NO. 137, ORIGINAL

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

STATE OF MONTANA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

No. 220137 ORG

STATE OF WYOMING and

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,

)

Defendants. )

## TRANSCRIPT OF TELEPHONIC PROCEEDINGS

STATUS CONFERENCE

MAY 24, 2013

Reported by Laurelle A. Simms, CSR No. 5762

KRAMM COURT REPORTING Page: 1

1	TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES:
2	
3	SPECIAL MASTER BARTON H. THOMPSON, JR.
4	STANFORD UNIVERSITY
5	JERRY YANG AND AKIKO YAMAZAKI
6	ENVIRONMENT & ENERGY BUILDING, MC-4205
7	473 Via Ortega, Mail Code 4205
8	Stanford, California 94305
9	605.721.1488
10	susan.carter@stanford.edu
11	
12	FOR THE STATE OF MONTANA:
13	MONTGOMERY & ANDREWS, P.A.
14	BY: JOHN B. DRAPER, ESQ.
15	JEFFREY J. WECHSLER, ESQ.
16	Special Assistant Attorneys General
17	DONNA OMEROD, Paralegal
18	325 Paseo de Peralta
19	Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501
20	505.982.3873; Fax 505.982.4289
21	jdraper@montand.com
22	jwechsler@montand.com
23	
24	
25	

1	TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES (CONTINUED)
2	FOR THE STATE OF MONTANA:
3	MONTANA ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE
4	TIMOTHY C. FOX, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MONTANA
5	BY: CORY J. SWANSON
6	Deputy Attorney General
7	ANNE YATES
8	Special Assistant Attorney General
9	215 North Sanders
10	Helena, Montana 59620-1401
11	406.444.5894; Fax 406.444.3549
12	cowswanson@mt.gov
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23 24	
∠ <del>1</del>	

```
1
                   TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES (CONTINUED)
2
    FOR THE STATE OF WYOMING:
3
    WYOMING ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE
4
    BY:
          PETER K. MICHAEL, ESQ.
5
          Chief Deputy Attorney General
6
          JAMES KASTE, ESQ.
7
          CHRISTOPHER M. BROWN, ESQ.
8
          ANDREW KUHLMANN, ESQ.
9
          DAVID WILLMS, ESQ.
10
          Senior Assistant Attorneys General
11
     200 West 24th Street
12
     123 Capitol Building
13
    Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002
14
     307.777.7841; Fax 307.777.6869
15
    peter.michael@wyo.gov
16
     james.kaste@wyo.gov
17
    chris.brown@wyo.gov
18
    andrew.kuhlmann@wyo.gov
19
    david.willms@wyo.gov
20
21
22
23
24
```

25

```
1
                   TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES (CONTINUED)
2
    FOR THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA:
    NORTH DAKOTA ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE
3
4
    BY:
          JENNIFER VERLEGER
5
          Assistant Attorney General
     500 North Ninth Street
6
7
    Bismarck, North Dakota 58501
8
     710.328.2210
9
     jverleger@nd.gov
10
11
    FOR AMICUS THE UNITED STATES:
12
    UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
13
    ENVIRONMENT & NATURAL RESOURCES
14
    DIVISION OF NATURAL RESOURCES SECTION
15
    BY:
          JAMES J. DUBOIS, ESQ.
16
    999 18th Street, Suite 370 South Terrace
17
    Denver, Colorado 80202
18
     303.844.1375
19
     james.dubois@usdoj.gov
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
1
                   TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES (CONTINUED)
2
    FOR AMICUS ANADARKO PETROLEUM COMPANY:
3
    BINGHAM McCUTCHEN, LLP
4
         MICHAEL B. WIGMORE, ESQ.
5
    2020 K Street N.W.
6
    Washington, D.C. 20006
7
    202.373.6000
8
    michael.wigmore@bingham.com
9
10
    FOR AMICUS NORTHERN CHEYENNE TRIBE:
11
    JEANNE S. WHITEING AT LAW
12
         JEANNE S. WHITEING, ESQ.
    BY:
13
    1628 5th Street
14
    Boulder, Colorado 80302
15
    303.444.2549
16
     jwhiteing@whiteinglaw.com
17
18
19
20
                       TELEPHONIC STATUS HEARING,
21
    reported at Kramm Court Reporting, 401 West A Street,
22
    Suite 750, San Diego, California 92101, commencing on
23
    Friday, May 24, 2013, at 10:02 a.m. before Laurelle A.
    Simms, Certified Shorthand Reporter, CSR No. 5762, in and
24
25
    for the state of California.
```

KRAMM COURT REPORTING Page: 6

1 SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA, FRIDAY, MAY 24, 2013, 10:02 A.M. 2 SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: So this is a status 3 4 conference in Montana versus Wyoming, which is No. 137 5 Original, before the United States Supreme Court. 6 And why don't we just start out with the various 7 parties identifying themselves or counsel for the parties 8 identifying themselves. 9 So why don't we start with counsel for Montana. 10 MR. DRAPER: Good morning, Your Honor. This is John Draper. I have with me here in Santa Fe 11 12 Jeffrey Wechsler and my assistant, Donna Omerod. Also, 13 for Montana on the phone separately are Cory Swanson and 14 Anne Yates. And if there's anybody else from Montana, I 15 would ask that they identify themselves. 16 SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. Good morning, 17 Mr. Draper. 18 So counsel for Wyoming. 19 MR. KASTE: Good morning, Your Honor. This is 20 James Kaste on behalf of State of Wyoming. I'm here with 21 Peter Michael, Chris Brown, David Willms, and 22 Andrew Kuhlmann, all from the Attorney General's Office. 23 SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. Good morning, 24 Mr. Kaste. 25 So next is, do we have counsel for North Dakota

