		_
	NO. 141 Original	
	In The	
	SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES	
	STATE OF TEXAS	
	v.	
	STATE OF NEW MEXICO and	
	STATE OF COLORADO	
HFARING REF	TRANSCRIPT OF MARCH 17, 2021, REMOTE FORE HONORABLE MICHAEL A. MELLOY, SPECIAL	
	TED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE, 111 SEVENTH	
	CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA 52401, beginning at	
11:00 a.m.	elbin idn ibb, iomi obiot, beginning de	

1 2	REMOTE APPEARANCES
3	FOR THE STATE OF TEXAS:
4	Mr. Stuart L. Somach Ms. Theresa C. Barfield
5	Mr. Robert B. Hoffman Mr. Francis Goldsberry II
6	SOMACH SIMMONS & DUNN 500 Capitol Mall, Suite 1000
7	Sacramento, California 95814 (916) 446-7979
8	ssomach@somachlaw.com tbarfield@somachlaw.com
9	rhoffman@somachlaw.com mgoldsberry@somachlaw.com
10	-and-
11	Ms. Sarah A. Klahn
10	SOMACH SIMMONS & DUNN
12	2701 Lawrence Street, Suite 113
	Denver, Colorado 80205
13	(720) 279-7868
	sklahn@somachlaw.com
14	
	-and-
15	<del>3.13.</del>
	Ms. Priscilla M. Hubenak
16	
10	STATE OF TEXAS ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE
	Post Office Box 12548
17	Austin, Texas 78711
	(512) 463-2012
18	priscilla.hubenak@oag.texas.gov
19	
	FOR THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO:
20	
	Mr. Jeffrey Wechsler
21	MONTGOMERY & ANDREWS
	325 Paseo De Peralta
2.2	
22	Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501
	(505) 986-2637
23	jwechsler@montand.com
24	-and-
25	

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

```
1
     FOR THE UNITED STATES:
 2
         Mr. James J. Dubois
         Mr. R. Lee Leininger
 3
         U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
         999 18th Street, Suite 370
 4
         Denver, Colorado 80202
         (303) 844-1375
 5
         james.dubois@usdoj.gov
         lee.leininger@usdoj.gov
 6
         -and-
 7
         Ms. Shelly Randel
 8
         U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
         1849 C Street NW
 9
         Washington, DC 20240
         (202) 208-5432
10
         shelly.randel@sol.doi.gov
11
         -and-
12
         Mr. Christopher B. Rich
         U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
13
         125 South State Street, Suite 6201
         Salt Lake City, Utah 84138
14
         (801) 524-5677
15
     FOR THE EL PASO COUNTY WATER AND IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT
16
    NO. 1:
17
         Ms. Maria O'Brien
         MODRALL SPERLING ROEHL HARRIS & SISK, P.A.
18
         500 Fourth Street N.W.
         Albuquerque, New Mexico 87103
19
         (505) 848-1800
         mobrien@modrall.com
20
         -and-
21
         Mr. Renea Hicks
22
         LAW OFFICE OF MAX RENEA HICKS
         Post Office Box 303187
23
         Austin, Texas 78703
         (512) 480-8231
24
         rhicks@renea-hicks.com
25
```

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

```
1
     FOR THE NEW MEXICO PECAN GROWERS:
 2
         Ms. Tessa T. Davidson
         DAVIDSON LAW FIRM, LLC
 3
         4206 Corrales Road
         Post Office Box 2240
 4
         Corrales, New Mexico 87048
         (505) 792-3636
 5
         ttd@tessadavidson.com
 6
     FOR THE NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY:
 7
         Mr. John W. Utton
         UTTON & KERY, P.A.
 8
         Post Office Box 2386
 9
         Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504
         (505) 699-1445
10
         john@uttonkery.com
11
     FOR THE SOUTHERN RIO GRANDE DIVERSIFIED CROP FARMERS
12
     ASSOCIATION:
13
         Mr. A.J. Olsen
         HENNIGHAUSEN OLSEN & MCREA
14
         604 North Richardson Avenue
         Roswell, New Mexico 88202
15
         (575) 624-2463
         ajolsen@h2olawyers.com
16
17
     COURT REPORTER:
18
         Ms. Heather L. Garza
         WORLDWIDE COURT REPORTERS
19
         3000 Weslayan Street, Suite 235
         Houston, Texas 77027
2.0
         (800) 745-1101
         heather_garza@ymail.com
21
22
23
24
25
```

1 JUDGE MELLOY: This, of course, is in 2 Supreme Court Original No. 141, State of Texas versus 3 State of New Mexico and State of Colorado, and let's 4 start by having the parties enter their appearance. 5 Mr. Somach, who's on for the State of 6 Texas? 7 MR. SOMACH: Yes, Your Honor. This is 8 Stuart Somach, counsel of record for the State of 9 With me from Somach Simmons & Dunn are Theresa 10 Barfield, Sarah Klahn, Francis Goldsberry, and Robert 11 Hoffman. From the Texas Attorney General's Office, 12 Priscilla Hubenak, and the engineer advisor for the 13 State of Texas, Suzy Valentine. 14 JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Mr. Wechsler, 15 who's on for New Mexico? 16 MR. WECHSLER: Good morning, Your Honor. 17 Jeff Wechsler for the State of New Mexico. We have 18 Cholla Khoury and Zachary Ogaz from the New Mexico Attorney General's Office; Susan Barela from Robles 19 20 Rael & Anaya; Lisa Thompson and Michael Kopp from 21 Trout Raley; John Draper from Draper & Draper. We 22 also have, I believe, state engineer John D'Antonio, 23 Greg Ridgley, the general counsel for the Office of 2.4 the State Engineer, Arianne Singer, the general 25 counsel for the Interstate Stream Commission, Shelly

1 Dalrymple also from the Interstate Stream Commission, 2 and one of our experts, Greg Sullivan. 3 JUDGE MELLOY: Thank you. Mr. Wallace, 4 are you on? 5 MR. WALLACE: Yes, good morning, Your 6 This is Chad Wallace for the State of Honor. 7 Colorado. Also with us today is Preston Hartman, also 8 from the Attorney General's Office. 9 JUDGE MELLOY: All right. 10 Mr. Dubois, are you on for the United States? 11 MR. DUBOIS: I am, Your Honor. Good 12 morning. Also on the line are, I believe, Lee 13 Leininger is getting on, and Shelly Randel and Chris 14 Rich from the Solicitor's Office are on the line, and 15 also a couple of our paralegals since the scheduling 16 is going to affect their lives for the next few 17 months. 18 JUDGE MELLOY: Do we have any new folks 19 from the SG's Office with the change in administration 20 or is that pretty much the same? 21 MR. DUBOIS: It should -- at this point, 22 it is still the same. It's still Fred Liu and 23 obviously the name at the top changes, but functionally, nothing has changed. 2.4 25 JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Albuquerque

1	Water Utility Authority, who do we have on for them?
2	MR. BROCKMANN: This is Jim Brockmann,
3	Your Honor, on, on behalf of the Albuquerque
4	Bernalillo Water Utility Authority.
5	JUDGE MELLOY: And City of El Paso?
6	Anyone on? I see Mr. Caroom, I believe, is on the
7	call.
8	MR. CAROOM: Sorry.
9	JUDGE MELLOY: Are you there,
10	Mr. Caroom?
11	MR. CAROOM: Yes, I am.
12	JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. Anybody else for
13	the City of El Paso?
14	MR. CAROOM: Susan Maxwell.
15	JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. City of Las
16	Cruces?
17	MR. STEIN: Good morning, Your Honor.
18	This is Jay Stein for the City of Las Cruces.
19	JUDGE MELLOY: El Paso County Water
20	Improvement District No. 1?
21	MR. HICKS: Your Honor, this is Renea
22	Hicks. I'm subbing for Maria O'Brien for the District
23	today. She's off communing with falcons and mountain
24	lions. She's joining by phone, for a while.
25	And, Heather, the phone number for your

1	reference point if you need it is (505) 280-8745.
2	That's the number for her.
3	And then, also, joining for the District
4	is Dr. Blair, the district engineer.
5	JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. Then we have
6	Elephant Butte Irrigation District? Ms. Barncastle,
7	are you on?
8	MS. BARNCASTLE: Yes, good morning, Your
9	Honor. Samantha Barncastle for the Elephant Butte
10	Irrigation District, and I am flying solo today.
11	JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Thank you.
12	Hudspeth County Conservation and Reclamation District
13	No. 1? Anybody on for Hudspeth County?
14	(No response.)
15	JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. New Mexico Pecan
16	Growers?
17	MS. DAVIDSON: Good morning, Your Honor.
18	Tessa Davidson on behalf of New Mexico Pecan Growers.
19	JUDGE MELLOY: Anybody on for New Mexico
20	State University?
21	MR. UTTON: Yes, Your Honor. Good
22	morning. This is John Utton on behalf of NMSU, and
23	also joining me is Scott Eschenbrenner from the
24	University President's Office.
25	JUDGE MELLOY: Okay. Southern Rio

1 Grande Diversified Crop Grower's Association, anyone 2 on for them? 3 MR. OLSEN: Good morning, Your Honor. A.J. Olsen on behalf of the crop growers. 4 5 JUDGE MELLOY: Anybody on that I didn't 6 get an appearance from? 7 MR. WECHSLER: Your Honor, this is Jeff 8 I inadvertently missed Marcus Rael, our 9 counsel of record. Apologize. He's also here with 10 us, as well. 11 JUDGE MELLOY: Thank you. All right. We're here today to talk about future scheduling in 12 13 this date and hopefully set a trial date and -- but 14 before we start with that, let me just ask 15 Mr. Wechsler and Mr. Somach, I guess, primarily, 16 although anybody else is free to jump in, any -- any 17 progress on the mediation? I've deliberately avoided 18 talking to the mediator. I've had no contact with 19 him, other than he copied -- copied me on a letter, I 20 think, back in December, some time before Christmas 21 anyway, where he set up sort of a preliminary schedule 22 of meetings, but I -- I haven't heard from anybody about the mediation. Is it still ongoing? Any 23 2.4 progress? Obviously I don't want to get into the 25 specifics, but just some idea of -- of where you might

1 be on that issue. Mr. Wechsler? Do you want to 2 speak? 3 Yes, Your Honor. MR. WECHSLER: 4 happy to. The mediation is ongoing. I think all of 5 the parties are participating in good faith, and those 6 conversations continue. I don't know how to assess 7 the likelihood of reaching an agreement right now. 8 don't know that progress has been as -- as rapid as we 9 would have liked, but nonetheless, probably the -- the 10 talks are continuing, and we remain cautiously 11 optimistic. 12 JUDGE MELLOY: Do you have any mediation 13 sessions scheduled or is it still -- or is at this 14 point, is the mediator, one of us talking to each of 15 the parties individually and conveying ideas back and 16 forth? 17 The latter, Your Honor. MR. WECHSLER: 18 We don't have a specific group mediation session 19 currently on the schedule that -- that I can think of, 20 but the mediator has been in contact as recently as, I 21 believe, last week, continuing to suggest settlement 22 proposals and -- and conveying ideas back and forth. 23 JUDGE MELLOY: Mr. Somach or anybody 2.4 else want to add anything to that?

MR. SOMACH: No. I think Mr. Wechsler

25

probably did a good job of covering where we're at.

He may be a little more optimistic than we are that -that it'll -- we'll reach a satisfactory conclusion.

It's -- I would suggest that it's kind of limping
along at this point in time, and -- but we're
certainly going to continue to engage as long as we
feel that there is any opportunity to -- to -- to
resolve this short of -- of a litigated resolution,
but I -- I -- I don't know that I'm overly optimistic
that that will be the result.

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

JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Well, that leads us obviously then into the question of setting a trial date. I've given this a fair amount of -- of thought and -- well, let me say this. A couple things about a trial. I would suggest that I agree with -with the request of the parties that it be in person as opposed to Zoom, with this caveat, as I think within the judiciary generally, there's been a lot of discussion over the past several months about the pros and cons of Zoom trials, Zoom hearings. We've done all of our oral arguments circa by Zoom, and while we're anxious to get back to in-person arguments, I'm not sure that there isn't some thought that we may never a hundred percent go back to the way it was before. So just -- which just leads me up to -- to

the suggestion is do the parties believe or have they given any consideration to the possibility that it would be somewhat of a hybrid scenario, that there would be witnesses that we would definitely want to have in the courtroom with all -- with the attorneys present who want to be present and who have a right to question, as -- whereas there may be other witnesses where they are such a nature that we could -- you could -- you could handle the examination from your offices or your homes, and we wouldn't have to bring everybody together in one location. I -- I don't know that it has to be an either/or anymore. And, of course, I also will be talking as we get closer to trial that there may be witnesses we can bring in by deposition. Hopefully there will be some that we can either take evidentiary depositions or use existing discovery depositions in lieu of live testimony. So to me, it -- I'm looking at this as not a one-size-fits-all for the whole trial, and this is something that will probably evolve as we get closer to the trial date. But -- but anyway, I just want to throw that out as a suggestion that -- that there may be time when we will be looking at doing Zoom trials -- trial days as opposed to in person.

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

Let me start with Mr. Somach. Have you

given any thought -- I assume you've given some -- to how many witnesses you may have and how long it's going to take to present your case?

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. SOMACH: Yes, we have. And, in fact, we're in the process now of trying to -- to figure that out. There are a lot of, you know, different factors there. We know how many witnesses we have total. We don't know, and we're trying to cull down the list to see how many we actually need to testify with respect to direct testimony. It may be that some of the witnesses might be more appropriate if -- if the Court allows rebuttal testimony, as rebuttal witnesses if -- if necessary, and that was one of the -- the questions I -- I was curious about as we move forward today is how the Court feels about a rebuttal testimony. But on this question of Zoom versus in person, I actually have -- I must admit, I -- we haven't talked internally about a hybrid situation. We -- and I have not done a Zoom trial. I've done lots of -- lots is a, you know, relative term, but I've done hearings, but -- but in terms of a trial, I haven't done one. I have sat in on several legal education webinars on Zoom trials, one that, in fact, was put on by the District Court at Washington about experiences they've had. If we decide to either

go fully or partially, one of the things I noted that they talk about greatly was the need to develop a whole set of procedures by which those -- that Zoom trial or portions of a Zoom trial would be conducted. So that would be one thing, I think, that the parties would -- would need to get together, see if we could pull together a -- and there are materials out there. I mean, the district court in Washington certainly has a whole developed list of procedures, as I assume do other districts within the -- the country. But it did seem to me that if we go all or part, that would be a important step to sit down and try to -- to work through procedures. I don't think we're inherently opposed to that at all. I just -- we haven't talked In fact, I hadn't even thought about it in that context until you raised it here. A little bit depends on how or when you -- when you decide to -- to hold the trial, because some of that will require some advance planning in order to figure out how best to -to mix the -- the live witnesses with -- with the Zoom or video witnesses. So that's -- that's an overly long answer to probably haven't really thought about it. I do know that if we're going to do any part of it as a Zoom, we'll need to talk about the procedures and work on those, and that'll take a little bit of

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

1 advanced time. But based upon the experience I had 2 with the other parties putting together the joint 3 status conference statement, I'm optimistic that we 4 can work together to put those procedures together. 5 JUDGE MELLOY: Have you thought about how long your presentation is going to take? 6 7 MR. SOMACH: I have thought about it. 8 We have talked about whether or not there ought to be 9 time limits, and I've thought about it in that In other words, if each side were allocated 10 context. 11 time, we were looking at 100 to 125 hours as an 12 appropriate time period. That would include not just 13 the time that -- that we would put on our direct case, 14 but it would also include any cross-examination we did 15 of the New Mexico case or -- or any other parties that 16 put on a case. So I've thought about it in that 17 context, and so we were thinking 100, 125 hours, you 18 know, at the outside, 150 if we add 25 hours for 19 rebuttal testimony, but that was the neighborhood that 20 we were -- we were looking at. So I've thought about 21 it definitely in that context that that would be 22 sufficient to -- to put on our case, cross-examine, 23 with some additional hours if allowed for rebuttal 24 testimony. 25 JUDGE MELLOY: Well -- all right.

me -- I guess, let me ask Mr. Wechsler: What are your thoughts on both whether it be hybrid or all in person and the amount of time that would reasonably be required?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. WECHSLER: Yeah. Thank you, Your We certainly understand in a trial as complex Honor. and large as this one, that flexibility is important. That's been our experience in other cases, and so we're certainly willing to consider a hybrid model, whatever other procedures would help make for as efficient a trial as possible. I will say I have had the opportunity to conduct three different evidentiary hearings or trials at this point. One was two-and-a-half weeks long, so it wasn't insignificant, and, you know, they're doable. They're, in my experience, not as effective, but I do agree with Mr. Somach that the parties would be quite capable of getting together and developing a set of procedures. I expect we'd reach agreement on most or, if not all of the proceeding -- the procedures we would simply bring those and dispute it to you the same way we did in this joint status report. As to the amount of time, we've looked at our witness list. We think the total number of witnesses we're likely to call is between 30 and 35 at this point. Again, my experience

1 is the closer you get to trial, and sometimes in 2 trial, you often find that certain witnesses that you 3 thought were necessary can be cut back, but that's our 4 thinking right now. We thought the total amount of 5 trial time based on, again, experience in other 6 original actions was likely to be somewhere between 50 7 and 60 days. Texas, and I don't know the United 8 States' position on the number of hours that it had 9 proposed a certain number of hours. We didn't have a 10 chance to fully discuss that. We're willing to talk 11 about the idea of being on a clock. Again, I had the 12 opportunity to do that in a trial. It can be 13 effective. One thing I would point out for that, 14 though, is New Mexico, as a defendant addressing 15 issues from two different plaintiffs, should 16 essentially be given an equal amount of time as the --17 the two plaintiffs collectively, and then on the --18 the possibility of rebuttal, we certainly recognize 19 that that possibility is out there. I think the 20 standard -- the normal standard is it's only for those 21 things which could not be reasonably anticipated, 22 which hard to imagine today what those would be, but obviously that's because that's the definition. 23 24 **JUDGE MELLOY:** When you say 30, 35 25 witnesses, do you feel that any of those could

reasonably be submitted by way of evidentiary deposition as opposed to live testimony?

