that's what I'm asking. If it's not part of the lawsuit -- I figure we have enough on our plate without worrying about that, but if it's going to be part of -- I mean, that's, I guess, one of the things I'm curious about. What about all the new uses of water, communities that have grown up over the years and are taking water out of the river? Are we going to be getting in all that? Is that part of the analysis or is that something that's irrelevant to this dispute?

MR. DUBOIS: Your Honor, we will be getting into the impact of that development on the river and on the project, but they are not part of the project contracts. I think you're kind of getting into a little more substance than you're needing to at this point. The Hudspeth County Contract was not part of the contracts that were in place in 1938 and 1939 when the Compact was agreed

to and ratified by Congress.

2.4

MS. O'BRIEN: Your Honor, this is Maria
O'Brien for El Paso County Water Improvement
District No. 1.

Mr. Somach indicated the parties would work together. I would request that amici be included in that discussion at least with regard to what was referenced as the downstream contract and Justice Gorsuch's opinion refers specifically to the contract that EBID and EPCWID have for their product supply, which was anticipated by this congressional authorization for the project. I do agree with what he said in terms of that being a limited universe, but it is a complex interplay of congressional authorizations and contracts and I think that the parties can work together to provide Your Honor with your request.

JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. A couple issues that I've flagged, which we may not resolve today, but I sort of want to get your preliminary read on is New Mexico in its letter takes the position that the United States -- New Mexico can correct me if I'm wrong about their position -- but that the United States is bound by the rulings of the New Mexico State Court concerning rights to mainly

groundwater I think below the reservoir and that seems inconsistent to some extent with the position that the United States is taking in its letter.

First of all, have I correctly articulated New Mexico's position on that?

MR. RAEL: Your Honor, this is Marcus
Rael on behalf of New Mexico. We're stating that
the United States is bound to the source of the
project water which is going into the project.

JUDGE MELLOY: Can you explain that? I'm sorry. I'm not sure I followed you.

MR. RAEL: So, Your Honor, the source of the project water going into the project is not the groundwater down below Elephant Butte Reservoir.

The source is the surface water only. We're saying the United States is bound by the state court litigation which -- and by this litigation -- which found that -- I guess the state court litigation which found that surface water -- I mean that groundwater is not a part of the project.

JUDGE MELLOY: That's my understanding.

As I understand it, the New Mexico State Court found that the surface water is part of the project and subject to jurisdiction of the United States, but that the groundwater was not and that you're

taking the position that the United States is bound by that determination. Am I saying that correctly?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

MR. RAEL: Yes, Your Honor. The United States is bound by that determination and that the water rights have been -- the surface water rights have been fully adjudicated.

JUDGE MELLOY: What's the United States' position on that or do you have a position?

MR. DUBOIS: Your Honor, we're getting into -- pardon the pun -- but deep water. project water rights are surface water rights, but the water that's running in the surface and runs in the drains and actually come back to the river has been impacted by a pumping development. The water is a continuous system. If you suck water out of the ground hard enough, it will impact the river and the amount of water available to the surface water users and to Texas, so you're really trying to -- if you want to look at it in the context of other Compact cases, this is not unlike Nebraska saying the Republican River Compact only apportions and allocates the surface water of the Republican River, the virgin water supply of the Republican River, and therefore pay no attention to the million acres irrigated by groundwater despite the

fact that that groundwater development impacts the flows of the Republican River. The Court rejected that and basically determined that the pumping of groundwater that affects that apportioned source is, in fact, impacted by and Government-regulated by to some degree the Compact itself. It's a similar situation here.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SOMACH: Your Honor, this is Stuart I want to make sure that you understand Somach. that Texas was not a party to that adjudication and that adjudication dealt with something other than the allegation of Compact rights and that, of course, is different than what we're doing here, which is looking at the Compact rights of Texas versus New Mexico. In our complaint and in the issues paper that we provided to you we did note that one of the significant legal and technical issues would be the nature and extent of interconnected groundwater with the surface water, the impacts of that interconnected groundwater. That is, the pumping of that interconnected groundwater and use of that water in New Mexico on Texas' Compact apportionment. It is -- it really is a complicated issue, but certainly knowable. That's part of the evidence that we will put on

that as our case in chief will go into that issue in some detail. I will add parenthetically just to underscore what Mr. Dubois said that there is Supreme Court precedence on interconnected groundwater. That is one of the issues that the State of Kansas was interested in and will, I'm sure, also want to participate in as we move forward with the actual substantive litigation of those issues.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

Well, I understand the JUDGE MELLOY: argument about the interconnectedness of the groundwater and the surface water. At least I understand that argument is out there and I generally understand what the concern is. point I was getting at -- and this is I'm sure probably something we'll just have to resolve as we go down the road -- is that if I understand the position of New Mexico correctly, there are certain arguments that the United States may make or may want to make that they feel are precluded by the adjudication in the New Mexico State Court. this point we probably can't do anything more than to flag that that's an issue that will have to be I also understand that Texas was not a resolved. party to those proceedings and that even if the

United States is bound, Texas may not be. understand it, that's at least a position of New Whether it's ultimately proven to be correct is something we'll have to work out. Another issue I noticed in the letters -- and I'm not sure what New Mexico's position on this is, but as I understand it Texas takes the position that the Supreme Court adjudicated three or four very key findings in this case and I would identify those as the ones that start at page 195 of the Special Master's Report. First, that New Mexico has relinquished control of the project water once it's delivered to the Elephant Butte Reservoir. Secondly, that the Rio Grande Project is holding completely integrated into the Compact and protects deliveries and releases from the reservoir. The third one was New Mexico is prohibited from capturing waters delivered to the project. then finally, that the Doctrine of Equitable Apportionment prohibits New Mexico from recapturing project water after it's released from the Elephant Butte Reservoir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Have I correctly set out Texas' position, that you feel that those findings have been adopted by the Supreme Court?

MR. SOMACH: Yes, Your Honor. Those are the basic fundamental Compact interpretations that the Special Master and the Court utilized and I do believe that those have been determined by the Court.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JUDGE MELLOY: What is New Mexico's position about that or do you have one at this point?

MR. RAEL: This is Marcus Rael on behalf I think it's important for the of New Mexico. Court to know that the Supreme Court didn't adopt the Special Master's Report, so I would say that none of that has been decided by the Supreme Court. They never especially adopted the Special Master's Report. There was numerous objections filed by not only the parties, but also almost all of the amici in this case, one side or the other. It's important to note that although that might be Texas' position, the Supreme Court never adopted that Special Master's Report, so I don't think any of those findings have been made.

MR. SOMACH: Let me just respond quickly by -- Go ahead. I'm sorry, Your Honor.

JUDGE MELLOY: I was just going to say the issue I think you're going to deal with,

though, Mr. Rael, is that you did file exceptions and the Supreme Court did say all the exceptions are overruled. So do we look at your exceptions and then say which ones did you make and which ones are overruled? I'm not saying I'm there yet, but that is what concerns me about the Supreme Court opinion and where we are uncertain of these issues.

MR. RAEL: Your Honor, I think you're correct. The exceptions were limited that each party filed, but I think it is preliminary like you're saying, Your Honor. I'm not sure we're there yet, but it's our position that the Special Master's Report was never adopted and so I don't know where to go from there.

JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. Mr. Somach, did you have something you wanted to add to that?

MR. SOMACH: I was actually just going to say what you said. New Mexico did not take exception to the recommendation that their Motion

To Dismiss the Texas Complaint be denied. They did take exception -- and that's what all the briefing was about -- the conclusions that the Special

Master reached that we're talking about now, the ones you identified. If that's not what their exceptions were, I have no idea what all that

writing was about and I am referring to the very specific denial of all the exceptions or overruling of all the exceptions that were in -- the Supreme Court overruled every exception except the United States. I don't know what could be clearer, but that is our view.

2.4

JUDGE MELLOY: Well, does New Mexico dispute at this point that the project agreements, contracts are basically part of the Compact?

MR. RAEL: We don't dispute that, Your Honor.

JUDGE MELLOY: I mean, that seems to be a pretty specific holding of the Supreme Court.

MR. RAEL: Yes. We agree with that, Your Honor.

JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. But your position is that you still have control of the water after it leaves the reservoir; is that right?

MR. RAEL: Not complete control, Your

Honor, but I think the case law is pretty

well-established that we don't relinquish our

sovereignty over water that remains within our

border. It's also pretty well-established that the

United States is subject to our sovereignty within

our borders. We don't relinquish control

completely, Your Honor, no, and I think that's
pretty well-established by the case law with this.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DUBOIS: Your Honor, this is Jim It seems to me we're sort of re-litigating Dubois. some of the issues and we're trying to go quite far afield and either we're going to get in making a lot of arguments now or probably it might be better to let the issues be shaped over the course of discovery and briefing because I think that we're probably going to go through a lot of this in sufficient detail with the ability to more adequately respond without feeling kind of constrained by the fact that this is an initial status conference. I'm concerned that we're leading ourselves to the point where we're going to have -- that I'm going to have to be making arguments about what Mr. Rael is asserting and I don't know that I'm comfortable trying to do that off-the-cuff.

JUDGE MELLOY: That's fine. I'm more of just telling you some of the concerns that I have in going through this. Like I say, this is still very preliminary for me. I think those are basically the ones I've flagged so far and I'm sure I'll come up with a lot more as we proceed on.

1 I don't know that there's a lot more we can do 2 Is there anything else that the parties 3 want to discuss today that we haven't talked about? 4 I will get out to you some proposed dates for an 5 in-person conference. My current thinking is Denver would probably be a convenient location for 6 7 everybody and I have to also check and make sure I 8 can get a courtroom in Denver if we go there. 9 Is there anything else we need to talk about today 10 or that the parties want to talk about or have any 11 questions about? 12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, Your Honor. 13 MR. SOMACH: No more questions. 14 JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Well, then 15 I'll sign off and I'll get that information out 16

I'll sign off and I'll get that information out about some dates fairly quickly and we'll see if we can't get something scheduled. Good talking to everybody. I'm going to sign off now.

(The conference concluded at 4:26 p.m.)