KRAMM COURT REPORTING Page: 7

1 on the line? MS. VERLEGER: Jennifer Verleger, Your Honor. 2 3 SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. Good morning. 4 And then we'll go through the various Amici. We'll start with the United States. 5 6 MR. DUBOIS: James Dubois, Your Honor. Good 7 morning. 8 SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Good morning. 9 And then next, counsel for the Northern 10 Cheyenne. So is Ms. Whiteing on the line? 11 MS. WHITEING: Yes, this is Jeanne Whiteing for 12 the Northern Cheyenne Tribe. 13 SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. Great. Thank 14 you very much. 15 And then, finally, for Anadarko? 16 MR. WIGMORE: Yes, Your Honor. Michael Wigmore 17 for Anadarko. 18 SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. Good morning, 19 Mr. Wigmore. 20 So this is a regularly scheduled status conference. And Susan Carter is on vacation today, and 21 22 she actually took off like about 2:30 yesterday, and I've 23 been out of town. So if there were any types of submissions either late yesterday or early this morning, 24 25 I haven't seen them.

1 So I think the very first thing I should ask is whether or not anyone submitted anything. 2 3 MR. DRAPER: Okay. Your Honor, this is 4 John Draper. 5 SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Yes, Mr. Draper. 6 MR. DRAPER: I was just going to say -- to 7 identify myself, John Draper, and say that I'm not aware 8 of any recent submittals. 9 SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. Great. Thank 10 you very much. 11 So then there's really just two things that I'd 12 like to do. The first one is to just get a quick status 13 update of both counsel for Montana and counsel for 14 Wyoming, and then, second, after that, talk about the 15 need to begin thinking about the details on the 16 scheduling for the variety of other pretrial matters 17 because, by my count, we're less than five months away 18 now from the beginning of trial. So it's time to begin 19 to think about those various other matters. 20 Before getting to that, just a status conference

Before getting to that, just a status conference on how discovery and designation of expert witnesses is coming along.

So, Mr. Draper.

MR. DRAPER: Thank you, Your Honor. This is

John Draper.

21

22

23

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 Since the last conference call, we've been taking the depositions of Wyoming experts and water users 2 3 upon whom those experts have relied. We anticipate 4 further discovery within the time allowed to do so. 5 We're preparing expert reports for submission on 6 June 4th. And this past month we've responded to 7 concerns of Wyoming on discovery responses. 8 So that's really a quick rundown of the status

of things as we see it.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you. And Mr. Kaste.

MR. KASTE: Thank you, Your Honor.

I think that's an accurate description of our activities over the past months. I have a couple of things I'd like to talk about in terms of our activities in the coming months to give everyone a head's up on a few things.

First, unfortunately, we're going to be filing a motion that I hate to file, and it's a motion to withdraw. It's going to be from Mr. Willms. Mr. Willms has finally figured out that we don't pay him nearly enough for the good work that he does, and he's going to enter private practice. So very shortly everyone will see a motion to withdraw filed by Mr. Willms. And we regret to see him go, but I want to make everyone aware

that that's going to take place here in the next month.

In addition, as Mr. Draper pointed out, the State of Montana responded to some discovery concerns that had been raised by the State of Wyoming. I think it's fair to say the State of Wyoming isn't satisfied with that response, and in the coming weeks we'll be taking the appropriate action to bring those matters to your attention. We're not yet finished with the drafting process to get those matters in front of you, but we'll follow the procedure outlined in the case management plan for doing that. And I don't want it to be a surprise to anybody that that's going to come. And I'm thinking next week, but we're not yet there.

Similarly, we are anticipating conducting further depositions in this case. We have been in contact with counsel for the tribe and with a couple members of the tribe to set up depositions to learn where their water has been going. And we have -- we anticipate ultimately getting a deposition set up for a representative from Decker Coal Mine. That's been complicated by the fact that the Decker Mine was recently purchased, and so finding the right people to make that process work has become more difficult in light of their changeover. I think we anticipate deposing one more Montana water user who was on, I think, our original

list, and it's just been difficult to get him in the same room with everybody.

At this time I think we're anticipating the depositions of the two tribal members on June 5th, and that date has been communicated to counsel for Montana. We've been working with the tribe to get that set up at a time that's convenient for those individuals.

With regard to additional written discovery, we haven't made a determination on whether or not that will be necessary. I know that the deadline for submitting that is coming right up, and we'll be making that determination here in the near future.

Otherwise, as it relates to depositions, I don't believe we see any additional depositions on the horizon from our side.

And then I guess it's probably necessary to make the Court aware that I think we anticipate filing a motion here in the near future related to Montana's claims that were included in the Bill of Complaint that relate to the Powder River. As you know, during a previous status conference there was an acknowledgement or admission by the State of Montana that they would not be bringing any claims related to the Powder River. We would like to see that aspect of the case formally closed. And so we think we'll need to make an

appropriate motion to obtain an order dismissing any and all claims related to the Powder River that may have been included in the Bill of Complaint.