MR. WECHSLER: I think they could, Your Honor. And if I may inquire, when you're talking about an evidentiary deposition, you're talking about a -- not the discovery depositions that have already been taken?

pudge Melloy: Well, I'm -- it could be either. There may be -- I'm thinking primarily of -- of the parties taking a deposition directed specifically for use of trial, but there may be witnesses who the parties feel were significantly examined in a discovery deposition that the discovery deposition could double as an evidentiary deposition. It could be either/or, but I'm thinking more that you would take a deposition in advance of trial just to limit the amount of time and the expense of bringing -- maybe expense of bringing the witness to -- to a trial.

MR. WECHSLER: Yes, Your Honor. I do
think that some of the witnesses could be done by
either existing or an evidently deposition. Again, my
experience with doing that, is that it's most
effective I think for the judge and for our
presentation if we set out a procedure for doing those

deposition designations, obviously there will be cross designations, as well, and then we actually provide those to you in -- in a particular order. And by that, I say that because oftentimes, you know, a certain witness matters in a certain context, right, and so we're hoping that you'll understand things in a particular order, and so, again, in the cases where I have had experience doing that, what we did was present those two days in advance of when we thought that it would make sense for the -- the judge to read. So that's more detail than maybe you were looking for, but, yes, the answer is I do think some of those witnesses could be done by deposition designation. JUDGE MELLOY: And certainly, I would anticipate in setting out a -- a trial order in this case that -- that there would be specific provisions

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

anticipate in setting out a -- a trial order in this case that -- that there would be specific provisions dealing with the designation and cross designation of exhibits. I've been looking at some form trial orders here in addition to what you've submitted and so I would anticipate I'll be putting something together that'll probably blend several different concepts. United States have anything to say about this, Mr. Dubois?

MR. DUBOIS: Sorry about that, Your Honor. My Internet is a little slow in moving my

cursor around. Not -- not really much to add. I think that the -- the idea of some of the -- of setting up some depositions to -- to preserve that testimony in far more of a -- sort of a cross-examine mode than -- than a simple discovery mode makes certain the trial will be useful. As far as Zoom and trial, I don't see any reason a hybrid can't work. a matter of fact, given sort of the scatter of -- of parties in Texas and New Mexico, it might be that having the trial -- the live portions available on -on Zoom may save an awful lot of the smaller parties a lot of money in travel and lodgings and so that may be -- that may be something that is -- is helpful for the -- the sweep of interested parties that are -- that are involved as amici in this case, as well. JUDGE MELLOY: Well, that sort of leads into one issue I wanted to talk about. It would be nice to talk about it right now. I guess before I do that, does Colorado have anything they want to add to this, Mr. Wallace? MR. WALLACE: Yes, thank you, Your

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. WALLACE: Yes, thank you, Your

Honor. We -- we have thought about remote versus

in-person trials, and -- and have, in fact, thought of
some sort of hybrid procedure as -- as being optimal
at this stage since we really don't know what our

situation is going to be, and we're looking at a complex and lengthy trial as a whole. So we agree that the parties, along with Your Honor, should work out procedures for either remote or hybrid proceedings. So that -- that seems like a good idea to us. We still have a lot of logistics that are up in the air, so we'll need to sort of call that situation as we get closer to the trial date.

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: Let me -- let me turn to the amici. If we assume that the amici will have a very limited role, if any, in the -- the actual examination of witnesses, and I know that the two water districts want a role, but putting that aside for a minute, assuming that their role is -- is, as I say, very limited, do the amici anticipate that they would actually physically come to the trial? And -and let me just say this before I -- you answer that I would anticipate, in spite of what you've question. requested, that the trial will be -- will be here in Cedar Rapids. We have the facilities. If I try to move it to Denver, we would have to get district court, courtroom, at least. We have the facilities. We have the capability here. The Supreme Court has asked that it be done here, and so that's my anticipation at this time. I'm not adverse to maybe

doing some of the hearings in Denver if we need to do some pretrial hearings, but the trial itself, I think is going to have to be here. But having said that, in talking to the IT folks here and the court, they would certainly have the capability if a particular amici -or amicus, I guess, if you're one, does not want to physically be here for the entire trial or for any of the trial for that matter, to observe the trial from their office. We could -- we have the capability of -- of, in essence, broadcasting the trial live, so that a person could sit at their office in some remote location and -- and be here and observe the trial, and, in fact, I'm not sure even using the special proceedings courtroom, which is as big as any courtroom you're going to find any place, that we can have much more than the principal parties in that If -- if we're going to have a number of courtroom. amici here who want to be physically present, we may have to use an overflow courtroom or they're going to be either sitting in a gallery, or we're going to be using an overflow courtroom, probably an overflow courtroom, which we would have the capability of doing here in Cedar Rapids, and having the trial broadcast to that courtroom. And it would seem to me that if that's going to be the situation, you might be doing

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

it from your office in Santa Fe or Albuquerque or

Denver or -- or wherever you might be located. But
having said that, do any amici want to speak to this
issue? Ms. Barncastle?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. BARNCASTLE: Yes, Your Honor. This is Samantha Barncastle for the Elephant Butte Irrigation District, and I appreciate your comments. They're very much along the lines of what I had anticipated for at least my participation, that I initially would only be seeking to observe hopefully from my office without the need to travel. I have still a very high-risk baby that I -- even though I have been vaccinated, I can still get my child sick after being in courtrooms or airports or what have you, but my instructions from my client are if my client is called into court in Denver, Cedar Rapids, or Hong Kong for that matter, I go with them. at the point in time, my experts or clients are going to be called up for testimony, if it's in person, I will be there in person, even if I'm asked to sit in the hall and wait. That being said, I do also anticipate that there will be large portions of the trial that I will want to physically be there in person for. As a limited example, and there are lots of examples, and I -- I don't intend to pick on New

1 Mexico, but this is the easiest example, and that is 2 when New Mexico starts presenting any of their 3 evidence related to the operating agreement, certainly 4 that affects EBID, and we will want to be there. 5 Whether we have an opportunity to participate or not, 6 there's a lot that goes on behind the scenes that we 7 will need to help and -- and participate with. initially like I said, I -- it would be my hope that I 8 9 could do the most of my work from my desk in Las 10 Cruces, New Mexico without ever leaving the comfort of 11 my office, but I don't anticipate that that will be 12 the case for the entire trial. 13 JUDGE MELLOY: Well, and I also would --14 I guess I should have added this further caveat that I 15 -- I would anticipate that most of the amici would 16 want to be physically present if their clients were 17 testifying. I assume you're not the only person that 18 -- that if -- if somebody from the El Paso -- City of 19 El Paso is called to testify, I assume Mr. Caroom is 20 going to want to be here or his client will want to be 21 here so -- but anybody else want to speak to this? 22 Does anybody feel that they would want to be here 23 physically for the whole trial?

MR. STEIN: Your Honor, this is Jay
Stein. We will be attending the trial when our

24

25

witness will be appearing as a state witness. Lee Wilson is testifying. I do want to make a comment on the Zoom trial process. I participated in a two-week Zoom trial in December on a -- a Compact compliance issue on the Pecos. We found that there were two problems that arose. You can do it. But there are technical glitches that occasionally intervene, and one persistent problem that we've encountered is the transcriptions contain more inaudible passages than we would like. Those two issues, we found to be present in -- in a Zoom presentation, in a multi-party case trial.

MR. HICKS: Your Honor -- sorry.

JUDGE MELLOY: Go ahead.

MR. HICKS: I hate to interrupt. This is Renea Hicks for the El Paso Water Improvement
District No. 1. I'm confident that we will want, if not a full-time presence during the trial of some people from our district, nearly a full-time presence there. I think the Zoom availability, the live Zooming will allow us to let some people not have to travel there, at least for the full time, but I anticipate that we will want to be there the full time because, frankly, we're not just observers here.

We're intimately tied into what's going on in the

1 case. 2 JUDGE MELLOY: Anybody else who thinks 3 that they would want to be here for any substantial 4 periods of time, other than when one of their own 5 witnesses may be testifying or one of their own 6 employees? 7 MS. DAVIDSON: Your Honor, this is Tessa 8 My clients have indicated an interest to 9 attend in person full time during the trial. Some of 10 them are also witnesses and, of course, if they're 11 testifying in person, I would be there. This was all 12 before we knew what was going to happen with the COVID 13 situation. I'm sure people will be flexible, but as 14 far as I know, they had intended to participate as 15 much as possible in person, at least observing, Your 16 Honor. 17 JUDGE MELLOY: Well, do you feel that 18 observing by video is not as -- they would not find 19 that adequate? 20 MS. DAVIDSON: They may, Your Honor. 21 I'm sure if that was available, I'm sure some of them 22 would even appreciate the convenience. JUDGE MELLOY: Or after the first week 23 and they find out how boring it is? 24 25 MS. DAVIDSON: Possibly. Possibly.

JUDGE MELLOY: All right.

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. BROCKMANN: Your Honor, this is Jim Brockmann, and I would say on behalf of the Water Authority, it would primarily be some Zoom participation on the portions of trial that -- that are of interest to them where the issues that could affect the Water Authority would come up, and it is possible that -- that in specific areas or specific witnesses, they may want to attend in person, but I think it would be a fairly limited basis. As you pointed out, these trials, when you're actually in them, tend to -- to create for very long days, and nobody really likes to be away from home and in hotels that long. So I think our -- our actual participation in Cedar Rapids would be limited to specific issues of witnesses, and most of our participation otherwise would be by Zoom. If we are participating or watching by Zoom, I think it gives us an opportunity to -- to understand the direction of the testimony, and -- and I also do agree with Ms. Barncastle that -- that sometimes having a physical presence even to be able to talk with the other attorneys on breaks at nights, on lunch breaks, et cetera, can -- can be a way that we can participate through the State of New Mexico and make sure our concerns are known. Of course, it's

cheaper to do that through phones and e-mails if that's possible, but sometimes it is not as effective as -- on an issue that directly affects us.

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: Well, and the type of witness that you're talking about is your client. Ι -- you know, without knowing exactly what the testimony is, but I suspect that there may be what I would call fact witnesses who are going to be laying foundational testimony about just how the project operates, what -- what their city has done or what their water district has done that while there may be some cross-examination, isn't all that controversial. It's more, you know, this is the foundational information we need for the experts to take off on, and it's those kind of witnesses that I was thinking we could either maybe do by evidentiary depositions to avoid using up too much trial time or by some type of Zoom presentation. Now, maybe -- maybe, as Mr. Stein indicates, there's just too many technical glitches with -- with Zoom trials, but I like to at least think that there might be some alternatives to having, you know, 20 lawyers sitting in a courtroom on a given day.

MR. BROCKMANN: Well, and as we've done in the past, Your Honor, I think we'll do our best to

work through New Mexico and with New Mexico on -- on issues so that we -- I think we -- we've -- so far, the amici participation has been pretty reasonable in this matter. I -- we've -- we've written our briefs when we've had those opportunities. We haven't gotten in the way of scheduling issues, and I anticipate that that would be the -- the case, also, at trial.

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

Your Honor, this is John MR. UTTON: I just wanted to echo some of the comments of the other amici. I think there are several client witnesses that are on the witness list. I don't know that they're going to be called, but if they are, I would want to be present. But I think otherwise, the opportunity to attend by Zoom is much more efficient. I was also in a two-day trial with Mr. Stein back in December. I actually found that despite the transcript glitch, overall to be quite efficient, probably more efficient than an in-person -- in-person trial. So I think I agree with Ms. Barncastle and others and their description of how we might want to participate. Thank you.

JUDGE MELLOY: This is a minor procedural point, but -- but just so I don't forget it, do you -- do you anticipate -- this is probably for the main parties -- that you're going to want

daily copy of a transcript? And if so, we're going to have to probably have you -- rely upon you to provide the court reporters for 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

MR. SOMACH: Yes. I know that we well want dailies and we're more than happy to -- to arrange, along with the other parties, court reporters.

JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Well, let's talk about a trial date. Here's my thought. first still dealing with the COVID situation, and I'm just -- I'm reluctant to get everybody together for a full-blown trial before the end of the summer. I just -- I don't know what's going to happen with -- with COVID, but that's sort of the -- what I am looking at as a date. I also have been somewhat influenced by the number of objections to exhibits. They're obviously well into the thousands when you look at the multiple objections to just one exhibit, and if we're going to have that many evidentiary objections, I think we've got a lot of work to do before we even start the trial where those whatever number of hours we're going to use in the courtroom are going to be eaten up very quickly by just talking about foundation and all the other things that have been raised by the parties of the case. And what I am -- what I am

anticipating doing is setting a date at least 60 days before the trial, maybe even a little further, whereby the parties will be exchanging their exhibit lists and then requiring opposing counsel to indicate the nature and -- well, whether and to what -- what is the nature of any objections, so that we can maybe get as many of those resolved before the trial ever starts as we can. Some probably can't be, but particularly if we're talking about, you know, you didn't -- you didn't include the attestation page, which I don't really her an objection around here very often. But those kinds of objections, I would hope we could get worked out well in advance of trial, but I -- it just seems to me there's a lot of work to be done before we ever start at trial or the time spent at the trial is going to be consumed with -- with a lot of things that really aren't advancing the ball very -- very far down the field. So what I'm -- what I would suggest, and I'm going to throw this date out, is we start Monday, August 30th. That will give -- after the first week, there will be a three-day weekend then with Labor Day, but I thought about starting after Labor Day, but I don't want everybody to have to travel over Labor Day weekend to start the trial so do we have a short week. So anyway, I'm thinking of August 30th as the start of

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

a trial date, and I throw that out. Does anybody have a problem with that or think it's too soon or too far down the road?