20

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

1 2 3 CERTIFICATE 4 5 I, Shannon N. Benter-Moine, Certified Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public of the State 6 of Iowa, do hereby certify that, on the 23rd day of April, 2018, at Cedar Rapids, Iowa, that I reported 7 in shorthand the above teleconference, reduced the same to printing under my direction and 8 supervision, and that the foregoing transcript is a true record of all proceedings. 9 I further certify that I am not related to or 10 employed by any of the parties to this deposition, and further that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties 11 hereto or financially interested in the action. 12 13 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have set my hand and 14 seal this 30th day of July, 2018. 15 16 /s/ Shannon Benter-Moine 17 Certified Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

1	<b>2168</b> [1] - 3:14	8	affects [1] - 51:4	20:12, 43:8
	<b>2240</b> [1] - 3:16		afield [1] - 57:6	anticipate [1] - 32:17
	<b>22nd</b> [1] - 20:8		afternoon [6] - 5:14,	anticipated [1] -
<b>/s</b> [1] - 59:16	<b>23</b> [2] - 1:11, 4:2	<b>80202</b> [1] - 2:13	5:19, 6:8, 6:23, 7:8,	48:11
	<b>2386</b> [1] - 3:22	<b>80203</b> [2] - 2:7, 2:10	8:5	anyway [1] - 31:9
1	<b>23rd</b> [1] - 59:6	<b>87048</b> [1] - 3:17	aggressive [2] -	apologize [2] -
	<b>244-2424</b> [1] - 18:14	<b>87102</b> [1] - 2:4	33:25, 34:8	37:15, 37:19
	<b>26</b> [2] - 21:15, 21:16	<b>87103</b> [1] - 3:14	agree [7] - 11:9,	apparent [1] - 27:16
<b>1</b> [17] <b>-</b> 3:13, 3:19,	<b>27</b> [1] - 32:10	<b>87504</b> [4] - 1:23, 3:2,	25:4, 25:17, 34:10,	APPEARANCES[2] -
6:17, 6:20, 7:5, 20:15,	27 [1] - 32.10	3:9, 3:22	43:6, 48:13, 56:14	1:16, 2:1
20:24, 21:10, 23:19,		<b>88004</b> [1] - 3:11	agreed [4] - 10:21,	
24:9, 26:3, 26:20,	3	8th [1] - 37:10	10:23, 12:16, 47:25	appendix [1] - 45:6
31:23, 39:8, 44:13,		<b>Gii</b> [i] - 37:10		Appendix [1] - 38:3
45:23, 48:4	<b>3</b> [2] - 22:16, 42:6	0	agreement [21] -	application [1] - 25:1
<b>100,000</b> [1] - 32:19	<b>30</b> [1] - 34:6	9	13:17, 19:13, 19:18,	applied [1] - 24:7
<b>1000</b> [1] - 1:20	<b>30's</b> [1] - 30:7		20:22, 38:22, 38:24,	<b>apply</b> [1] - 32:10
<b>11.2</b> [1] - 34:19		<b>9-700</b> [1] - 2:15	38:25, 39:4, 39:10,	apportioned [1] -
<b>111</b> [1] - 1:12	<b>300</b> [2] - 3:6, 34:8	<b>90</b> [3] - 17:9, 20:22,	39:12, 39:18, 39:22,	51:4
<b>1120</b> [1] - 2:6	<b>30th</b> [1] - 59:14	21:12	39:23, 40:6, 40:9,	Apportionment [1] -
<b>12</b> [1] - 44:11	<b>314</b> [1] - 18:14		40:14, 40:16, 40:19,	53:20
<b>12.1.2.1</b> [2] - 34:24,	<b>319</b> [1] - 3:24	<b>919</b> [1] - 3:19	40:21, 40:25, 42:17	apportionment [4] -
	<b>370</b> [1] - 2:13	<b>95814</b> [2] - 1:20, 2:16	agreements [1] -	24:15, 24:25, 25:10,
35:21	<b>3711</b> [1] - 3:5	<b>999</b> [1] - 2:12	56:8	51:23
<b>12.2</b> [1] - 35:20	<b>38</b> [1] - 46:15		ahead [3] - 18:1,	apportions [1] -
<b>13</b> [1] - 30:2	<b>3:00</b> [1] - 1:13	Α	47:4, 54:23	50:21
<b>1300</b> [1] - 2:9	• •		<b>air</b> [1] - 16:7	appreciate [2] - 22:1,
<b>1305</b> [1] - 3:19	4	abilituru 57.11	Albuquerque [6] -	46:3
<b>14</b> [1] - 35:24	7	ability [1] - 57:11	2:4, 3:1, 3:14, 5:25,	
<b>141</b> [2] - 1:1, 4:6		absolutely [1] - 24:2	6:3, 27:9	appropriate [3] -
<b>15</b> [1] - 35:24	<b>4</b> [1] - 30:15	accept [1] - 14:23	allegation [1] - 51:12	25:3, 27:1, 27:13
<b>1508</b> [1] - 1:23	<b>480-0908</b> [1] - 3:24	accommodate [2] -	allocates [1] - 50:22	APRIL [1] - 1:11
<b>1556</b> [1] - 3:11	<b>4:26</b> [1] - 58:19	30:4, 30:8		<b>April</b> [4] - 4:2, 9:12,
<b>16</b> [1] - 29:24	4th [1] - 10:20	accommodated [1] -	<b>allow</b> [3] - 13:21,	10:20, 59:6
<b>1600</b> [1] - 2:7	[.]	37:4	34:9, 41:13	argue [1] - 24:20
<b>18</b> [2] - 33:19, 33:24	5	accurate [1] - 19:3	allowed [1] - 27:25	arguing [2] - 24:4,
<b>1849</b> [1] - 2:19	3	Acosta [1] - 3:4	almost [1] - 54:16	27:2
18th [1] - 2:12		acres [1] - 50:25	amici [37] - 11:12,	argument [4] -
	<b>5</b> [1] - 31:2	action [1] - 59:11	11:23, 12:3, 12:7,	34:10, 34:12, 52:11,
<b>1938</b> [3] - 45:12,	<b>500</b> [2] - 1:20, 2:3	active [2] - 28:19,	12:10, 12:11, 12:23,	52:13
45:21, 47:25	<b>501</b> [1] - 2:15	43:4	13:1, 22:21, 23:3,	arguments [4] -
<b>1939</b> [1] - 47:25	<b>52401</b> [1] - 1:13	actual [1] - 52:8	23:10, 23:14, 23:25,	28:4, 52:19, 57:7,
<b>195</b> [1] - 53:10	<b>57</b> [1] - 44:14	add [3] - 33:17, 52:2,	24:4, 24:5, 24:6,	57:17
	<b>91</b> [1] 77.17	l ·	24:12, 25:3, 25:5,	<b>Article</b> [1] - 42:5
2	e	55:16	25:20, 26:6, 26:22,	articulated [1] - 49:4
	6	addition [1] - 33:21	26:24, 27:1, 27:3,	ascertain [1] - 40:15
2 20.45		address [7] - 9:13,	27:5, 27:12, 27:17,	aside [1] - 40:13
<b>2</b> [1] - 32:15	<b>6.2.1.1</b> [1] - 31:22	9:18, 9:19, 10:6, 22:7,	27:25, 28:3, 28:11,	1
<b>2.2</b> [1] - 22:5	<b>6.2.7</b> [1] - 31:24	39:25, 40:1	28:17, 29:12, 29:15,	assemblage [1] -
<b>2.3</b> [1] - 22:12	<b>60</b> [2] <b>-</b> 17:9, 34:7	addresses [1] -	38:14, 48:6, 54:16	45:19
<b>20</b> [2] - 28:21, 29:5	6th [1] - 9:12	22:10	amicus [2] - 6:14,	asserting [1] - 57:17
<b>2000</b> [1] - 39:3	VIII[1] - 3.12	adequately [1] -	22:17	assume [1] - 41:7
<b>20044-7611</b> [1] - 2:23	-	57:12	amount [5] - 33:10,	<b>assuming</b> [1] - 34:10
<b>2006</b> [3] - 19:13,	7	adjudicated [2] -		assumption [1] -
19:17		50:6, 53:8	34:9, 42:9, 43:11,	21:10
<b>2008</b> [5] - 19:13,	<b>7</b> [1] - 32:13	adjudication [3] -	50:17	attendance [1] -
19:15, 19:17, 38:22,	<b>700</b> [1] - 2:3	51:10, 51:11, 52:21	analysis [2] - 46:21,	27:19
39:9		adopt [1] - 54:11	47:16	attended [1] - 28:3
<b>2018</b> [5] - 1:11, 4:2,	<b>7611</b> [1] - 2:22	adopted [4] - 53:24,	Anaya [1] - 2:2	attending [1] - 30:7
31:23, 59:6, 59:14	<b>78701</b> [1] - 3:20	54:14, 54:19, 55:13	<b>ANDREW</b> [1] - 3:18	attention [1] - 50:24
<b>2020</b> [1] - 36:10	<b>78746</b> [1] - 3:6	advance [1] - 15:9	answer [3] - 16:4,	Attorney [2] - 1:22,
		advise [1] - 7:25	17:5, 18:17	5:9
<b>20240</b> [1] - 2:19		advise [1] - 7.25 affected [1] - 24:19	answered [1] - 22:13	attorney [3] - 15:25,
<b>2067</b> [2] - 3:2, 3:8		anecieu [1] - 24.19	answers [3] - 17:4,	16:9, 59:11
1				10.0, 00.11
	~1	N. Benter-Mo	ine, CSR	