We have attempted to obtain a notice of voluntary withdrawal from the State of Montana voluntarily. That hasn't been forthcoming. And we do believe we're entitled to a formal resolution of those complaints. And it's fair to say that Montana, true to its word, has included nothing related to the Powder River in its expert reports and discovery since that time has focused exclusively on the Tongue River. We'd just like to have it in the Court's file in an appropriate document that those claims are dismissed with prejudice. We may need to make that motion here in the near future.

Finally, I think -- and this falls in line very well with the second matter that you'd like to discuss. We were going to ask the Court whether we could get a scheduling order in place for the remaining events in this litigation. As you know, we're working currently on a letter that was drafted by counsel and some discussions in a status conference like this, and the parties -- I think we'd all be better served by having that formal scheduling order in place that puts specific dates on all the remaining events that are going to be necessary in the course of this case.

So I guess I would suggest that consistent with the prior procedure the parties take a shot at drafting a stipulated scheduling order. And instead of maybe doing it in a letter form this time, to ease the burden on you, perhaps we could draft it in the form of an order, and you could sign it if the parties' stipulation meets with your approval. And my assumption would be that there would be a number of dates that we still probably need to settle on, working back from the October trial date that you had set.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. Mr. Draper, did you want to respond to anything that Mr. Kaste said, or do you want to add any of your thoughts regarding activities over the next month or so?

MR. DRAPER: Yes, if I may. We have discussed with Wyoming the need to file the proper motion disposing of our claims on the Powder, and we do intend to do that. And so I don't think it's necessary for them to move that, but we will go ahead and get that done, and I appreciate Mr. Kaste mentioning that because it is something we intend to do and bring before you and get that entered.

With respect to the scheduling, yes, at this point we're working off of an April 21 email from Susan Carter giving proposed dates, and we're assuming

I would second Mr. Kaste's thoughts that it would be good to have that, you know, in a formal order.

Also, with respect to future activities, I might add that we had the next conference -- status conference we have scheduled in this case is for Friday, June 21, and I'm going to be away for most of the time -- well, it's actually, from this Tuesday until June 23rd. And I would, therefore, ask your indulgence, if it's not inconvenient for you or the parties, to hold that scheduling conference or status conference in the following week of June 24th to 28th.

I had one other request for future activities that might be appropriate for me to mention at this point. We're coming up on the end of the fiscal year for Montana and, I think, for many states. And it would be helpful if in July Your Honor could provide the states with the fees and expenses approved by you and your office through June 30 so that we can designate funds and hold those to support the payment of your next application to the Court whenever that may occur.

So those were the things that came to mind as I listened to Mr. Kaste.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. Great. Let me just go back over several of them.

1 The first is that I see no problem -- actually, let me go back. So you said you are out of town, 2 3 Mr. Draper, or at least not available starting next week 4 through the week of June 21st? 5 MR. DRAPER: Yes, that's right, Your Honor, 6 through June 21st. 7 SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: So, basically, then it 8 doesn't make any sense to try to advance the June 21st 9 date; instead, we would need to delay it until the week 10 after? 11 MR. DRAPER: Yes, if that would be possible. 12 SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: I think that should be 13 And, in fact, the date of June 21st was not going 14 to end up working for me either. So I have no problem 15 changing that particular date. But let's come back and 16 talk about that in a minute when we talk about doing a 17 scheduling order. 18 With respect to any discovery motion that you're 19 filing, Mr. Kaste, I think there's really sort of two 20 questions on there. The first is Mr. Draper's 21 availability, and obviously if you need a guick ruling on 22 any discovery, then we'll proceed according to the case 23 management plan. I should let you know, however, that I'm actually going to be out of the country from 24 25 June 13th through June 21st. So during that period if

any of the parties try to reach me it will be difficult.

I will have email, but it will be only periodic.

On the Powder River, it sounds like that Montana will be dealing with that particular issue, but obviously, Mr. Kaste, if you don't feel that what they do is satisfactory, you are free to file any type of motion that you want on that, but it sounds like that's going to resolve itself.

I have no problem on filing or providing the parties before July with fees and expenses. And, in fact, what I will do is I will actually file my motion for fees with the Supreme Court before then so that it's actually an official filing that you can rely on at that stage. The Court obviously won't get to that until their beginning October term, but at least that will be officially filed.

And so unless anyone has anything in addition to talk about, what I would suggest we do is to turn to a scheduling order.

So is there anything else before we turn to that that people want to discuss?

MR. KASTE: Well, this is James Kaste. I would just put on the record that moving the status conference to accommodate Mr. Draper's schedule and your schedule is fine with us. We're available anytime the following

1 | week.

With regard to the timing related to the discovery motion that will be forthcoming, I don't see where either the absence of counsel or your absence from the country for a limited period should be a problem.

Montana's entitled to, you know, a sufficient amount of time to respond to that, and, you know, we've done a lot of motions in the course of this case on very short notice, and this one can be an exception to that practice. I don't have a problem with taking this one in due time.

I would say with regard to the motion related to the claims related to the Powder River, if we could get some resolution on that in the next couple of days, perhaps before Mr. Draper leaves the country, that would help. That matter has kind of been pending out there for the last five months or so since the status conference for that information was relayed. Certainly our draft motion hasn't been out there on the table that long, but it's been a while. And if we could put that matter behind us relatively quickly, I'd appreciate it.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Mr. Draper, do you think it's possible to take care of that before you leave?

