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## PROCEEDINGS

(August 11, 2016)
THE SPECIAL MASTER: Good afternoon, Counse1. Is everybody on the line? I apologize. I think I'm three minutes 1ate. We had a little trouble with the equipment here in New Orleans, but we are good to go now.

Let's begin by taking roll for the benefit of the court reporter who is with us today. We are on the record.

Is counsel for Texas on the line, please?
MR. SOMACH: Yes. Stuart Somach, counsel of record for the State of Texas. I believe also on the line at another location is Mac Goldsberry and another location is Robert Hoffman. I do have Pat Gordon, the Texas Rio Grande commissioner, sitting here with me.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Thank you, Mr. Somach.
Is counsel for New Mexico on the line?
MR. FARRIS: Yes, Your Honor. This is Stephen Farris, counsel of record for the State of New Mexico. I have several other people with me, but I will be the only one speaking for the State of New Mexico on the record.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: I apologize for interrupting you. Would you identify them for the record, please.

MR. FARRIS: I'11 have them all do it so I don't mess this up.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: That's great.

MS. MAESTAS: Good afternoon, Counse1. This is Deputy Attorney General Tania Maestas.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Could you spel1 your last name, please.

MS. MAESTAS: M-A-E-S-T-A-S.
THE SPECIAL MASTER: Thank you.
MR. BLAINE: Good afternoon. This is Tom Blaine, the Rio Grande compact commissioner and state engineer.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Thank you, Mr. Blaine.
Anyone else for New Mexico?
MR. ROMAN: David Roman from the law firm of Robles Rael \& Anaya.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Thank you, Mr. Roman. Anybody else for New Mexico?

MS. DRENNAN: Yes, Your Honor. This is Lindsay Drennan also from the law firm of Robles Rae1 \& Anaya.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Thank you, Ms. Drennan.
Anyone else for New Mexico?
MR. RIDGLEY: Thank you, Special Master. This is Greg Ridgley, general counsel to the New Mexico state engineer.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Anyone else for New Mexico?
MR. LINDEEN: Good afternoon, Special Master. This is Chris Lindeen, deputy general counse1 for the Office of the State Engineer.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Thank you, Mr. Lindeen.

Anyone else for New Mexico?
MR. SCHMIDT-PETERSEN: Good afternoon, Special Master. This is Rolf Schmidt-Petersen, New Mexico Rio Grande compact engineer adviser.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Thank you, Mr. Petersen.
Is that everyone for New Mexico, please?
MS. HAAS: No, Special Master. Good afternoon. This is Amy Haas. I am legal adviser to New Mexico's Rio Grande compact commissioner.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Yes, Ms. Haas. We have you.
Thank you.
Anyone else?
MR. FARRIS: No, Special Master. That's all of us.
THE SPECIAL MASTER: Thank you, Mr. Farris.
Is counsel for Colorado on the line, please?
MR. WALLACE: Yes, Your Honor. This is Chad Wallace, and with me is Preston Hartman.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Thank you, Mr. Wallace.
Anyone else on the line for the State of Colorado?

MR. WALLACE: No.
THE SPECIAL MASTER: Thank you, Mr. Wallace.
Is the United States on the phone, please?
MR. DUBOIS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. This is Jim Dubois. Also on the phone are Steven Mcfarlane,

Judy Coleman, and I believe Shelly Randel from the solicitor's office is also listening in.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Thank you, Mr. DuBois. Is that everyone for the United States?

MR. DUBOIS: Yes, sir.
THE SPECIAL MASTER: Thank you.
Next are the folks who have, I believe, notified us in advance. Is counse1 for E1 Paso Water Improvement District No. 1 on the line, please?

MR. SPEER: Yes, Mr. Grimsal. I'm James Speer here. I'm here with Maria O'Brien.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Thank you, Mr. Speer.
MR. SPEER: We also have our board of directors
chairman, Mr. Johnny Stubbs, spelled S-T-U-B-B-S.
THE SPECIAL MASTER: Thanks, Mr. Speer.
Elephant Butte Irrigation District?
MR. SPEER: Excuse me. I'm so sorry, Mr. Grimsal. I left out one of our directors is also here, Mr. Art Ivey, spelled I-V-E-Y.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Thanks, Mr. Speer.
Is that it? Is that everyone?
MR. SPEER: That's it for the E1 Paso district.
THE SPECIAL MASTER: Thank you.
Is Elephant Butte Irrigation District counsel on the line, please?

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes, Special Master. Steven
Hernandez. With me is Lee Peters. On the phone in Santa Fe is Dr. Lisa Henne. I also have my board chairman, Willie Koenig, here. It's K-O-E-N-I-G.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Thanks, Mr. Hernandez.
Is counsel for the City of Las Cruces on the 1ine?

MR. STEIN: Yes, Special Master. This is Jay Stein, counse1 of record for the City of Las Cruces. With me is Jim Brockmann of our law firm and Dr. Jorge Garcia, who is the utilities director for the City of Las Cruces.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Thanks, Mr. Stein. Is that everyone for you?

MR. STEIN: Yes, sir.
THE SPECIAL MASTER: Is counse1 for New Mexico Pecan Growers on the line, please?

MS. DAVIDSON: Yes, Special Master Grimsal. This is Tessa Davidson, with the Davidson Law Firm, for New Mexico Pecan Growers.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Thank you, Ms. Davidson. Anyone else with you?

MS. DAVIDSON: No, sir.
THE SPECIAL MASTER: Is there anyone else on the line other than the parties who have identified themselves?

MR. JONES: Yes, sir, Special Master. This is

Alvin Jones on behalf of the Southern Rio Grande Diversified Crop Farmers Association.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Would you repeat the name of your entity, please, slowly.

MR. JONES: Yes, sir. Yes, sir. Southern Rio Grande Diversified Crop Farmers Association.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Thanks, Mr. Jones. Anyone else there with you on their behalf?

MR. JONES: No, sir.
THE SPECIAL MASTER: Any other parties on the line, please?

MS. THOMPSON: Good afternoon, Your Honor. It's Lisa Thompson listening in also for the State of New Mexico, along with Dr. Ken Knox.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Thank you, Ms. Thompson. Anyone else on the line?

Thank you, Counse1, for getting with us today. I've got a couple things I want to work through.

First, I want to make sure that our service list is correct and complete. There may have been a couple of people who've dropped off the case or gotten on the case since the case got started. I would ask everyone to have a look at the service list that was filed in connection with Case Management Order No. 2 that lists everyone's address and contact information. If any of that needs to be updated, I
would appreciate it if you would let us know via e-mail at your earliest convenience. That's the first thing I wanted to mention.

Second, I wanted to remind everyone about our general rules regarding participation in telephone conferences. In that regard, I would again call your attention to Case Management Order No. 2. Nonparties are welcome and permitted to participate and listen in on these conferences, but we request the courtesy of letting us know at least 24 hours before the conference by calling Anne Provosty, our paralegal, who I think most of you know by now, who has handled the administrative matters for this case.