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: It's -- I mean, we knew that August was the date that we were looking at. We've been looking at that date for a long time. little bit of that depends on the ability to travel, I I think I was thinking -- I'll just throw this I was thinking, actually, another month down. September would be a -- a better, you know, starting time. I realize that August 30th is essentially September. I figured that out. But, you know, some time deeper into September might be a better time to Things would clarify itself. I am worried about all this pre-trial stuff. We did -- we took a look at August, September, October, November. We took a look at some of the dates that we were -- that we had put in the joint status conference statement that you've got in front of you, and we worked backwards from those dates, and August moves us into, you know, we -- we will need to start moving through some of those issues as early as the end of April, beginning of May, and we thought, given the fact that we didn't know when the trial was going to start, some of that stuff is in various stages of moving forward and

getting ready. So having a little bit of extra time, and here, I'm not talking about, you know, six months. I'm really talking about two weeks to -- to a month back from that August 30th date. But if we -- if -- if you want August 30th, we certainly will be ready. But I was looking -- I was just counting backwards from -- from the beginning of trial and looking at when things would -- would otherwise have to be due and thought that it was going to be pretty ambitious if we start in -- in August.

2.4

strong objection to moving it back a couple weeks.

And, actually, I think, Mr. Somach, you've been kind of the one that's been pushing for an earlier date all along. I'm guessing -- I'll let Mr. Wechsler speak, but I assume he's probably not going to be too adverse to that either. What's your feeling, Mr. Wechsler?

MR. WECHSLER: Your Honor, we could be ready by August 30th. We could be ready by mid

September. Either one, we'll be ready. And the only thing I would add is the parties have begun the discussion about exhibits, so I'm hopeful that a lot of the efficiencies you're talking about will be taken care of, and I also very much support the process that you're talking about so that we can eliminate

unnecessary objections at trial.

2.4

JUDGE MELLOY: Well -- go ahead.

MR. SOMACH: Just simply, I am curious, we -- I think we understood that you were thinking about going two weeks on, two weeks off. I'm not certain if you're still thinking of doing that. And then the other question was I -- I don't know if you're planning five days a week or whether you have a day where you have to -- to hold off. So I -- I am kind of curious as we project out once the trial starts, what our day, what our weeks will look like, because I think, you know, we've got to plan the -- the time that it's going to take, and I'm just trying to figure out for planning purposes how long, once we start, you know, what that looks like.

point. I had at one point had said two weeks on, two weeks off. I think -- I think I'm more inclined to say two weeks on, one week off. I just think we're going to need, both from my perspective and yours, a week to -- to get -- gear up for the next two-week cycle. I probably would prefer a four-day court week, but I'm also cognizant of -- of the fact that you're spending time traveling, and once you get here, you'd just as soon use as much -- use as much time as

So I'm willing to go a five-day week or at possible. least try that initially and see how it goes. if you would prefer a four-day week, I'm certainly fine with that, but it means not having to travel probably on a weekend day. But -- but my -- my initial -- my initial thought is we do five days. Well, let's -- let's -- I'm trying to think here. Ιf we do -- you know, if -- if we -- if this turns out to be a ten-week trial, which is what I'm hearing is possible -- I hope we can do it in eight, but if it is ten, we'd be -- we could still finish it before the holidays. I think we want to try to be done by the 1st of December. So -- or shortly thereafter. looking at my calendar here. Let's plan on September 13th being the start of the trial, and we'll work back from there. Any objection to that from anyone? (No response.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JUDGE MELLOY: All right. And for the most part, I don't have a lot of -- of objections to your -- your -- the one thing I do probably will set an earlier date on will be the exchange of exhibit lists so we can start whittling down the number of objections and see what really is going to require evidentiary hearings, and, you know -- and I'm not averse to having some pretrial hearings, as well,

either -- excuse me -- if it's safe to do so by in person by, you know, mid August, or by Zoom if we have to, to try to even, you know, get the number of evidentiary objections resolved prior to trial. But -- but I'm going to go through the -- through the schedule here again, but I will be setting out some dates, and I'll be setting out some probably further requirements, particularly as it relates to exhibits, before -- within the next several days, and I'll get an order out. Do you think there's a necessity for trial briefs in this case, given all the pleadings that have been filed so far?

MR. SOMACH: I hadn't thought about that, but I -- I don't know what else I would -- I mean, I'm sure our trial brief would look a lot like many of the briefs that we've -- we've put together. I think only if it would aid the Court in some -- some way, as far as the Texas position. We're willing to do a trial brief. I don't know that we -- we think it is critical, again, given the -- the briefing that we've done and the responses to briefing that we've done, but, you know, we -- we certainly -- if you want one, we will put one together.

JUDGE MELLOY: Well, I think what I'm going to do in the order that's coming out in the next

few days is just leave that issue open for the time being. Not require one, but -- but -- and I'm sure there will be other issues that as we go along, we're going to be -- require some refinement, and I think that's one that will definitely be included in that category.

Let me ask about the issue of damages. In your proposed stipulation, you indicate that remedies and the amount of damages will be held for a separate proceeding. What is your thought -- I guess I'll start with you, Mr. Somach, since you're the plaintiff. What are you going to do about damages? Are you just going to -- are we just going to assume damages if there's a violation? Do you -- are you going to prove up the years without going into the specifics? What -- what -- what's your thought?

MR. SOMACH: Well, we intended to put on evidence -- number one, I -- I think that there is an aspect of -- of this case that says if there's a violation of the Compact, that's injury, and that's sufficient, but we weren't going to stop there. The reason why we separated putting a dollar number and push that into the remedy phase and preserve the ability to put on testimony with respect to damages was to -- in addition, to just simply relying upon the

-- the idea that we -- the Compact was violated, go one step further and put on evidence with respect to the effect that the Compact violation has had on But we were going to stop short and not put dollar numbers on that until we got to the trial on -on remedies, and the reason we decided to do it that way, in large part, revolved around some of your earlier orders, and the way you addressed some of the motions noting that, among other things, damages might be effected by equitable considerations, and we thought that those also would effect the remedy and so that addressing actual dollar amounts would be more appropriate in tandem with -- with the remedies. do think it's a good idea to separate out remedies simply because getting an idea of what the liability looks like will assist us in trying to move forward with proposing various remedial actions to address those liabilities.

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: All right. Mr. Wechsler, do you have any thoughts on that?

MR. WECHSLER: I would only add, I think the most recent case that separated those out was the Montana versus Wyoming case. It was fairly effective to be establishing liability and then saving remedies for a separate proceeding. From -- from our view, the

1 remedies phase -- I should say the liability phase 2 includes liability and defenses, and then you move to 3 remedies where we're talking about is there 4 declaratory relief, is there injunctive relief, and 5 then from a damages perspective, it's multiple fold. 6 Money and water are the first decision point, you 7 know, so if New Mexico is successful, we're likely to 8 want damages in water. We think that that's most 9 effective for our citizens, and once you're talking 10 about that, then you're also talking about things like 11 the amount, timing, and procedure for -- for that 12 water. That's how we view the remedies phase. 13 JUDGE MELLOY: And what's the United 14 States' position, if any? 15 MR. SOMACH: Jim, you're muted. 16 MR. DUBOIS: Sorry. I was un-muted 17 before, and I forgot I put it back on. Apologize. 18 We're not seeking monetary damages, and we're looking 19 only at prospective relief, so I think that it -- it 20 probably makes the most sense to figure out if there 21 is a violation in liability and then -- then deal with 22 what any prospective relief looks like later. So I --23 I don't see that there's any utility for us in -- in 24 trying to fold in prospective relief and how you 25 manage the system until you find out if there's a

violation.

JUDGE MELLOY: And, Mr. Wallace, as I understand it, Colorado is not asking for any affirmative relief; you're more in this as a making sure nothing is done that it would affect your existing rights. Am I correct in understanding where you are in this case?

MR. WALLACE: That's essentially correct, Your Honor. We're here to defends Colorado's rights and -- and make sure that -- that any remedy or liability finding is consistent with what the Compact provides. We have no objection to how the other parties have proposed at trial.

you this, going back to the trial date for a moment. Obviously, the parties at this point don't know what the ruling on the summary judgment is going to be.

I'm not a hundred percent certain I've totally decided it yet, so it's -- it's going to take some more study and hopefully get something out in the next several weeks, but does either -- does anybody think there's a -- any chance that they would try to go to the Supreme Court on the summary judgment order? Mr. Wallace, you're probably not the person who's the best to speak to that, but since you're up on the screen, go ahead.

1 MR. WALLACE: All I can really say, Your 2 Honor, is we're going to wait and see what your order 3 says and then determine whether we believe that 4 materially impacts our reading of the Compact. I 5 realize we have no water at stake, but our -- our 6 analysis would really only go to methods of Compact 7 interpretation. 8 Okay. All right. JUDGE MELLOY: 9 Mr. Somach or Mr. Wechsler, either of you want to 10 speak to that? 11 Well, it really does depend MR. SOMACH: 12 upon the nature and extent of -- of whatever rulings 13 you may make. I certainly can envision a desire not 14 to go to trial if a significant issue becomes a 15 dispositive motion is out of the case, and we're 16 precluded from litigating the issue. So I -- you 17 know, we've thought about it and I just don't know the 18 answer and I won't know the answer until I see exactly 19 what -- how you'll address and deal with the issues 20 that are in play in those dispositive motions. 21 JUDGE MELLOY: I suppose that your 22 response, Mr. Wechsler, will be similar, you've got to 23 see the ruling? 24 MR. WECHSLER: It is, Your Honor. The 25 only thing that I would add is I believe the Court

including in the order of reference leaves the timing of interim reports to you and so I think in the first instance, if we felt like that was necessary, we would obviously be appealing to you to send up a report.

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: Well, you know, and then, you know, that is one glitch that could obviously impact the whole schedule if -- if -- if the ruling is such that one side or the other feels it's significantly dispositive that they want to get the Supreme Court's view on it before we go further. thing I noticed in your proposed order, you're not -you're not asking for the exclusion of witnesses. Is that -- am I -- sequestration of witnesses. Is that my understanding that parties -- witnesses will be able to observe the trial, even before they testify? MR. WECHSLER: Yes, your Honor. That's the impact of Paragraph 2.3.

MR. SOMACH: I do have a question related to that. We agree that they're not to be excluded, but earlier, there was a discussion of possible rebuttal testimony, and I think Mr. Wechsler indicated that he thought that the rule was you could do rebuttal testimony if you could not reasonably anticipate what it is that you're rebutting. This goes to -- to some of our trial planning and so I'd

like to ask this question. You know, we will put on our case first. Mr. Wechsler's case is both an affirmative and a defensive case. In his affirmative case, among other things, they've developed a lot of modeling and other information. I had anticipated allowing him to move forward with the introduction of that modeling and other information and then address it in terms of a rebuttal testimony. Otherwise, if I have to rebut in my direct testimony, I actually have to bear the burden of explaining what hasn't been explained yet by New Mexico. And so for trial planning purposes, and we're certainly moving forward pretty rapidly to needing to do that on a very specific basis, I had assumed that we would first hear from New Mexico on all of their modeling and technical information and then we would put on, if appropriate, rebuttal testimony to that, even though, of course, we've deposed all these folks, and it's -- it's -- we anticipate they're going to put on this testimony, but to have the burden of first explaining what they haven't put on yet and then rebutting what they haven't put on yet is, I think, inappropriate, but I wanted to make sure so that as we plan, we can plan appropriately for our trial presentation.

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

What's your position

JUDGE MELLOY:

about that, Mr. Wechsler?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think, Your Honor, the MR. WECHSLER: procedure that occurs in federal district courts throughout the country is that regardless of what the issues are and who's putting on a model, the plaintiff puts on its case, including all of the opinions from the experts that they are aware of, including those that might be responsive so that ultimately first creates the most efficient trial presentation, and secondly, it may very well be that there are issues that their witnesses are raising. They already know what our experts' opinions are, and -- and as the defending, we're entitled to then hear those and address them. As to this idea that our model is only for defensive purposes, that's not correct. I mean, our -- our model was created. It allows us to evaluate all of the claims, including Plaintiff's claims, and it's not simply being put forward as some sort of support of our countering.

JUDGE MELLOY: Well, let me say this. For today's purposes, I would indicate that Texas or the United States for that matter would be allowed to present rebuttal testimony. I'm not -- I'm not prepared today, without -- as I said, I think this is going to be part of what we're going to be talking

1 about over the summer, exactly how that is going --2 what the scope of that is going to be, the parameters, 3 and -- and how it's actually going to come in, but I 4 would say I certainly can see where, particularly 5 given the extent and number of counterclaims that New Mexico has, that at least part of the response to the 6 7 counterclaim would -- would come in through rebuttal. 8 And I don't know that Texas or the United States 9 should be expected to anticipate every one of the 10 defenses or anticipate exactly how the case comes in 11 from New Mexico's perspective, particularly on the 12 counterclaims. So some rebuttal will be allowed. T'm 13 not sure how much. And as I said, I think that's one 14 of the issues we'll be working through over the summer 15 as we get ready for trial. 16 Is there anything else we need to talk

Is there anything else we need to talk about today? What I would --

MR. HICKS: Your Honor.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JUDGE MELLOY: Go ahead.

MR. HICKS: Renea Hicks for El Paso

District. This goes to the question about our limited participation, as we had requested in the March 15th letter. We understand that you may be deferring making the decision about that, but we just want to re-urge that and think it's important. It worked well

with only the most minor stats during the deposition process to do that. Nothing ever got to you, rose to the level of getting to you, and, of course, we'd all, I'm sure, be on better behavior when we're in front of you. So I don't anticipate that being disruptive at all, and it seems consistent with the way EBID and the El Paso County Water Improvement District have been treated during the preceding phases with the case.

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: Well, again, without making a final dispositive ruling on that issue, my current thinking is that participation by any of the amici will be very limited, if at all, and that it would only be with -- with leave of the Court. in other words, if it turns out there's a specific witness that one of the amici -- I wouldn't limit it to just the two water districts -- feel that they need to question that witness and that whatever presentation is being made by Texas or New Mexico or the United States does not adequately cover their ground, they're going to have to seek permission to do that, and it'll probably be given fairly sparingly. But I'm not going to totally cut it off, but that's my -- that's my initial thought, if -- if this case is going to proceed on any kind of basis that's reasonably efficient and so -- and that's not to say,

though, that I will not -- I would -- I would anticipate that if -- I shouldn't say if. I assume there will be post-trial briefs filed, and I would -- I would anticipate allowing the amici some -- some role in that process, that they would, just as we did on the motion for summary judgment, that they would be allowed to at least be heard on post-trial briefing and so they'll have a participation of that respect.

MR. HICKS: Thank you. The leave of Court thing sounds -- sounds good to us. I hope it's not too sparing, but anyway, that sounds like a workable prospect. Thank you.

JUDGE MELLOY: Anything else?

MS. BARNCASTLE: Your Honor, this is

Samantha Barncastle for the Elephant Butte Irrigation

District. I just want to point out that, like I said

previously, I don't anticipate a large need for

participation by EBID, but I can see a situation where

even the presentation by the United States, Texas, or

New Mexico doesn't quite line up with what the

District's view is, and when I say "District's," I am

actually speaking for both districts here because we

run the project. We run the water. And we have a

very different way of presenting the -- the picture,

if you will, of how that happens. And so not just

necessarily questioning of witnesses, but potentially summarizing for you, through a closing argument or otherwise, what our view of the evidence is that -that would impact you in a different way than maybe what the parties are saying. So I appreciate that the Court is leaving the opportunity open to request leave of the Court to participate, because the fact of the matter is, this case is taking to trial another case in which EBID is a defendant, and that's the 2011 operating agreement case in federal district court, and you are going to hear all the exact same evidence that would be presented in that case, only the districts will not be allowed to present evidence of our own. And so that's going to become incredibly important at various points in time in trial. appreciate, like I said, the opportunity being left on the table. We certainly will use it sparingly, if at all, but we -- we want to make sure you understand that the reason we have such a different view is because sometimes none of the parties speak for us. JUDGE MELLOY: I understand that, and that's why I said I would anticipate the amici would be given a role in post-trial briefing, and you said closing arguments. I'm -- I'm anticipating that there

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

will not be much, if any, oral closing arguments, that

the closing arguments will be through written submissions, and amici will have an opportunity to submit something, just as they did on the summary judgment motion.

MR. WALLACE: Your Honor, this is Chad
Wallace. I was wondering if you wanted to resolve at
this time a disputed part of the case management
statement, which is Colorado's participation at trial?

JUDGE MELLOY: Well, let me -- let me
hear the -- let me hear the position. What -- let me

hear your position, Mr. Wallace.