MR. DRAPER: Yes, your Honor. I would mention

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that Jeffrey Wechsler in my office will be covering for my functions while I'm away. So we should be in good shape. And I will make sure we address that very quickly.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. Excellent.

So on the scheduling order, so there's a variety of things that I think the order will need to address. So, as you pointed out, there was the email which set out dates both for the dispositive motions as well as the beginning of trial, and so, hopefully, the scheduling order could incorporate those. It should also address motions in limine and other pretrial motions, dates for pretrial briefs, not expert witnesses -- and we should come back and talk about that for a moment in a minute -exhibits, and any other matters that you think would be relevant to that. And, in particular, to the degree that we are at this stage going to be addressing exhibits, probably also use of confidential documents or information, any items of that nature that you think should be incorporated into an order at this stage, that would seem appropriate to me.

And then what I would propose is that the counsel for the parties meet, see whether or not they can come to an agreement with respect to the provisions of this order. I agree that the best thing to do would be,

if you can come to an agreement, just submit it to me as a draft document that the parties have agreed to. And to the degree that there are any open issues where there is any disagreement between the parties, what I would propose is that you submit a draft order which includes all of the provisions that you've agreed to, to the degree that there is any disagreement, then alternative provisions -- and then you can do this again in the form of letters to me -- discussion of the nature of any disagreement and the arguments for why you think it should provide the provisions that you've proposed.

MR. KASTE: This is James Kaste. I assume this order would include a pretrial conference date. And when you say "pretrial briefs," is it your preference to see -- you know, my experience is that in advance of trial -- in advance of trial parties file a pretrial conference memo. The contents of those vary somewhat. I think the parties could agree on a form of pretrial conference memorandum.

Is it your preference to see a pretrial conference memorandum that is, you know, very traditional looking and what sounds like a pretrial brief on the law that might be governing the various aspects of this case, or one or the other?

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: I think both.

1 MR. KASTE: Both, okay. 2 SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: That would be my 3 preference. 4 So let me come back to the nonexpert witnesses. 5 So, Mr. Draper, in the Kansas versus Nebraska case, was all the direct testimony there in writing or 6 7 was there also oral direct? 8 MR. DRAPER: In that case, the trial that took 9 place last summer, the Master required prefiled 10 testimony. 11 SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. 12 MR. DRAPER: And then what occurred in trial was 13 cross-examination and redirect. 14 SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: All right. Okay. So 15 another thing that I would ask the parties to consider is 16 whether or not it would make sense to do any and/or all 17 of the direct testimony in writing. 18 MR. KASTE: I don't need much time. This is 19 James Kaste, Your Honor. The State of Wyoming will not consent to that procedure. 20 21 SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. 22 I would object vehemently to it. MR. KASTE: SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. Let me ask then 23 a different question, which is, given that we still have 24 25 dispositive motions coming up, do the two sides have any

estimate right now for how long they think the trial would last? Let's assume that the dispositive motions don't dispose of anything.

MR. DRAPER: Your Honor, this is John Draper. Frankly, I don't, but we could, perhaps, include that in a subsequent submittal after the parties have a chance to consider it and discuss it to give you an estimate that might be more useful.

MR. KASTE: I think that that's fair -- this is James Kaste -- that we could in the proposed scheduling order that we submit would reference the trial date and the parties would identify, if we can agree, that it would be whatever length we could identify towards the end of that document what we anticipate. I think that's a good conversation for counsel on both sides to have, frankly. And, of course, some portion of that is going to depend on the rulings on summary judgment.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Yeah, I understand that.

And so I would appreciate if -- as part of the discussions with respect to the scheduling order, if you were able to discuss your thoughts as to the potential length of the trial, and then at the same time that you file the draft scheduling order, if you could provide along with that -- and, again, conform -- take the form

of a joint letter -- your thoughts as to the length of the trial.

Let me go back to the direct testimony in writing.

Mr. Draper, do you have any thoughts on this?

You may not have been able or had a chance to talk to the Attorney General's Office, but I'm curious to see your thinking.

MR. DRAPER: Well, Your Honor -- this is

John Draper -- we haven't had that discussion internally.

I would say it does shorten trial, but it has certain disadvantages. I think parties naturally like to have a chance -- an unfettered chance to present their experts and other witnesses in a way they'd like to have the Special Master see them. And you miss all of that when you prefile testimony. So there's advantages in terms of if there's some reason that you've got to finish up trial very quickly. I think in that case the Master did feel that that was necessary.

But I think we do need to keep in mind in this type of proceeding that the Court has indicated over the years that it needs to have a full record when it's making a decision between sovereigns. So I think that's a consideration that counterbalances the speed that it adds to the trial to have prefiled testimony.

So those are some considerations that would be at play in how we approached this, and, as I say, we haven't formulated a final recommendation to you on that.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: All right. Okay. So let me do some additional thinking on that. I think for purposes of your discussion right now you can assume that there would not be direct testimony in writing, but, as I say, I'm going to keep that issue open for the moment so I can do some additional thinking on the question.

So ideally what I would like to be able to do is at the next -- at the next status conference to actually have the draft scheduling order, which, as I say, I'll probably enter in the form of a case management order, to have that draft from you so that if there's any issues to discuss we can address them then.

So thoughts on when that would mean that we would schedule the next status conference? And, ideally, I would like to either be able to do it that week of the 24th, or, if necessary, we can do it the very beginning of the week of the 1st.