Finally, before I move on to the substantive stuff, I wanted to remind particularly the parties if you need a conference call, if you think that we need to confer about anything, please let us know, and we will try to accommodate you in that regard.

Now, let me move on. The purpose of the conference today is to set a couple of deadlines. The context for that, as I think you all know, is we have provided a draft report and recommendation to the parties. I've solicited letter briefs on those. We have received all those. We are working through that material.

We, in due course, will prepare what we will regard as a final version of the report and recommendation and
file that with the Supreme Court. At that point, as we have discussed at the last conference, my understanding is the Court will probably set that for conference and make a determination whether to handle the matter with or without oral argument. You will be afforded the opportunity to file objections. The Court will accept or reject what we have recommended, and then the matter will proceed according to what the Court ultimately rules.

In the meantime, I wanted to move this along as much as I can under the circumstances. I think I am within the bounds of fair play by asking that issue be joined and then further asking the parties to confer and prepare a draft case management plan so that if and when the matter does come back, we are prepared to hit the ground running.

That's my general approach here. In that regard, I have taken my guidance from the example in the record of other special masters in other original jurisdiction matters.

The first thing I would like to do is to ask Texas and the United States to please file with me the complaint that you attached as exhibits to your motions for leave with the Supreme Court of United States. That will be merely a filing with me. That won't be a filing with the Court. Once that's done, that pleading will be treated as a complaint under Supreme Court Rule 17.2 and Federal Rules 8
through 11.
So I would ask, Mr. Somach and Mr. DuBois, how long do you think you would need to do that, to file your complaints with me so that they will appear on my record as your complaint?

MR. SOMACH: This is Stuart Somach. We can do that -- I'm out of the office now, but certainly by Monday, Tuesday at the very latest.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Mr. DuBois, does Tuesday work for you?

MR. DUBOIS: Monday or Tuesday will be fine, Your Honor. Your choice.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: It wil1 be Tuesday, the 16th, Texas and the United States will file with me their complaints. Then at that point I would turn to New Mexico first.

Mr. Wallace, I'm going to come back to you, as Colorado, but let me ask New Mexico first.

Mr. Farris, is there any reason why New Mexico could not file an answer with me within 21 days after the 16th?

MR. FARRIS: Yes, Your Honor. This is Steve Farris for the State of New Mexico. Our suggestion is that we believe that filing an answer, until we have heard from the Supreme Court, would be a waste of judicial resources. Depending on what the Supreme Court does, it could change the whole complexion of the case. We could end up answering claims
that are no longer there or are there and things like that. We would suggest instead that we would commit that within 45 days after the Supreme Court remands the case to the special master we would not only file our answer, but we would file any counterclaims that we have on that same date.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Mr. Wallace --
MR. WALLACE: Yes, Your Honor.
THE SPECIAL MASTER: -- I assume Colorado wanted to file an answer since you're actually named as a defendant.

MR. WALLACE: Well, Your Honor, I think the complaints raise an interesting question as to whether an answer is, in fact, required of the State of Colorado. There are no claims asserted against it.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.
MR. WALLACE: I'm a bit at a loss. I'm not really taking a position one way or another on it other than I think the question is still out there what it is we need to do about the various complaints.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: That's fair, Mr. Wallace. I respect your thinking in that regard. I simply wanted to give you an opportunity to weigh in as to how much time might be required if, in fact, you did want to file an answer. That's the purpose.

The purpose of this is not to force you to do an answer if you think that, because of what the complaints say,

Colorado doesn't need to file one. If you did want to file one, I wanted to give you an opportunity to say how long you needed to do it.

MR. WALLACE: I appreciate that clarification. I think that we would tend to agree with New Mexico's position that it might benefit everybody and the special master's time to know exactly what form the complaints will take before an answer is filed.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Well, we are talking about the complaints that have been filed as exhibits to the motions for leave.

MR. WALLACE: How is the special master treating New Mexico's motion to dismiss in that regard?

THE SPECIAL MASTER: In other words, a11 I'm doing at this juncture is completing my record. I don't believe that this prejudices any party in any way from objecting to my report and recommendation when I file it with the Supreme Court. A11 I'm doing is completing my record here. I want to be diligent. I want to be expeditious. I want to move the matter along. I want my record to be in shape that if the matter does come back, we are ready to move it forward. That's my philosophy here.

MR. WALLACE: Perhaps you could instruct us and help us out. Just as an example, with the U.S. complaint, my recollection is that it sounded primarily as a compact
violation, but that may or may not be the case after the first report. So would we respond to a compact violation claim or a contractual violation claim? I don't mean to put anybody on the spot, Your Honor. I'm just trying to figure out how we would end up filing an answer.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: We11, Mr. Wallace, I'm going to leave that up to you. The complaints say what they say, and my report says what it says. I think you can decide for yourself what you want to do in the face of those texts. Is that clear?

MR. WALLACE: I think, in answering your question, we would certainly prefer to have an order from the Supreme Court so that we could best give you an answer. If we are required to file one before that happens, we could probably do so within about 45 days.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.
MR. FARRIS: Your Honor, this is Stephen Farris for the State of New Mexico again. A while back you expressed a concern of not prejudicing any of the parties. New Mexico believes that if we have to file an answer before we have heard from the Supreme Court that we are, in fact, prejudiced. For example, the Supreme Court could grant one or more of our motions to dismiss. So we just think that it's better that we wait until we hear from the Supreme Court.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: How in that instance would you be prejudiced? The case would be over. It would be time to
open the champagne.
MR. FARRIS: Well, I suppose I took the example of New Mexico totally winning. If it's anything in between there, we need to know what it is that we have to answer. Certain7y we are going to have to answer what the Supreme Court leaves standing, and we won't know that until the Supreme Court tells us.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: We11, it seems to me that if the Supreme Court modifies what's left, we can revisit that at the time. Perhaps it will be necessary for the plaintiff and the plaintiff in intervention to file an amended complaint. Perhaps you could be given leave to file an amended answer. I don't see any of this as particularly problematic.

MR. FARRIS: We11, Your Honor, the other thing that I think you have to consider, respectfully, is that as we may be having counterclaims against both Texas and the U.S., we won't know for sure what they will be until we have a final decision from the Supreme Court.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Why not? Why not? Why wouldn't you know what the counterclaims are now?

MR. FARRIS: Because again, Your Honor, it's going to depend on what claims the United States Supreme Court leaves standing, and we don't know that now.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Mr. Somach, do you have any thoughts about this matter?

MR. SOMACH: I think that what you are proposing is very clear. I think it's appropriate. I don't think there's any prejudice to any of the parties. Certainly if the Supreme Court rejects in its entirety your report and recommendations, it will be over. If there's a modification -this answer, as I understand it, and any cross complaints will be filed solely with you. The Court won't see those. If it's appropriate either to modify our complaint or their answers, that certainly could be done without prejudice.

I think the benefit of moving forward -- and I would state this with respect to the case management plan -- is getting this case moved along. So when the Supreme Court finally decides what it wants to do, you can pull this stuff off the shelf, we can pull it off the shelf, and move expeditiously. It's important. I think what's what you are proposing, and certainly the State of Texas supports that.