MR. WALLACE: Well, it's essentially the one that -- that is outlined in the exceptions portion of the statement. Colorado believes it's a party and will be bound by the ruling, which ruling could be rather far reaching in interpretation of how the Compact apportions water among the three states, and because of that, we feel we're entitled to present a case through argument and through witnesses. As Colorado has maintained throughout this proceeding, our -- our interest is in maintaining the standards of juris prudence on Compact interpretation and ensuring that the particular interpretation of the Rio Grande Compact is not adverse to Colorado's interest. None

of the other parties, the states or the United States,

1 represents our interest in that, and as a sovereign 2 state, we are the only entity able to represent 3 Colorado's interest. We anticipate our case would be 4 very limited in protecting those interests, so 5 certainly would not need the same amount of time as 6 the other parties. 7 JUDGE MELLOY: Do you anticipate being 8 here full time for the trial? 9 MR. WALLACE: At this point, we do. 10 may be that we would attend remotely if Your Honor 11 extends that privilege to certain portions of the 12 trial. I think certainly Phase 2, the liability -- or 13 the damages phase, we'd be more likely to attend 14 remotely. We'll certainly start out attending in 15 person, and may, in fact, have either myself or 16 Mr. Hartman in the courtroom for the duration. 17 JUDGE MELLOY: Do you anticipate 18 presenting witnesses? 19 We have thought about that MR. WALLACE: 20 Our witness list would be very small, and 21 right now, I -- I'm thinking a handful of witnesses 22 with, at most, a week trial time, if the situation 23 presents itself. 24 JUDGE MELLOY: What kind of witnesses 25 would you be presenting?

1 MR. WALLACE: Our witnesses, we filed no 2 expert disclosures, so they'd be limited to factual 3 witnesses regarding Colorado's Compact administration 4 and participation in the Rio Grande Compact 5 Commission. 6 JUDGE MELLOY: Are -- is there any real 7 dispute about most of that? Is that the kind of thing 8 that could be submitted by deposition? 9 MR. WALLACE: I think that's something 10 that we could discuss with the other parties to see if 11 we could agree to do it that way. I think our real 12 position has been laid out most extensively in our 13 response brief to the motions for summary judgment, 14 and that really defines our current interest in the 15 case, what we're trying to defend. 16 JUDGE MELLOY: Mr. Somach, I understand 17 you're the one who's objecting to Colorado 18 participating in the trial. What's your view on this? 19 MR. SOMACH: Yes. It -- it's pretty 20 There are no claims against Colorado. 21 Colorado hasn't made any claims. They haven't filed 22 an answer. They haven't filed a complaint. I was surprised to hear they have a handful of witnesses. 23 24 Their Rule 26 disclosure only included two witnesses.

In this entire time, most of what Colorado has

25

1 provided is opinions as to, in this way, you know, 2 legal opinions as to how the Compact should be 3 interpreted. I haven't heard anything that 4 Mr. Wallace said that -- that moved into the ability 5 to actually put on a case, and that's really what we 6 were objecting to because we have no idea what that 7 case might be, because there's -- there are no 8 boundaries on it, other than what he's briefed, but 9 he's already briefed it. He's already said it. 10 didn't object to some cross-examination with time 11 limits for -- for Colorado, so if someone says 12 something that needs to be probed, we certainly didn't 13 object to that, but -- but, you know, our objection is 14 no more complicated than what I just said. 15 JUDGE MELLOY: Have you deposed any of 16 Colorado's proposed witnesses? 17 MR. SOMACH: No. Because the two 18 witnesses that were disclosed, we -- we basically know 19 what they would testify to. It is stuff that -- that 20 is not in dispute, and -- and it could be handled 21 simply through a written document or through --22 through deposition-type testimony, but -- and we 23 certainly don't object to that. 24 JUDGE MELLOY: Well, it would seem that 25 a week -- even a week would be a lot of time for

Colorado to be presenting a case in which it has no claims, and -- and has not filed an answer. On the other hand, I'm reluctant to have -- to go -- go to the Supreme Court at the end of this case and say that one of the main parties was precluded from presenting any kind of a case. So I -- my initial feeling is that they are a named party and that they should be given some opportunity to present a case in a defense if they feel it's necessary, but that it's going to be very limited in what they're going to be presenting, and as much of it could come in by stipulation of depositions as possible so that we don't use up a lot of trial time on something that's not really in dispute. But I -- I guess I'm reluctant to say that a named party should be totally precluded from presenting any kind of case. What that case is going to look like is probably going to, again, evolve over the time as we get ready for trial, and I should just add one other thing, as we go forward with the case, both in terms of -- of evidentiary presentation and exhibits, it's -- it's my understanding from -- from cases that the Supreme Court has decided, as well as the guidance in the Special Master's Manual that my charge is to -- to the extent I err to err on the side of inclusion. The last thing we want to do is go 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

the Supreme Court at the end of this case and then have them bounce it back and say, Well, you should have let this evidence in, you should have let that evidence in. It's my -- it's my understanding that they would prefer to let it in, and if they decide it's not relevant or hearsay, it's whatever, shouldn't have been considered, they can look at it and decide how to deal with it. Now, that, you know, doesn't give a wholesale license to put in anything but the kitchen sink, but on the other hand, on close calls, it's my understanding the Supreme Court would rather have the evidence in than be excluded, particularly given the fact that is a non-jury proceeding, and, you know, I've done enough non-jury trials over my time, although not as many as recently, to know that things come in in non-jury trials that you'd probably never let in, in front of a jury, with the idea that at the end of the day, the trial judge can hopefully sort it But that's just sort of an observation to think out. about as we go 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

Anything else?

MR. HICKS: Your Honor, this is Renea

Hicks again. I'm belaboring the point, I guess.

While you are evaluating the -- what to allocate to

Colorado, I would just point out that the two project

1 districts have infinitely more interest and 2 involvement in this case than Colorado does. 3 interest pales in comparison to ours. I hope you 4 would take that into account when you're evaluating 5 the comparative --6 JUDGE MELLOY: I'm aware of your 7 position. 8 Your Honor, I have one MR. WECHSLER: 9 question, and that -- that is last week, Texas had 10 filed a list of documents which you had indicated you 11 were interested in hearing about, in the order leading 12 up to last week's argument. We have a list, as well, 13 but rather than simply respond and file that, we 14 thought we would inquire with you. Would it be 15 helpful for us to provide that list and the documents? 16 JUDGE MELLOY: Why don't you just -- if 17 you have it, why don't you just supply it for purposes 18 of completeness? I think -- I think between the written submissions and the oral arguments last week, 19 20 I have a pretty good idea of what each party's 21 position is, but if you want to have it in the record 22 just for purpose of completeness, I certainly am 23 willing to take a look at it, Mr. Wechsler. 2.4 Thank you. MR. WECHSLER: 25 MS. BARNCASTLE: Your Honor, I just have

one last quick question, and I apologize.

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

JUDGE MELLOY: Oh, no, that's fine.

MS. BARNCASTLE: Samantha Barncastle for EBID. Just so that I can update my client, and I'm sure other amici are interested, as well. Is it the Court's view that you are going to provide Zoom or some other web-based platform for us to participate or observe, I should say, from afar? Can we go ahead and let our clients know that that is anticipated?

JUDGE MELLOY: Yes.

MS. BARNCASTLE: Thank you.

JUDGE MELLOY: That is -- that is my anticipation. And quite frankly, as I -- the reason -- one of the reasons I thought about this was if everybody were here in person, I'm not sure I could get everybody into one courtroom. And so if you're going to have to observe from a second courtroom, it really doesn't make a whole -- other than to have the opportunity to meet with counsel at breaks and over the lunch and maybe in the even, you could observe from your office just as easy as you could observe from another courtroom. So the only real advantage I could see of being here in person is the opportunity to meet in person with the attorneys from Texas or New Mexico or United States or whomever. So -- so, yes, I

just think it'd be much more efficient if we can -and I've been assured that technology can -- is
available and that it will -- we can make it work. As
Mr. Stein said, there are glitches, so -- so if
there's any change in that, I'll certainly let you
know, but -- but I've been assured that that -- that
technology is available, and we can do it.

2.4

MR. SOMACH: Yeah. And following up on that, I just -- because it will help because we'll start, now, logistically planning for a trial in mid September, September 13th, in Cedar Rapids, and my assumption is that we'll have the capability that if I don't bring every attorney working on the case to Cedar Rapids, that those attorneys will be able to participate remotely, and if something unanticipated happens, and one of those attorneys needs to question or be involved more directly, they'll have the technical ability to do so?

JUDGE MELLOY: You're starting to -- to test my technological, so I -- I don't know. That, I'm not -- we may have to set up a separate link if somebody wants to do that. My -- my thought was observe only was what I'd been talking to our people about. So if we want that additional capability, I'll have to do some checking on that.

MR. SOMACH: I -- it would be helpful to know because it would provide more flexibility for us, and the only reason for asking now as opposed to later is because we really do need to start logistically doing the things we need to do to be ready to -- to try the case there in -- in September. So it would be helpful to know that.

2.4

is maybe -- I -- I know the local folks are able to do the observe-only capability. Maybe if we want to go beyond that, we'll have to work with Worldwide Reporting to do some -- something similar to what we're doing right now. I don't know. And I assume if we have to do that, that the parties would be agreeable to that. And -- and, you know, I don't know to what extent you want to use the -- the Zoom functions of meeting rooms and -- and that type of thing, so we'll just have to talk about that. I'll have to talk to them, and we'll talk about technical aspects of it.

And -- and in that regard, let me ask this: If you would -- if -- if each of the principal parties, and to the extent, I guess amici want to, if you would just send us a notice of who the -- the court's people should talk to from a technical

standpoint. I -- I don't plan to be too involved in the technology and -- and maybe Mr. Somach and Mr. Wechsler and someone wants to be personally involved in that, too, but if you have some people who are your technical people that they can -- the technical people could talk to the technical people, that might be the most efficient way to handle it.

Let us -- let us know who would be sort of your point person on -- on those issues, and just let us know who those are with e-mail and phone numbers that I can have the people in the clerk's office who are handling the technology talk -- talk to your folks.

2.4

MR. SOMACH: We'll provide you that information.

MS. BARNCASTLE: And, Your Honor, for the parties' sake and for your sake, I should note that EBID anticipated that there would be some amount of financial expenditure necessary for a Zoom trial or even a hybrid Zoom trial, and EBID is willing to share in that cost, particularly if it means I don't have to travel to be at trial 100 percent of the time.

JUDGE MELLOY: Well, that's certainly my anticipation that you will not have to travel and be here a hundred percent of the time. It'll be up to you as to how often and how much you want to be here.

And I will be arranging, particularly for the principal parties, Texas, New Mexico -- United States I'm not so concerned about -- and Colorado secure locations where you can have -- store files, store materials, have rooms where you can adjourn to at breaks and over the lunch hour and so on. I presume the United States will just use the U.S. Attorney's Office. They got -- they got ample space there. But I'll make -- we have -- we have a new courthouse. We have lots of room. It's -- it's an underutilized courthouse, so we got lots of places we can put people.

2.4

MR. BROCKMANN: Your Honor, if I might ask one more question, just in terms of the -- the big picture timing. It sounds like your -- your ruling or your order would come out, I think you said in the next few days setting up these deadlines.

JUDGE MELLOY: No -- oh, the deadlines.

I thought you were going to say summary judgment

order. In the next -- yes, within the next week.

MR. BROCKMANN: And then once that is set with a mid -September trial date, is there any anticipation, without trying to obviously pin you down on a timing, but is there any anticipation on when those rulings might be so that if there is an

adjustment to that trial schedule, when we might be -when that decision might be made, whether it's a
matter of weeks or months?

2.4

JUDGE MELLOY: Well, without being pinned down, we're now in mid March. Let me -- let me put it this way: My -- my goal is to have it out some time in May, hopefully earlier than later, but six to eight weeks is kind of what I'm hoping for.

MR. BROCKMANN: I appreciate that. It helps in terms of informing our clients what the -- what the schedule looks like and when decision points might be if there's a change in that. Thank you, Your Honor.

JUDGE MELLOY: All right. Anything else?