Austin [2] - 3:6, 3:20 23:4, 57:7 6:8 concern [3] - 18:13, claims [2] - 24:18, between [4] - 39:13, Authority [3] - 3:2, Caroom [1] - 6:9 41.9 29:19, 52:14 6:4, 27:10 44:11, 44:15, 45:22 case [46] - 8:14, clear [3] - 27:2, concerned [5] beyond [2] - 13:19, 8:21, 8:22, 9:10, 9:11, 38:15. 40:5 28:19, 28:22, 29:3, authorization [1] -43:7 9:23, 10:12, 10:14, **clearer** [1] - 56:5 34:14, 57:14 48:12 authorizations [1] -Bickerstaff [1] - 3:3 15:21, 15:24, 16:5, clerk[1] - 22:9 concerning [1] -16:19, 17:24, 18:22, 48:25 48.15 **bit** [8] - 11:22, 14:15, clerks [1] - 8:1 18:23, 19:8, 21:3, 19:4, 19:5, 19:24, concerns [3] - 38:10, automatically [2] clock [1] - 20:14 19:25, 20:4, 21:25, 9:17, 9:20 30:13, 33:8, 34:25 55:6. 57:21 closely [2] - 43:3, 22:4, 24:1, 24:3, automation [1] - 8:7 **blank** [2] - 35:24, 43:13 concluded [1] -24:14, 25:7, 26:8, available [5] - 33:16, 58:19 clutter [1] - 31:11 26:10, 26:21, 27:23, 35:18, 37:8, 43:12, border [1] - 56:23 conclusions [1] -**COLEMAN**[1] - 2:21 28:12, 29:5, 29:10, borders [1] - 56:25 55:22 50:17 Coleman [1] - 5:22 30:1, 32:2, 33:5, 34:1, **AVENUE**[1] - 1:13 bound [6] - 48:24, Colorado [18] - 2:7, concur [1] - 13:14 36:8, 36:13, 42:25, Avenue [2] - 2:3, 49:8, 49:16, 50:1, 2:8, 2:9, 2:10, 2:13. confer [1] - 34:22 52:1, 53:9, 54:17, 3:19 50:4, 53:1 conference [13] -4:5, 5:13, 5:16, 40:4, 56:20, 57:2 Box [7] - 2:22, 3:2, 17:7, 17:11, 17:20, avoid [2] - 42:24, 40:5, 41:16, 41:20, cases [1] - 50:20 3:8, 3:11, 3:14, 3:16, 21:4, 22:20, 27:15, 43:2 41:23, 42:5, 42:10, Cedar [1] - 59:6 3:22 36:24, 37:2, 37:19, aware [1] - 13:14 42:12, 42:25, 43:3 **CEDAR** [1] - 1:13 38:16, 57:14, 58:5, bridge [1] - 15:11 awful [1] - 19:20 **COLORADO** [1] - 1:9 certain [2] - 13:19, **brief** [1] - 27:25 58:19 comfortable [1] -52.18 В **briefing** [3] - 29:3, 57:18 conferences [1] certainly [21] - 11:7, 27:20 55:21, 57:9 coming [1] - 10:5 13:20, 15:22, 16:7, briefs [1] - 28:1 confess [1] - 32:21 commencing [1] -Barfield [2] - 4:13, 19:21, 20:24, 31:4, confidential [4] bringing [1] - 42:20 21:12 32:2, 33:25, 34:11, 13:15, 14:22, 34:20, Brittany [2] - 4:13, commendable [1] -**BARFIELD**[1] - 1:19 34:22, 35:17, 36:7, 34:23 38:4 Barncastle [3] -36:11, 36:17, 38:3, **BRITTANY**[1] - 1:19 confidentiality [2] comment [1] - 43:21 3:10, 6:24, 25:15 43:13, 43:22, 45:1, broadly [1] - 27:18 13:17, 13:19 comments [3] -BARNCASTLE[3] -45:17, 51:24 Broadway [1] - 2:9 25:17, 26:5, 38:6 confirm [1] - 9:21 CERTIFICATE[1] -3:10, 6:23, 25:14 Congress [2] - 3:19, **Brockmann** [4] - 3:1, communities [1] based [4] - 19:3, 59:4 48:1 3:7, 6:3, 27:9 47:13 24:17, 25:13, 38:10 Certificates [2] congressional [2] -BROCKMANN[3] -Compact [22] - 25:1, basic [1] - 54:2 30:16, 31:12 48:12, 48:15 25:8, 25:11, 25:13, 3:1, 6:2, 27:8 basis [2] - 24:13, Certified [2] - 59:5, conjunction [1] brought [1] - 40:13 26:13, 26:14, 41:22, 26:16 59:17 25:23 **Browning** [1] - 41:12 42:6, 42:12, 44:6, become [2] - 27:16, certify [2] - 59:6, 46:9, 46:14, 47:25, Conservation [4] -Building [1] - 3:6 28:20 59:9 Butte [16] - 3:10, 50:20, 50:21, 51:6, 3:18, 7:5, 44:19, becomes [1] - 30:9 Chad [4] - 5:15, 6:22, 6:25, 22:23, 51:12, 51:14, 51:23, 46:23 **BEFORE** [1] - 1:12 13:23, 40:4, 46:7 53:15, 54:2, 56:9 consideration [1] -23:7, 23:22, 24:8, beginning [3] - 1:13, CHAD [1] - 2:9 25:15, 42:7, 42:10, compelling [1] -26:25 26:7, 33:19 chance [1] - 21:2 considering [1] -44:12, 45:15, 45:22, 31:13 behalf [7] - 6:3, 7:14, change [3] - 31:22, complaint [2] - 40:2, 30:10 49:14, 53:13, 53:22 23:18, 32:25, 36:2, 32:1. 32:8 BY [17] - 1:17, 1:22, 51:15 consistent [1] -49:7, 54:9 **changed** [1] - 41:22 Complaint [1] -2:2, 2:6, 2:9, 2:11, belaboring [1] changes [1] - 9:2 constrained [1] -55:20 2:15, 2:18, 2:21, 3:1, 23:20 charge [2] - 16:6, 57:13 complete [1] - 56:19 3:4, 3:8, 3:10, 3:13, below [3] - 45:16, 16:20 construction [2] completely [3] -3:16, 3:18, 3:21 49:1, 49:14 check [1] - 58:7 25.9 25.12 bystander [1] - 41:18 16:4, 53:15, 57:1 Benter [2] - 59:5, **checked** [1] - 9:8 construe [1] - 24:15 complex [2] - 26:8, 59:16 chief [1] - 52:1 C 48:14 construed [1] -Benter-Moine [2] -**Christine** [1] - 8:6 complexity [1] - 32:3 27:18 59:5, 59:16 circuit [2] - 17:14, complicated [2] **consult** [1] - 46:5 Caballo [1] - 45:15 benter.moine@ 17:16 contains [1] - 14:21 20:1, 51:24 California [2] - 1:20, gmail.com [1] - 3:24 **CIRCUIT** [1] - 1:12 compressed [1] context [2] - 24:1, Bernalillo [3] - 3:1, Circuit [2] - 9:7, 9:8 33:23 cannot [1] - 40:8 6:4, 27:9 **City** [11] - 3:3, 3:7, computer [3] - 43:8, continue [2] - 10:17, best [4] - 8:16, 15:6, Capitol [1] - 1:20 6:6, 6:9, 6:11, 6:14, 43:9, 43:20 11:19 33:14, 41:19 capturing [1] - 53:18 24:11, 33:1, 40:11, conceivable [1] continuous [1] -

better [3] - 16:1,

**CAROOM** [2] - 3:4,

40:14

-Shannon N. Benter-Moine, CSR-

42:21

50:15

contract [10] - 44:11, 44:13, 44:20, 45:12, 45:22, 45:24, 46:24, 47:3, 48:8, 48:10 Contract [1] - 47:24 contracts [15] -26:18, 44:8, 44:9, 44:15, 44:17, 44:23, 45:17, 46:1, 46:9, 46:16, 46:20, 47:21, 47:24, 48:15, 56:9 control [4] - 53:12, 56:17, 56:19, 56:25 **Control** [1] - 7:2 convenient [4] -17:14, 17:18, 17:22, 58:6 conversation[1] -33:13 copies [7] - 9:25, 10:1, 10:15, 11:6, 22:16, 22:18, 28:6 **copy** [17] - 9:15, 9:20, 10:3, 10:4, 10:8, 10:9, 10:10, 10:12, 10:13, 14:13, 15:15, 15:17, 16:14, 16:16, 22:6, 22:9 Corrales [1] - 3:17 correct [10] - 11:8, 12:13, 21:9, 21:19, 41:3, 41:5, 41:10, 48:22, 53:4, 55:9 correctly [5] - 10:16, 49:4, 50:2, 52:18, 53:23 counsel [7] - 4:11, 5:8, 6:4, 7:4, 25:18, 27:22, 59:11 count [1] - 40:15 counterclaim [1] -42.21 counterclaims [2] -20:9, 20:12 County [15] - 3:1, 3:12, 3:18, 5:25, 6:16, 6:19, 7:2, 7:4, 23:18, 26:3, 27:9, 44:19, 46:23, 47:23, 48:3 couple [11] - 8:3, 8:25, 13:2, 14:18, 15:19, 19:2, 27:10, 31:24, 34:4, 37:23, 48:18 course [10] - 4:3, 7:25, 8:19, 8:21, 14:7, 37:18, 38:13, 43:6, 51:13, 57:8 COURT [1] - 1:4

court [5] - 7:25,

16:10, 16:20, 49:16, 49:18 Court [36] - 3:23, 4:5, 8:24, 10:7, 10:11, 15:20, 16:4, 16:13, 16:23, 19:11, 19:12, 19:23. 24:14. 26:9. 26:12. 32:2. 32:9. 32:11, 44:5, 48:25, 49:22, 51:2, 52:4, 52:21, 53:8, 53:25, 54:3, 54:5, 54:11, 54:13, 54:19, 55:2, 55:6, 56:4, 56:13 **courtesy** [1] - 9:15 courtroom [2] -17:16, 58:8 covers [2] - 22:2, 39:23 created [3] - 23:5, 24:12, 25:10 creates [1] - 33:12 credit [1] - 42:11 cross [1] - 15:11 Cruces [7] - 3:8, 3:11, 6:12, 6:14, 24:11, 40:11, 40:12 **cuff** [1] - 57:19 **curiae** [2] - 6:14, 22:17 **curious** [1] - 47:12 current [8] - 17:11, 18:2, 22:13, 22:17, 26:24, 29:24, 35:23, 58:5

deal [3] - 14:1, 32:21,

dealing [2] - 13:8,

dealt [1] - 51:11

debts [1] - 42:11

decide [4] - 16:23,

decided [1] - 54:13

decision [1] - 36:4

decisions [2] -

deep [1] - 50:10

deeply [1] - 23:1

**degree** [1] - 51:6

delay [1] - 43:2

definitely [1] - 27:24

**definitive** [2] - 16:4,

delaying [1] - 43:14

**Delgado** [1] - 3:3

deliver [1] - 41:23

delivered [2] - 53:13,

**deliveries** [1] - 53:16

delivery [1] - 42:5

demonstrates [1] -

delve [1] - 23:1

denial [1] - 56:2

Denver [7] - 2:7,

2:10, 2:13, 10:21,

17:17, 58:6, 58:8

Department [5] - 2:8,

2:11, 2:14, 2:17, 2:20

deposition [3] -

denied [1] - 55:20

54.25

24:14

29:8, 29:14

20:19, 40:7

20:19

53:18

26:23

### D

28:20, 30:18, 59:10 depositions [5] -**D.C** [1] - 2:23 27:19, 29:20, 29:22, dam [1] - 14:2 30:8, 35:19 damages [1] - 41:3 depository [2] data [2] - 19:6, 43:13 12:22, 44:22 date [7] - 20:5, **Deputy** [1] - 5:9 20:23, 20:25, 21:14, designations [1] -21:15, 31:22, 46:10 34:7 dates [8] - 19:14, desire [1] - 32:4 20:19, 21:1, 37:3, **despite** [1] - 50:25 37:21, 37:23, 58:4, detail [6] - 17:8, 58:16 21:5, 22:20, 27:14, **David** [1] - 5:10 52:2, 57:11 Davidson [2] - 3:15, determination [2] -7:9 50:2, 50:4 DAVIDSON [2] determined [2] -3:16, 7:8 51:3, 54:4 day-to-day [1] - 40:8 development [3] davs [5] - 17:9. 47:19, 50:14, 51:1 20:22, 21:12, 34:7, different [10] - 23:8, 34:8 23:10, 23:24, 25:20, DC [1] - 2:19 26:1, 28:12, 28:21,

42:13, 47:2, 51:13 differently [4] - 11:3, 23:12, 23:25, 42:8 difficult [2] - 26:14, 32:20 direct [4] - 18:12, 35:4, 45:7, 46:2 direction [1] - 59:7 directly [2] - 16:15, 24:19 disagree [3] - 12:5, 24:23, 26:4 disclosure [1] -21:15 disclosures [2] -20:22, 21:15 discovery [23] - 11:9, 12:2, 12:3, 12:17, 12:22, 12:23, 21:12, 21:18, 21:21, 25:21, 25:22, 27:19, 28:7, 28:18, 28:23, 29:2, 29:10, 29:15, 30:17, 31:5, 32:22, 35:1, 57:9 discuss [4] - 17:5, 21:4, 44:2, 58:3 discussed [1] -17:21 **discussion** [1] - 48:7 disk [1] - 45:6 Dismiss [1] - 55:20 dispute [3] - 47:17, 56:8, 56:10 disputes [4] - 30:22, 30:23, 35:1, 35:19 **distant** [1] - 17:19 distinction [1] - 25:5 **District** [21] - 3:10, 3:13, 3:19, 6:17, 6:20, 6:22, 6:25, 7:5, 19:12, 22:24, 23:6, 23:7, 23:18, 23:23, 24:8, 25:16, 26:3, 44:12, 45:23, 46:24, 48:4 district [4] - 23:22, 25:18, 45:13, 46:17 districts [11] - 23:24, 25:19, 26:19, 26:20, 27:5, 28:14, 28:15, 38:23, 39:5, 39:13, 44:16 division [1] - 24:16 **Division** [1] - 2:22