MR. FARRIS: Your Honor, this is Stephen Farris again. I just point out that having an answer that may not fit anything that the Supreme Court leaves standing is certainly not going to move things along. Instead, it's going to tie up judicial resources and the resources of the parties. In the short term, I can see your concern of it looks like we have accomplished something. If we have to go back and redo it a11, we have actually lost time.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: We11 . . .

MR. FARRIS: Your Honor, this is Stephen Farris again. I was reminded -- and I apologize -- that the precedent in other original actions similar to this, what you are proposing is unprecedented. In the other cases, the special masters have waited until they hear from the Supreme Court.

I realize that in your case management order you spoke of Montana v. Wyoming, but it was significantly different in that Wyoming agreed and, in fact, I understand even suggested the procedure used there. So it's not actually precedent.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: What about Kansas v. Nebraska? I thought they had a similar situation there.

MR. FARRIS: We11, I don't believe so, Your Honor. The general precedent is to wait to hear from the Supreme Court.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Counsel, for the time, I'm going to take this under advisement. I will confer with counse1 again shortly about this. I was not expecting opposition to the filing of the answers. I'm going to take this under advisement and get back with you all shortly. That's all I have for the moment. Once we resolve this issue, we will be able to talk about conferring about a case management plan in the meantime.

MR. SOMACH: This is Stuart Somach again. I apologize for interrupting.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: No, not at a11. Go ahead, Mr. Somach.

MR. SOMACH: I would urge you to move forward with the case management plan, notwithstanding whatever happens with the answer.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Right.
MR. SOMACH: The only situation where the case management plan wouldn't be appropriate was, of course, if the whole case got thrown out. Every other scenario requires a case management plan to be developed.

I have, as I indicated in a letter to you, submitted to all the parties for our meet-and-confer a draft of a case management plan. I will just simply say it's formatted so that all of the times within it typically run from a starting point which won't be determined -- it will be determined ultimately by you once the case gets back from the Court.

Getting what is going to be a complex piece of work done and out of the way and, as I said before, on the shelf so that we can get going when this comes back from the Court I think is important. I think it is a way that allows the case to move forward in an appropriate manner.

This is a little bit of a broken record for me, I realize, but I think at every case management conference I have urged moving forward. We believe we are suffering harm
and that delay doesn't work to our benefit. This is one little thing -- a big little thing -- that could be done now that absolutely will not prejudice any party whatsoever.

I would propose that you schedule a date 60 or 90 days out by which the parties submit to you a draft for your consideration and final determination on what you want to do. That's one thing that can be done easily. There can't be any argument that, wel1, we don't know what the Supreme Court is going to say.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Thank you. Mr. Somach, I haven't taken that off the table, the case management plan.

Let me point out two things. It seemed to me, cart-and-horse-wise, it made more sense for the parties to have joined issue, to have a complaint and an answer before you start looking at the case management plan and figuring out what kind of discovery you needed. It seemed to me that would be an important thing you would need to be able to draft the case management plan. It's not impossible, but it seemed to me that made a lot more sense to do it that way, cart-and-horse-wise.

Second, just to make sure -- you and I may be actually looking at the same thing. Mr. Somach, the case management plan I saw was the one in Kansas v. Nebraska. That seemed to me to be -- I would mention this for everyone's attention -- a useful model for this matter.

Obviously, it may need to be tailored for the
particularities of this case, but that's the one that I would just recommend you have a look at. I don't know if that's the one you circulated to the parties or not. As long as you were having those discussions, that's the one I wanted to do.

Before we get to that, I think I need to resolve this issue about whether I'm going to require people to file an answer over objection. I'm not saying I'm not going to do a required case management plan as well, but I have to look at that question first, as to the requirement of an answer.

Any other discussion? Any other items for the good of the order?

MR. SOMACH: First, implied in your opening is you don't need any further discussion/briefing on the letters that were submitted to you. We were concerned a bit because we thought that Colorado's, New Mexico's, and a bit Las Cruces' went beyond technical issues. We did have significant disagreements with the substantive arguments that were made.

I'm not suggesting -- I don't really want to, but I don't want things to be considered unanswered when they went beyond the scope certainly of what we had understood was supposed to be submitted. That's the first issue.

The second is embedded in Las Cruces' comments is kind of a motion to appear as amici. I would like us collectively to have more discussion before that simply becomes a fait accompli.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: We11, let me take your issues one at a time.

Is there anyone else who feels they need an opportunity to file a response to another party's letter?

I think we are good to go, Mr. Somach, on that. I think we can figure out what goes to the substance and what goes to the technical issues. I appreciate your concern, but I think we are okay with respect to the letters.

With respect to the involvement of amici, are you interested in discussing the scope of participation of amici? Is that the issue, Mr. Somach?

MR. SOMACH: It is the fact that I think that Elephant Butte Irrigation District and EP No. 1 are in a different situation than Las Cruces. I do think one of the things the case management plan should do is discuss how active participation by amici is, but I do want to draw that distinction. I think we are talking about two different kinds of participation as we move forward. I don't want it just simply to be not discussed before something occurs in that regard.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: No, sir. I have actually -Sorry. Go ahead.

MR. SPEER: This is James Speer again. We strongly support the State of Texas as an amicus, E1 Paso County Water Improvement District No. 1. We really appreciate what we took
your suggestion to include that we be an active amicus. We would like to be able to respond to anything that's filed by anybody acting as an amicus. We would respond to anybody else.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: We11, let me cut through this. It seems to me the case management plan is the appropriate place to set out what everyone regards as the appropriate involvement of amici. My understanding -- again, from looking at other case management plans in other matters -- is that amici have no direct participation in discovery or in the presentation of an affirmative case of fact issues at trial. Amici monitor the case and obviously, when I would file a report, can file amicus briefs concerning my recommendations. You may need to flesh out a little more detail from those generalities, but that's my understanding.

Again, I would suggest that the parties confer and attempt to come to some sort of agreed ground rule for participation by amici. Does that work?

MR. STEIN: Your Honor, this is Jay Stein. May I be heard very briefly on the Las Cruces issue?

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Yes, Mr. Stein. Go ahead.
MR. SPEER: May I finish my remarks?
THE SPECIAL MASTER: Go ahead, Mr. Speer.
MR. SPEER: The facts on the ground are that the two -- and only two -- true beneficiaries of this federally created reclamation project are the two districts, the

Elephant Butte Irrigation District and the El Paso district, so we are sort of super amici. I just want to state that for the record. We are the real people who have an interest here. Nobody else does, but we do.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Thank you, Mr. Speer.
Mr. Stein, did you have something to say?
MR. STEIN: Yes, Your Honor, just very briefly. Our position was set forth in our letter of comments. Las Cruces' request, in effect, to be treated as an amicus in the same manner as EBID or EP No. 1 was based on two points. The first is that municipalities are granted amicus status by the Supreme Court rules, specifically Supreme Court Rule 37.4. Secondly, on the subject of an actual interest, we noted that in Your Honor's draft report, you stated EBID actually has less of an interest in this case, if any interest at all, than any other affected Rio Grande water user or claimant in New Mexico.