And so, Mr. Draper, I think it depends on the degree to which you think that people in your office and the Montana Attorney General's Office can address a lot of the scheduling issues while you're away.

MR. DRAPER: Your Honor, this is John Draper. I

1 think it is true that the Attorney General's Office and 2 Mr. Wechsler here can make good progress on that. I 3 would suggest that maybe we look at the last day or two 4 of that week to give me some chance to get over jet lag 5 and to participate in the finalization of that proposed 6 scheduling order. 7 SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. 8 MS. VERLEGER: Your Honor? 9 SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Yes. 10 MS. VERLEGER: This is Jennifer Verleger. I'm 11 in depositions all day on the 27th and 28th. So maybe 12 the 26th would be better. 13 SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Well, what I'm 14 wondering is, are people planning on being in on 15 July 1st? 16 MR. DRAPER: Your Honor, we're available that 17 day. 18 SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Mr. Kaste? 19 MR. KASTE: This is Mr. Kaste. We're always 20 available. We're available July 1st and --21 SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Now I know why 22 Mr. Willms is leaving. 23 That's right. MR. WILLMS: 24 SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: My thought would be if 25

we scheduled the status conference on July 1, that then

if we could, say, schedule the time for submitting the draft scheduling order as, you know, sometime late that week of June 24th, you know, say either June 26th or June 27th, that would give me an opportunity to review things after you've submitted it and then for us to have the conference call on July 1.

How would that sound to people?

MR. DRAPER: Your Honor, this is John Draper.

That would be fine, and I would request the 27th for that submittal of those two options.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Mr. Kaste?

MR. KASTE: The 27th is fine for Wyoming.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. So why don't we go ahead and do that. As I say, you know, in addition to the matters that I've outlined a moment ago, I would encourage you to be inclusive rather than exclusive. We can always decide not to include something. So anything that you think it would be appropriate to agree to at this particular point in time let's put into that particular order.

Also, I've not checked on various locations for the proceeding at the moment, but I think I've mentioned before my current inclination will be that if the trial lasts more than two weeks, which my guess is it probably will, is that it will be here probably at Stanford. And

I realize that there are witnesses who may not have a lot that they want to testify to, but that -- and, therefore, you don't want them to have to travel all the way here to California.

And so, as I mentioned before, there are at least two options that I could see for handling those witnesses. The first -- and, again, this depends, I think, on the overall length of the trial. But one possibility would be that we could actually hold, say, two weeks of proceedings in Billings, which I believe was the city that everyone was agreed to before, and anyone who you wanted to present there rather than here could be presented at that point in the proceeding. Obviously, the disadvantage of that from your standpoint is that some witnesses would be presented out of order that you might ideally want to be presented. But it would mean that we'd all be in one place for purposes of that testimony.

Another option would be the possibility of video presentation. And I can tell you that here we would be totally capable of handling that, and I think there wouldn't be any problem finding locations in both Montana and Wyoming where the witness could be. And, obviously, that also has advantages and disadvantages to it. There might be other options that I'm not thinking of.

But the bottom line is if it's a very short proceeding, then I don't have any problem doing it in Montana, but if it's more than two weeks, then I'm planning on doing it here. I am open to any type of options that you would like to consider for purposes of listening to the testimony of witnesses, who, again, it doesn't make any sense to fly them here to California.

So another thing that I'd like you to think about for purposes of that scheduling -- well, let me say one thing that you should think about in the same time that you are coming up with a draft scheduling order is how you might want to deal with that, and then we can talk about that more the next conference call.

MR. KASTE: This is James Kaste. Can I make a suggestion/request? In the intervening period between now and our next conference call I think it would be beneficial for the parties to understand whether or not there are federal facilities available to us in Billings. I've been hesitant to make that call up to the judges in Billings. I think a call from you to the district judges in Billings to ask and inquire about the availability and the feasibility of their facilities for any portion of this case there would be certainly well received in a way that it wouldn't be from me. And it would be helpful for all of us to know whether or not those federal facilities

are even available to us and whether or not we would need to make provisions to do something different in the city of Billings.

I can tell you my initial inclination with regard to video testimony is that it's awful. I've been through that morass a few times, and it's never, never good and certainly nowhere near as valuable to anybody as testimony in person.

I'm troubled by scheduling trial -- obviously the blocks of time that we're in California and the blocks of time we're in Billings will be sequential, and yet we'd be taking witnesses out of order. The Plaintiffs' case-in-chief, if we're going to do certain witnesses in Billings, they're going -- if there's going to be witnesses that we would try and squeeze into that block, that doesn't strike me as optimal, I guess.

And I guess I'm still more than a little reluctant to fly our whole trial team and witnesses out to California and have Montana do the same in these -- in these times where everybody in my state is being asked to cut their budget, and I bet the same is true in Montana. I mean, it seems like the most expensive option for us. And I have a responsibility to voice that concern and try my best to protect our public fisc here in Wyoming. That is a lot of heavy hauling to get this case from where it

is in Wyoming and Montana out to California.

And I understand the difficulty that it presents for you and your schedule, and I suspect you're teaching next semester, but please consider the burden that it puts on the parties to pick this puppy up and move it a thousand miles away.

MR. DRAPER: Your Honor, this is John Draper.