docket [2] - 9:9,

**Doctrine** [1] - 53:19

document [2] - 9:25,

documents [22] -

31:11

10:1

12:18, 13:4, 13:5, 13:7, 14:16, 14:23, 15:5, 15:13, 22:6, 22:14, 31:7, 32:15, 32:19, 32:22, 33:3, 33:10, 33:20, 33:22, 34:20, 34:23, 45:20 done [2] - 11:10, 28:24 doting [1] - 29:21 Doug [1] - 6:9 **DOUGLAS** [1] - 3:4 down [7] - 16:23, 33:8, 33:13, 36:3, 39:16, 49:14, 52:17 downstream [5] -28:13, 44:7, 44:8, 45:13, 48:8 draft [2] - 22:4, 22:21 drains [1] - 50:13 Drawer [1] - 1:23 **Drew** [1] - 7:4 drop [2] - 18:6, 18:20 **DUBOIS** [10] - 2:11, 5:19, 12:15, 24:22, 31:15, 39:2, 47:1, 47:18, 50:9, 57:3 **Dubois** [10] - 5:20, 12:15, 24:23, 26:4, 31:16, 39:3, 39:9, 47:2, 52:3, 57:4 **due** [1] - 20:8 **Dunn** [1] - 1:17 Ε

e-discovery [1] -32:22 early [4] - 13:16, 43:20, 44:1 easier [1] - 17:15 easiest [1] - 15:15 **EBID** [3] - 23:22, 26:20, 48:10 effect [1] - 40:15 efficient [2] - 35:16, 43:19 Eighth [2] - 9:7, 9:8 either [5] - 14:23, 23:16, 33:15, 39:8, 57:6 EI [13] - 3:4, 3:12, 6:7, 6:9, 6:16, 6:19, 22:24, 23:6, 23:18, 26:2, 44:12, 45:23, 48:3 electronic [6] -10:23, 10:25, 11:7, 15:3, 15:5, 15:14

essential [1] - 24:5 fact [7] - 13:7, 34:16, 42:11 48:9 electronically [5] -11:10, 14:10, 14:11, essentially [1] -42:12, 43:15, 51:1, forgot [1] - 5:1 Government [1] -14:19, 28:24 42:20 51:5, 57:13 form [1] - 40:8 51:5 **elementary** [1] - 44:3 established [3] factual [1] - 47:5 formal [1] - 35:12 Government-Elephant [16] - 3:10, 56:21, 56:23, 57:2 fairly [2] - 45:19, format [2] - 14:20, regulated [1] - 51:5 6:22, 6:24, 22:23, evaluate [2] - 42:3, 58:16 14:24 Grande [6] - 23:24, 23:7, 23:22, 24:8, 42:15 far [5] - 19:4, 34:14, forms [1] - 19:9 25:11, 25:23, 27:6, 25:15, 42:7, 42:9, 38:12, 57:5, 57:24 evaluation [1] forth [3] - 20:20, 43:11, 53:14 44:12, 45:15, 45:22, 25:12 fashions [1] - 26:25 27:21, 28:7 granting [1] - 26:16 49:14, 53:13, 53:21 eventually [1] -**Fe** [4] - 1:23, 3:2, 3:9, forward [9] - 10:24, Grimsal [2] - 9:24, eliminate [3] - 9:14, 10:11 3:22 11:15, 15:24, 20:18, 30:24, 31:12 evidence [1] - 51:25 Federal [1] - 41:12 27:1, 28:11, 31:24, ground [2] - 19:18, eliminating [2] -41:13, 52:8 50:16 evolve [1] - 29:11 fee [2] - 16:12, 16:21 22:5, 31:25 exactly [4] - 14:16, fees [2] - 15:25, 16:9 forwarded [1] - 9:17 groundwater [15] -Elser [1] - 8:6 15:12, 34:25, 39:16 fellow [1] - 17:15 four [5] - 9:24, 10:1, 40:16, 43:8, 43:9, email [7] - 9:13, 9:15, examining [2] - 29:6, 10:21, 19:7, 53:8 49:1, 49:14, 49:20, **few** [1] - 9:2 9:17, 9:18, 22:7, Francis [1] - 4:12 49:25, 50:25, 51:1, 43:12 figure [3] - 29:25, 22:14, 35:4 51:4, 51:19, 51:20, **FRANCIS**[1] - 1:18 **example** [5] - 14:2, 46:22, 47:9 employed [2] -51:22, 52:5, 52:12 25:19, 25:25, 28:10, frankly [1] - 17:23 file [9] - 14:7, 14:14, 59:10, 59:11 Growers [3] - 3:16, free [3] - 16:2, 18:11, 33:18 14:24, 15:16, 20:11, **employee**[1] - 59:10 7:7, 7:10 **examples** [1] - 34:4 20:16, 30:24, 31:3, 18:21 encourage [1] except [4] - 32:1, 55:1 Freeman [1] - 2:5 grown [1] - 47:14 18:10 32:9, 32:10, 56:4 filed [13] - 9:11, 9:24, front [2] - 22:5, 45:22 guess [11] - 11:13, 15:1, 16:1, 20:21, end [7] - 10:11, exception [3] -11:12, 12:1, 14:3, full [1] - 26:16 27:13, 42:23, 44:21, 14:12, 16:5, 16:19, 55:19, 55:21, 56:4 14:9, 14:19, 30:17, fully [2] - 39:10, 50:6 25:6, 33:19, 47:5 34:23, 38:18, 54:15, 44:24, 47:8, 47:12, exceptions [7] functioning [2] enforceable [1] -55:1, 55:2, 55:3, 55:9, 49:18 55:10 39:11, 40:22 39:10 55:25, 56:2, 56:3 files [2] - 20:7, 20:8 **guidance** [1] - 26:9 fundamental [1] enhanced [1] - 23:9 exchange [1] - 33:11 filing [8] - 8:18, 8:20, 54.2 entire [1] - 46:8 Н exchanges [1] -10:1. 11:20. 13:25. **future** [1] - 17:19 entities [2] - 13:8, 34:20, 35:3, 35:13 13:16 24:3 exclusion [1] - 24:4 **filings** [1] - 9:18 G half [1] - 42:24 finally [1] - 53:19 entitlement [1] - 41:2 Exhibit [1] - 44:11 hand [1] - 59:13 entity [1] - 6:1 exist [1] - 15:5 financially [1] handle [5] - 8:17, Gans [9] - 8:2, 9:6, Environment [1] expand [2] - 29:13, 59:11 9:1, 15:6, 30:23, 35:1 10:4, 10:10, 14:4, 2:21 42:18 findings [3] - 53:9, handled [4] - 8:19, 15:13, 15:16, 18:13, environmental [1] expanded [1] - 22:25 53:24, 54:21 8:20, 9:3 34:18 28:13 expenses [4] - 16:3, fine [5] - 11:7, 11:21, handling [2] - 8:22, **GANS** [6] - 8:5, **EP** [3] - 24:9, 26:20, 18:5, 31:20, 57:20 16:6. 16:17. 16:21 8:23 14:17, 18:9, 18:14, 39:8 expensive [1] firm [1] - 27:21 hands [1] - 19:24 18:19, 18:24 **EPCWID** [1] - 48:10 Firm [2] - 3:10, 3:15 15:25 hands-on [1] - 19:24 Gans' [4] - 8:16, equal [6] - 23:5, first [11] - 9:4, 9:9, expert [5] - 21:16, hang [1] - 18:24 9:12, 9:16, 13:3 24:13, 24:21, 26:6, 29:22, 29:24, 32:22, 9:22, 13:6, 14:18, happy [2] - 34:12, general [1] - 35:21 27:11 23:2, 25:17, 32:21, 34:7 35:18 General [2] - 1:22, 45:3, 49:4, 53:11 equally [4] - 12:11, experts [3] - 21:2, hard [13] - 10:1, 25:6. 27:25. 28:11 30:3, 34:11 fit [1] - 46:20 10:3, 10:4, 10:8, generally [1] - 52:14 **Equitable** [1] - 53:19 flag [1] - 52:23 **explain** [1] - 49:10 10:10, 10:15, 11:6, Georgia [1] - 32:14 **equitable** [5] - 24:15, **Expressway** [1] - 3:5 flagged [2] - 48:19, 15:15, 15:17, 22:9, giant [1] - 13:21 24:16, 24:25, 25:7, 57:24 extent [6] - 19:25, 22:16, 50:16 given [3] - 13:7, 25:10 29:11, 41:8, 43:2, fleshed [1] - 19:9 **Harris** [1] - 3:12 32:18, 35:5 equities [2] - 24:18, Florida [1] - 32:14 49:2, 51:18 hash [1] - 17:7 **goal** [1] - 36:12 25:12 Florida/Georgia [1] hear [1] - 34:12 goals [1] - 34:1 **especially** [1] - 54:14 F 33:18 hearing [2] - 16:12, GOLDSBERRY [1] -**ESQ** [20] - 1:17, 1:18, flows [1] - 51:2 16:14 1:18 1:18, 1:19, 1:19, 1:22, folks [2] - 4:14, hearings [2] - 27:20, face [3] - 36:24, Goldsberry [3] -2:2, 2:6, 2:9, 2:11, 29.21 28.4 42:12 4:12, 4:25, 5:1 2:12, 3:1, 3:4, 3:5, **followed** [1] - 49:11 Heath [1] - 3:3 face-to-face [1] -Gorsuch [3] - 44:23, 3:8, 3:10, 3:13, 3:16, foregoing [1] - 59:8 36.24 help [1] - 16:2 45:11, 46:13 3:18, 3:21 **forever** [1] - 37:20 faces [1] - 42:13 hereby [1] - 59:6 Gorsuch's [2] - 44:6, essence [1] - 46:14 forgiveness [1] -

hereto [1] - 59:11 hesitate [2] - 18:15, 34:21 HOFFMAN [1] - 1:18 Hoffman [2] - 4:13, 4.18 hold [1] - 14:25 holding [2] - 53:14, 56.13 Honor [63] - 4:10, 5:7, 5:15, 5:19, 6:8, 6:13, 6:18, 6:24, 7:3, 7:9, 7:13, 7:22, 11:3, 11:4, 11:16, 13:23, 23:13, 23:20, 24:10, 24:22, 25:14, 26:6, 26:25, 27:8, 29:18, 31:15, 32:25, 33:6, 35:7, 35:13, 36:1, 36:3, 36:15, 39:2, 39:7, 40:3, 40:10, 40:20, 41:5, 41:10, 42:1, 43:6, 45:1, 46:7, 47:1, 47:18, 48:2, 48:17, 49:6, 49:12, 50:3, 50:9, 51:8, 54:1, 54:23. 55:8. 55:11. 56:11, 56:15, 56:20, 57:1, 57:3, 58:12 HONORABLE [1] -1:12 **hope** [5] - 29:13, 36:13, 42:23, 43:3, 43:23 hopefully [7] - 17:13, 17:18, 29:13, 32:16, 35:16, 37:24, 38:4 hoping [1] - 36:11 Hudspeth [7] - 3:18, 7:2, 7:4, 22:24, 44:19, 46:23, 47:23 huge [1] - 45:19 ı

idea [3] - 33:3, 36:25, 55.25 **identified** [1] - 55:24 identify [1] - 53:9 II [1] - 1:18 **imagine** [1] - 13:9 immediately [1] -16:17 impact [4] - 42:10, 43:15, 47:19, 50:16 impacted [3] - 41:21, 50:14, 51:5 impacts [2] - 51:1, 51:20

important [4] - 27:4, 41:11, 54:10, 54:18 importantly [1] impose [1] - 17:15 impossible [1] -26:15 Improvement [9] -3:13, 6:17, 6:19, 22:24, 23:6, 23:18, 26:3, 45:23, 48:3 IN [1] - 59:13 in-person [6] - 17:7, 21:4, 22:20, 27:15, 34:13, 58:5 inclination [1] -17:11 inclined [1] - 17:6 include [2] - 9:4, 10:6 included [3] - 12:7, 45:2, 48:6 includes [1] - 14:8 including [2] - 4:8, 28:1 inconsistent [1] -49:2 incorporated [1] -46:14 incorporating [1] -44:7 index [3] - 32:18, 32:20, 32:23 indexed [1] - 33:3 indicate [1] - 37:5 indicated [6] - 9:11, 20:4, 32:13, 36:23, 41:17, 48:5 inextricably [1] informal [1] - 35:3 **informally** [1] - 35:10 information [4] -19:7, 31:8, 43:16, 58:15 informed [1] - 28:9 infrastructure [1] -