All right. And the other thing is, just one final thing, I don't know that there's necessarily a reason to have a status conference before the ruling on summary judgment. If anybody thinks one is important, let me know. I'd be happy to set one up. Otherwise, I anticipate that once the summary judgment motion gets out, and we're start -- starting to exchange exhibits and starting to get some idea of where the issues are on admissibility, that we will be going back to regular status conferences to try to

```
1
     iron -- to work through those issues. But I'm not
     going to set one at this time unless somebody thinks
 2
 3
     we need one.
 4
                    All right. If nothing else, then thank
 5
     you, everyone. We'll be adjourned.
                    (The proceedings adjourned at 12:28
 6
 7
     p.m.)
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

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

25

800-745-1101

	l		l	l
A	advancing 33:17	50:22 51:2	anyway 11:21	60:13
<b>A.J</b> 6:13 11:4	advantage 58:22	58:5 60:23	14:21 33:25	assumed 45:14
<b>a.m</b> 1:14	adverse 23:25	amicus 24:6	49:11	assuming 23:14
ability 34:7	35:16 51:24	<b>amount</b> 13:13	apologize 11:9	assumption
39:24 54:4	advisor 7:12	18:3,22 19:4	41:17 58:1	59:12
59:18	<b>afar</b> 58:8	19:16 20:17	appealing 44:4	assured 59:2,6
able 29:21 44:15	<b>affect</b> 8:16 29:7	39:9 41:11	appearance 7:4	<b>attend</b> 28:9 29:9
52:2 59:14	42:5	52:5 61:17	11:6	31:14 52:10,13
60:9	affirmative 42:4	amounts 40:12	appearing 27:1	attending 26:25
account 57:4	45:3,3	<b>ample</b> 62:8	apportions	52:14
ACOSTA 5:13	<b>agree</b> 13:15	analysis 43:6	51:17	attestation
actions 19:6	18:16 23:2	<b>Anaya</b> 3:7 7:20	appreciate 25:7	33:10
40:17	29:20 31:19	<b>and-</b> 2:10,14,24	28:22 50:5,16	attorney 2:16
actual 23:11	44:19 53:11	3:5,11,15 4:6	63:9	3:17 7:11,19
29:14 40:12	agreeable 60:15	4:11,20	appropriate	8:8 59:13
add 12:24 17:18	agreement 12:7	ANDREWS	15:11 17:12	Attorney's 62:7
22:1,19 35:21	18:19 26:3	2:21	40:13 45:16	attorneys 14:5
40:21 43:25	50:10	answer 16:22	appropriately	29:22 58:24
55:19	ahead 27:14	21:12 23:17	45:24	59:14,16 65:12
added 26:14	36:2 42:25	43:18,18 53:22	<b>April</b> 34:22	<b>August</b> 33:20,25
addition 21:19	47:19 58:8	55:2	65:17	34:5,11,16,20
39:25	<b>aid</b> 38:17	anticipate 21:15	areas 29:8	35:4,5,10,19
additional 17:23	air 23:7	21:20 23:15,18	argument 50:2	38:2
59:24	airports 25:14	25:22 26:11,15	51:19 57:12	<b>Austin</b> 2:17 4:23
address 40:17	ajolsen@h2ol	27:23 31:6,24	arguments	5:14
43:19 45:7	6:15	44:24 45:19	13:21,22 50:24	Authority 5:6
46:14	Albuquerque	47:9,10 48:5	50:25 51:1	9:1,4 29:4,7
addressed 40:8	3:8 4:18 5:6	49:2,4,17	57:19	availability
addressing	8:25 9:3 25:1	50:22 52:3,7	Arianne 7:24	27:20
19:14 40:12	allocate 56:24	52:17 63:21	arose 27:6	available 22:10
adequate 28:19	allocated 17:10	anticipated	arrange 32:6	28:21 59:3,7
adequately	allow 27:21	19:21 25:9	arranging 62:1	<b>Avenue</b> 1:14 3:8
48:19	allowed 17:23	45:5 58:9	aside 23:13	6:14
adjourn 62:5	46:22 47:12	61:17	asked 23:24	averse 37:25
adjourned 64:5	49:7 50:13	anticipating	25:20	avoid 30:17
64:6	allowing 45:6	33:1 50:24	asking 42:3	avoided 11:17
adjustment 63:1	49:4	anticipation	44:12 60:3	aware 46:7 57:6
administration	allows 15:12	23:25 58:13	<b>aspect</b> 39:19	awful 22:11
8:19 53:3	46:16	61:23 62:23,24	aspects 60:20	B
admissibility	alternatives	anxious 13:22	assess 12:6	<b>B</b> 2:4 4:12
63:24	30:21	anybody 9:12	assist 40:16	baby 25:12
admit 15:17	ambitious 35:9	10:13,19 11:5	Association 6:12	back 11:20
advance 16:19	amici 22:15	11:16,22 12:23	11:1	12:15,22 13:22
20:16 21:9	23:10,10,15	26:21,22 28:2	assume 15:1	13:24 19:3
33:13	24:5,18 25:3	34:1 42:21	16:9 23:10	31:15 35:4,12
advanced 17:1	26:15 31:3,10	63:19	26:17,19 35:16	37:15 41:17
	48:12,15 49:4	anymore 14:12	39:13 49:2	31.13 +1.11

	1	•	ī	
42:15 56:2	bounce 56:2	capacity 65:10	54:12,23 57:22	<b>close</b> 56:10
63:25	<b>bound</b> 51:15	Capitol 2:6	59:5 61:22	<b>closer</b> 14:13,20
backwards	boundaries 54:8	caption 65:6	CERTIFICATE	19:1 23:8
34:19 35:6	Box 2:16 4:22	care 35:24	65:1	<b>closing</b> 50:2,24
<b>ball</b> 33:17	5:8,19 6:3,8	Caroom 5:12	Certification	50:25 51:1
<b>Barela</b> 3:7 7:19	breaks 29:22,23	9:6,8,10,11,14	65:20	cognizant 36:23
Barfield 2:4	58:19 62:6	26:19	Certified 65:3	collectively
7:10	<b>brief</b> 38:15,19	case 15:3 17:13	<b>certify</b> 65:5,9,12	19:17
Barncastle 5:2,2	53:13	17:15,16,22	cetera 29:23	Colorado 1:9
10:6,8,9 25:4,5	<b>briefed</b> 54:8,9	21:16 22:15	<b>Chad</b> 3:21 8:6	2:12 3:3,20,22
25:6 29:20	briefing 38:20	26:12 27:11	51:5	3:23 4:4 7:3
31:19 49:14,15	38:21 49:7	28:1 31:7	chad.wallace	8:7 22:19 42:3
57:25 58:3,3	50:23	32:25 38:11	3:24	51:14,20 53:17
58:11 61:15	<b>briefs</b> 31:4 38:11	39:19 40:22,23	<b>chance</b> 19:10	53:20,21,25
<b>based</b> 17:1 19:5	38:16 49:3	42:7 43:15	42:22	54:11 55:1
basically 54:18	<b>bring</b> 14:10,14	45:2,2,3,4 46:6	change 8:19	56:25 57:2
<b>basis</b> 29:10	18:21 59:13	47:10 48:8,23	59:5 63:12	62:3
45:14 48:24	bringing 20:17	50:8,8,10,12	changed 8:24	Colorado's 42:9
<b>bear</b> 45:10	20:18	51:7,19 52:3	changes 8:23	51:8,24 52:3
beginning 1:14	broadcast 24:23	53:15 54:5,7	charge 55:24	53:3 54:16
34:22 35:7	broadcasting	55:1,4,6,8,16	cheaper 30:1	come 23:16 29:7
begun 35:21	24:10	55:16,19 56:1	checking 59:25	47:3,7 55:11
<b>behalf</b> 9:3 10:18	Broadway 3:23	57:2 59:13	child 25:13	56:16 62:16
10:22 11:4	BROCKMAN	60:6	<b>Cholla</b> 3:16 7:18	comes 47:10
29:3 65:11	5:19	cases 18:8 21:7	Chris 8:13	<b>comfort</b> 26:10
behavior 48:4	<b>Brockmann</b> 5:7	55:22	Christmas 11:20	coming 38:25
belaboring	5:8 9:2,2 29:2	category 39:6	Christopher	comment 27:2
56:23	29:3 30:24	cause 65:13	4:12	comments 25:7
believe 7:22 8:12	62:13,21 63:9	cautiously 12:10	circa 13:21	31:9
9:6 12:21 14:1	<b>Building</b> 5:14	caveat 13:17	<b>CIRCUIT</b> 1:13	Commission
43:3,25	<b>burden</b> 45:10,20	26:14	citizens 41:9	7:25 8:1 53:5
believes 51:14	<b>Butte</b> 5:1 10:6,9	Cedar 1:14 23:20 24:23	city 4:13 5:11,17	9:23
<b>Bernalillo</b> 5:6 9:4	25:6 49:15	25:16 29:15	9:5,13,15,18 26:18 30:10	
best 16:19 30:25	C	59:11,14		Compact 27:4
42:24	C 2:1,4 4:8 5:7	certain 19:2,9	ckhoury@nm 3:19	39:20 40:1,3 42:11 43:4,6
better 34:10,13	calendar 37:14	21:5,5 22:6	claims 46:17,18	51:17,22,24
48:4	California 2:6	36:6 42:18	53:20,21 55:2	53:3,4 54:2
beyond 60:11	call 9:7 18:24	52:11	clarify 34:14	comparative
BICKERSTA	23:7 30:8	certainly 13:6	clerk's 61:11	57:5
5:13	<b>called</b> 25:16,19	16:8 18:6,9	client 25:15,16	comparison 57:3
<b>big</b> 24:14 62:14	26:19 31:12	19:18 21:14	26:20 30:5	complaint 53:22
bit 16:16,25	<b>calls</b> 56:10	24:5 26:3 35:5	31:10 58:4	complaint 55.22
34:7 35:1	capability 23:23	37:3 38:22	clients 25:18	completeness
<b>Blair</b> 10:4	24:5,9,22	43:13 45:12	26:16 28:8	57:18,22
blend 21:21	59:12,24 60:10	47:4 50:17	58:9 63:10	complex 18:6
boring 28:24	capable 18:17	52:5,12,14	clock 19:11	23:2
	<u> </u>	,		

	I	I	I	
compliance 27:4	Corrales 6:3,4	courts 46:3	38:7	17:21 39:5
complicated	<b>correct</b> 42:6,9	cover 48:19	Davidson 6:2,2	<b>definition</b> 19:23
54:14	46:15 65:7	covering 13:1	10:17,18 28:7	DELGADO
comprise 65:7	cost 61:20	<b>COVID</b> 28:12	28:8,20,25	5:13
concepts 21:21	<b>counsel</b> 7:8,23	32:10,14	day 30:23 33:21	deliberately
concerned 62:3	7:25 11:9 33:4	create 29:12	33:22,23 36:9	11:17
concerns 29:25	58:19 65:14	created 46:16	36:11 37:5	<b>Denver</b> 2:12 3:3
conclusion 13:3	counterclaim	creates 46:9	56:18 65:17	3:23 4:4 23:21
conduct 18:12	47:7	critical 38:20	days 14:24 19:7	24:1 25:2,16
conducted 16:4	counterclaims	<b>crop</b> 6:11 11:1,4	21:9 29:12	DEPARTME
conference 17:3	47:5,12	cross 21:1,17	33:1 36:8 37:6	3:22 4:3,8,12
34:18 63:18	countering	cross-examina	38:9 39:1	<b>depend</b> 43:11
conferences	46:19	17:14 30:12	62:17	depends 16:17
63:25	counting 35:6	54:10	<b>DC</b> 4:9	34:7
confident 27:17	country 16:10	cross-examine	dcaroom@bic	deposed 45:18
cons 13:20	46:4	17:22 22:4	5:15	54:15
Conservation	<b>County</b> 4:15 5:6	<b>CRR</b> 65:19	<b>De</b> 2:21 3:13	deposition 14:15
10:12	9:19 10:12,13	Cruces 5:3,17	deadlines 62:17	20:2,5,10,13
consider 18:9	48:7	9:16,18 26:10	62:18	20:14,14,16,22
consideration	couple 8:15	<b>CSR</b> 65:19	deal 41:21 43:19	21:1,13 48:1
14:2	13:14 35:12	<b>cull</b> 15:9	56:8	53:8
considerations	<b>course</b> 7:1 14:13	curious 15:14	dealing 21:17	deposition-type
40:10	28:10 29:25	36:3,10	32:10	54:22
considered 56:7	45:17 48:3	current 48:11	December 11:20	depositions
consistent 42:11	<b>court</b> 1:4 6:17	53:14	27:4 31:16	14:16,17 20:6
48:6	6:18 7:2 15:12	currently 12:19	37:13	22:3 30:16
consumed 33:16	15:15,24 16:8	cursor 22:1	decide 15:25	55:12
contact 11:18	23:22,23 24:4	<b>cut</b> 19:3 48:22	16:17 56:5,7	description
12:20	25:16 32:3,6	<b>cycle</b> 36:22	decided 40:6	31:20
contain 27:9	36:22 38:17		42:18 55:22	designation
context 16:16	42:23 43:25	<b>D</b>	decision 41:6	21:13,17,17
17:10,17,21	48:13 49:10	D'Antonio 7:22	47:24 63:2,11	designations
21:5	50:6,7,10 55:4	dailies 32:5	declaratory 41:4	21:1,2
continue 12:6	55:22 56:1,11	<b>daily</b> 32:1	deeper 34:13	desire 43:13
13:6	65:23	Dalrymple 8:1	<b>defend</b> 53:15	<b>desk</b> 26:9
continuing	<b>court's</b> 44:10	damages 39:7,9	defendant 19:14	despite 31:16
12:10,21	58:6 60:25	39:12,14,24	50:9	<b>detail</b> 21:11
controversial	courthouse	40:9 41:5,8,18	<b>defending</b> 46:13	determine 43:3
30:12	62:10,11	52:13	defends 42:9	develop 16:2
convenience	courtroom 14:5	date 11:13,13	defense 55:8	developed 16:9
28:22	23:22 24:14,15	13:13 14:21	defenses 41:2	45:4
conversations	24:17,19,21,22	23:8 32:9,15	47:10	developing
12:6	24:24 30:22	33:1,19 34:1,5	defensive 45:3	18:18
conveying 12:15	32:22 52:16	34:6 35:4,14	46:15	different 15:7
12:22	58:16,17,22	37:21 42:15	deferring 47:23	18:12 19:15
<b>copied</b> 11:19,19	courtrooms	62:22 65:20	defines 53:14	21:21 49:24
<b>copy</b> 32:1	25:14	dates 34:17,20	definitely 14:4	50:4,19
	I	I	I	I

direct 15:10	24:1,22,25	<b>eight</b> 37:10 63:8	57:4	20:18
17:13 45:9	33:1 36:6 60:5	either 14:16	everybody 14:11	experience 17:1
directed 20:10	60:13	15:25 20:9,22	32:11 33:23	18:8,16,25
direction 29:19	dollar 39:22	23:4 24:20	58:15,16	19:5 20:23
directly 30:3	40:5,12	30:16 35:17,20	evidence 26:3	21:8
59:17	<b>double</b> 20:14	38:1 42:21	39:18 40:2	experiences
disclosed 54:18	Douglas 5:12	43:9 52:15	50:3,11,13	15:25
disclosure 53:24	<b>Dr</b> 10:4	either/or 14:12	56:3,4,12	expert 53:2
disclosures 53:2	<b>Draper</b> 3:12,12	20:15	evidentiary	experts 8:2
discovery 14:17	3:12 7:21,21	<b>El</b> 4:15 5:11 9:5	14:16 18:12	25:18 30:14
20:6,13,13	7:21	9:13,19 26:18	20:1,5,14	46:7
22:5	Drawer 3:17	26:19 27:16	30:16 32:19	experts' 46:12
discuss 19:10	<b>Dubois</b> 4:2 8:10	47:20 48:7	37:24 38:4	Expiration
53:10	8:11,21 21:23	Elephant 5:1	55:20	65:20
discussion 13:19	21:24 41:16	10:6,9 25:6	evidently 20:22	explained 45:11
35:22 44:20	<b>due</b> 35:8	49:15	evolve 14:20	explaining 45:10