I'd like to just say, since Mr. Kaste has gone on in some lengths about his choice of location, I probably need to check with the Attorney General in Montana, but my initial reaction is it's not that big of a deal to bring the people out to Stanford. We've had -- when we've done this before -- we have brought witnesses from other states who are the party states to trial proceedings -- it hasn't caused any great problem. And picking up and moving a whole trial apparatus, including your office and facilities, and changing to a different one not only has the disadvantages of dislocating witnesses in the order, but also it's an expense in and of itself.

So I think that this is something we can discuss further with Wyoming, but would not -- I would not immediately jump to the conclusion that Mr. Kaste seems to be jumping to.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: All right. Just let me just then say several things. The first is that, as I

said, I haven't checked on any venues, and that is one of the things I was planning on doing over the next month, and I do believe that's the Special Master's responsibility rather than the parties' responsibility.

So I will have a much better sense of what facilities might even be available by the time of the next status conference.

The second thing is that I understand,

Mr. Kaste, your concerns. You've voiced those before.

And I will remain aware of and take those into account.

I should warn you, though, at the moment my plan is to do it here. And, therefore, I would hope that you and

Mr. Draper can talk about, assuming it is held here, how you would think about handling witnesses, whether or not you would have any desire, if it is held here, to do any of the testimony either by video or by having a portion of the proceeding held there where you can actually have local witnesses who you do not expect to be on the stand for a lengthy period of time.

I'm not making a determination today that it will be here at Stanford. I expect to make a determination on that after the next conference call.

And so you're certainly -- both parties -- all three parties are more than welcome to state their preference for holding it some place other than Stanford when we

have the next conference call. But at the moment that is my inclination, and so it would be, I think, very valuable if you could think, when you get together with Mr. Draper, about if it is held here whether or not you would want any type of option for having witnesses heard in Montana or Wyoming. Maybe it's because I'm in Silicon Valley, but I've found video proceedings a little bit better than I think it sounds like you had the experience, Mr. Kaste, although I realize that they are not perfect. And so, anyway, I would hope that you would spend a little bit of time talking about that as part of the discussion over the scheduling order.

The other thing that would -- I'd appreciate your thinking on is whether or not there is a value for me actually taking a tour of the area. My own inclination is that it would be valuable. I think it's very difficult sometimes to have discussions of water issues, particularly when you're talking about an interstate dispute of this nature, without actually having a sense of the overall geography.

And so the other thing that we should probably think about doing is scheduling a day when I could actually see the areas that we are talking about. And presumably that would be a tour that both of the two parties would agree to or all three parties would agree

to and that any counsel who wanted to could accompany me.

MR. KASTE: Your Honor, this is Mr. Kaste. I can tell you for a fact that a day is not enough.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. That's fine.

MR. KASTE: We're talking about a lot of country out there, and to get a real sense of what's at issue you're going to be traveling, what, a couple of hundred miles from the Big Horn Mountains all way down to the confluence with Yellowstone. I think it's a fantastic idea. I do think you need to see that country and see some diversion works and the reservoirs and the fields, and it will give you a much better sense of what the parties are arguing about.

I guess my inclination -- and maybe I'm wrong -is the best time to do that would be in July or August
when we're at those periods where really the parties are
in conflict, those periods where water is a little bit
shorter than during the spring runoff. And I think that
the parties could work out an agreeable protocol about
who is there and how we would treat the transmission of
information to you for purposes of your future decisions
in this case. I mean, it's important that you get to ask
questions when you see things, but nobody is under oath,
and it presents weird problems. But I think we can get
over those hurdles relatively easily.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 And, like I say, my suggestion would be let's go in July and August and see the period at issue in action. But I think, to be fair, you'd better schedule three days 3 4 on the ground because there's a lot of driving to get from one place to another out there.

MR. MICHAEL: Your Honor, Pete Michael. I would also -- Mr. Kaste just said on the ground. In the air, that's been done -- was done in the North Platte case with the Special Master there, I think, in 2001. So some kind of aerial overview is probably a concept, too, as part of this.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. Mr. Draper, your thoughts?

MR. DRAPER: Your Honor, I think it would be helpful. I've seen cases where the Master has taken tours and cases where the Master has not. And I think it's generally been beneficial. I think it would be I think we need to figure out the conditions great. thereunder and the entourage that would be going, but we could work that out for your approval.

And in terms of the amount of time, I would think two days should probably be good. I know your schedule may -- the more and more time we try to find, it may be more difficult for you. But it probably is more than a day, but I would think one day would likely do it.

And I would support the idea of Mr. Michael that it's
helpful to have an aerial tour along with the ground tour
to give you a full sweeping view of the basin at issue.

MR. KASTE: You need three days to work in some fishing.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: I would love to do that, but I think on this trip it will be probably business, particularly if it's three days.

So that's very helpful. I agree that ideally also it would be nice to do that in July or August, but, again, I will leave that up to counsel for the parties to discuss over the next month. I can tell you -- I was just looking at my calendar right now -- probably the ideal times, if you think it is still a relevant period, would be at the beginning of the week of August 12th or the week of August 19th.

MR. DRAPER: Your Honor, this is John Draper. I should mention that right at that point we're going to be in trial in Portland, Maine, in the Kansas-Nebraska case. The Special Master just set a couple days at the end of that week of the 12th, in other words, August 15th and 16th. So as we discuss this with Wyoming, we'll be looking at various schedules, but I just wanted to mention that that is an issue there.