initial [5] - 20:2, 20:5, 20:22, 21:14, 57:13 input [2] - 23:14, 28:25 insert [2] - 36:20, 37:5

instance [3] - 27:23,

28:20. 46:22

53:15

integrated [1] -

intend [1] - 27:14

12:2, 12:5, 13:18 interconnected [4] -51:19, 51:20, 51:21, 52.4 interconnectednes s [1] - 52:11 interest [6] - 24:21, 26:13, 26:14, 27:6, 28:13, 43:1 interested [4] - 46:8, 46:12, 52:6, 59:11 interestingly [1] -33:17 interests [1] - 28:12 Interior [2] - 2:17, 5:23 interplay [1] - 48:14 interpretation [1] -24:25 interpretations [1] -54:2 Interrogatories [3] -22:15, 30:20, 31:6 intertwined [1] -26:13 intervened [2] -40:12, 40:14 intervention [1] -26:17 involve [1] - 45:24 involved [4] - 16:22, 28:15, 33:10, 41:18 involving [1] - 45:12 IOWA [1] - 1:13 lowa [2] - 59:6, 59:6 irrelevant [1] - 47:17 irrigated [1] - 50:25 Irrigation [8] - 3:10, 6:22, 6:25, 23:7, 23:23, 24:8, 25:15, 44:12 irrigation [7] - 23:22, 28:14, 38:23, 39:13, 44:16, 46:16 issue [16] - 13:21, 20:23, 21:20, 26:21, 30:5, 31:22, 36:8, 36:14, 37:17, 42:5, 43:10, 51:24, 52:1, 52:23, 53:5, 54:25 issues [31] - 8:15, 13:3, 14:1, 15:19, 17:8, 19:10, 20:10, 20:13, 21:5, 21:10, 22:2. 22:19. 27:17. 28:1, 28:17, 29:12, 30:11, 34:22, 38:10,

-Shannon N. Benter-Moine, CSR-

intended [1] - 33:13

intention [4] - 11:19,

intent [1] - 42:18

38:13, 39:24, 41:1, 47:6, 48:18, 51:16, 51:18, 52:5, 52:9, 55:7, 57:5, 57:8 **IT** [1] - 8:3 items [1] - 13:24 itself [3] - 30:14, 41:22, 51:6 J JAMES [2] - 2:11, 3:1 **JAY** [1] - 3:8

**Jay** [3] - 6:13, 24:10, 40:10 **Jim** [9] - 5:20, 6:3, 12:15, 24:22, 27:8, 31:15, 39:2, 47:1, 57:3 **job** [1] - 15:23 **JOHN** [1] - 3:21 John [2] - 7:14, 8:6 **JOHNSON** [1] - 1:19 Johnson [2] - 4:14, 4:20 **join** [1] - 8:3 joint [1] - 23:21 JR [1] - 2:2 judge [1] - 17:14 JUDGE [71] - 1:12, 4:3, 4:16, 4:19, 4:23, 5:4, 5:12, 5:17, 5:24, 6:6, 6:11, 6:16, 6:21, 7:1, 7:6, 7:11, 7:16, 7:19, 7:24, 8:8, 8:12, 10:25, 11:11, 11:21, 12:19, 14:4, 15:10, 17:1, 18:15, 18:20, 19:1, 19:16, 21:13, 21:17, 21:20, 23:16, 28:16, 30:12, 31:19, 32:8, 33:24, 35:14, 36:5, 37:7, 37:13, 37:22, 38:9, 40:17, 40:24, 41:7, 41:14, 42:22, 43:17, 45:5, 45:21, 46:11, 46:18, 47:7, 48:18, 49:10, 49:21, 50:7, 52:10, 54:6, 54:24, 55:15, 56:7, 56:12, 56:16, 57:20, 58:14 Judge [7] - 8:5, 12:19, 14:17, 18:19,

18:25, 28:16, 41:12

judges [1] - 17:16

**JUDITH** [1] - 2:21

**Judy** [1] - 5:22

July [2] - 37:14,

59:14 jumping [2] - 21:24, 31:24 June [5] - 20:15, 20:24, 21:10, 31:23, 37:10 jurisdiction [1] -49:24 jurisprudence [1] -24:14 Justice [8] - 2:11, 2:14, 2:20, 44:5, 44:23, 45:11, 46:12, 48:8

## K

Kansas [3] - 7:17, 7:20, 52:6 **keep** [5] - 14:13, 15:16, 19:25, 20:24, 31:14 keeping [1] - 8:23 Kemp [1] - 3:18 kept [1] - 28:8 Kery [1] - 3:21 key [1] - 53:9 kind [6] - 12:24, 21:23, 38:9, 47:2, 47:21, 57:12 knowable [1] - 51:24 **KOPP** [1] - 2:6 Kopp [1] - 5:11

#### L

large [1] - 26:16 **Las** [7] - 3:8, 3:11, 6:12, 6:14, 24:11, 40:11, 40:12 last [1] - 14:15 law [3] - 8:1, 56:20, 57:2 **Law** [3] - 2:8, 3:10, 3.15 lawsuit [3] - 40:12, 47:8, 47:9 lawyer [1] - 29:21 lawyers [1] - 32:7 leading [1] - 57:15 leads [1] - 10:13 leaning [1] - 17:17 least [10] - 11:23, 17:12, 21:11, 22:17, 38:14, 38:15, 43:23, 48:7, 52:12, 53:2 leave [2] - 35:24, 36:4

leaves [1] - 56:18 LEE [1] - 2:12 Lee [1] - 5:21 legal [3] - 25:5, 47:6, 51:17 Leininger [1] - 5:21 LEININGER [1] -2:12 less [2] - 28:22, 32:17 letter [12] - 9:12, 23:21, 27:11, 27:21, 32:14, 34:3, 42:16, 43:18, 44:18, 46:22, 48:21, 49:3 letters [5] - 12:9, 12:20, 22:23, 38:21, 53:5 likewise [2] - 40:6, 40:7 limited [7] - 22:22, 24:6, 27:18, 28:6, 45:19, 48:14, 55:9 **Lincoln** [1] - 2:6 line [3] - 18:12, 21:22, 42:5 **Lisa** [1] - 5:10 list [5] - 4:15, 8:17, 11:18, 12:6, 12:11 listening [1] - 8:2 **litigating** [1] - 57:4 litigation [16] - 19:8, 19:10, 19:11, 19:20, 32:15, 39:24, 41:13, 41:21, 42:9, 42:14, 42:18, 45:25, 49:17, 49:18, 52:8 live [2] - 39:18, 39:20 LLC [2] - 3:10, 3:15 **LLP** [2] - 3:4, 3:18 loath [1] - 29:5 located [1] - 44:17 location [2] - 17:13, look [7] - 37:22, 41:20, 42:4, 43:23, 44:22, 50:19, 55:3 **looked** [1] - 44:9 looking [4] - 30:4, 34:5, 42:6, 51:14

#### M

Macfarlane [1] - 5:21 MACFARLANE [1] -2:15 Maestas [1] - 5:10 MAESTAS [1] - 1:22 mailing [1] - 10:6

managed [1] - 42:8 management [7] -9:23, 10:14, 18:23, 20:4, 21:25, 22:4, manager [1] - 19:24 MARCUS [1] - 2:2 Marcus [7] - 5:7, 10:19, 32:25, 35:7, 36:2, 49:6, 54:9 MARIA [1] - 3:13 **Maria** [5] - 6:19, 23:17, 26:2, 39:8, 48:2 **Marquette** [1] - 2:3 master [1] - 16:1 MASTER [1] - 1:12 Master [6] - 6:2, 8:19, 27:24, 28:5, 54:3, 55:23 Master's [7] - 44:9, 45:4, 53:11, 54:12, 54:14, 54:20, 55:13 material [4] - 13:12, 13:16, 19:21, 20:2 materials [6] - 14:24, 30:17, 30:24, 45:3, 45:11, 46:6 math [1] - 29:23 matter [5] - 4:4, 9:10, 27:14, 34:16, 41:2 Maxwell [1] - 6:10 **MAXWELL**[1] - 3:5 mean [8] - 29:15, 29:24, 30:6, 33:9, 45:7, 47:11, 49:19, 56:12 means [1] - 19:20 mechanical [2] -13:2, 15:19 mechanics [4] -8:14, 8:25, 15:12, 18:4 meeting [2] - 10:20, 38:16 Melloy [3] - 8:5, 12:19, 28:16 **MELLOY** [71] - 1:12, 4:3, 4:16, 4:19, 4:23, 5:4, 5:12, 5:17, 5:24, 6:6, 6:11, 6:16, 6:21, 7:1. 7:6. 7:11. 7:16. 7:19, 7:24, 8:8, 8:12, 10:25, 11:11, 11:21,

maintain [1] - 13:18

maintaining [1] -

maintenance [1] -

Mall [1] - 1:20

8:24

8:21

12:19, 14:4, 15:10, 17:1, 18:15, 18:20, 19:1, 19:16, 21:13, 21:17, 21:20, 23:16, 28:16, 30:12, 31:19, 32:8, 33:24, 35:14, 36:5, 37:7, 37:13, 37:22, 38:9, 40:17, 40:24, 41:7, 41:14, 42:22, 43:17, 45:5, 45:21, 46:11, 46:18, 47:7, 48:18, 49:10, 49:21, 50:7, 52:10, 54:6, 54:24, 55:15, 56:7, 56:12, 56:16, 57:20, 58:14 mention [1] - 43:17 mentioned [5] - 4:17, 16:10, 21:21, 34:18, 42:17 met [1] - 30:1 **MEXICO** [1] - 1:8 Mexico [53] - 1:21, 1:22, 1:23, 2:2, 2:4, 2:5, 3:2, 3:9, 3:11, 3:14, 3:15, 3:17, 3:21, 3:22, 4:5, 5:5, 5:8, 6:15, 7:7, 7:9, 7:11, 7:14, 10:20, 19:11, 20:7, 24:11, 30:19, 32:13, 33:1, 33:2, 35:8, 36:2, 39:14, 40:13, 40:18, 40:21, 41:8, 48:21, 48:22, 48:25, 49:7, 49:22, 51:15, 51:22, 52:18, 52:21, 53:3, 53:11, 53:17, 53:20, 54:10, 55:18, 56:7 Mexico's [5] - 34:3, 41:1, 49:5, 53:6, 54:6 Michael [10] - 5:11, 8:2, 8:4, 8:16, 13:3, 14:11, 18:5, 18:13, 18:21, 21:22 MICHAEL [2] - 1:12, 2:6 Michael's [1] - 8:22 middle [1] - 37:14 might [13] - 13:25, 15:3, 16:22, 17:18, 17:20, 27:20, 42:2, 43:8, 43:14, 43:17, 43:25, 54:18, 57:7 MILLER [2] - 3:18, 7:3 Miller [1] - 7:4 million [2] - 32:15,

minimal [1] - 16:8 minimum [1] - 38:17 minute [2] - 13:1, 30.15 misheard [1] - 39:8 misread [1] - 31:20 missed [2] - 5:4, 8:9 missing [2] - 41:24, 44:10 misspoke [1] - 39:9 misstating [1] - 14:5 model [1] - 43:20 modeling [2] - 43:9, 43:10 **Modrall** [1] - 3:12 Moine [3] - 3:23, 59:5, 59:16 moment [1] - 12:25 monitor [1] - 43:3 Montano [1] - 2:5 month [3] - 31:4, 31:17, 31:19 monthly [1] - 31:9 months [4] - 29:9, 33:19, 33:25 **MoPac** [1] - 3:5 most [2] - 13:9, 22:2 Motion [1] - 55:19 motion [3] - 14:8, 14:18, 14:21 move [2] - 11:9, 52:7 moving [1] - 19:25 MR [72] - 4:10, 4:18, 4:22, 5:2, 5:7, 5:14, 5:19, 6:2, 6:8, 6:13, 7:3, 7:13, 7:21, 8:5, 10:19, 11:2, 11:4, 11:16, 12:4, 12:15, 13:13, 13:23, 14:17, 18:9, 18:19, 18:24, 21:7, 21:16, 21:19, 24:10, 24:22, 25:9, 27:8, 29:18, 31:15, 33:6, 35:7, 36:1, 36:15, 37:9, 37:15, 39:2, 39:20, 40:3, 40:10, 40:20, 41:4, 41:10, 42:1, 43:5, 44:25, 45:9, 46:4, 46:7, 46:15, 47:1, 47:18, 49:6, 49:12, 50:3, 50:9, 51:8, 54:1, 54:9, 54:22, 55:8, 55:17, 56:10, 56:14, 56:19, 57:3, 58:13 **MS** [9] - 6:18, 6:23, 7:8, 23:13, 23:17, 25:14, 26:2, 39:7, 48:2