The City of Las Cruces is an actual beneficial user of water and supplies water to a municipality of over 100,000 people, the second largest municipality in New Mexico, and therefore has a direct and immediate interest as a beneficial user of water in this area.

Those were the two full bases for our request to be treated as an amicus on the same basis as EBID or EP No. 1.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Thank you, Mr. Stein.
Anybody else?

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes, Special Master. This is Steven Hernandez. I'm not going to get into an argument over our positions, just to point out to you to pay particular attention to our technical corrections on that issue.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Yes, sir. We are reading everyone's letters very carefully.

Counse1, thank you for your remarks today. What I propose to do --

MR. FARRIS: Your Honor, excuse me. This is Stephen Farris again.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Yes, Mr. Farris.
MR. FARRIS: Going back to Mr. Somach's comment and discussion with you about his letter and the case management plan, today is the very first time that we have heard that Mr. Somach wrote a letter to you. He did distribute his case management plan to the other parties but not the letter to the special master. With that case management plan, we have significant problems.

We have, in our own heads, been taking what you said to heart in the transcript of our last meeting on page 11 at line 20. You state your intention that the parties confer. We haven't done that. Instead, apparently Mr. Somach has started out with his letter to you. That in no way represents the position of any of the other parties, certainly not New Mexico.

MR. SOMACH: Let me respond, if I could. First of all, you were on the service list. I don't know why you didn't get a copy. I have a copy of the e-mail service list here and you're there, so I don't know why.

A11 the letter did was inform the special master in advance of this case management conference, the subject of which was case management planning, that I had distributed something and that we would follow up based upon whatever the special master's determination was today. I think it was one sentence, maybe two, and it certainly did not contain the case management plan.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: That's correct. My impression was it was an oversight. I don't believe he intended not to copy you. That's why at the beginning I asked everyone to make sure we have everyone's correct contact information included on the service list so everything gets copied appropriately going forward.

Counsel, if there's nothing else for the good of the order, I'm going to take under advisement the question of whether I can require the defendants to file an answer over objection at this point. The issue of the case management plan is logically anterior to that, in my view, so we will cross that bridge once I have dealt with the issue of the answer.

I expect to be back in contact with you in fairly short order, and we will set up another call at
everyone's mutual convenience to discuss this and get it resolved. I can assure you in the meantime we are working on your letters. We are working on revising the report and recommendation to get it on file as soon as we can.

Is there anything else for the good of the order?

Thanks for calling in, Counsel. Have a good afternoon. We will be back in touch with you before long. Thank you.

## (Proceedings adjourned.)
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|  | 6 | allows [1] 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MR. BLAINE: [1] 6/6 | 60 [1] 21/4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { along [5] } 10 / 1412 / 145 / 20 \text { 18/12 } 18 / 20 \\ & \text { also [9] } 4 / 15 / 116 / 167 / 258 / 28 / 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| MR. DUBOIS: [3] 7/23 8/4 13/10 MR. FARRIS: [13] 5/16 5/22 7/12 13/19 16/15 17/1 17/13 17/20 18/16 | 601 [1] 2/17 | $\begin{aligned} & 8 / 189 / 310 / 13 \\ & \text { ALVIN [2] } 3 / 1910 / 1 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 7 |  |
| 18/25 19/12 26/8 26/11 | 700 [1] 2/14 | Alvin Jones [1] 10/1 <br> am [2] 7/8 12/10 <br> amended [2] 17/11 17/12 |
| MR. HERNANDEZ: [2] 8/25 25/25 | 70130 [1] 4/9 |  |
