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## PROCEEDINGS

(December 14, 2018)

JUDGE MELLOY: This is Judge Melloy. We're here this morning on a status conference. Let's maybe just start and I'll run through the list of parties. If you could tell me who is on the line for each of you, I'd appreciate it.

For the State of Texas?
MR. SOMACH: Yes, Your Honor. This is Stuart Somach and with me is Francis Goldsberry, Theresa Barfield, Robert Hoffman and I believe also on the telephone is Priscilla Hubenak from the Texas Attorney General's Office.

MS. HUBENAK: That's correct, Stuart. I'm on the line.

JUDGE MELLOY: Thank you. For New

Mexico?

MR. RAEL: Good morning, Your Honor.
This is Marcus Rael on behalf of the State of New Mexico. With me I have Deputy Attorney General Tonia Maestas as well as David Roman, Lisa Thompson and Michael Kopp.

JUDGE MELLOY: And for the State of

Colorado?

MR. WALLACE: Good morning, Your Honor.
Shannon N. Benter-Moine, CSR

This is Chad Wallace for Colorado. JUDGE MELLOY: For the United States? MR. DUBOIS: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Jim Dubois and also on the phone are Stephen MacFarlane from the Department of Justice, Judy Coleman from the Department of Justice and Shelly Randel from the Solicitor's Office. JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. Albuquerque Water Utility Authority? Anyone on for them? MR. STEIN: Mr. Brockmann will not be joining today, Your Honor.

JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. What about the City of El Paso?

MR. CAROOM: Good morning, Your Honor. Doug Caroom and Susan Maxwell for the City of El Paso.

JUDGE MELLOY: City of Las Cruces?
MR. STEIN: This is Jay Stein for the City of Las Cruces, Your Honor.

JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. El Paso Water Improvement District No. 1?

MS. O'BRIEN: Good morning, Your Honor.
Maria O'Brien on the telephone for El Paso County Water Improvement District No. 1. JUDGE MELLOY: And Elephant Butte

Irrigation District?
MS. BARNCASTLE: Good morning, Your
Honor. This is Samantha Barncastle for Elephant Butte Irrigation District.

JUDGE MELLOY: Hudspeth County
Conservation District?

MS. TREJO: This is Deborah Trejo
stepping in for Drew Miller for the Hudspeth County Conservation and Reclamation District No. 1 . JUDGE MELLOY: I'm sorry. What was your last name?

MS. TREJO: Trejo, T-R-E-J-O.
JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Thank you.
New Mexico Pecan Growers?
MS. DAVIDSON: Good morning, Your Honor.
This is Tessa Davidson for New Mexico Pecan Growers.

JUDGE MELLOY: Anyone on for New Mexico
State University?
MR. UTTON: Yes, Your Honor. Good morning. This is John Utton. JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. And then State of Kansas?

MR. CLARK: Yes. Good morning, Your
Honor. This is Bryan Clark in the Kansas Attorney

General's office for the State of Kansas.
JUDGE MELLOY: All right. And is there anyone else on that $I$ have missed? (No response.)

JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Thank you. I don't think we have a lot to talk about this morning, but if the parties have something they want to bring up, certainly we can discuss it.

I would as a preliminary matter ask one question. I'm trying to think -- I think it was your office, Mr. Somach, sent an email a few days ago to a very lengthy list indicating that some people may not have received notice of the date, time and call-in number for this hearing. Do you know anything about that or why? Are there people who aren't on the service list? Do you know anything about that?

MR. SOMACH: Yes. We had a meeting and I believe -- and Mr. Dubois can correct me, but we had understood that -- some people had inquired of us as to whether or not we had received notice of -- It wasn't notice of the meeting. I think everybody knew that there was going to be a status conference. The question became whether or not everybody had gotten the call-in information. We Shannon N. Benter-Moine, CSR-
provided the call-in information and at the same time $I$ believe my paralegal here sent out a note to the full list just to make sure that everybody had the call-in information. I believe that's what that was about, just making sure everybody had the call-in number information.

JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. Well, the call-in
information remains the same from hearing to hearing, but we can send a notice out in the future to make sure that everybody knows what that telephone number is.