And I think one of the things we can do is

1 work out with Wyoming what the itinerary would be, and that would tell us then how long it will take, and then 2 3 we could present that to you for your review and 4 approval. MR. DUBOIS: Your Honor, this is Jim Dubois. I 5 6 apologize, but I'm going to have to drop off. And I will 7 point out that the fishing in the Big Horns is much 8 better the end of July than it is if you get into August. 9 SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Well, it sounds like 10 Counsel has already been up there. 11 MR. DUBOIS: My mother grew up in Sheridan, Your 12 I've spent a lot of time in the Big Horns. Honor. 13 But I have to drop off for another hearing. I 14 apologize. I don't think I have anything to add to the 15 discussion, though. 16 SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you very 17 much. 18 MR. DUBOIS: Your Honor. 19 (Mr. Dubois left the telephonic proceedings.) 20 SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: So, yes, I was more 21 than anything else -- and we're talking about July --22 trying to help on thinking about dates. The other -there are some options, looking at my calendar, in July. 23 24 So we could probably do it also early in the week of July

the 15th. I just need to be in Utah on July the -- by

25

July the 19th. And, similarly, we could do it the week
of July 22nd, but I would be coming -- I would be
flying -- if we did it that week, that Monday, July 22nd,
I'd be flying from Utah. But both of those two weeks are
possibilities for me, too.

So, anyway, I just wanted to give you those dates because if we are going to do it in July or August we need to be thinking about that sooner rather than later.

MR. MICHAEL: Your Honor, this is Pete Michael. I would add one other thing. If August became necessary, certainly I know Montana has its various people that are good tour guides for how the Tongue River operates there that are either with the State or even a water user. And we have our commissioner or our hydrologist or head of the office in Sheridan that are probably the best tour guides, really, to say this is what you're looking at.

So it's possible that, you know, attorneys -- I would think an attorney from both Attorney General's Office would probably be sufficient if, you know, it's pretty limited to that, unless, you know, obviously other people want to see with their own eyes what you see so they can comment on it later. I guess that's another idea.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Yeah. And so I'll

leave that for a discussion between counsel for the various parties.

Just thinking about the dates, however, what I would suggest is that the parties try to reach at least a tentative agreement within the next week or so as to whether or not it makes sense to do a trip in July or August and agree on some tentative dates that would work for the parties. And then what I would then be able to do is to put a hold on my calendar for those particular dates because I'm just afraid otherwise that Susan Carter will start scheduling things in the meantime.

You don't have to reach a final agreement, but it will be nice to have at least a tentative agreement as to whether or not we're going to try and do something in July or August and the dates. Again, what I would suggest at this point is let's go ahead and reserve three dates if we can -- or three days in a row than a shorter period of time. Again, that way at least it's set out in my calendar.

MR. KASTE: We can do that. And I would say -this is James -- that the last joint scheduling
submission that we made Mr. Wechsler drafted, so -- and
took the laboring more on that. So I think I owe them
the first crack at this order that we need to work on
together, and I can take the first crack at drafting

- 1 these things up and send them on to Montana.
- MR. WIGMORE: Your Honor, this is Mike Wigmore
- 3 | for Anadarko. Just real briefly, we've been talking
- 4 about the scheduling order among the parties, and I think
- 5 consistent with what we did last time I'd ask that the
- 6 Amici also be able to participate in those discussions.
- 7 | I think we've all -- all Amici have taken an appropriate
- 8 role here and tried to be cooperative, you know,
- 9 understanding this is primarily an issue among the
- 10 parties. And so I'd ask that we be allowed to
- 11 participate as well.
- 12 SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Any concerns about
- 13 that from States of Montana or Wyoming?
- MR. DRAPER: Your Honor, no concerns from
- 15 | Montana.
- MR. KASTE: No, none from Wyoming.
- 17 | SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. Great.
- Okay. So then what we have, then, is first the
- 19 parties, in conjunction with Amici, will give thought as
- 20 to whether or not we could organize a tour of the
- 21 relevant area for July or August. And if the parties
- 22 could let Ms. Carter know by, I was going to say,
- June 7th.
- All right? So that's two weeks from today.
- 25 Do you think that will be enough time? It should be.

MR. DRAPER: Yes, Your Honor, that should be enough.

MR. KASTE: It should be enough time for Wyoming. We just need to check on the availability of our hydrologist and commissioner to make sure when we schedule this they will be there to take us to the appropriate locations.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. Great. So if you can then let Ms. Carter know by June 7th whether the parties believe that we can schedule something for July or August in the way of a tour.

The other thing, just in the goal of being totally complete, you know, once we get at the very end of August, that week of August 20 -- yeah, so just going through again just on the various dates, it's possible I could do something on the week of July 8, but that's right now a week that's already pretty heavily scheduled. So I'd have to change a variety of meetings around if I did that.

Again, it looks to me as if there wouldn't be a problem doing it the week of July 15th for me so long as I can get to Utah by the evening of July the 18th. The week of July 22nd, I would need that Monday to travel from Utah, but otherwise that entire week is free for me. Then I'm not available the week of July 29th, not

available the week of August 5th. That week of August 12th, I'm available at the beginning of the week and just need to be in Boulder, Colorado, by the evening of August 14th for, actually, a conference -- a retrospective on Arizona versus California.