# Ν

name [1] - 4:16 named [2] - 4:7, 10:22 narrowed [2] - 29:13, 29:14 Natural [1] - 2:21 nature [1] - 51:18 Nebraska [2] - 27:22, 50.20 Nebraska/ Wyoming [1] - 27:23 necessarily [2] -15:14, 30:21 necessary [3] - 31:1, 31:10, 35:11 necessity [1] - 32:12 need [11] - 10:2, 15:14, 18:1, 20:11, 30:16, 30:17, 30:21, 32:6, 37:1, 37:21, 58.9 needed [1] - 39:21 needing [1] - 47:23 needs [3] - 14:3, 24:2, 30:19 **never** [3] - 54:14, 54:19, 55:13 **New** [58] - 1:21, 1:22, 1:23, 2:2, 2:4, 2:5, 3:2, 3:9, 3:11, 3:14, 3:15, 3:17, 3:21, 3:22, 4:4, 5:5, 5:8, 6:14, 7:7, 7:9, 7:11, 7:14, 10:20, 19:11, 20:7, 24:11, 30:19, 32:13, 33:1, 34:3, 35:8, 36:2, 39:14, 40:13, 40:18, 40:21, 41:1, 41:8, 48:21, 48:22, 48:24, 49:4, 49:7, 49:22, 51:15, 51:22, 52:18, 52:21, 53:2, 53:6, 53:11, 53:17, 53:20, 54:6, 54:10, 55:18, 56:7 new [3] - 46:20, 47:5, 47:13 **NEW** [1] - 1:8 next [3] - 17:9, 29:17, 31:1 nightmare [1] -28:21 non [2] - 31:7, 42:17 non-party [1] - 31:7 non-waiver [1] -42:17 none [1] - 54:13

-Shannon N. Benter-Moine, CSR-

mind [1] - 17:10

50:25

Notary [2] - 59:5, 20:3, 20:20, 21:20, 20:18 paper [3] - 14:20, person [6] - 17:7, 21:23, 22:8, 22:9, 21:4, 22:20, 27:15, 59.17 14:25, 51:16 present [2] - 12:2, 22:19, 23:16, 25:19, note [4] - 27:20, paragraph [1] -34:13, 58:5 16:11 41:11, 51:16, 54:18 25:25, 28:17, 29:22, 30:15 perspective [4] **presume** [1] - 31:8 nothing [2] - 40:25, 34:1, 38:12, 38:20, pardon [1] - 50:10 13:20, 13:22, 14:6, pretty [8] - 15:23, 45.16 40:14, 41:14, 42:16, parenthetically [1] -41:6 15:24, 20:10, 22:22, 42:23, 44:4, 44:22, 52:2 noticed [4] - 12:20, phone [2] - 5:21, 56:13, 56:20, 56:23, 34:5, 43:17, 53:5 46:21, 47:12, 51:17, 34:18 57:2 part [13] - 26:16, 52:5, 53:17, 54:7, 33:7, 45:3, 47:7, 47:9, notices [1] - 38:18 physical [1] - 14:13 **previously** [1] - 9:3 54:17 **number** [1] - 33:22 47:11, 47:16, 47:20, **place** [9] - 9:6, 17:17, **printing** [1] - 59:7 ones [8] - 25:22, private [2] - 15:25, numbers [2] - 30:7, 47:24, 49:20, 49:23, 20:25, 30:8, 36:20, 46:12, 46:19, 53:10, 51:25, 56:9 37:5, 39:6, 39:10, 16:9 43:10 55:4, 55:24, 57:24 partes [1] - 14:21 47:25 privilege [1] - 34:15 numerous [2] operating [14] - 25:2, 26:18, 54:15 participant [1] - 43:4 plan [10] - 18:23, privileged [1] - 13:4 38:22, 39:3, 39:5, 21:13, 22:1, 22:4, **NW** [2] - 2:3, 2:19 participate [1] - 52:7 privy [1] - 40:7 39:9, 39:17, 39:22, 22:13, 22:21, 30:2, participating [1] problem [7] - 21:8, 40:9, 40:14, 40:16, 43:4, 43:12, 43:13 30:9, 34:17, 35:15, 27:3 0 40:19, 40:21, 40:25 plate [1] - 47:10 participation [4] -35:17, 35:22, 40:2 **operation** [1] - 39:6 **play** [1] - 25:24 24:21, 27:12, 27:17, problems [5] - 21:6, O'Brien [6] - 6:19, operations [1] - 40:8 29:12 pleading [1] - 9:10 22:3, 33:12, 34:15, 23:17, 25:18, 26:2, opinion [4] - 40:9, particular [3] - 29:2, pleadings [2] - 9:19, 40:1 39:8, 48:3 44:6, 48:9, 55:7 35:6, 46:10 38:18 procedure [2] -**O'BRIEN** [7] - 3:13, opposed [2] - 12:23, particularly [3] **plus** [1] - 29:25 34:19, 34:25 6:18, 23:13, 23:17, 20:15 11:9, 21:1, 28:23 pocket [1] - 16:6 procedures [1] -26:2, 39:7, 48:2 order [12] - 9:5, 9:21, parties [29] - 4:7, point [22] - 10:24, 25:21 objections [1] -10:4, 13:5, 14:7, 10:15, 10:22, 12:13, 13:15, 15:17, 17:6, proceed [1] - 57:25 54.15 16:15. 20:4. 22:11. 13:22, 14:2, 15:2, 17:8, 20:9, 20:13, proceedings [4] objects [3] - 39:15, 30:14, 38:3, 38:6, 16:3, 16:18, 22:23, 20:17, 21:18, 22:16, 10:9, 20:6, 52:25, 40:18, 40:21 41:12 23:15, 24:19, 28:2, 26:17, 32:12, 38:7, 59:8 obligations [1] ordered [3] - 32:1, 29:5, 30:1, 31:3, 33:7, 38:19, 39:1, 43:15, PROCEEDINGS [1] -42:13 32:9, 32:10 43:21, 43:23, 45:25, 47:23, 52:15, 52:22, 4:1 observation [2] orders [3] - 9:23, 46:5, 48:5, 48:16, 54:8, 56:8, 57:15 process [2] - 25:25, 20:3, 27:13 10:14, 34:6 54:16, 58:2, 58:10, position [23] - 23:10, 29:2 observations [2] -Original [2] - 1:1, 4:6 59:10, 59:11 39:17, 39:19, 40:19, product [1] - 48:11 19:3, 27:10 otherwise [2] party [13] - 16:15, 41:24, 42:3, 42:15, **production** [1] - 31:7 obvious [1] - 15:23 18:21, 33:5 25:24, 26:19, 31:7, 48:21, 48:23, 49:2, progress [2] - 31:4, obviously [3] ourselves [1] - 57:15 39:14, 39:15, 40:6, 49:5, 50:1, 50:8, 31:5 27:11, 30:22, 43:20 out-of-pocket [1] -43:5, 44:13, 45:24, 52:18, 53:2, 53:6, prohibited [1] occur [1] - 39:21 16.6 51:10, 52:25, 55:10 53:7, 53:23, 54:7, 53:17 **OF** [5] - 1:4, 1:6, 1:8, outset [1] - 29:7 Paso [13] - 3:4, 3:12, 54:19, 55:12, 56:16 prohibits [1] - 53:20 1:9, 1:11 overruled [3] - 55:3, 6:7, 6:9, 6:16, 6:19, possible [3] - 33:4, Project [5] - 23:24, off-the-cuff [1] -22:24, 23:6, 23:18. 55:5, 56:4 34:2, 42:19 25:23, 27:6, 43:12, 57:19 **overruling** [1] - 56:2 26:2, 44:12, 45:23, Post [7] - 1:23, 3:2, 53:14 Office [9] - 1:22, Owen [1] - 27:24 48.3 3:8, 3:11, 3:14, 3:16, project [18] - 26:11, 1:23, 2:17, 3:2, 3:8, own [2] - 16:16, paused [1] - 11:5 3.22 26:12, 26:14, 44:7, 3:11, 3:14, 3:16, 3:22 26:11 pay [1] - 50:24 potential [1] - 13:24 47:20, 47:21, 48:12, office [4] - 8:16, paying [1] - 16:16 potentially [1] - 42:8 49:9, 49:13, 49:20, 8:23, 9:16, 13:3 Ρ **Pecan** [3] - 3:15, 7:7, power [1] - 28:14 49:23, 50:11, 53:12, Official [1] - 3:23 practical [2] - 29:19, 53:18, 53:21, 56:8 offline [2] - 15:2, people [4] - 8:3, 30:9 projects [1] - 45:14 **P.A** [4] - 3:1, 3:7, 15:16 29:24, 29:25, 30:2 practice [2] - 11:13, properly [1] - 24:7 3:13, 3:21 **Olpin** [1] - 27:24 people's [1] - 28:22 11:15 proposal [2] - 20:20, once [5] - 14:9, 20:7, **P.C** [3] - 1:17, 2:2, percent [1] - 44:14 precedence [1] -29:20 2:5 31:4, 43:14, 53:12 percent/43 [1] -52:4 propose [2] - 14:24, **p.m** [2] - 1:13, 58:19 **One** [1] - 3:6 44.14 precluded [1] - 52:20 20:14 **P.O**[1] - 2:22 one [43] - 7:19, 9:18, preclusion [1] - 27:2 perhaps [2] - 24:6, proposed [6] - 13:5, page [3] - 9:9, 28:9, 10:3, 10:4, 10:12, 27:15 preliminary [5] -14:7, 21:25, 28:2, 53:10 12:7, 12:8, 12:20, 19:2, 38:11, 48:20, **period** [1] - 33:23 28:3, 58:4 pages [1] - 31:24 12:21, 13:24, 15:20, perpetuate [2] -55:10, 57:23 proposition [1] -