Then $I$ guess let me just talk about dates for a minute. When $I$ put out the amended scheduling order a few weeks ago, I sort of just adopted what you had suggested and I didn't realize you had put -- I guess I realized it, but it just didn't register about the December 24 th date. Are you okay with that date or do you want some adjustment? I guess that mainly affects you, Mr. Somach.

MR. SOMACH: And the United States. We did put that date out. We were aware of the fact that the 24 th was Christmas Eve. I think we'd like to stick with that date. I mean, that's what we're working on. We're certainly going to get, quite frankly, work done before the 24 th. That was the
reason, in fact, that we did inquire of your chambers as to what you wanted to do or what was the appropriate way to handle in terms of the format of the briefing because it would have created a problem if we had to move through a printer to put it in supreme court form, in that booklet form. That's how that came up. That would have created a problem, but because the response was we could put that in the normal and ordinary format that we could do here ourselves, then that resolved that problem and so at least the state of Texas is comfortable with that date. We did talk to the United States earlier this week and that was one of the issues we talked about because we were aware of your inquiry on that. Again, the United States can speak for itself on that. JUDGE MELLOY: Does the United States feel any differently? (No response.)

JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. Hearing nothing, then, we'll just stay with that date.

MR. DUBOIS: I'm sorry, Your Honor. I was on mute to make sure that $I$ didn't say anything. We're fine with that date. The alternative, Your Honor, unfortunately, means that Shannon N. Benter-Moine, CSR
either way you're sort of sandwiching around the Christmas holiday and we in picking that date determined that it was probably more sensible to get it done before rather than straddle it.

MR. RAEL: Your Honor, this is Marcus Rael on behalf of the State of New Mexico. We're also fine with keeping the Christmas Eve date. However, we think it makes sense and we would appreciate -- because we're basically going to be losing a week around the Christmas and New Years holiday, we would appreciate moving the January $23 r d$ date back 10 days and then maybe moving the February 7 th date back 10 days if Your Honor would be willing to do so.

JUDGE MELLOY: Well, let's hold that thought for a moment. What $I$ want to talk about is a date for the hearing and then we'll move back from there as to what's a realistic time frame. Let me just look here for a moment. I need some time to read the motions, get ready. When we were talking about the reply briefs due on February 7th, I was looking either at the week of February 19th for a hearing. This would be an in-person hearing and I would anticipate we'd do it in Denver again unless there's any objection to that. I'm pretty
committed the next two weeks after that, the week of February 26 th and the first week of March, the week of March 4th. I could do it the week of March 12th or -- well, actually, I could do it in any time in March after that. How do those dates look? Do people have their schedules available? How do those dates look to you? Let me just say this too. If we adopt Mr. Rael's suggestion, we're almost certainly then into those March dates.

MR. SOMACH: This is Stuart Somach, Your Honor. You know, you can expect, I guess, from me that $I$ prefer the dates not moving at all. Like I've said every conference we've had, this constant delay creates all kinds of problems particularly with respect to the question of what issues have been decided or not and so that what we've -- the reason we filed the early motions or the reason why we recommend moving in this direction was to get this issue resolved as early as possible in discovery. From the State of Texas' prospective we'd like to keep the schedule as it is. After all, all the parties had agreed to that schedule initially when it was proposed to you. We're fine with the February $19 t h$ date because presumably after you've read the briefs and heard the oral
arguments and had the additional time you'll want to take, getting a determination from you one way or another as early as possible is helpful. Anything else just drags these critical issues on and further complicates discovery. Our preference here is to go with February $19 t h$ and keep the existing schedule.

JUDGE MELLOY: How does that week -either the 19th or some other date during that week -- I'm pretty open that week. How does that work for everybody else?

MR. DUBOIS: This is Jim Dubois for the United States. The week of the $19 t h$ or the week of the 11 th both work for the United States.

MR. WALLACE: Your Honor, this is Chad Wallace for Colorado. Either of those weeks will work as long as the hearing is in Denver. I would not be able to travel the week of the 19th.