| MR. JONES: [3] 9/24 10/4 10/8 | 7778 [1] 4/9 |  |
| MR. LINDEEN: [1] 6/21 | 79901 [1] 2/23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { amici [9] 22/23 23/9 23/11 23/16 24/7 } \\ & \text { 24/9 24/11 24/17 25/2 } \end{aligned}$ |
| MR. RIDGLEY: [1] 6/18 MR. ROMAN: [1] 6/10 | 8 | amicus [7] 23/24 24/1 24/3 24/12 25/9 |
| MR. SCHMIDT-PETERSEN: [1] 7/1 | 80202 [1] 2/11 | AMY [2] 1/22 7/8 <br> Anaya [2] 6/12 6/16 <br> Anne [1] 11/10 |
| MR. SOMACH: [9] 5/9 13/5 17/25 | 80203 [2] 2/4 2/8 |  |
| 19/23 20/2 20/6 22/11 23/11 26/25 | 87048 [1] 3/17 |  |
| MR. SPEER: [7] 8/9 8/12 8/16 8/21 | 87102 [1] 3/4 87501 [1] 1/23 | another [5] 5/11 5/12 14/16 23/4 27/25 |
| MR. STEIN: [4] 9/7 9/13 24/17 25/6 | 87504 [1] 3/14 | answer [22] 13/19 13/22 14/4 14/9 |
| MR. WALLACE: [9] 7/15 7/20 14/6 | 88004 [1] 3/11 | 14/12 14/22 14/25 |
| 14/9 14/14 15/3 15/11 15/22 16/9 | 88013 [1] 3/8 | 16/19 17/4 17/5 17/12 |
| MS. DAVIDSON: [2] 9/16 9/21 | 88202 [1] 3/20 | answering [2] 13/25 16/10 |
| MS. DRENNAN: [1] 6/14 MS. HAAS: [1] 7/6 | 9 | answers [2] 18/8 19/19 |
| MS. MAESTAS: [2] 5/25 6/4 | 9-700 [1] 2/14 | anterior [1] 27/22 |
| MS. THOMPSON: [1] 10/11 | 90 [1] 21/5 | any [20] 10/10 10/25 13/18 14/5 15/16 |
| THE SPECIAL MASTER: [61] | 95814 [2] 1/19 2/14 | $18 / 621 / 321 / 722 / 1022 / 1022 / 13$ |
| 1 | A | 25/15 25/15 26/24 |
| 100,000 [1] 25/19 |  | anybody [5] 6/14 16/3 24/3 24/3 25/25 anyone [11] 6/10 6/18 6/21 7/1 7/12 |
| 1000 [1] 1/19 |  |  |
| 1032 [1] 2/23 |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{lll}11 \\ 1120 & \text { [4] } 1 / 11 & 5 / 2 \\ 13 / 1 & 26 / 20\end{array}$ | about [13] 11/4 11/15 14/17 15/9 16/14 <br> 17/25 19/11 19/18 19/22 19/22 22/6 | anything [5] 11/16 17/3 18/19 24/2 28/5 apologize [4] 5/4 5/21 19/2 19/25 |
| $\begin{array}{ll} 1120[1] & 2 / 4 \\ 1300[1] & 2 / 7 \end{array}$ | 23/17 26/13 | apparently [1] 26/22 |
| 13108 [1] 3/7 | above [1] 28/17 | appear [2] 13/4 22/23 <br> Appearances [3] 1/15 2/1 3/1 |
| 141 [1] 1/1 | above-entitled [1] 28/17 |  |
| 1415 [1] 3/20 | absolutely [1] 21/3 | appreciate [4] 11/1 15/4 23/7 23/25 approach [1] 12/15 |
| 1508 [1] 1/23 | accept [1] 12/6 |  |
| 1600 [1] 2/4 | accommodate [1] 11/16 | appropriate [6] 18/2 18/8 20/8 20/22 24/5 24/6 |
| 16th [2] 13/13 13/19 | accompli [1] 22/25 | appropriately [1] 27/16 |
| 17.2 [1] $12 / 25$ 1849 [1] $2 / 20$ | accomplished [1] 18/23 according [1] 12/7 | appropriately [1] 27/16 are [33] |
| 1849 [1] 2/20 18th [1] $2 / 10$ | according [1] 12/7 <br> acting [1] 24/3 | area [1] 25/21 |
| 18th [1] 2/10 | acting [1] 24/3 <br> actions [1] 19/3 |  |
| 2 | active [2] 23/15 24/1 | arguments [1] 22/17 |
| 20 [1] 26/21 | actual [2] 25/13 25/17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Art [2] } 4 / 58 / 18 \\ & \text { as [36] } \end{aligned}$ |
| 2016 [2] 1/11 5/2 | actually [6] 14/9 18/24 19/9 21/21 | ask [4] 10/22 12/19 13/2 13/17 |
| 20240 [1] 2/21 | 23/21 25/14 |  |
| 20530 [1] 2/17 2067 [1] 3/14 | address [1] 10/24 adjourned [1] 28/10 | asked [1] 27/14 |
| 2067 [1] 3/14 | adjourned [1] 28/10 | asking [2] 12/11 12/12 |
| 21 days [1] 13/19 2168 [1] $3 / 4$ | administrative [1] 11/12 advance [2] 8/827/6 | asserted [1] 14/13 |
| 2168 [1] 3/4 2240 [1] 3/17 | advance [2] 8/8 27/6 | Association [3] 3/20 10/2 10/6 assume [1] 14/8 |
| 2240 [1] 3/17 | advisement [3] 19/17 19/20 27/19 <br> adviser [2] 7/4 7/8 | assure [1] 28/2 |
| 24 hours [1] 11/10 | adviser [2] 7/4 7/8 |  |
| 275 [1] 4/8 | affected [1] 25/16 | at [25] 5/11 10/22 11/1 11/9 12/1 12/2 |
| 2796 [1] 3/10 | affirmative [1] 24/10 | 20/24 21/15 21/21 22/2 22/8 23/8 |
| 3 | after [3] 13/19 14/3 16/1 | 24/10 25/15 26/21 27/14 27/21 27/25 attached [1] 12/21 |
| 300 [1] 2/23 | afternoon [9] 5/3 6/1 6/7 6/22 7/2 7/7 |  |
| 37.4 [1] 25/12 | 7/24 10/12 28/8 | attempt [1] 24/16 |
| 370 [1] 2/11 | again [11] 11/6 16/17 17/21 18/18 19/2 | attention [3] 11/6 21/24 26/3 <br> Attorney [2] $1 / 216 / 2$ |
| 4 | against [2] 14/13 17/16 AUGUST [2] 1/11 5/2 |  |
| 45 [2] 14/3 16/14 | agree [1] 15/5 | B |
| 5 | ahead [4] 20/1 23/22 24/20 24/22 | ```B-275 [1] 4/8 back[11] 12/13 13/16 15/21 16/17 18/23 19/20 20/16 20/20 26/12 27/24 28/8 based [2] 25/10 27/8 bases [1] 25/22``` |
| 500 [2] 1/19 4/8 | aided [1] 4/12 |  |
| 501 [1] 2/14 | Albuquerque [1] 3/4 |  |
| 504 [1] 4/9 | all [15] 5/23 7/13 11/20 11/22 15/14 |  |
| 589-7778 [1] 4/9 | 15/18 18/23 19/20 19/20 20/1 20/12 20/14 25/15 27/2 27/5 |  |