dispositive	<b>Dunn</b> 2:5,11 7:9	eliminate 35:25	55:17	45:20
43:15,20 44:9	duration 52:16	<b>employ</b> 65:12	exact 50:11	Expressway
48:10		employee 65:10	exactly 30:6	5:14
dispute 18:21	<u>E</u>	employees 28:6	43:18 47:1,10	extends 52:11
53:7 54:20	<b>E</b> 2:1,1,1,1	encountered	examination	extensively
55:14	<b>e-mail</b> 61:10	27:8	14:9 23:12	53:12
disputed 51:7	<b>e-mails</b> 30:1	engage 13:6	examined 20:13	<b>extent</b> 43:12
disruptive 48:5	earlier 35:14	<b>engineer</b> 7:12,22	example 25:24	47:5 55:24
<b>district</b> 4:15 5:1	37:21 40:8	7:24 10:4	26:1	60:16,23
9:20,22 10:3,4	44:20 63:7	ensuring 51:22	examples 25:25	extra 35:1
10:6,10,12	early 34:22	enter 7:4	exceptions 51:13	
15:24 16:8	easiest 26:1	entire 24:7	exchange 37:21	<u>F</u>
23:21 25:7	easy 58:21	26:12 53:25	63:23	<b>F</b> 5:18
27:17,19 30:11	eaten 32:23	entitled 46:13	exchanging 33:3	facilities 23:20
46:3 47:21	<b>EBID</b> 26:4 48:6	51:18	excluded 44:20	23:22
48:7 49:16	49:18 50:9	entity 52:2	56:12	fact 15:5,24
50:10	58:4 61:17,19	envision 43:13	exclusion 44:12	16:15 22:8,23
District's 49:21	echo 31:9	<b>equal</b> 19:16	excuse 38:1	24:13 30:8
49:21	education 15:23	equitable 40:10	exhibit 32:18	34:23 36:23
districts 16:10	effect 40:3,11	err 55:24,24	33:3 37:21	50:7 52:15
23:13 48:16	effected 40:10	Eschenbrenner	exhibits 21:18	56:13
49:22 50:13	<b>effective</b> 18:16	10:23	32:16 35:22	factors 15:7
57:1	19:13 20:24	essence 24:10	38:8 55:21	facts 65:5
Diversified 6:11	30:2 40:23	essentially 19:16	63:23	<b>factual</b> 53:2
11:1	41:9 efficiencies	34:11 42:8	existing 14:16	fair 13:13
<b>doable</b> 18:15	35:23	51:12	20:22 42:6	<b>fairly</b> 29:10 40:23 48:21
document 54:21	efficient 18:11	establishing	expect 18:19	faith 12:5
documents	31:14,17,18	40:24	expected 47:9	falcons 9:23
57:10,15	46:9 48:25	et 29:23	expenditure	far 22:4,6 28:14
doing 14:23	59:1 61:7	evaluate 46:17	61:18	31:2 33:17
20:23,25 21:8	JJ.1 U1./	evaluating 56:24	expense 20:17	31.4 33.17
	•	-	=	•

34:2 38:12,18	45:18 60:9	<b>gear</b> 36:21	39:15,21 40:4	32:13
51:16	61:12	general 7:23,24	42:15,17,19	<b>happens</b> 49:25
<b>FARMERS</b> 6:11	following 59:8	General's 2:16	43:2 45:19	59:16
<b>Fe</b> 2:22 3:13,18	foregoing 65:6	3:17 7:11,19	46:25,25 47:1	happy 12:4 32:5
5:9,20 6:9 25:1	<b>forget</b> 31:23	8:8	47:2,3 48:20	63:20
federal 46:3	<b>forgot</b> 41:17	generally 13:18	48:22,24 50:11	hard 19:22
50:10	form 21:18	getting 8:13	50:14 55:9,10	<b>HARRIS</b> 4:17
<b>feel</b> 13:7 19:25	<b>forth</b> 12:16,22	18:18 35:1	55:16,17 58:6	Hartman 3:22
20:12 26:22	forward 15:15	40:15 48:3	58:17 62:19	8:7 52:16
28:17 48:16	34:25 40:16	<b>give</b> 33:20 56:9	63:25 64:2	hate 27:15
51:18 55:9	45:6,12 46:18	<b>given</b> 13:13 14:2	Goldsberry 2:5	hear 45:14 46:13
<b>feeling</b> 35:17	55:19 56:20	15:1,1 19:16	7:10	50:11 51:10,10
55:6	<b>found</b> 27:5,10	22:8 30:22	<b>good</b> 7:16 8:5,11	51:11 53:23
feels 15:15 44:8	31:16	34:23 38:11,20	9:17 10:8,17	heard 11:22
<b>felt</b> 44:3	foundation	47:5 48:21	10:21 11:3	49:7 54:3
<b>field</b> 33:18	32:23	50:23 55:8	12:5 13:1 23:5	hearing 1:13
<b>figure</b> 15:6	foundational	56:13 65:16	36:16 40:14	37:9 57:11
16:19 36:14	30:9,13	<b>gives</b> 29:18	49:10 57:20	65:8,11
41:20	<b>four-day</b> 36:22	<b>glitch</b> 31:17 44:6	gotten 31:5	hearings 13:20
figured 34:12	37:3	glitches 27:7	Grande 6:11	15:21 18:13
<b>file</b> 57:13	Fourth 4:18	30:19 59:4	11:1 51:23	24:1,2 37:24
<b>filed</b> 38:12 49:3	<b>Francis</b> 2:5 7:10	<b>go</b> 13:24 16:1,11	53:4	37:25
53:1,21,22	frankly 27:24	25:17 27:14	greatly 16:2	hearsay 56:6
55:2 57:10	58:13	36:2 37:1 38:5	Greg 7:23 8:2	<b>HEATH</b> 5:13
<b>files</b> 62:4	Fred 8:22	39:3 40:1	<b>ground</b> 48:20	Heather 6:18
<b>final</b> 48:10 63:17	<b>free</b> 11:16	42:22,25 43:6	<b>group</b> 12:18	9:25 65:3,19
financial 61:18	<b>front</b> 34:19 48:4	43:14 44:10	Grower's 11:1	heather_garza
<b>find</b> 19:2 24:15	56:17	47:19 55:3,3	growers 6:1	6:20
28:18,24 41:25	full 27:22,23	55:19,25 56:20	10:16,18 11:4	held 39:9
finding 42:11	28:9 52:8	58:8 60:10	guess 11:15 18:1	help 18:10 26:7
fine 37:4 58:2	<b>full-blown</b> 32:12	goal 63:6	22:18 24:6	59:9
finish 37:11	<b>full-time</b> 27:18	goes 26:6 37:2	26:14 39:10	helpful 22:13
Firm 5:2 6:2	27:19	44:25 47:21	55:14 56:23	57:15 60:1,7
65:23	<b>fully</b> 16:1 19:10	going 8:16 13:6	60:23	helps 63:10
first 28:23 32:10	functionally	15:3 16:23	guessing 35:15	HENNIGHA
33:20 41:6	8:24	17:6 23:1 24:3	guidance 55:23	6:13
44:2 45:2,14	functions 60:17	24:15,17,19,20	H	hereto 65:6
45:20 46:8	further 26:14	24:25 25:18	hall 25:21	Hicks 4:21,22
five 36:8 37:6	33:2 38:7 40:2	26:20 27:25	hand 55:3 56:10	9:21,22 27:13
five-day 37:1	44:10 65:9 <b>future</b> 11:12	28:12 30:8	65:16	27:15,16 47:18
<b>flexibility</b> 18:7 60:2	141414 11:12	31:12,25 32:1 32:13,19,22,22	handful 52:21	47:20,20 49:9 56:22,23
flexible 28:13	G	33:15,19,22,22	53:23	high-risk 25:12
Floor 3:23	$\overline{\mathbf{G}}$ 5:12	35:13,19 34:24	handle 14:9 61:7	Hoffman 2:4
flying 10:10	gallery 24:20	36:13,20 37:23	handled 54:20	7:11
<b>fold</b> 41:5,24	Garza 6:18 65:3	38:5,25 39:4	handling 61:11	hold 16:18 36:9
folks 8:18 24:4	65:19	39:12,13,13,15	happen 28:12	holidays 37:12
101NS 0.10 24.4		37.12,13,13,13	FF	Hondays 57.12

	•	•	•	
home 29:13	15:18 18:2,9	influenced 32:15	59:17 61:1,4	joining 9:24
homes 14:10	22:7,24 23:4	information	involvement	10:3,23
Hong 25:17	61:19	30:14 45:5,7	57:2	joint 17:2 18:22
<b>Honor</b> 7:7,16		45:16 61:14	<b>IOWA</b> 1:14	34:18
8:6,11 9:3,17	I	informing 63:10	<b>iron</b> 64:1	<b>Jr</b> 3:6
9:21 10:9,17	idea 11:25 19:11	inherently 16:13	Irrigation 5:1	judge 1:13 7:1
10:21 11:3,7	22:2 23:5 40:1	initial 37:6,6	10:6,10 25:7	7:14 8:3,9,18
12:3,17 18:6	40:14,15 46:14	48:23 55:6	49:15	8:25 9:5,9,12
20:4,20 21:25	54:6 56:17	initially 25:10	issue 12:1 22:17	9:15,19 10:5
22:22 23:3	57:20 63:23	26:8 37:2	25:4 27:5 30:3	10:11,15,19,25
25:5 26:24	ideas 12:15,22	injunctive 41:4	39:1,7 43:14	11:5,11 12:12
27:13 28:7,16	II 2:5	<b>injury</b> 39:20	43:16 48:10	12:23 13:11
28:20 29:2	imagine 19:22	inquire 20:4	52:20	17:5,25 19:24
30:25 31:8	<b>impact</b> 44:7,17	57:14	issues 19:15	20:8,24 21:10
35:18 42:9	50:4	insignificant	27:10 29:6,15	21:14 22:16
43:2,24 44:16	impacts 43:4	18:14	31:2,6 34:22	23:9 26:13
46:2 47:18	important 16:12	instance 44:3	39:3 43:19	27:14 28:2,17
49:14 51:5	18:7 47:25	instructions	46:5,10 47:14	28:23 29:1
52:10 56:22	50:15 63:20	25:15	61:9 63:24	30:4 31:22
57:8,25 61:15	Improvement	intend 25:25	64:1	32:8 35:11
62:13 63:13	4:15 9:20	intended 28:14	it'd 59:1	36:2,16 37:18
HONORABLE	27:16 48:7	39:17	it'll 13:3 48:21	38:24 40:19
1:13	in-person 13:22	interest 28:8	61:24	41:13 42:2,14
hope 26:8 33:12	22:23 31:18,18	29:6 51:21,24		43:8,21 44:5
37:10 49:10	inadvertently	52:1,3 53:14	J	45:25 46:20
57:3	11:8	57:1,3	<b>J</b> 3:6 4:2	47:19 48:9
hopeful 35:22	inappropriate	interested 22:14	<b>James</b> 4:2 5:7	49:13 50:21
hopefully 11:13	45:22	57:11 58:5	james.dubois	51:9 52:7,17
14:15 25:10	inaudible 27:9	65:13	4:5	52:24 53:6,16
42:20 56:18	inclined 36:18	interests 52:4	<b>Jay</b> 5:18 9:18	54:15,24 56:18
63:7	<b>include</b> 17:12,14	interim 44:2	26:24	57:6,16 58:2
<b>hoping</b> 21:6	33:10	INTERIOR 4:8	jcbrockmann	58:10,12 59:19
63:8	included 39:5	4:12	5:10	60:8 61:22
hotels 29:13	53:24	internally 15:18	<b>Jeff</b> 7:17 11:7	62:18 63:4,14
hour 62:6	includes 41:2	Internet 21:25	Jeffrey 2:20	judgment 42:17
hours 17:11,17	including 44:1	interpretation	jfstein@newm	42:23 49:6
17:18,23 19:8	46:6,7,17	43:7 51:16,22	5:21	51:4 53:13
19:9 32:21	inclusion 55:25	51:23	<b>Jim</b> 9:2 29:2	62:19 63:19,21
<b>Houston</b> 6:19	incredibly 50:14	interpreted 54:3	41:15	judiciary 13:18
65:24	indicate 33:4	interrupt 27:15	<b>job</b> 13:1	jump 11:16
Hubenak 2:15	39:8 46:21	Interstate 7:25	<b>John</b> 3:12 6:7	juris 51:22
7:12	indicated 28:8	8:1	7:21,22 10:22	jury 56:17
Hudspeth 10:12	44:22 57:10	intervene 27:7	31:8	JUSTICE 4:3
10:13	indicates 30:19	intimately 27:25	john.draper@	jwechsler@m
hundred 13:24	individually	introduction	3:14	2:23
42:18 61:24	12:15	45:6	john@uttonk	
hybrid 14:3	infinitely 57:1	involved 22:15	6:10	K
	l	<u> </u>	l	<u> </u>

		•		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
<b>KERY</b> 6:8	laid 53:12	47:21 48:12	looked 18:23	<b>MASTER</b> 1:13
Khoury 3:16	<b>Lake</b> 4:13	52:4 53:2	<b>looking</b> 14:18,23	<b>Master's</b> 55:23
7:18	large 18:7 25:22	55:10	17:11,20 21:11	materially 43:4
kin 65:13	40:7 49:17	<b>limits</b> 17:9 54:11	21:18 23:1	materials 16:7
kind 13:4 30:15	<b>Las</b> 5:3,17 9:15	limping 13:4	32:14 34:5,6	62:5
35:13 36:10	9:18 26:9	Lincoln 3:2	35:6,7 37:14	matter 22:8 24:8
48:24 52:24	LAW 3:22 4:22	line 8:12,14	41:18	25:17 31:4
53:7 55:6,16	5:2 6:2	49:20	looks 36:15	46:22 50:8
63:8	Lawrence 2:12	lines 25:8	40:16 41:22	63:3
kinds 33:11	lawyers 30:22	link 59:21	63:11	matters 21:5
<b>kitchen</b> 56:10	laying 30:8	lions 9:24	<b>lot</b> 13:18 15:6	MAX 4:22
<b>Klahn</b> 2:11 7:10	leading 57:11	<b>Lisa</b> 3:1 7:20	22:11,12 23:6	Maxwell 5:13
knew 28:12 34:4	leads 13:12,25	<b>list</b> 15:9 16:9	26:6 32:20	9:14
know 12:6,8	22:16	18:23 31:11	33:14,16 35:22	<b>MCREA</b> 6:13
13:9 14:11	leave 39:1 48:13	52:20 57:10,12	37:19 38:15	mean 16:8 34:4
15:6,7,8,20	49:9 50:6	57:15	45:4 54:25	38:15 46:15
16:23 17:18	leaves 44:1	lists 33:3 37:22	55:12	means 37:4
18:15 19:7	leaving 26:10	litigated 13:8	lots 15:20,20	61:20
21:4 22:25	50:6	litigating 43:16	25:24 62:10,11	mediation 11:17
23:12 28:14	Lee 4:2 8:12	<b>little</b> 13:2 16:16	lthompson@t	11:23 12:4,12
30:6,13,22	27:1	16:25 21:25	3:4	12:18
31:11 32:4,13	lee.leininger@	33:2 34:7 35:1	lunch 29:23	mediator 11:18
33:9 34:10,12	4:5	Liu 8:22	58:20 62:6	12:14,20
34:20,24 35:2	<b>left</b> 50:16	live 14:17 16:20		meet 58:19,24
36:7,12,15	legal 15:23 54:2	20:2 22:10	M	meeting 60:17
37:8,24 38:2,3	Leininger 4:2	24:10 27:20	<b>M</b> 2:1,15 3:1	meetings 11:22
38:14,19,22	8:13	lives 8:16	5:13	<b>MELLOY</b> 1:13
41:7 42:16	lengthy 23:2	<b>LLC</b> 3:12 5:2	main 5:3 31:25	7:1,14 8:3,9,18
43:17,17,18	let's 7:3 32:8	6:2	55:5	8:25 9:5,9,12
44:5,6 45:1	37:7,7,14	<b>LLP</b> 5:13	maintained	9:15,19 10:5
46:11 47:8	<b>letter</b> 11:19	<b>local</b> 60:9	51:20	10:11,15,19,25
54:1,13,18	47:23	located 25:2	maintaining	11:5,11 12:12
56:8,14,15	level 48:3	location 14:11	51:21	12:23 13:11
58:9 59:6,20	liabilities 40:18	24:12	making 42:4	17:5,25 19:24
60:2,7,9,13,15	liability 40:15	locations 62:4	47:24 48:10	20:8 21:14
60:15 61:8,9	40:24 41:1,2	lodgings 22:12	Mall 2:6	22:16 23:9
63:17,20	41:21 42:11	logistically	manage 41:25	26:13 27:14
knowing 30:6	52:12	59:10 60:4	management	28:2,17,23
known 29:25	license 56:9	logistics 23:6	51:7	29:1 30:4
<b>Kong</b> 25:17	lieu 14:17	long 13:6 15:2	<b>Manual</b> 55:23	31:22 32:8
<b>Kopp</b> 3:1 7:20	<b>liked</b> 12:9	16:22 17:6	March 1:12	35:11 36:2,16
т	likelihood 12:7	18:14 29:12,14	47:22 63:5	37:18 38:24
L 2.2 (.19 (5.2	likes 29:13	34:6 36:14	Marcus 3:6 11:8	40:19 41:13