JUDGE MELLOY: Well, is anybody proposing it be anywhere else? We could certainly have it here in Iowa, but I presume it's much more convenient for everybody if we do it in Denver. As I've indicated in the past and as I've talked with the clerk of the Supreme Court, there's no -- I'm willing to go to Denver for these hearings. The
trial will almost certainly be here, however. For these hearings we're going to have a couple or three times a year and $I$ don't mind going to Denver and that's fine with the Supreme Court as well. Does anybody have a problem with the week of February 19th?

MS. BARNCASTLE: This is Samantha
Barncastle. I don't know who I cut off. I recognize that I'm amici and $I$ may be towing the line a bit, but I may have some issues that I'm asking the court to consider at this next hearing and I'm still determining whether or not that will be necessary, but $I$ will be unavailable completely on February 21st and 22nd. Otherwise, I'm completely free the two weeks that are on the table.

MS. O'BRIEN: Special Master, this is Maria O'Brien for EP No. 1. I have some similar constraints and just wanted to clarify. People are articulating the week of February 19th? JUDGE MELLOY: It should be the 18th actually.

MS. O'BRIEN: Okay. Thank you. I just wanted to be clear that we weren't skipping the Monday. That week we'll have similar constraints Shannon N. Benter-Moine, CSR
to Ms. Barncastle. EP No. 1 does plan on participating relativity actively in this briefing. Anything we would want to address with the Court I would be available the $18 t h$ and the $19 t h$ of that week.

JUDGE MELLOY: But not the 20th?

MS. O'BRIEN: The 20th is possible, but difficult and definitely not -- the 20th, 21st and 22nd are relatively difficult. I have some pending out-of-state travel that is scheduled around many other counsel's schedules as well.

JUDGE MELLOY: And let me say $I$ would anticipate that when we do get together in Denver that the hearing would not necessarily be limited to the motions. That would certainly be the lion's share of the time I expect we will spend. If there are other matters -- scheduling or whatever they might be -- certainly that would be a time we could take those up as well.

MS. TREJO: Your Honor, this is Deborah
Trejo. I just wanted to point out that it's President's Day February 18th. I think that's a federal holiday. I just wanted to point that out to the extent that that might impact anything . JUDGE MELLOY: Right. Let's do this.

I'm going to schedule it for the $19 t h$ and I'm going to leave the dates as they are. Probably the only people who really are affected by the federal holiday are federal employees and I certainly don't mind traveling on the 18 th and getting out there the evening before and hopefully the United States parties won't either. Let's just plan on the 19th. All right? That's February 19th. Any questions about that?
(No response.)
JUDGE MELLOY: We'll plan to start at
9:00. I do need to -- the only caveat is $I$ do need to make sure that's not the 10 th Circuit's court week and that they'd be using all their courtrooms or that we can find another courtroom, but subject to courthouse availability we'll do it on the 19th of February.

All right. Let's talk for a minute about Kansas' participation. I received the pleadings or the notice or whatever we want to call it from the State of Kansas. I guess I'm having a little trouble understanding exactly where -- It's Mr. Clark, isn't it, that's on the phone? MR. CLARK: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE MELLOY: Tell me where you're
coming from in terms of your participation in this case.

MR. CLARK: Sure. Our interest in the case is pretty limited to legal issues dealing with interstate compact, interpretation of them and basically the legal issues that we briefed as an amicus to the U.S. Supreme Court when the case was there on exceptions. I don't want to necessarily limit us to a particular issue or particular set of issues, but just sort of generally speaking that's our interest in the case. That's sort of where we are coming from. We don't have an interest like maybe some of the other amici do in participating in discovery or sitting in on depositions or having access to the Veritext Vault, but we do still have an interest in the legal issues that we'd like to monitor and review the motions, for example, when they are filed on December 24 th and decide whether those sets of legal issues that are raised are something that we want to weigh in on or we have an interest in. I do suspect that those motions that are filed on the 24 th will touch on the issues that we are interested in because it deals with some of the issues that we briefed to the U.S. Supreme Court when the case was there on exception s. We'd
like to reserve the right or the ability to file briefs on those issues that are of interest to us, but don't foresee getting involved in any deeper or more involved way like, for example, what the case management plan envisions for amici generally.