| B | City [5] 3/12 9/6 9/9 9/11 25/17 | D |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| basis [1] 25/23 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { cla } \end{aligned}\right.$ | date [2] 14/5 21/4 |
| be [49] | $\text { claims [3] } 13 / 25 \quad 14 / 1317 / 22$ | David [2] 4/2 6/11 |
| because [3] 14/25 17/21 22/14 | clarification [1] 15/4 | Davidson [5] 3/16 3/16 9/18 9/18 9/20 |
| becomes [1] <br> been [3] 10 | clear [2] 16/9 18/2 | days [4] |
| before [12] 1/12 11/10 11/13 15/7 | COLEMAN [2] 2/16 8/1 | deadlines [1] 11/19 |
| 16/13 16/19 20/19 21/14 22/5 22/24 | collectively [1] 22/24 <br> COLORADO [12] 1/9 2/4 2/6 2/6 2/8 | dealt [1] 27/23 |
| 23/19 28/8 |  | decide [1] 16/8 |
| begin [1] 5/7 | Colorado's [1] 22 | decides [1] 18/13 |
| beginning [1] 27/14 | come [4] 12/13 13/16 15/21 24/16 | decision [1] 17/17 |
| behalf [2] 10/1 10/8 believe [8] 5/11 8/1 8/7 13/21 15/15 | comes [1] 20/20 | defendant [1] 14/9 |
| believe [8] 5/11 8/1 8/7 13/21 15/15 19/13 20/25 27/13 | comment [1] 26/12 | defendants [1] 27/20 |
| 19/13 20/25 | comments [2] 22/22 25/8 | delay [1] 21/1 |
| beneficial [2] 25/17 25/2 | commissioner [3] 5/14 6/8 7/ commit [1] 14/2 | Department[5] 2/6 2/9 2/13 2/16 2/19 |
| beneficiaries [1] 24/24 | compact [5] 6/8 7/4 7/9 15/25 16/2 | depend [1] 17/22 |
| benefit [4] 5/7 15/6 18/10 21/1 | complaint [7] 12/21 12/25 13/5 15/24 | Depending [1] 13/24 |
| best [2] 16/12 28/16 | $17 / 11 \quad 18 / 8 \quad 21 / 14$ | deputy [2] 6/2 6/23 |
| better | complaints [9] 13/4 13/14 14/11 14/18 | detail [1] |
| beyond [2] 22/16 | 14/25 15/7 15/10 16/7 18/6 | determined [2] 20/15 20/16 |
| big [1] 21/2 | complete [1] 10/20 | developed [1] 20/10 |
| bit [4] 14/15 20/23 22/14 22/15 | completing [2] 15/15 15/18 | did [7] 14/22 15/1 22/16 25/6 26/15 |
| Blaine [3] 4/1 6/7 6/9 | Co | 27/5 27/10 |
| board [2] 8/13 9/3 | computer [1] 4/12 | didn't [1] 27/2 |
| both [1] 17/16 | computer-aided [1] | different [3] 19/7 23/14 23/1 |
| bounds [1] 12/11 | concern [3] 16/18 18/22 23/7 | diligent [1] 15/19 |
| Box [6] 3/4 3/7 3/10 3/14 3/17 3/20 | concerned [1] 22/14 | direct [2] 24/9 25/20 |
| bridge [1] 27/23 | concerning [1] 24/12 | director [1] 9/11 |
| briefing [1] 22/13 | $\text { confer [6] } 11 / 15 \text { 12/12 19/17 20/12 }$ | directors [2] 8/13 8/18 |
| briefly [2] 24/19 25/7 | confer [6] 11/15 12/12 19/17 20/12 24/15 26/21 | disagreements [1] 22/17 |
| briefs [2] 11/22 24/12 | conference [8] 1/12 11/10 11/15 11/19 | discovery [2] 21/16 24/9 |
| Broadway [1] 2/7 | conference [8] 1/12 11/10 11/15 11/19 $12 / 212 / 320 / 2427 / 6$ | discuss [2] 23/15 28/1 |
| Brockmann [3] 3/12 3/13 9/10 | conferences [2] 11/5 11/8 | discussed [2] 12/2 23/19 |
| broken [1] 20/23 | $\text { conferring [1] } 19 / 22$ | discussing [1] 23/10 |
| but [18] 5/6 5/19 11/9 13/7 13/17 14/4 | connection [1] 10/23 | discussion [4] 22/10 22/13 22/24 26/13 |
| 16/1 19/7 20/24 21/18 22/1 22/8 22/19 | $\text { consider [1] } 17 / 15$ | discussion/briefing [1] 22/13 |
| 23/7 23/16 24/14 25/4 26/16 | consideration [1] 21/6 | discussions [1] 22/4 |
| Butte [6] 3/6 3/9 8/16 8/24 23/13 25/1 | consideration [1] 21/6 considered [1] 22/19 | dismiss [2] 15/13 16/22 |
| C | contact [3] 10/25 27/15 27/24 | I] |
| California | contain [1] 27/10 | distributed [1 |
| call [3] 11/6 11/15 27/25 | context [1] | district [14] 2/23 3/3 3/6 3/10 8/9 8/16 |
| calling [2] 11/10 28/7 | contractual [1] 16/3 | 8/22 8/24 23/13 23/25 25/1 25/1 28/14 |
| can [14] 12/10 13/6 16/8 17/9 18/13 | copied [1] 27/16 | 28/14 |
| 18/14 18/22 20/20 21/7 23/6 24/12 | copy [3] 27/3 27/3 27/14 | districts [1] 24/25 |
| 27/20 28/2 28/4 | Corrales [1] 3/17 | Diversified [3] 3/19 10/1 10/6 |
| can't [1] 21/7 | Corrales [1] 3/17 | do [22] 5/13 5/23 12/19 13/3 13/3 13/6 |
| Capitol [1] 1/19 | correct [4] 10/20 27/12 | 14/17 14/24 15/3 16/9 16/13 17/24 |
| carefully [1] 26/6 | corrections [1] 26/4 | 18/13 21/6 21/19 22/4 22/7 23/14 |
| cart [2] 21/13 21/19 | could [12] 6/3 13/19 13/24 13/25 15/23 | 23/15 23/16 25/4 26/8 |
| cart-and-horse-wise [2] 21/13 21/19 case [42] | $\begin{aligned} & 16 / 12 \\ & 27 / 1 \end{aligned}$ | does [6] 12/13 13/9 13/24 15/21 24/17 |
| Case Management [2] 10/24 11/7 cases [1] 19/4 | 6/20 6/23 7/15 8/8 8/24 9/6 9/9 9/15 <br> 10/17 19/16 19/17 26/7 27/18 28/7 | doesn't [2] 15/1 21/1 doing [2] 15/14 15/18 |
| CCR [3] 4/8 28/13 28/20 | 10/17 19/16 19/17 26/7 27/18 28/7 | don't [16] 5/23 15/15 16/3 17/13 17/23 |
| certainly [10] 13/7 16/11 17/4 18/3 18/9 | County [3] 2/22 3/2 23/24 | 18/2 19/13 21/8 22/2 22/13 22/18 |
| 18/16 18/19 22/20 26/24 27/10 | $\text { couple [3] } 10 / 1810 / 2011 / 19$ | $22 / 1923 / 1827 / 227 / 427 / 13$ |
| CERTIFICATE [1] 28/12 | $\text { course [2] } 11 / 2420 / 8$ | done [6] 12/24 18/9 20/19 21/2 21/7 |
| certify [1] 28/15 | court [37] | 26/22 |
| CHAD [2] 2/6 7/16 | $\text { courtesy [1] } 11 / 9$ | Doyle [4] 4/8 28/13 28/20 28/20 |
| chairman [2] 8/14 9/3 | created [1] 24/25 | Dr. [3] 9/3 9/10 10/14 |
| champagne [1] 17/1 | $\text { Crop [3] } 3 / 19 \text { 10/2 } 10 / 6$ | Dr. Jorge [1] 9/10 |
| change [1] 13/24 | Crop [3] 3/19 10/2 10/6 cross [2] 18/6 27/22 | Dr. Ken [1] 10/14 |
| choice [1] 13/12 | cross [2] 18/6 27/22 Cruces [9] 3/8 3/11 $3 / 13$ 9/6 | Dr. Lisa [1] 9/3 |
| Chris [2] $4 / 36 / 23$ circulated [1] 22/3 circumstances [1] 12/ | Cruces [9] 3/8 3/11 3/13 9/6 9/9 9/11 23/14 24/19 25/17 <br> Cruces' [3] 22/15 22/22 25/8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { draft [6] } 11 / 20 \text { 12/12 20/12 21/5 } 21 / 17 \\ & 25 / 14 \\ & \text { draw [1] } 23 / 16 \end{aligned}$ |