paid [1] - 16:12

32:5, 32:7

-Shannon N. Benter-Moine, CSR-

prepared [2] - 17:5,

35:21

17:1, 17:9, 19:22,

re [1] - 57:4 released [1] - 53:21 20:17 37:20, 37:23, 38:1 protects [1] - 53:15 proven [1] - 53:3 re-litigating [1] releases [1] - 53:16 responses [4] scheduled [5] provide [5] - 33:14, 57:4 relinquish [2] -12:17, 12:23, 22:14, 36:25, 37:10, 37:16, 37:3, 45:1, 46:6, reached [1] - 55:23 56:21, 56:25 28:23 37:25, 58:17 48.16 read [3] - 12:8, 19:4, relinquished [1] responsible [2] schedules [1] provided [2] - 35:20, 48:20 53:12 16:16. 16:18 28:22 51:16 ready [2] - 15:7, 36:8 remains [1] - 56:22 rest [4] - 14:13, scheduling [5] -25:20, 34:16, 34:17 13:5, 28:20, 30:14, provision [1] - 35:20 realizes [1] - 42:25 remember [1] - 11:6 38:2. 38:6 provisions [1] really [7] - 17:5, remembers [1] - 11:2 restrictions [1] -24:7 schematics [1] -30.2333:3, 42:14, 43:10, replicate [1] - 33:21 14:2 Public [2] - 59:5, 45:16, 50:18, 51:23 result [2] - 42:8, reply [1] - 28:1 scratched [1] - 38:12 59:17 42:13 reason [4] - 30:25, Report [5] - 53:11, review [1] - 38:11 scratching [1] **public** [3] - 13:8, 31:14, 35:4, 42:16 54:12, 54:15, 54:20, 13:10, 28:14 reasons [1] - 15:20 rights [9] - 42:20, 17:25 55:13 44:20, 48:25, 50:5, SE [1] - 1:13 **pull** [3] - 45:1, 45:9, recapturing [1] report [5] - 31:4, seal [6] - 13:25, 14:9, 45:17 50:11, 51:12, 51:14 53:20 31:5, 31:9, 44:10, Rio [6] - 23:24, 14:18, 14:24, 15:8, pumping [3] - 50:14, receive [2] - 9:20, 45:4 25:11, 25:22, 27:5, 59:14 51:3. 51:21 22:18 **reported** [1] - 59:6 43:11, 53:14 sealed [2] - 13:4, received [2] - 22:22, **pun** [1] - 50:10 reporter [2] - 7:25, river [4] - 47:15, 14:16 **put** [3] - 26:20, 28:6 16:10 47:20, 50:13, 50:16 41:19, 51:25 search [2] - 33:15, receiving [1] - 38:17 Reporter [3] - 3:23, Reclamation [3] -59:5, 59:17 **River** [4] - 50:21, 45:10 50:23, 50:24, 51:2 Q 3:19, 7:5, 46:23 reporting [2] - 16:12, searchable [2] -32:23, 33:4 reclamation [1] road [3] - 16:24, 16:20 36:3, 52:17 second [2] - 4:16, reports [1] - 31:16 questions [13] -**ROBERT**[1] - 1:18 9:23 recognize [1] - 33:9 representing [2] -14:18, 16:24, 16:25, recognized [1] - 26:7 Robert [2] - 4:13, **Secondly** [1] - 53:14 24:11, 40:11 17:3, 17:4, 17:10, 4:18 section [5] - 31:2, recommendation [1] Republican [4] -18:10, 18:18, 21:6, - 55:19 50:21, 50:22, 50:23, Robles [1] - 2:2 31:25, 34:15, 35:2, 38:6, 38:20, 58:11, record [13] - 4:11, 51:2 Roehl [1] - 3:12 35.6 58.13 role [12] - 22:21, Section [2] - 31:2, 5:8, 6:5, 7:4, 8:21, request [3] - 46:19, quickly [3] - 34:2, 22:22, 22:25, 24:2, 32:13 8:23, 10:8, 26:23, 48:6, 48:17 54:22, 58:16 24:5, 25:3, 25:24, security [1] - 14:1 27:4, 27:22, 30:19, requests [1] - 31:6 quite [8] - 10:2, 27:1, 28:18, 28:19, see [11] - 16:17, 40:5, 59:8 require [2] - 10:8, 17:23, 19:8, 28:12, 30:15, 32:2, 36:7, 29:1, 38:14 reduced [1] - 59:7 41:23 29:3, 30:9, 39:11, **Roman** [1] - 5:10 36:17, 37:8, 37:24, refer [1] - 9:5 requirement [5] -57:5 44:8, 44:18, 46:18, reference [3] - 12:21, 9:14, 14:8, 22:6, rule [1] - 35:19 58:16 13:4, 44:19 30:25, 31:2 **Rule** [3] - 21:15, R seeking [1] - 23:14 21:16, 32:10 **referenced** [1] - 48:8 reserve [1] - 20:25 **ruling** [1] - 20:25 seem [1] - 25:4 reservoir [3] - 49:1, references [1] rulings [1] - 48:24 send [9] - 9:14, 9:16, 53:16, 56:18 44:15 rael [1] - 55:1 10:3, 12:17, 22:6, running [2] - 20:14, Reservoir [5] - 42:7, referred [2] - 34:4, Rael [10] - 2:2, 5:7, 42:10, 49:14, 53:13, 50.12 22:7, 22:10, 22:16, 44:24 10:19, 11:8, 32:25, runs [1] - 50:12 37:23 53:22 35:8, 36:2, 49:7, 54:9, referring [2] - 46:13, sending [1] - 10:10 57:17 Reservoirs [1] sense [3] - 19:5, S refers [2] - 46:24, 45:15 **RAEL** [16] - 2:2, 5:7, 24:24, 25:11 10:19, 11:2, 35:7, 48:9 resolution [1] - 35:3 sent [9] - 9:12, refine [1] - 38:16 resolve [4] - 35:9, 36:1, 40:20, 41:10, Sacramento [2] -10:11, 14:25, 15:15, reflect [1] - 31:11 40:25, 48:19, 52:16 49:6, 49:12, 50:3, 1:20, 2:16 22:9, 23:21, 30:20, 54:9, 55:8, 56:10, reflection [1] - 15:22 resolved [2] - 14:16, SAMANTHA[1] -31:6 56:14, 56:19 reflects [1] - 27:4 52.24 3:10 raised [2] - 39:24, regard [4] - 11:15, **Resources** [1] - 2:22 separate [4] - 12:8, Samantha [2] - 6:24, 14:13, 15:16, 26:15 40:2 26:4, 26:9, 48:7 respect [1] - 29:23 25:15 **sequence** [1] - 36:19 Raley [1] - 2:5 regards [1] - 42:11 respectfully [1] -Santa [4] - 1:23, 3:2, sequencing [3] -26.4 Randel [1] - 5:22 regulated [1] - 51:5 3:9, 3:22 21:2, 34:3, 34:11 respond [3] - 34:7, **RANDEL**[1] - 2:18 rejected [1] - 51:2 saw [2] - 19:16, series [1] - 46:8 range [1] - 46:10 related [2] - 14:23, 54:22. 57:12 29:20 seriously [1] - 44:2 Rapids [1] - 59:6 59:9 responding [1] schedule [8] - 17:6, serve [3] - 12:2, 25:22 **RAPIDS**[1] - 1:13 relative [2] - 16:8, 29:11, 30:5, 30:18, 12:6, 12:12

response [2] - 20:7,

-Shannon N. Benter-Moine, CSR-

ratified [1] - 48:1

59:10

38:24

sword [1] - 19:22

system [1] - 50:15

served [4] - 11:24, 11:25, 12:12, 31:7 Service [2] - 30:16, 31.12 service [10] - 4:14, 8:17, 8:18, 8:20, 10:23, 10:25, 11:8, 11:10, 11:18, 12:6 **serving** [10] - 9:24, 9:25, 10:15, 11:6, 11:12, 11:17, 12:10, 12:23, 28:23, 32:19 **set** [15] - 8:17, 9:6, 9:15, 15:1, 20:20, 20:24, 23:21, 27:21, 29:9, 30:20, 31:5, 40:13, 47:5, 53:23, 59:13 **SEVENTH**[1] - 1:13 sever [1] - 26:15 Shannon [3] - 3:23, 59:5, 59:16 **shaped** [1] - 57:8 SHELLY [1] - 2:18 **Shelly** [1] - 5:22 shoot [1] - 36:7 Shorthand [2] - 59:5, 59:17 **shorthand** [1] - 59:7 shows [1] - 9:9 side [2] - 32:16, 54:17 **sign** [2] - 58:15, 58:18 signed [2] - 27:11, 46:16 significant [2] -36:25, 51:17 significantly [1] -32:16 signing [1] - 46:9 Silence [3] - 7:18, 8:11, 38:8 **similar** [1] - 51:7 similarly [1] - 33:16 Simmons [1] - 1:17 **simple** [1] - 42:4 simply [1] - 43:15 single [1] - 43:20 Sinor [1] - 2:5 Sisk [1] - 3:13 sister [2] - 23:21, 25:18 sit [2] - 33:8, 33:13 sitting [1] - 8:1 situated [1] - 23:25 situation [2] - 26:10, six [2] - 29:8, 37:11

small [1] - 39:23

Smith [1] - 3:18 smoother [1] - 33:5 Solicitor [1] - 2:18 Somach [16] - 1:17, 4:11, 4:21, 7:21, 11:5, 11:17, 13:13, 21:7, 29:19, 33:7, 36:16, 41:4, 44:25, 48:5, 51:9, 55:15 **SOMACH** [28] - 1:17, 4:10, 4:18, 4:22, 5:2, 7:21, 11:4, 11:16, 12:4, 13:13, 21:7, 21:16, 21:19, 29:18, 33:6, 36:15, 37:9, 37:15, 39:20, 41:4, 44:25, 45:9, 46:4, 51:8, 54:1, 54:22, 55:17, 58:13 someone [2] - 12:13, someplace [2] -19:16, 44:22 somewhat [4] - 16:7, 19:23, 23:7, 41:18 sooner [1] - 37:17 **sorry** [3] - 31:20, 49:11, 54:23 **sort** [14] - 15:2, 15:19, 17:16, 18:1, 19:2, 20:2, 25:5, 28:9, 36:10, 36:13, 39:19, 41:17, 48:20, 57:4 sounds [1] - 36:10 source [4] - 49:8, 49:12, 49:15, 51:4 **South** [1] - 2:13 sovereignty [2] -56:22, 56:24 **SPEAKER** [4] - 4:25, 19:15, 32:6, 58:12 **SPECIAL**[1] - 1:12 special [1] - 16:1 Special [13] - 6:2, 8:19, 27:23, 28:4, 44:9, 45:3, 53:11, 54:3, 54:12, 54:14, 54:20, 55:12, 55:22 **specific** [3] - 27:17, 56:2, 56:13 specifically [1] spent [2] - 16:9, 17:24 **Sperling** [1] - 3:12 **split** [1] - 44:14 **spring** [1] - 36:9

staff [2] - 8:3, 8:7

stage [1] - 44:1

stakeholder [1] -

12:9 stakeholders [1] start [9] - 4:7, 8:13, 10:17, 18:22, 19:2, 20:5, 20:6, 20:14, 53:10 **started** [1] - 5:2 **starting** [2] - 19:18, starts [1] - 21:18 **STATE**[3] - 1:6, 1:8, **state** [3] - 42:5, 49:16, 49:18 State [34] - 1:17, 1:21, 2:2, 2:5, 2:8, 3:21, 4:4, 4:5, 4:9, 4:12, 5:5, 5:8, 5:12, 5:15, 7:12, 7:14, 7:16, 7:20, 10:19, 19:11, 21:8, 33:1, 35:8, 40:4, 40:13, 40:20, 41:16, 48:25, 49:22, 52:6, 52:21, 59:5 states [3] - 24:17, 24:19, 25:1 **States** [35] - 2:11, 2:14, 2:17, 2:20, 4:8, 5:18, 5:20, 12:16, 19:12, 20:11, 20:16, 24:23, 25:24, 26:17, 28:10, 31:16, 38:23, 39:3, 39:4, 39:14, 44:15, 46:17, 46:25, 48:22, 48:24, 49:3, 49:8, 49:16, 49:24, 50:1, 50:4, 52:19, 53:1, 56:5, 56:24 **STATES**[2] - 1:4, 1:12 **States'** [1] - 50:7 **stating** [1] - 49:7 status [10] - 11:23. 26:23. 27:15. 27:20. 31:9, 31:16, 38:22, 38:25, 41:16, 57:14 **stay** [1] - 18:5 stayed [1] - 41:12 Stein [8] - 3:1, 3:7, 6:14, 24:10, 24:24, 25:4, 26:5, 40:10 **STEIN** [5] - 3:8, 6:13, 24:10, 25:9, 40:10 **STEPHEN** [1] - 2:15 Steve [1] - 5:21 still [6] - 16:7, 32:17, 34:18, 40:19, 56:17, 57:22 stone [1] - 29:9