L 2:3 6:18 65:3	<b>limit</b> 20:17	look 32:17 34:16	marcus@robl	42:2,14 43:8
65:19	48:15	34:17 36:11	3:9	43:21 44:5
<b>Labor</b> 33:21,22	<b>limited</b> 23:11,15	38:15 55:17	Maria 4:17 9:22	45:25 46:20
33:23	25:24 29:10,15	56:7 57:23	Marquette 3:8	47:19 48:9
L	1	1	1	1

	1	ı	i	i
49:13 50:21	moment 42:15	necessary 15:13	10:2 18:24	6:8 7:11,19,23
51:9 52:7,17	<b>Monday</b> 33:19	19:3 44:3 55:9	19:8,9 24:17	8:8,14,19
52:24 53:6,16	monetary 41:18	61:18	32:16,21 37:22	10:24 24:9,11
54:15,24 57:6	money 22:12	necessity 38:10	38:3 39:18,22	25:1,11 26:11
57:16 58:2,10	41:6	need 10:1 15:9	47:5	58:21 61:11
58:12 59:19	Montana 40:23	16:2,6,24 23:7	numbers 40:5	62:8 65:16
60:8 61:22	MONTGOM	24:1 25:11	61:10	offices 14:10
62:18 63:4,14	2:21	26:7 30:14	NW 3:8 4:8	oftentimes 21:4
methods 43:6	month 34:9 35:3	34:21 36:20		<b>Ogaz</b> 7:18
<b>Mexico</b> 1:9 2:19	months 8:17	47:16 48:16	0	oh 58:2 62:18
2:22 3:8,13,17	13:19 35:2	49:17 52:5	<b>O</b> 2:1	Okay 9:12,15
3:18 4:18 5:3,9	63:3	60:4,5 64:3	<b>O'Brien</b> 4:17	10:5,15,25
5:20 6:1,4,6,9	<b>MoPac</b> 5:14	needing 45:13	9:22	43:8
6:14 7:3,15,17	morning 7:16	needs 54:12	<b>object</b> 54:10,13	<b>Olsen</b> 6:13,13
7:18 10:15,18	8:5,12 9:17	59:16	54:23	11:3,4
10:19 17:15	10:8,17,22	neighborhood	objecting 53:17	once 36:10,14,24
19:14 22:9	11:3	17:19	54:6	41:9 62:21
26:1,2,10	<b>motion</b> 43:15	never 13:24	objection 33:11	63:21
29:24 31:1,1	49:6 51:4	56:16	35:12 37:16	one-size-fits-all
41:7 45:11,15	63:22	new 1:9 2:19,22	42:12 54:13	14:19
47:6 48:18	motions 40:9	3:8,13,17,18	objections 32:16	ongoing 11:23
49:20 58:25	43:20 53:13	4:18 5:3,9,20	32:18,19 33:6	12:4
62:2	mountain 9:23	6:1,4,6,9,14	33:12 36:1	open 39:1 50:6
Mexico's 47:11	move 15:15	7:3,15,17,18	37:19,23 38:4	operates 30:10
mgoldsberry	23:21 40:16	8:18 10:15,18	observation	operating 26:3
2:9	41:2 45:6	10:19 17:15	56:19	50:10
Michael 1:13	moved 54:4	19:14 22:9	<b>observe</b> 24:8,12	opinions 46:6,12
3:1 7:20	moves 34:20	25:25 26:2,10	25:10 44:15	54:1,2
mid 35:19 38:2	moving 21:25	29:24 31:1,1	58:8,17,20,21	opportunities
59:10 62:22	34:21,25 35:12	41:7 45:11,15	59:23	31:5
63:5	45:12	47:5,11 48:18	observe-only	opportunity
minor 31:22	multi-party	49:20 58:24	60:10	13:7 18:12
48:1	27:11	62:2,9	observers 27:24	19:12 26:5
minute 23:14	<b>multiple</b> 32:18	nice 22:18	observing 28:15	29:18 31:14
missed 11:8	41:5	nights 29:22	28:18	50:6,16 51:2
mix 16:20	muted 41:15	NMSU 10:22	obviously 8:23	55:8 58:19,23
mkopp@trout		non-jury 56:13	11:24 13:12	opposed 13:17
3:4	N	56:14,16	19:23 21:1	14:24 16:14
mobrien@mo	N 2:1	normal 19:20	32:17 42:16	20:2 60:3
4:19	<b>N.W</b> 4:18	North 6:14	44:4,6 62:23	opposing 33:4
mode 22:5,5	name 8:23	<b>note</b> 61:16	occasionally	optimal 22:24
model 18:9 46:5	named 55:7,15	<b>noted</b> 16:1	27:7	optimistic 12:11
46:14,16	<b>nature</b> 14:8 33:4	<b>notice</b> 60:24	occurs 46:3	13:2,9 17:3
<b>modeling</b> 45:5,7	33:5 43:12	noticed 44:11	<b>October</b> 34:16	oral 13:21 50:25
45:15	<b>nearly</b> 27:19	noting 40:9	office 2:16,16	57:19
MODRALL	necessarily 50:1	November 34:16	3:17,17 4:22	order 16:19 21:3
4:17	63:17	number 9:25	4:22 5:8,19 6:3	21:7,15 38:10
	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	

				Page 74
38:25 42:23	47:22 48:11	permission	<b>point</b> 8:21 10:1	27:10 31:13
43:2 44:1,11	49:8,18 51:8	48:20	12:14 13:5	46:23 50:13
57:11 62:16,20	53:4	persistent 27:8	18:13,25 19:13	51:18 55:8
orders 21:18	particular 21:3	person 13:16	25:18 31:23	presentation
40:8	21:7 24:5	14:24 15:17	36:17,17 41:6	17:6 20:25
original 1:1 7:2	51:23	18:2 24:11	42:16 49:16	27:11 30:18
19:6	particularly	25:19,20,24	52:9 56:23,25	45:24 46:9
ought 17:8	33:8 38:8 47:4	26:17 28:9,11	61:8	48:18 49:19
outlined 51:13	47:11 56:12	28:15 29:9	<b>pointed</b> 29:11	55:20
outside 17:18	61:20 62:1	38:2 42:24	points 50:15	presented 50:12
overall 31:17	parties 7:4 12:5	52:15 58:15,23	63:11	presenting 26:2
overflow 24:19	12:15 13:16	58:24 61:9	<b>portion</b> 51:13	49:24 52:18,25
24:21,21	14:1 16:5 17:2	personally 61:3	portions 16:4	55:1,5,10,16
overly 13:9	17:15 18:17	perspective	22:10 25:22	presents 52:23
16:21	20:10,12 22:9	36:20 41:5	29:5 52:11	preserve 22:3
	22:11,14 23:3	47:11	<b>position</b> 19:8	39:23
P	24:16 31:25	phase 39:23	38:18 41:14	President's
<b>P</b> 2:1,1	32:6,25 33:3	41:1,1,12	45:25 51:10,11	10:24
<b>P.A</b> 4:17 5:8,19	35:21 42:13,16	52:12,13	53:12 57:7,21	Preston 3:22 8:7
6:8	44:14 50:5,20	phases 48:8	possibility 14:2	preston.hartm
<b>P.C</b> 3:7	51:25 52:6	phone 9:24,25	19:18,19	3:25
<b>p.m</b> 64:7	53:10 55:5	61:10	possible 18:11	<b>presume</b> 62:6
<b>page</b> 33:10	60:14,23 62:2	<b>phones</b> 30:1	28:15 29:8	presume 62:6
pages 65:6	65:10,14	physical 29:21	30:2 37:1,10	37:25
<b>pales</b> 57:3	parties' 61:16	physically 23:16	44:21 55:12	pretty 8:20 31:3
Paragraph	party 51:14 55:7	24:7,18 25:23	Possibly 28:25	35:9 45:13
44:17	55:15	26:16,23	28:25	53:19 57:20
paralegals 8:15	party's 57:20	pick 25:25	Post 2:16 3:17	previously 49:17
parameters 47:2	Paseo 2:21 3:13	<b>picture</b> 49:24	4:22 5:8,19 6:3	primarily 11:15
part 16:11,23	Paso 4:15 5:11	62:15	6:8	20:9 29:4
37:19 40:7	9:5,13,19	pin 62:23	<b>post-trial</b> 49:3,7	principal 24:16
46:25 47:6	26:18,19 27:16	pinned 63:5	50:23	60:22 62:2
51:7	47:20 48:7	place 24:15	potentially 50:1	prior 38:4
partially 16:1	passages 27:9	places 62:11	pre-trial 34:15	Priscilla 2:15
participate 26:5	Pecan 6:1 10:15	plaintiff 39:12	preceding 48:8	7:12
26:7 28:14	10:18	46:5	precluded 43:16	priscilla.hube
29:24 31:21	Pecos 27:5	Plaintiff's 46:17	55:5,15	2:18
50:7 58:7	people 27:19,21	plaintiffs 19:15	prefer 36:22	privilege 52:11
59:15	28:13 59:23	19:17	37:3 56:5	probably 12:9
participated	60:25 61:4,5,6	plan 36:12 37:14	preliminary	13:1 14:20
27:3	61:6,11 62:12	45:23,23 61:1	11:21	16:22 21:21
participating	Peralta 2:21	planning 16:19	prepared 46:24	24:21 31:18,24
12:5 29:17	3:13	36:8,14 44:25	presence 27:18	32:2 33:8
53:18	percent 13:24	45:12 59:10	27:19 29:21	35:16 36:22
participation	42:18 61:21,24	platform 58:7	<b>present</b> 14:6,6	37:5,20 38:7
25:9 29:5,14	period 17:12	play 43:20	15:3 21:9	41:20 42:24
29:16 31:3	periods 28:4	pleadings 38:11	24:18 26:16	48:21 55:17
	<u>                                     </u>	-	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

	İ	İ	1	1
56:16	provisions 21:16	<b>Randel</b> 4:7 8:13	recognize 19:18	represent 52:2
<b>probed</b> 54:12	prudence 51:22	rapid 12:8	record 7:8 11:9	represents 52:1
problem 27:8	<b>pull</b> 16:7	rapidly 45:13	57:21	request 13:16
34:2	purpose 57:22	Rapids 1:14	reference 10:1	50:6
problems 27:6	purposes 36:14	23:20 24:23	44:1	requested 23:19
procedural	45:12 46:15,21	25:16 29:15	refinement 39:4	47:22
31:23	57:17	59:11,14	<b>regard</b> 60:21	require 16:18
procedure 20:25	push 39:23	re-urge 47:25	regarding 53:3	37:23 39:2,4
22:24 41:11	pushing 35:14	reach 13:3 18:19	regardless 46:4	required 18:4
46:3	<b>put</b> 15:24 17:4	reaching 12:7	Registration	requirements
procedures 16:3	17:13,16,22	51:16	65:23	38:8
16:9,13,24	34:18 38:16,23	read 21:10	regular 63:25	requiring 33:4
17:4 18:10,18	39:17,24 40:2	reading 43:4	65:10,12	resolution 13:8
18:20 23:4	40:4 41:17	ready 35:1,5,19	related 26:3	resolve 13:8
proceed 48:24	45:1,16,19,21	35:19,20 47:15	44:19	51:6
proceeding	45:22 46:18	55:18 60:5	relates 38:8	resolved 33:7
18:20 39:10	54:5 56:9	real 53:6,11	relative 15:20	38:4
40:25 51:20	62:12 63:6	58:22	relevant 56:6	respect 15:10
56:13	<b>puts</b> 46:6	realize 34:11	relief 41:4,4,19	39:24 40:2
proceedings	putting 17:2	43:5	41:22,24 42:4	49:8
23:5 24:14	21:20 23:13	really 16:22 22:1	reluctant 32:11	respond 57:13
64:6 65:8	39:22 46:5	22:25 29:13	55:3,14	response 10:14
process 15:5		33:10,16 35:3	<b>rely</b> 32:2	37:17 43:22
27:3 35:24	Q	37:23 43:1,6	relying 39:25	47:6 53:13
48:2 49:5	question 13:12	43:11 53:14	remain 12:10	responses 38:21
progress 11:17	14:7 15:16	54:5 55:13	remedial 40:17	responsive 46:8
11:24 12:8	23:18 36:7	58:18 60:4	remedies 39:9	result 13:10
project 30:9	44:18 45:1	reason 22:7	40:6,13,14,24	revolved 40:7
36:10 49:23	47:21 48:17	39:22 40:6	41:1,3,12	rhicks@renea
56:25	57:9 58:1	50:19 58:13	<b>remedy</b> 39:23	4:24
proposals 12:22	59:16 62:14	60:3 63:18	40:11 42:10	rhoffman@so
proposed 19:9	questioning 50:1	reasonable 31:3	remote 1:12	2:8
39:8 42:13	questions 15:14	reasonably 18:3	22:22 23:4	<b>Rich</b> 4:12 8:14
44:11 54:16	quick 58:1	19:21 20:1	24:11	Richardson 6:14
proposing 40:17	quickly 32:23	44:23 48:25	remotely 52:10	Ridgley 7:23
<b>pros</b> 13:19	quite 18:17	reasons 58:14	52:14 59:15	<b>right</b> 7:14 8:9,25
prospect 49:12	31:17 49:20	<b>rebut</b> 45:9	<b>Renea</b> 4:21,22	10:11 11:11
prospective	58:13	rebuttal 15:12	9:21 27:16	12:7 13:11
41:19,22,24	R	15:13,16 17:19	47:20 56:22	14:6 17:25
protecting 52:4	R2:1,14:25:2	17:23 19:18	report 18:22	19:4 21:5
<b>prove</b> 39:15	Rael 3:6,7 7:20	44:21,23 45:8	44:4	22:18 29:1
provide 21:2	11:8	45:17 46:23	Reporter 6:17	32:8 37:18
32:2 57:15	raised 16:16	47:7,12	65:4	40:19 42:14
58:6 60:2	32:24	rebutting 44:24	reporters 6:18	43:8 52:21
61:13	raising 46:11	45:21	32:3,7 65:23	60:13 63:14,16
provided 54:1	Raley 3:2 7:21	Reclamation	Reporting 60:12	64:4
provides 42:12	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	10:12	reports 44:2	<b>rights</b> 42:6,10
			1	1

<b>Rio</b> 6:11 10:25	scenes 26:6	33:1 38:6,7	smaxwell@bic	48:14
51:23 53:4	schedule 11:21	62:17	5:16	specifically
road 6:3 34:3	12:19 38:6	settlement 12:21	Solicitor's 8:14	20:11
<b>Robert</b> 2:4 7:10	44:7 63:1,11	<b>SEVENTH</b> 1:13	<b>solo</b> 10:10	specifics 11:25
<b>Robles</b> 3:7 7:19	scheduled 12:13	<b>SG's</b> 8:19	<b>Somach</b> 2:3,5,11	39:16
<b>ROEHL</b> 4:17	scheduling 8:15	<b>share</b> 61:19	7:5,7,8,9 11:15	spending 36:24
<b>role</b> 23:11,13,14	11:12 31:6	<b>Shelly</b> 4:7 7:25	12:23,25 14:25	spent 33:15
49:5 50:23	<b>scope</b> 47:2	8:13	15:4 17:7	SPERLING
<b>room</b> 62:10	Scott 10:23	shelly.randel	18:17 32:4	4:17
rooms 60:17	screen 42:25	4:10	34:4 35:13	<b>spite</b> 23:18
62:5	<b>SE</b> 1:14	<b>short</b> 13:8 33:24	36:3 38:13	ssomach@so
rose 48:2	<b>SEAL</b> 65:16	40:4	39:11,17 41:15	2:7
Roswell 6:14	<b>second</b> 58:17	Shorthand 65:4	43:9,11 44:18	stage 22:25
<b>RPR</b> 65:19	secondly 46:10	<b>shortly</b> 37:13	53:16,19 54:17	stages 34:25
rule 44:22 53:24	secure 62:3	sick 25:13	59:8 60:1 61:2	stake 43:5
<b>ruling</b> 42:17	see 9:6 15:9 16:6	side 17:10 44:8	61:13	standard 19:20
43:23 44:7	22:7 37:2,23	55:24	somebody 26:18	19:20
48:10 51:15,15	41:23 43:2,18	significant 43:14	59:22 64:2	standards 51:21
62:15 63:18	43:23 47:4	significantly	somewhat 14:3	standpoint 61:1
rulings 43:12	49:18 53:10	20:12 44:9	32:15	<b>start</b> 7:4 11:14
62:25	58:23	similar 43:22	soon 34:2 36:25	14:25 32:21
run 49:23,23	seek 48:20	60:12	sorry 9:8 21:24	33:14,19,24,25
	seeking 25:10	<b>Simmons</b> 2:5,11	27:13 41:16	34:14,21,24
<u>S</u>	41:18	7:9	<b>sort</b> 11:21 22:4,8	35:10 36:15
S 2:1 5:14	send 44:4 60:24	simple 22:5	22:16,24 23:7	37:15,22 39:11