JUDGE MELLOY: Well, I guess I'm having a little trouble understanding how you can meaningfully brief a case if you don't have access to the documents that may form the basis for the briefing.

MR. CLARK: I think that the issues that we are interested in will mostly deal with interpretation of the compact. It may deal with some historical facts that were fleshed out in the Special Master's first report. In terms of getting into the details of what will be fleshed out in discovery, $I$ don't anticipate that we would be getting involved in that. Obviously as the briefs are filed if that changes, then we would have to decide whether we wanted to become more involved at that point and then cross that bridge when we come to it or just hold our -- keep our powder dry for a later time. At this point -- for example, when we filed the brief with the U.S. Supreme Court, we didn't have access to discovery or anything like
that. What we briefed pretty much was just sort of general well-accepted facts of hydrology basically and then interstate compact law and didn't get into the weeds of what -- and I don't anticipate that being the case even now that discovery is underway. Again, maybe that will change depending on what's filed, but that's just sort of our sense of it as we sit here right now.

JUDGE MELLOY: Well, I think the issue becomes either you're in or you're out. If you're in, then you get served with all the pleadings and the other parties have that obligation to keep you advised, you're given notice of everything that happens. I don't know. I'm having a little trouble with the idea that you're sort of in, but sort of out.

MR. CLARK: Sure. I definitely
understand that. Maybe a better way of framing what our interest is or how we envision being a participant is sort of how amici participate, for example, at the federal circuit level, at the U.S. Supreme Court level. Typically -- at least in my experience in filing amicus briefs in those courts -- the briefs are limited to legal issues that don't require what's made available in
discovery and the factual development in the record. That's sort of how we envision it. I mean, I guess if you're -- we're trying to find a way of how exactly Kansas fits into the mix since we don't envision being as involved as some of the other amici are. If Your Honor would be open to allowing Kansas to file an amicus brief without being formally labeled an amici as defined in the case management plan, $I$ think maybe we would be open to that. For example, I guess maybe what I'm thinking is, you know, we have been an amicus in support of Texas. When the briefs come in on the 24th, Texas can send us the brief and we can decide whether we are interested in those issues and whether we want to file a brief and then we can decide to weigh in at that point. That would be sort of a less formal role. We'd have to figure out exactly how that would work. That's sort of what we're envisioning.

JUDGE MELLOY: Well, here's what I was envisioning. Either Kansas is in for all purposes as an amicus or you're out. If you're out, then you would not be served or there would be no obligation to serve you as an amici. That wouldn't preclude you from monitoring the case, consulting
with Texas or any of the other parties with whom you may be aligned. I mean, you can monitor the case just like anybody else can by just looking at the docket. If at some point you feel like you want to be heard on an issue, just file a motion at that time and ask to be allowed to submit a brief. I guess I don't think it's fair to the other parties to be -- to have the same rights, but without any of the obligations. I'm not inclined to allow you to continue as an amicus with all the rights that everybody else has if you're not willing to take on the responsibilities and burdens that they have as well.

MR. CLARK: Sure. That makes perfect sense to me and we're not interested in having -to be honest with you -- all the rights and opportunities to participate that the other amici do want. That does make sense to me. What you've proposed sounds like it would take care of our interests and still allow us to be involved if we wanted to in terms of requesting permission to file a brief with the issues that arise or are of interest to us. One question $I$ have just as I think about how this would play out is if we are out and we see the briefs come in on December 24 th,
then what would the deadline be for an amicus brief that we might file if we're out and when would you want to receive -- what would be the timing of a motion and then the filing of the brief?

JUDGE MELLOY: Well, $I$ think the brief would have to be filed by the deadline set in the briefing schedule, which is January 23rd, and what I would want would be if you want to file something to get it on file with -- I'd like the motion and brief to be filed together and then we'd allow whether or not it's going to be docketed.