| R | since [2] 10/21 14/9 <br> sir [9] 8/5 9/14 9/22 9/25 10/5 10/5 | substance [1] 23/6 substantive [2] 11/13 22/17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| resolve [2] 19/21 22/5 |  |  |
| resor | Sisk [1] $3 / 3$ | suffering [1] 20/25 |
|  | Sisk [1] 3/3 sitting [1] 5/14 | suggest [2] 14/2 24/15 |
| fu | sitting [1] 5/14 <br> situation [3] 19/12 20/7 23/14 <br> slowly [1] 10/4 <br> so [18] 5/23 8/17 12/13 13/2 13/4 16/2 | suggested [1] $19 / 9$ <br> suggesting [1] $22 / 18$  |
| spond [4] |  | suggestion [2] 13/21 24/1 |
| ponse [1] |  | Suite [5] $1 / 19$ 2/4 $2 / 11$ 2/14 $2 / 23$super [1] $25 / 2$ |
| vising [1] 28 | 16/12 16/13 16/22 18/12 19/9 19/13 20/14 20/20 25/1 27/4 27/16 27/22 |  |
| visit [1] 17/9 | 20/14 20/20 25/1 27/4 27/16 27/22 <br> software [1] $4 / 12$ | supplies [1] 25 |
| dgley [2] 4/3 6 | solely [1] 18/7 | support [1] 23/24 |
| ght [1] 20/6 | solicited [1] $11 / 21$ suppose [1] 17/2 <br> Solicitor [1] $2 / 19$ supposed [1] 22/21 |  |
| $25 / 16$ |  |  |  |
| Rio Grande [7] 5 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | 13/6 17/24 19/24 20/2 21/10 21/21 23/5 23/11 26/15 26/22 | 16/21 16/23 17/5 17/6 17/9 17/18 <br> 17/22 18/4 18/12 18/19 19/5 19/15 |
|  |  | 17/22 18/4 18/12 18/19 19/5 19/15 <br> 21/8 25/12 25/12 |
| ] | Somach's [1] 26/12 21/8 25/12 25/12 <br> some [1] 24/16 Supreme Court [23] 12/1 12/22 12/25 |  |
|  | something [4] $18 / 23$ $23 / 19$ $25 / 6$ $27 / 8$ $13 / 23$ $13 / 24$ $14 / 3$ $15 / 18$ $16 / 11$ $16 / 20$ <br> soon [1] 28/4  $16 / 21$ $16 / 23$ $17 / 5$ $17 / 6$ $17 / 9$ $17 / 18$    |  |
| $\text { ] } 5$ |  |  |  |
| man [3] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sorry [2] } 8 / 17 \quad 23 / 2 \\ & \text { sort [2] } 24 / 1625 / 2 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |  |
| Il [1] | South [1] 2/11 |  |
| [3] 12 |  |  |
| ule 17.2 [1] 12/25 | Southern [3] 3/19 10/1 10/5 <br> speaking [1] 5/20 <br> special [19] 1/13 6/19 6/22 7/3 7/7 7/13 | ```table [1] 21/11 tailored [1] 21/25 take [5] 15/7 19/17 19/19 23/1 27/19 taken [2] 12/16 21/11 taking [3] 5/7 14/16 26/19 talk [1] 19/22``` |
| 37.4 [1] 25/12 |  |  |
| [4] 11/5 12/8 12/25 25/12 | S/1 9/8 9/17 9/25 12/17 14/4 15/6 |  |
| run | 15/12 19/4 26/1 26/17 27/5 27/9 |  |
|  |  |  |
| S | specifaly [1] |  |
| S-T-U-B-B-S [1] 8/14Sacramento [2] $1 / 19$ 2/14said [2] 20/19 26/20same [4] 14/5 21/21 25/9 25/23Santa [3] 1/23 3/14 9/2saw [1] 21/22say [7] 14/25 15/2 16/7 16/7 20/13 21/9$25 / 6$ | SPEER [8] 2/22 8/10 8/12 8/15 8/20 23/23 24/22 25/5 | talking [2] 15/9 23/17 |
|  | 23/23 24/22 25/5 <br> spell [1] 6/3 | Tania [1] 6/2 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { spell [1] 6/3 } \\ & \text { spelled [2] 8/14 8/ } \end{aligned}$ | technical [3] 22/16 23/7 26 |
|  | Sperling [1] 3/2 | Is [1] 17 |
|  | spoke [1] 19/7 | nd [1] 15 |
|  | spot [1] 16/4 | term [1] 18/22 |
|  | standing [3] 17/6 17/23 18/ | Terrace [1] 2/11 |
| saying [1] 22/7 | start [1] 21/15 <br> started [2] 10/22 26/23 | TESSA [2] 3/16 |
| says [2] 16 |  | TEXAS [11] 1/6 1 |
| [1] | starting [1] 20/15 |  |
|  |  |  |
| Schmidt [2] |  |  |  |
| chmidt-Pete | 7/19 10/13 13/21 14/12 16/17 18/11 18/16 23/24 25/2 26/21 | thank [24] 5/15 6/6 6/9 6/13 6/17 6/1 |
| cope [2] 22/20 23/10 |  | 6/25 7/5 7/11 7/14 7/18 7/22 8/3 8/6 <br> 8/12 8/23 9/20 10/15 10/17 21/10 25/5 |
| second [4] 11/4 21/20 22 | stated [1] 25/14 STATES [12] 1/4 2/9 2/13 2/16 2/19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 8/12 8/23 9/20 10/15 10/17 21/10 25/5 } \\ & \text { 25/24 26/7 28/9 } \end{aligned}$ |
| Secondly [1] 22 see [3] 17/13 | $\begin{aligned} & 7 / 238 / 412 / 2012 / 2213 / 1417 / 22 \\ & 28 / 14 \end{aligned}$ | Thanks [6] 8/15 8/20 9/5 9/12 10/7 |
| med [4] |  | 28/7 |
|  | status [2] 1/12 25/11 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
|  | Stein [8] 3/12 3/13 9/8 9/12 24/18 that's [19] $5 / 257 / 138 / 2211 / 212 / 15$ <br> $24 / 2025 / 625 / 24$ $12 / 2414 / 1914 / 2215 / 2119 / 2021 / 7$ |  |
| ntence [1] |  |  |  |
|  | stenography [1] 4/12 | 22/1 22/2 22/4 22/21 24/2 24/14 27/12 |
| [5] 11/19 12/3 24/6 25/8 27/25 | STEPHEN [7] 1/22 2/13 5/17 16/16 18/17 19/1 26/9 | 27/14 <br> their [3] 10/8 13/14 18/8 |
| eral [1] 5/19 | Steve [1] 13/20 | them [2] 5/22 5/23 |
|  | Steven [5] 3/6 3/6 7/25 9/1 26/1 still [1] 14/17 | themselves [1] 9/2 |
|  |  | then [3] 12/6 12/11 13/15 |
| [2] $18 / 2227$ |  | there [15] 9/23 10/8 10/20 |
| [2] 18/22 $27 / 25$ | Street[7] 2/4 2/10 2/14 2/17 2/20 2/23 4/8 | 14/1 14/12 14/17 17/3 19/9 19/12 |
| [2] 19/18 19/20 [1] $23 / 15$ | strongly [1] 23/23 | 23/3 27/4 28/5 |
| ant [2] 22/16 26/18 | STUART [4] 1/17 5/10 13/6 19/24 Stubbs [2] 4/4 8/14 | there's [3] 18/2 18/5 27/18 |
| t[2] 22/16 26/18 |  | therefore [1] 25/20 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}\text { significantly [1] } & 19 / 7 \\ \text { similar [2] } & 19 / 3 & 19 / 12\end{array}$ | stuff [2] 11/14 18/13 |  |
| mons [1] 1/17 | subject [2] 25/13 27/6 <br> submit [1] 21/5 <br> submitted [3] 20/12 22/14 22/21 |  |
| mons [1] 1 |  | $22 / 19 \text { 23/3 }$ |
|  |  | thing [8] 11/2 12/19 17/14 21/2 21/2 |