Sacramento 2:6	sense 21:10	53:20	32:14 46:19	52:14 59:10
safe 38:1	41:20	<b>simply</b> 18:20	56:18,19 61:8	60:4 63:22
sake 61:16,16	separate 39:10	36:3 39:25	sounds 49:10,10	starting 33:22
<b>Salt</b> 4:13	40:14,25 59:21	40:15 46:18	49:11 62:15	34:10 59:19
Samantha 5:2	separated 39:22	54:21 57:13	<b>South</b> 4:13 5:3	63:22,23
10:9 25:6	40:22	Singer 7:24	Southern 6:11	starts 26:2 33:7
49:15 58:3	September	sink 56:10	10:25	36:11
samantha@h	34:10,12,13,16	<b>SISK</b> 4:17	sovereign 52:1	<b>state</b> 1:7,9,9 2:2
5:4	35:20 37:14	<b>sit</b> 16:12 24:11	<b>space</b> 62:8	2:16,19 3:20
Santa 2:22 3:13	59:11,11 60:6	25:20	sparing 49:11	4:13 6:6 7:2,3
3:18 5:9,20 6:9	62:22	sitting 24:20	sparingly 48:21	7:3,5,8,13,17
25:1	sequestration	30:22	50:17	7:22,24 8:6
Sarah 2:11 7:10	44:13	situation 15:19	speak 12:2 25:3	10:20 27:1
sat 15:22	session 12:18	23:1,8 24:25	26:21 35:15	29:24 52:2
satisfactory 13:3	sessions 12:13	28:13 32:10	42:24 43:10	65:4
save 22:11	set 11:13,21 16:3	49:18 52:22	50:20	stated 65:5
saving 40:24	18:18 20:25	six 35:2 63:7	speaking 49:22	statement 17:3
saying 50:5	37:20 59:21	sklahn@soma	special 1:13	34:18 51:8,14
says 39:19 43:3	62:22 63:20	2:13	24:13 55:23	states 1:4,13 4:1
54:11	64:2	slow 21:25	specific 12:18	8:10 21:22
scatter 22:8	setting 13:12	small 52:20	21:16 29:8,8	46:22 47:8
scenario 14:3	21:15 22:3	smaller 22:11	29:15 45:14	48:19 49:19
L	1	<u> </u>	1	•

				rage 11
51:17,25,25	50:2	61:6,12,12	2:17 4:23 5:14	47:13,25 52:12
58:25 62:2,7	summary 42:17	talked 15:18	6:19 7:2,6,9,11	53:9,11 56:19
States' 19:8	42:23 49:6	16:14 17:8	7:13 19:7 22:9	57:18,18 59:1
41:14	51:3 53:13	talking 11:18	38:18 40:4	62:16
stats 48:1	62:19 63:19,21	12:14 14:13	46:21 47:8	thinking 17:17
status 17:3	summer 32:12	20:4,5 24:4	48:18 49:19	19:4 20:9,15
18:22 34:18	47:1,14	30:5 32:23	57:9 58:24	30:15 33:25
63:18,25 65:8	<b>supply</b> 57:17	33:9 35:2,3,23	62:2 65:4	34:8,9 36:4,6
65:11	support 35:24	35:25 41:3,9	thank 8:3 10:11	48:11 52:21
<b>Stein</b> 5:8,18,19	46:19	41:10 46:25	11:11 18:5	thinks 28:2
9:17,18 26:24	<b>suppose</b> 43:21	59:23	22:21 31:21	63:19 64:2
26:25 30:18	<b>Supreme</b> 1:4 7:2	talks 12:10	49:9,12 57:24	Thompson 3:1
31:15 59:4	23:23 42:22	tandem 40:13	58:11 63:12	7:20
step 16:12 40:2	44:10 55:4,22	tbarfield@so	64:4	thought 13:14
stipulation 39:8	56:1,11	2:8	<b>Theresa</b> 2:4 7:9	13:23 15:1
55:11	sure 13:23 24:13	technical 27:7	they'd 53:2	16:15,22 17:5
stop 39:21 40:4	28:13,21,21	30:19 45:15	thing 16:5 19:13	17:7,9,16,20
store 62:4,4	29:25 38:15	59:18 60:19,25	35:21 37:20	19:3,4 21:9
<b>Stream</b> 7:25 8:1	39:2 42:5,10	61:5,6,6	43:25 44:11	22:22,23 32:9
Street 2:12 3:2	45:23 47:13	technological	49:10 53:7	33:22 34:23
4:3,8,13,18	48:4 50:18	59:20	55:19,25 60:8	35:9 37:6
6:19	58:5,15	technology 59:2	60:18 63:16,17	38:13 39:10,16
strong 35:12	surprised 53:23	59:7 61:2,12	things 13:14	40:11 43:17
<b>Stuart</b> 2:3 7:8	Susan 3:7 5:13	ten 37:11	16:1 19:21	44:22 48:23
study 42:19	7:19 9:14	ten-week 37:9	21:6 32:24	52:19 57:14
stuff 34:15,25	susan@robles	tend 29:12	33:16 34:14	58:14 59:22
54:19	3:10	term 15:21	35:8 40:9	62:19
subbing 9:22	suspect 30:7	terms 15:21 45:8	41:10 45:4	thoughts 18:2
submissions	Suzy 7:13	55:20 62:14	56:15 60:5	40:20
51:2 57:19	sweep 22:14	63:10	think 11:20 12:4	thousands 32:17
submit 51:3	system 41:25	Tessa 6:2 10:18	12:19,25 13:17	three 18:12
submitted 20:1		28:7	16:5,13 18:23	51:17
21:19 53:8	T	test 59:20	19:19 20:3,21	three-day 33:21
substantial 28:3	<b>T</b> 2:1 6:2	testify 15:10	20:24 21:12	throw 14:22
successful 41:7	<b>table</b> 50:17	26:19 44:15	22:2 24:2	33:19 34:1,8
sufficient 17:22	take 14:16 15:3	54:19	27:20 29:10,14	tied 27:25
39:21	16:25 17:6	testifying 26:17	29:18 30:20,25	time 11:20 13:5
suggest 12:21	20:16 30:14	27:2 28:5,11	31:2,10,13,19	14:23 17:1,9
13:4,15 33:18	36:13 42:19	testimony 14:17	32:20 34:2,8,8	17:11,12,13
suggestion 14:1	57:4,23	15:10,12,16	35:13 36:4,12	18:3,23 19:5
14:22	taken 20:7 35:23	17:19,24 20:2	36:18,18,19	19:16 20:17
Suite 2:6,12 3:2	65:11	22:4 25:19	37:7,12 38:10	23:25 25:18
3:8 4:3,13 5:3	talk 11:12 16:2	29:19 30:7,9	38:17,19,24	27:22,23 28:4
5:14 6:19	16:24 19:10	39:24 44:21,23	39:4,18 40:14	28:9 30:17
65:24	22:17,18 29:22	45:8,9,17,19	40:21 41:8,19	33:15 34:6,11
Sullivan 8:2	32:9 47:16	46:23 54:22	42:21 44:2,21	34:13,13 35:1
summarizing	60:18,19,19,25	Texas 1:7 2:2,16	45:22 46:2,24	36:13,24,25
	<u> </u>			- , , <del></del>

	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	•	<u> </u>
39:1 50:15	33:13,15,15,24	<b>type</b> 30:4,17	vaccinated	51:6
51:7 52:5,8,22	34:1,24 35:7	60:17	25:13	wants 59:22
53:25 54:10,25	36:1,10 37:9		Valentine 7:13	61:3
55:13,18 56:14	37:15 38:4,11	U	various 34:25	Washington 4:9
61:21,24 63:7	38:15,19 40:5	<b>U.S</b> 4:3,8,12	40:17 50:15	15:24 16:8
64:2 65:8	42:13,15 43:14	62:7	versus 7:2 15:17	wasn't 18:14
timing 41:11	44:15,25 45:11	ultimately 46:8	22:22 40:23	watching 29:17
44:1 62:15,24	45:24 46:9	<b>un-muted</b> 41:16	<b>video</b> 16:21	water 4:15 5:6
today 8:7 9:23	47:15 50:8,15	unanticipated	28:18	9:1,4,19 23:13
10:10 11:12	51:8 52:8,12	59:15	view 40:25	27:16 29:3,7
15:15 19:22	52:22 53:18	understand 18:6	41:12 44:10	30:11 41:6,8
46:24 47:17	55:13,18 56:18	21:6 29:19	49:21 50:3,19	41:12 43:5
today's 46:21	59:10 61:18,19	42:3 47:23	53:18 58:6	48:7,16 49:23
top 8:23	61:21 62:22	50:18,21 53:16	violated 40:1	51:17
total 15:8 18:24	63:1	understanding	violation 39:14	way 13:24 18:21
19:4	trials 13:20	42:6 44:14	39:20 40:3	20:1 29:23
totally 42:18	14:23 15:23	55:21 56:4,11	41:21 42:1	31:6 38:18
48:22 55:15	18:13 22:23	understood 36:4		40:7,8 48:6
transcript 1:12	29:11 30:20	underutilized	W	49:24 50:4
31:17 32:1	56:14,16	62:11	<b>W</b> 6:7	53:11 54:1
65:7	<b>Trout</b> 3:2 7:21	<b>United</b> 1:4,13	wait 25:21 43:2	61:7 63:6
transcriptions	true 65:6,7	4:1 8:10 19:7	<b>Wallace</b> 3:21 8:3	we'll 13:3 16:24
27:9	try 16:12 23:20	21:22 41:13	8:5,6 22:20,21	23:7 30:25
travel 22:12	37:2,12 38:3	46:22 47:8	42:2,8,23 43:1	35:20 37:15
25:11 27:22	42:22 60:6	48:19 49:19	51:5,6,11,12	47:14 52:14
33:23 34:7	63:25	51:25 58:25	52:9,19 53:1,9	59:9,12 60:11
37:4 61:21,23	trying 15:5,8	62:2,7	54:4	60:18,19 61:13
traveling 36:24	36:13 37:7	University 6:6	want 11:24 12:1	64:5
treated 48:8	40:16 41:24	10:20,24	12:24 14:4,6	we're 11:12 13:1
<b>trial</b> 11:13 13:13	53:15 62:23	unnecessary	14:21 22:19	13:5,22 15:5,8
13:15 14:14,19	ttd@tessadavi	36:1	23:13 24:6,18	16:13,23 18:9
14:21,24 15:19	6:5	update 58:4	25:3,23 26:4	18:24 19:10
15:22 16:4,4	turn 23:9	use 14:16 20:11	26:16,20,20,21	21:6 23:1
16:18 18:6,11	turns 37:8 48:14	24:19 32:22	26:22 27:2,17	24:17,20 27:24
19:1,2,5,12	two 19:15,17	36:25,25 50:17	27:23 28:3	27:25 32:1,5,9
20:11,16,19	21:9 23:12	55:12 60:16	29:9 31:13,20	32:18,22 33:8
21:15,18 22:6	27:5,10 35:3	62:7	31:25 32:5	36:19 38:18
22:7,10 23:2,8	36:5,5,17,17	useful 22:6	33:23 35:5	39:3 41:3,7,18
23:16,19 24:2	36:19 48:16	<b>Utah</b> 4:13	37:12 38:22	41:18 42:9
24:7,8,8,10,12	53:24 54:17	utility 5:6 9:1,4	41:8 43:9 44:9	43:2,15 45:12
24:23 25:23	56:25	41:23	47:24 49:16	46:13,25 48:4
26:12,23,25	two-and-a-half	<b>Utton</b> 6:7,8	50:18 55:25	51:18 53:15
27:3,4,12,18	18:14	10:21,22 31:8	57:21 59:24	60:13 63:5,22
28:9 29:5	two-day 31:15	31:9	60:10,16,23	we've 13:20
30:17 31:7,15	two-week 27:3	<b>V</b>	61:25	18:23 27:8
31:19 32:9,12	36:21	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	wanted 22:17	30:24 31:2,4,4
32:21 33:2,7	<b>TX</b> 65:24	v 1:8 3:22	31:9 45:23	31:5 32:20
L	<u> </u>	l	<u> </u>	l

34:6 36:12	15:11,13 16:20	15:16,19,23	<b>20240</b> 4:9	<b>570-4591</b> 3:14
38:16,16,21,21	16:21 18:24	16:3,4,20,24	<b>2067</b> 5:8,19	<b>575</b> 5:4 6:15
43:17 45:18	19:2,25 20:12	22:6,11 27:3,4	<b>208-5432</b> 4:9	
web-based 58:7	20:21 21:13	27:11,20 29:4	<b>223</b> 65:23	6
webinars 15:23	23:12 28:5,10	29:17,18 30:18	<b>2240</b> 6:3	<b>60</b> 19:7 33:1
Wechsler 2:20	29:9,16 30:8	30:20 31:14	<b>235</b> 6:19 65:24	<b>604</b> 6:14
7:14,16,17	30:15 31:11	38:2 58:6	<b>2386</b> 6:8	<b>6201</b> 4:13
11:7,8,15 12:1	44:12,13,14	60:16 61:18,19	<b>242-2228</b> 3:9	<b>624-2463</b> 6:15
12:3,17,25	46:11 50:1	<b>Zooming</b> 27:21	<b>25</b> 17:18	<b>636-2377</b> 5:4
18:1,5 20:3,20	51:19 52:18,21		<b>26</b> 53:24	<b>699-1445</b> 6:9
35:15,17,18	52:24 53:1,3	0	<b>2701</b> 2:12	
40:19,21 43:9	53:23,24 54:16	<b>04-30-22</b> 65:20	<b>279-7868</b> 2:13	7
43:22,24 44:16	54:18		<b>280-8745</b> 10:1	<b>700</b> 3:8
44:21 46:1,2	wondering 51:6	1	200-07-45-10.1	<b>720</b> 2:13 3:24
57:8,23,24	words 17:10	<b>1</b> 4:16 9:20	3	<b>745-1101</b> 6:20
61:3	48:14	10:13 27:17	<b>30</b> 18:25 19:24	<b>77027</b> 6:19
Wechsler's 45:2	work 16:12,25	<b>100</b> 17:11,17	<b>300</b> 5:14	65:24
week 12:21	17:4 22:7 23:3	61:21	<b>3000</b> 6:19 65:24	<b>78703</b> 4:23
28:23 33:20,24	26:9 31:1	<b>1000</b> 2:6	<b>303</b> 3:3 4:4	<b>78711</b> 2:17
36:8,19,21,22	32:20 33:14	<b>11:00</b> 1:14	<b>303187</b> 4:22	<b>78746</b> 5:14
37:1,3 52:22	37:15 59:3	<b>1100</b> 5:3	<b>30th</b> 33:20,25	<b>792-3636</b> 6:4
54:25,25 57:9	60:11 64:1	<b>111</b> 1:13	34:11 35:4,5	<b>7th</b> 3:23
57:19 62:20	workable 49:12	<b>1120</b> 3:2	35:19	
week's 57:12	worked 33:12	<b>113</b> 2:12	<b>325</b> 2:21 3:13	8
weekend 33:21	34:19 47:25	<b>12:28</b> 64:6	<b>329-4672</b> 3:18	<b>800</b> 6:20
33:24 37:5	working 47:14	<b>125</b> 4:13 17:11	<b>35</b> 18:25 19:24	800-745-1101
weeks 18:14	59:13	17:17	<b>370</b> 4:3	65:25
35:3,12 36:5,5	Worldwide 6:18	<b>12548</b> 2:16	<b>3711</b> 5:14	<b>801</b> 4:14
36:11,17,18,19	60:11 65:23	<b>1300</b> 3:23		80202 4:4
42:21 63:3,8	worried 34:14	<b>13th</b> 37:15 59:11	4	<b>80203</b> 3:3,23
weren't 39:21	wouldn't 14:10	<b>141</b> 1:1 7:2	<b>4206</b> 6:3	<b>80205</b> 2:12
Weslayan 6:19	48:15	<b>150</b> 17:18	<b>446-7979</b> 2:7	<b>8262</b> 65:20
65:24	<b>written</b> 31:4	<b>1508</b> 3:17	<b>463-2012</b> 2:17	<b>84138</b> 4:13
whittling 37:22	51:1 54:21	<b>15th</b> 47:22 65:17	<b>472-8021</b> 5:15	<b>844-1375</b> 4:4
whiteing 57:22 wholesale 56:9	57:19	<b>1600</b> 3:2	<b>480-8231</b> 4:23	<b>848-1800</b> 4:19
willing 18:9	<b>Wyoming</b> 40:23	<b>17</b> 1:12		<b>861-1963</b> 3:3
19:10 37:1	<b>vv yonning</b> +0.23	<b>1849</b> 4:8	5	<b>87048</b> 6:4
38:18 57:23	X	<b>18th</b> 4:3	<b>50</b> 19:6	<b>87102</b> 3:8
61:19		<b>1st</b> 37:13	<b>500</b> 2:6 3:8 4:18	<b>87103</b> 4:18
Wilson 27:2	Y		<b>505</b> 2:22 3:9,14	<b>87501</b> 2:22 3:13
witness 18:23	<b>Yeah</b> 18:5 59:8	2	3:18 4:19 5:9	3:18
20:18 21:5	<b>years</b> 39:15	<b>2</b> 52:12	5:20 6:4,9 10:1	<b>87504</b> 5:9,20 6:9
27:1,1 30:5		<b>2.3</b> 44:17	<b>508-6281</b> 3:24	<b>88005</b> 5:3
31:11 48:15,17	<u>Z</u>	<b>20</b> 5:3 30:22	<b>512</b> 2:17 4:23	<b>88202</b> 6:14
52:20	Zachary 7:18	<b>2011</b> 50:9	5:15	9
witnesses 14:4,7	<b>Zoom</b> 13:17,20	<b>202</b> 4:9	<b>524-5677</b> 4:14	
14:14 15:2,7	13:20,21 14:23	<b>2021</b> 1:12 65:17	<b>52401</b> 1:14	<b>916</b> 2:7
17.17 13.2,7		_		

<b>95814</b> 2:6 <b>983-3880</b> 5:9,20 <b>986-2637</b> 2:22 <b>999</b> 4:3		