MR. CLARK: Okay. So this is just a for
example. I don't know that Kansas would get
involved at this point, but just since we have
these hard dates in front of us, the January $23 r d$ response deadline, if we were to decide we didn't want to file a brief, we could file the motion requesting permission to file it, attach the brief and file both of those on January $23 r d ?$ JUDGE MELLOY: Yes. MR. CLARK: Okay. JUDGE MELLOY: At least that's my thought on it. Let me ask if any of the other parties have any problems with that or if they have any other thoughts?

MR. SOMACH: This is Stuart Somach for the State of Texas. We have no problem with that. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We have no problem with that, Your Honor.

JUDGE MELLOY: So unless anybody wants to be heard, we'll go ahead on that basis.

Let me circle back to one issue I wanted to mention. Mr. Somach's office had sent that request about clarification concerning filing with the Supreme Court. Does anybody have any question about that? We might as well make sure we're all on the same page. I did check with the clerk just to confirm my understanding. Until a report is filed or somebody wants the Supreme Court to do something -- which I'm not exactly sure at this point what that would be before a report is filed -- but to the extent you did, the Supreme Court does not want any of those filings that are made in this case. So until we ask the Supreme Court to do something or a report is filed, we don't file anything with the Supreme Court. Is there any question about that?

MR. DUBOIS: Your Honor, this is Jim
Dubois. I think part of Mr. Somach's question was just the format issue and $I$ was going to -- for
what it's worth -- observe that in the other cases that I've been in that until there is something being filed with the Supreme Court that the standard federal court format for papers has been used before the Special Master on other cases, so what you've suggested at this point is consistent with at least what the United States has seen in these kinds of cases.

JUDGE MELLOY: Yes. I hope I was clear in the email that it will be filed in the standard 8 1/2 x 11, these motions and anything else, until they actually get to the Supreme Court. They were clear that if for some reason a filing in the Supreme Court needs to be referred back to something that's been filed with me that they will have that available. They will have it available in a couple ways. Obviously they can look at the docket just like everybody else can and see what's been filed. Plus, $I$ don't know if you're aware of this or not, but the Supreme Court has directed that we keep a paper copy of everything. At some appropriate time -- maybe at the end of the case, maybe earlier -- we'll be sending bankers boxes full of documents, I'm sure, to the Supreme Court. We have to keep a paper record of everything that's
filed. They will have access to everything. Any questions about that?
(No response.)
JUDGE MELLOY: I had a question about an email I received a couple days ago with a Veritext invitation to register for Veritext. I'm not planning to do that at this time. If at some point we set up a separate file or folder as we've talked about previously for documents that $I$ may need access to, I presume $I$ can get access at that time. Given the Supreme Court's requirement that they want to see just about everything in paper form, I'm assuming that unless it's extremely voluminous that most everything is going to have to be filed with paper copies attached.