| T | useful [1] 21/24 | words [1] 15/14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| thing... [3] 21/7 21/17 21/21 | user [3] 25/16 25/18 25/2 using [1] 4/12 | work [5] 10/18 13/9 20/19 21/1 24 working [3] 11/23 28/2 28/3 |
| things [6] 10/18 14/1 18/20 21/12 22/19 | utilities [1] 9/11 | would [35] |
| think [30] | V | wouldn't [2] 17/19 20/8 |
| thinking [1] 14/20 | various [1] 14/18 | Wyoming [2] 19/7 19/8 |
| THOMPSON [3] 2/3 10/13 10/15 | very [6] 13/8 18/2 24/19 25/7 26/6 | Y |
| those [7] 11/22 11/22 16/9 18/7 22/4 | 26/14 | Yes [21] 5/10 5/17 6/15 7/10 7/16 8/5 |
| thought [2] 19/12 22/15 | via [1] 11/1 | 8/10 9/1 9/8 9/14 9/17 9/25 10/5 10/5 |
| thoughts [1] 17/25 | view [1] 27/22 | 13/20 14/7 24/20 25/7 26/1 26/5 26/11 |
| three [1] 5/4 | violation [3] 16 | you [100] |
| through [4] 10/18 11/23 13/1 24/4 | W | you're [2] <br> your [41] |
| thrown [1] 20/9 <br> tie [1] 18/20 | wait [2] 16/23 19/14 waited [1] 19/5 | Your Honor [17] 5/17 7/16 7/24 13/12 13/20 14/7 14/10 16/4 16/16 17/14 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { time [8] 14/21 15/6 16/25 17/10 18/24 } \\ & 19 / 1623 / 2 ~ 26 / 14 \end{aligned}$ | WALLACE [8] 2/6 7/16 7/18 7/22 13/16 14/6 14/19 16/6 | $\begin{array}{lllll} 17 / 21 & 18 / 17 & 19 / 1 & 19 / 13 & 24 / 18 \\ 26 / 9 \end{array}$ |
| times [1] 20/14 | want [15] 10/18 10/19 14/22 15/1 15/19 | Your Honor's [1] 25/14 |
| today [6] 5/8 10/17 11/19 26/7 26/14 <br> 27/9 | 15/19 15/19 15/20 16/9 21/6 22/18 22/19 23/16 23/18 25/2 | yourself [1] 16/8 |
| Tom [2] 4/1 6/7 | wanted [8] 11/2 11/4 11/14 12/9 14/8 |  |
| Toni [4] $4 / 828 / 13$ 28/20 28/20 took [2] $17 / 2$ 23/25 | 14/20 15/2 22/4 |  |
| took [2] 17/2 23/25 <br> totally [1] 17/3 | wants [1] 18/13 |  |
| touch [1] 28/8 | was [15] 10/23 19/2 19/7 19/18 20/8 |  |
| transcript [3] 1/11 26/20 28/16 | 21/22 22/20 25/8 25/10 27/5 27/7 27/9 27/9 27/13 27/13 |  |
| transcription [1] 4/12 | Washington [2] 2/17 2/21 |  |
| treated [3] 12/24 25/9 25/23 | waste [1] 13/23 |  |
| treating [1] $15 / 12$ <br> trial [1] 24/10 | water [8] 2/22 3/2 8/8 23/24 25/16 |  |
| trouble [1] $5 / 5$ | 25/18 25/18 25/21 |  |
| Trout [1] 2/2 | way [6] 14/16 15/16 20/19 20/21 21/19 |  |
| true [2] 24/24 28/15 | we [93] |  |
| try [1] 11/16 | weigh [1] 14/21 |  |
| trying [1] 16/4 | welcome [1] 11/7 |  |
| Tuesday [4] 13/8 13/9 13/11 13/13 | well [12] 14/10 15/9 16/6 17/2 17/8 |  |
| turn [1] 13/15 | 17/14 18/25 19/13 21/8 22/8 23/1 24/4 |  |
| Tusa [4] 4/8 28/13 28/20 28/20 | went [2] 22/16 22/20 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { two [8] 21/12 23/17 24/24 24/24 24/25 } \\ & 25 / 1025 / 2227 / 10 \end{aligned}$ | were [6] 22/3 22/14 22/14 22/17 25/22 |  |
| typically [1] 20/14 | $\begin{aligned} & 27 / 2 \\ & \text { what [31] } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| U | what's [2] 17/9 18/15 |  |
| U.S [6] 2/9 2/13 2/16 2/19 15/24 17/16 | whatever [2] 20/4 27/8 whatsoever [1] 21/3 |  |
| ultimately [2] 12/7 20/16 | $\text { when [6] } 12 / 1315 / 17 \text { 18/12 20/20 }$ |  |
| unanswered [1] 22/19 under [5] 12/10 12/25 19/17 19/19 | $22 / 1924 / 11$ |  |
| $27 / 19$ | where [1] 20/7 |  |
| understand [2] 18/6 19/8 | whether [4] 12/4 14/11 22/6 27/20 |  |
| understanding [4] 12/2 24/7 24/14 | which [3] 20/15 21/5 27/7 |  |
| 28/16 | while [1] 16/17 |  |
| understood [1] 22/20 | who [8] 5/8 8/7 9/10 9/24 11/11 11/11 $23 / 325 / 3$ |  |
| UNITED [12] 1/4 2/9 2/13 2/16 2/19 | who've [1] 10/21 |  |
| $7 / 23$ $28 / 14$ 12/20 12/22 13/14 17/22 | whole [2] 13/25 20/9 |  |
| United States [6] 7/23 8/4 12/20 12/22 | why [7] 13/18 17/19 17/19 17/19 27/2 |  |
| 13/14 17/22 | 27/4 27/14 |  |
| unprecedented [1] 19/4 | will [27] 5/19 11/16 11/24 11/24 12/3 12/5 12/6 12/7 12/22 12/24 13/4 13/11 |  |
| until [5] 13/22 16/23 17/6 17/17 19/5 | 13/13 13/14 15/7 17/10 17/17 18/5 |  |
| up [7] 5/24 13/25 16/5 16/7 18/20 27/8 | 18/6 19/17 19/21 20/13 20/15 21/3 |  |
| updated [1] 10/25 | 27/22 27/25 28/8 |  |
| upon [1] 27/8 | Willie [2] 4/5 9/3 |  |
| urge [1] 20/3 | winning [1] 17/3 |  |
| urged [1] 20/25 | within [5] 12/10 13/19 14/3 16/13 20/14 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { us [11] } 5 / 8 \quad 7 / 13 \text { 8/8 } 10 / 1711 / 111 / 9 \\ & 11 / 1615 / 2315 / 2417 / 722 / 23 \\ & \text { used [1] } 19 / 9 \end{aligned}$ | without [2] 12/4 18/9 <br> Witwer [1] 2/2 <br> won't [5] 12/23 17/6 17/16 18/7 20/15 |  |