And then the week of August 19th looks fine, but I have surgery the morning of August the 22nd. So I would just need to fly back the evening of August 21st for that surgery. It's possible I'd be available the week of August 26th. The surgery is just some hand surgery, but I'd have to check with my doctor to find out whether or not it's fine to fly that week.

Okay. So that's just for your purposes so that you'll have a sense of my schedule. And so, again, if you could just let Susan Carter know by June the 7th as to whether or not a tour looks feasible in July or August and then give her the dates, and she can set those aside. And, you know, I'll even offer -- if at that point it looks like maybe there are two dates that you want to have set aside, feel free to tell her that, but, obviously, it would be better if we narrowed it down to one set of dates at that particular point.

So that's Item No. 1. Any questions on that?

MR. DRAPER: This is John Draper. In your schedule do you have any options for early September?

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Yes. Right now the week of September the 2nd looks like it's available. I could do September 9th and 10th, but I have a board meeting back here on September 11th. So that would cut that fairly close.

Again, the week of September 16th also looks fine.

MR. KASTE: I'd just caution about that time that irrigation is essentially over. This is

James Kaste. And with irrigation essentially over, there will be quite a lot of information that you won't be able to see.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Mr. Kaste, you know, I agree with you. To the degree that we can do this at a period when, you know, people are still irrigating, I think that would be the preferable period, but I also wanted to provide Mr. Draper with those additional dates if for any reason you can't work out dates in July or August. Preferably it would be in July or August.

MR. SWANSON: Your Honor, this is Cory Swanson from Montana. Do you have an objection to, say, a Sunday fly-in and beginning a tour on a Monday? Just looking at a lot of these dates, the tour may not start, say, on Monday, but there's a travel day on the front end of it.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: No, I don't. As a

general matter, on the various dates that I have given you so far, I don't see any problems immediately -- on that Sunday immediately before except ones that I've mentioned. So again, if it's the week of July 22nd, I will be in Utah and wouldn't be available to fly out until that Monday, July 22nd.

And let me just check. No. All the other

Sundays are free. So there would be no problem coming in on Sunday. The dates I've given you are basically dates that I could be there and ready at, you know, 7 a.m. in the morning if you wanted me to go out.

Okay. So that's the first item. Then the second item is the draft scheduling order. And, again, we will have a deadline for the submission of that on July -- I'm sorry -- June 27th.

And then I will have -- well, let me just ask right now. What about my morning on July 1st, is there a preference as to time? I would be happy to do it at 9 a.m. our time out here, which would be 10 a.m. your time, or we could do it at 10, 11 a.m. your time. Any preferences?

MR. DRAPER: Your Honor, this is John Draper.

Either one will work for us.

MR. KASTE: This is James. I prefer earlier so we can get them out of the way given that you're already

an hour earlier on your end. Nine a.m. your time works great for us.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. Why don't we then -- unless we have any objection, then we will do it on July 1st at 9 a.m. Pacific Time, 10 a.m. Mountain Time, and let's reserve an hour and a half so that we have plenty of time for that.

And we will also then be canceling the current conference -- status conference call which is scheduled for June 21st. So that will come off the calendar. And the topics for that will be: the draft scheduling order; second of all, we will also spend additional time at that point talking about the location of the trial and the question of, if the trial is here in the Bay Area, whether or not the two parties would like to have a provision for having either a portion of the trial in Montana or Wyoming or, alternatively, to have the opportunity for doing part of it by video.

And I think that covers everything that I have on my sheet at the moment.

Anything else that we haven't discussed?

MR. DRAPER: This is John Draper, Your Honor.

That's all I have.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. Just going back, I'm going to file fees and expenses with the Court

1 as soon as possible and, at the latest, probably early next month. And I've given you the dates I'll be out of 2 3 town in June, but otherwise I will be here and available 4 for any type of issues that the parties want to raise. 5 And if you have any questions along the way as 6 to what to include in the scheduling order, again I would err in favor of being inclusive. And if you have any 7 8 questions, just relay them to Ms. Carter, and I will 9 respond right away. 10 This is Mr. Kaste. I don't have MR. KASTE: 11 anything further on behalf of the State of Wyoming. 12 SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. Great. Then 13 unless any Amici or State of North Dakota have anything, 14 then we can go ahead and adjourn this call. 15 Thank you. Okay. 16 MR. DRAPER: Thank you. 17 MR. KASTE: Thank you, your Honor. 18 SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you. For 19 everyone, have a great weekend. Enjoy the three-day 20 holiday even in Wyoming where you work every day

(The proceedings concluded at 11:09 a.m.)

24

23

21

25

apparently.

```
1
     STATE OF CALIFORNIA )
2
                         ) ss
 3
    COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO )
 4
5
          I, LAURELLE A. SIMMS, Certified Shorthand Reporter
6
    No. 5762, State of California, do hereby certify:
7
    That said proceedings were taken at the time and
8
    place therein named and were reported by me in shorthand
9
    and transcribed by means of computer-aided transcription,
10
    and that the foregoing pages are a full, complete, and
11
    true record of said proceedings.
12
         And I further certify that I am a disinterested
13
    person and am in no way interested in the outcome of said
14
    action, or connected with or related to any of the
15
    parties in said action, or to their respective counsel.
16
    The dismantling, unsealing, or unbinding of the
17
    original transcript will render the reporter's
18
    certificate null and void.
19
          IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
20
    this 30th day of May, 2013.
21
22
23
24
                               Laurelle A. Simms, CSR No. 5762
25
```