-Shannon N. Benter-Moine, CSR-

storage [1] - 40:16 Street [4] - 2:6, 2:12, 2:15, 2:19 strongly [1] - 17:6 structured [1] -31:17 **STUART**[1] - 1:17 Stuart [12] - 4:11, 7:21, 11:4, 11:17, 13:13, 21:7, 29:18, 33:6, 36:15, 41:4, 44:25, 51:8 **study** [1] - 21:3 subject [2] - 49:24, 56:24 submit [2] - 15:2, 15:7 submitted [1] - 21:14 substance [1] -47:22 substantive [1] -52:8 suck [1] - 50:15 sudden [2] - 30:3, 42:25 sufficient [1] - 57:11 suggested [1] -43:18 suggestion [1] -43:24 suit [1] - 41:11 Suite [7] - 1:20, 2:3, 2:7, 2:13, 2:15, 3:6, 3:19 supervision [1] **supply** [3] - 46:25, 48:11, 50:23 supporting [1] -27:11 supports [1] - 33:2 Supreme [22] - 4:5, 8:24, 10:7, 10:11. 15:20, 16:4, 16:13, 16:23, 19:23, 24:13, 26:9, 44:5, 52:4, 53:8, 53:25, 54:11, 54:13, 54:19, 55:2, 55:6, 56:3, 56:13 **SUPREME**[1] - 1:4 surface [13] - 17:25, 38:12, 43:9, 49:15, 49:19, 49:23, 50:5, 50:11, 50:12, 50:17, 50:22, 51:19, 52:12 surgery [4] - 36:25, 37:9, 37:10, 37:21

**SUSAN**[1] - 3:5

Susan [1] - 6:10

suspended [1] -

Т table [1] - 12:24 **Tania** [1] - 5:9 **TANIA**[1] - 1:22 technical [1] - 51:17 teleconference[1] -59:7 **TELECONFERENC** E[1] - 1:12 telephone [3] - 7:23, 17:22, 35:11 term [3] - 16:2, 20:5, 23:5 terms [6] - 15:25, 16:9, 26:5, 33:9, 34:8, 48:13 **Terrace** [1] - 2:13 TESSA [1] - 3:16 Tessa [1] - 7:9 testimony [1] - 32:5 **TEXAS**[1] - 1:6 Texas [23] - 1:17, 3:6, 3:20, 4:4, 4:9, 4:12, 11:5, 11:17, 20:11, 20:16, 21:8, 30:20, 31:6, 36:16, 39:15, 50:18, 51:10, 51:14, 52:24, 53:1, 53:7, 55:20 **Texas'** [7] - 13:20, 39:17, 41:1, 41:5, 51:23, 53:23, 54:19 **THE** [1] - 1:4 therefore [2] - 24:20, 50:24 Theresa [2] - 4:13, 4:19 **THERESA** [1] - 1:19 thinking [5] - 18:2, 30:3, 35:25, 37:17, 58:5 thinks [1] - 31:13 third [1] - 53:17 **Thompson** [2] - 2:5, thorough [1] - 22:1 three [3] - 29:9, 29:17, 53:8 throw [4] - 29:19, 29:25, 30:10, 38:9 today [13] - 8:13, 17:2, 17:5, 20:18, 23:1, 29:8, 29:14,

talks [2] - 44:6, 44:14

42:13, 44:18, 48:19,	2:17, 2:20	7:13	well-informed [1] -
58:2, 58:3, 58:9	ultimately [1] - 53:3		28:9
together [4] - 14:3,	uncertain [1] - 55:7	V	<b>Werner</b> [1] - 8:6
34:13, 48:6, 48:16	unclear [1] - 23:13		WHEREOF [1] -
took [1] - 37:20	under [14] - 9:22,	various [1] - 22:23	59:13
tool [1] - 39:25	13:17, 13:25, 14:9,	version [3] - 15:6,	<b>whole</b> [3] - 40:1,
top [1] - 17:10	15:7, 34:19, 34:24,	15:14, 20:21	46:21, 47:5
towards [1] - 17:17	35:2, 35:21, 38:24,	versions [2] - 15:4,	willing [3] - 18:17,
traditional [2] - 24:6,	39:5, 42:5, 42:12,	20:21	39:18, 39:20
25:3	59:7	versus [1] - 51:15	WITNESS [1] - 59:13
transcript [3] -	underscore [1] -	view [2] - 24:12, 56:6	witnesses [1] - 29:6
16:11, 16:14, 59:8	52:3	virgin [1] - 50:23	wonder [1] - 20:6
TRANSCRIPT[1] -	unfortunately [3] -	voluminous [1] -	wonderful [1] - 15:23
1:11	37:20, 37:21, 42:3 UNIDENTIFIED [4] -	32:18	wondering [1] - 46:1
transmit [2] - 14:10,	4:25, 19:15, 32:6,	<b>vs</b> [2] - 4:4, 32:14	word [2] - 23:9,
transpatriate [1] -	58:12		31:10
25:2	unique [4] - 26:8,	W	<b>works</b> [2] - 25:23, 37:24
travel [2] - 16:21,	26:10, 26:23, 27:6		4
37:12	United [35] - 2:11,		worrying [1] - 47:10 worthwhile [1] -
treated [4] - 23:11,	2:14, 2:17, 2:20, 4:8,	wait [1] - 20:11	43:25
25:6, 27:24, 28:11	5:18, 5:20, 12:16,	waiting [1] - 20:15	writing [1] - 56:1
trial [5] - 16:19, 29:4,	19:12, 20:11, 20:16,	waive [1] - 42:19	written [3] - 9:5,
33:19, 34:2, 36:8	24:23, 25:23, 26:17,	waiver [1] - 42:17	9:21, 22:11
tried [1] - 36:14	31:16, 38:23, 39:3,	WALLACE [8] - 2:9,	0.21, 22.11
trouble [1] - 44:4	39:4, 39:14, 44:15,	5:14, 13:23, 40:3,	Υ
Trout [1] - 2:5	46:17, 46:25, 48:22,	42:1, 43:5, 46:7, 46:15	
true [3] - 41:8, 42:15,	48:24, 49:3, 49:8,	<b>Wallace</b> [5] - 5:15,	
59:8	49:16, 49:24, 50:1,	13:24, 40:4, 41:17,	<b>year</b> [1] - 42:24
try [10] - 19:24, 34:1,	50:3, 50:7, 52:19,	46:8	<b>years</b> [4] - 19:8,
35:2, 35:9, 35:10,	53:1, 56:4, 56:24	wants [2] - 18:4,	29:17, 36:9, 47:14
35:12, 35:18, 36:7,	<b>UNITED</b> [2] - 1:4,	33:21	
37:24, 42:18	1:12	Washington [2] -	Z
trying [4] - 36:9,	<b>universe</b> [4] - 39:23,	2:19, 2:23	
50:18, 57:5, 57:18	45:2, 45:19, 48:14	water [38] - 24:16,	<b>zero</b> [1] - 19:19
turn [3] - 30:15, 38:5,	University [3] - 3:21,	24:17, 24:18, 41:2,	20.0[.]
42:10	7:12, 7:15	41:23, 42:9, 42:11,	
tweak [1] - 35:20	unless [5] - 11:2,	43:9, 43:11, 44:20,	
two [16] - 8:1, 19:22,	18:3, 31:13, 41:21,	46:25, 47:13, 47:14,	
23:23, 24:2, 25:19,	43:5	49:9, 49:13, 49:15,	
26:24, 27:5, 29:8,	unlike [1] - 50:20	49:19, 49:23, 50:5,	
29:17, 36:9, 38:23,	unrealistic [2] - 36:6, 36:12	50:10, 50:11, 50:12,	
39:13, 44:13, 45:13,	unusual [1] - 19:5	50:14, 50:15, 50:17,	
45:24	unusuar [1] - 19.5 up [15] - 8:17, 9:6,	50:18, 50:22, 50:23,	
two-party [2] - 44:13,	9:15, 13:25, 15:2,	51:19, 51:22, 52:12,	
45:24	16:7, 18:25, 25:6,	53:12, 53:21, 56:17,	
two-way [1] - 19:22	27:14, 31:11, 38:18,	56:22	
TX [1] - 22:7	46:9, 47:5, 47:14,	Water [13] - 3:2,	
txvnm141@ca8	57:25	3:13, 5:25, 6:4, 6:17,	
uscourts.gov [1] - 9:13	useful [4] - 28:5,	6:19, 7:2, 22:24, 23:6,	
	31:3, 33:14, 43:25	23:18, 26:3, 27:10, 48:3	
type [3] - 12:22,	users [2] - 24:18,		
1 13:11 43:10		waters [1] - 53:18	
13:11, 43:19 types (1) - 13:7	50:18		
types [1] - 13:7	50:18 uses [1] - 47:13	website [2] - 9:7, 9:8	
		week [1] - 14:15	
types [1] - 13:7 typo [1] - 19:17	uses [1] - 47:13	week [1] - 14:15 weeks [2] - 29:8,	
types [1] - 13:7	uses [1] - 47:13 Utility [4] - 3:2, 5:25,	week [1] - 14:15 weeks [2] - 29:8, 37:11	
types [1] - 13:7 typo [1] - 19:17	uses [1] - 47:13 Utility [4] - 3:2, 5:25, 6:4, 27:10	week [1] - 14:15 weeks [2] - 29:8, 37:11 weigh [1] - 14:4	
types [1] - 13:7 typo [1] - 19:17	uses [1] - 47:13 Utility [4] - 3:2, 5:25, 6:4, 27:10 utilized [1] - 54:3	week [1] - 14:15 weeks [2] - 29:8, 37:11 weigh [1] - 14:4 well-established [3]	
types [1] - 13:7 typo [1] - 19:17	uses [1] - 47:13 Utility [4] - 3:2, 5:25, 6:4, 27:10 utilized [1] - 54:3 Utton [2] - 3:21, 7:14 UTTON [2] - 3:21,	week [1] - 14:15 weeks [2] - 29:8, 37:11 weigh [1] - 14:4	ine, CSR