I think that pretty well covers the things $I$ wanted to talk about. Any issues with discovery or anything that the parties need to bring up at this point?
(No response.) JUDGE MELLOY: Hearing none, we'll adjourn, then, and I'll see everybody in Denver on February 19th. If something else comes up in the meantime, be sure to let me know and we can set up a phone conference if we have to. All right?
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| 15:11scheduling [2] - | South [1] - 2:16 <br> SPEAKER[1]-23:3 | $23: 19,23: 21,24:$ | 7:7, 7:12, 15:20 <br> trial [1] - 14:1 | wants [2]-23:5, $23: 14$ |
|  |  | 24:12, 24:14, 24:20, | trouble [3] - 16:22 | Washington [2] - |
| 9:13, 15:17 | SPEAKER [1] - 23:3 <br> speaking [1] - 17:10 | 24:24, 25:11 | 18:7, 19:15 | 2:23, 3:4 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { SE }_{[1]}-1: 14 \\ \text { seal }[1]-26: 17 \\ \text { see }[4]-21: 25, \\ 24: 18,25: 12,25: 22 \end{gathered}$ | SPECIAL [1] - 1:13 <br> Special [3]-14:17, | SUPREME ${ }_{[1]}-1: 5$ | Trout [1]-2:8 | Water [4]-3:15, 6:8 |
|  |  | SUSAN [1] - 3:7 | true [1]-26:12 | 6:20, 6:24 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18:15, 24:5 } \\ & \text { spend }[1]-15: 16 \end{aligned}$ | suspect [1] - 17:21 | trying [2]-8:10, 20:3 | $\begin{gathered} \text { weeds }[1]-19: 4 \\ \text { week }[18]-10: 13, \\ \text { 11:10, 11:22, 12:1, } \end{gathered}$ |
| $24: 18,25: 12,25: 22$ |  |  | two [2]-12:1, 14:15 typically [1]-19:22 |  |
| sending [1] - 24:23 <br> sense [4]-11:8, | standard [2]-24:4, | T |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24:10 } \\ & \text { start }[2]-5: 5,16: 11 \\ & \text { STATE }[3]-1: 7,1: 9, \\ & 1: 10 \end{aligned}$ |  | U | 12:2, 12:3, 13:8, |
| sent[3]-8:11, 9:2, |  | T-R-E-J-O ${ }_{[1]}-7: 12$ table [1] - 14:16 | U.S [8]-2:15, 2:18, | $14: 5,14: 20,14: 2$ $15: 5,16: 14$ |
| 23:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1:10 } \\ & \text { state }[1]-15: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\operatorname{TANIA}_{[1]}-2: 3$ | 2:20, 3:2, 17:7, 17:24, |  |
| separate [1]-25:8 | State [21]-1:18 | TELECONFERENC$E_{[1]}-1: 13$ | $18: 24,19: 21$ | weeks [4]-9:14, 12:1, 13:16, 14:15 |
| serve [1] - 20:24 | 1:22, 2:2, 2:5, 2:8, |  | unavailable [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { weigh [2] - 17:20, } \\ & \text { 20:16 } \end{aligned}$ |
| served [2]-19:11, | 2:12, 3:23, 4:2, 5:8, | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \mathrm{E}_{[1]}-1: 13 \\ \text { teleconference }[1] \end{array}$ | 14:13 ${ }^{\text {under }[1]-26: 1}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20:23 } \\ & \text { service }[1]-8: 16 \\ & \text { set }[5]-17: 9,22: 6, \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 26:10 } \\ & \text { telephone }[3]-5: 12, \end{aligned}$ |  | well-accepted ${ }^{[1]}$ - |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 19,5: 23,7: 19,7: 22, \\ & 8: 1,10: 11,11: 6, \end{aligned}$ |  | understood [1] | 19:2 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 12: 20,16: 21,23: 2 \text {, } \\ & 26: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6:23, 9:11 } \\ & \text { terms [4] - 10:3, } \end{aligned}$ | 8:20 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WHEREOF }{ }_{[1]}^{-} \\ & \text {26:17 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{array}{\|c} 25: 8,25: 24,26: 17 \\ \text { sets }[1]-17: 19 \end{array}$ |  | $17: 1,18: 15,21: 21$ | underway [1] - 19:5 unfortunately [1] - |  |
| sets [1] - 17:19 <br> SEVENTH [1] - 1:14 | States [13]-2:15, |  |  | willing [3] - 11:14 |
| Shannon [3]-4:5, | $2: 18,2: 20,3: 2,6: 2,$ | Terrace [1] - 2:16 <br> TESSA $[1]-3: 18$ | $10: 25$ | 13:25, 21:12 <br> WITNESS [1] - 26:17 <br> worth [1]-24:1 |
| 26:8, 26:19 | $10: 17,13: 13,13: 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tessa }_{[1]}-7: 16 \\ & \text { TEXAS }_{[1]}-1: 7 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| share [1] - 15:16 | 16:6, 24:7 |  | UNITED [2] - 1:5, |  |
| SHELLY [1]-2:22 | STATES ${ }_{[2]}-1: 5$, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Texas [12] - 1:18, } \\ & \text { 1:22, 1:24, 3:8, 3:22, } \\ & 5: 8,5: 13,10: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1:13 } \\ & \text { United [13]-2:15, } \\ & \text { 2:18, 2:20, } 3: 2,6: 2 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Shelly ${ }_{[1]}$ - 6:7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1:13 } \\ & \text { status }[2]-5: 4,8: 23 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Shorthand [2]-26:9, |  |  |  |  |
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