NO. 137, ORIGINAL

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

STATE OF MONTANA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

No. 220137 ORG

STATE OF WYOMING and

Defendants.

BEFORE THE HONORABLE BARTON H. THOMPSON, JR. SPECIAL MASTER

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TELEPHONIC HEARING

July 19, 2010

Reported by: Antonia Sueoka, RPR, CSR No. 9007

1	TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES:
2	
3	SPECIAL MASTER:
4	STANFORD LAW SCHOOL
5	HONORABLE BARTON H. THOMPSON, JR., ESQUIRE
6	Crown Quadrangle
7	559 Nathan Abbott Way
8	Stanford, California 94305-8610
9	650.723.2465; Fax 650.725.0253
10	buzzt@stanford.edu
11	
12	
13	
14	FOR THE PLAINTIFF STATE OF MONTANA:
15	MONTGOMERY & ANDREWS, P.A.
16	BY: JOHN B. DRAPER
17	JEFFREY J. WECHSLER
18	SPECIAL ASSISTANT ATTORNEYS GENERAL
19	325 Paseo de Peralta
20	Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501
21	505.982.3873; Fax 505.982.4289
22	jdraper@montand.com
23	jwechsler@montand.com
24	
25	

1	TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES (CONTINUED)
2	
3	FOR THE PLAINTIFF STATE OF MONTANA:
4	MONTANA ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE
5	BY: JENNIFER ANDERS, ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL
6	CHRISTIAN D. TWEETEN, CHIEF CIVIL COUNSEL
7	215 North Sanders
8	P.O. Box 201401
9	Helena, Montana 59620-1401
10	406.444.5894; Fax 406.444.3549
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES (CONTINUED)
2	
3	FOR THE DEFENDANT STATE OF WYOMING:
4	WYOMING ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE
5	BY: PETER MICHAEL
6	SENIOR ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL (Counsel of Record)
7	DAVID WILLMS
8	ANDREW KUHLMANN
9	ASSISTANT ATTORNEYS GENERAL
10	PATRICK TYRRELL, STATE ENGINEER
11	DEAN HIRT, INTERN
12	200 West 24th Street
13	123 Capitol Building
14	Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002
15	307.777.7841; Fax 307.777.6869
16	pmicha@state.wy.us
17	dwillm@state.wy.us
18	akuhlm@state.wy.us
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES (CONTINUED)
2	
3	FOR THE DEFENDANT STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA:
4	NORTH DAKOTA ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE
5	BY: TODD A. SATTLER,
6	ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL (Counsel of Record)
7	500 North Ninth Street
8	Bismarck, North Dakota 58501
9	710.328.2210
10	tsattler@nd.gov
11	
12	FOR THE UNITED STATES AS AMICUS CURIAE:
13	UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
14	BY: WILLIAM M. JAY
15	ASSISTANT SOLICITOR GENERAL
16	950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
17	Washington, D.C. 20530-0001
18	202.514.8976; william.m.jay@usdoj.gov
19	and
20	UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT Of JUSTICE
21	ENVIRONMENT & NATURAL RESOURCES DIVISION
22	JAMES DUBOIS, ESQUIRE
23	1961 Stout Street, 8th Floor
24	Denver, Colorado 80294
25	(303) 844-1375; james.dubois@usdoj.gov

TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES (CONTINUED) ALSO PRESENT: SUSAN CARTER, ASSISTANT TO SPECIAL MASTER REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS taken telephonically on Thursday, July 19, 2010, at 11:03 a.m. before Antonia Sueoka, Certified Shorthand Reporter, CSR No. 9007, RPR.

1 Thursday, July 19, 2010, 11:03 a.m. 2 3 SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Why don't we go ahead 4 and start and begin with identifications of the people on 5 the line for the court reporter, so we'll start with the 6 State of Montana. MR. DRAPER: Yes, Your Honor. This is John 7 Draper here for the State of Montana. With me in my 8 9 office I have Jeffrey Wechsler. Also on the line from 10 Montana are Chris Tweeten and Jennifer Anders. 11 SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Thank you. 12 And State of Wyoming. MR. MICHAEL: Yes, Your Honor. This is Peter 13 14 Michael from the State of Wyoming. With me is David 15 Willms, who has appeared previously in the case; our State 16 engineer Patrick Tyrrell, that is T-y-r-r-e-l-l, for the court reporter; new attorney with our office Andrew 17 18 Kuhlmann, and that last name is spelled, K-u-h-l-m-a-n-n; 19 and we have a law student intern that is here just 20 observing for the summer Dean Hirt, last name is spelled H-i-r-t. 21 22 Thank you. SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. 23 And then finally for the United States which is not a party in this action but has participated as amicus 24

in most of the proceedings.

25

MR. DUBOIS: This is Jim Dubois on behalf of the United States, and also on the phone is William Jay from the Solicitor General's Office.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. Again, thank you very much everyone for -- oh, I'm sorry, from North Dakota, I almost forgot. Sorry about that.

MR. SATTLER: No problem. This is Todd Sattler from North Dakota, and it's just me on the phone from North Dakota.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you.

So, again, thank you everyone for participating this morning. I thought that given that all of the briefs have now been filed in connection with Montana's exceptions to the First Interim Report that it would be a good time to check in with everybody, and in particular, I was interested in the parties from the United States views on whether or not there are ways in which we could advance the proceedings in this case pending the Supreme Court taking action on the exceptions.

So I know that the Supreme Court has not decided yet whether or not to actually hear the exceptions. If they did, though, it looks to me as if we're probably talking about oral argument in December, and so it could be seven, eight, nine months before we would actually have a decision and opinion from the Supreme Court.

Given that Wyoming did not file exceptions at this stage, there are a number of issues that we know will be with us no matter what the Supreme Court were to say in connection with Montana's exceptions, so the question that I'm interested in is whether or not there might be things that we could be doing in the meantime so this case could get further along at the point that it does come back from the -- from the U.S. Supreme Court. And my current thought pending your all comments would be to ask the parties to meet and confer by -- did we lose somebody?

Is everybody still on the line, I guess I should ask?

THE REPORTER: Court reporter is still on.

MR. MICHAEL: I am still here from Wyoming.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. Well, for the moment we'll assume everybody is on the line. They'll call back in a moment if they're not. I just wanted to make sure I hadn't been dropped.

So, anyway, so I'll ask the parties to meet and confer by telephone to talk about what proceedings might take place, again, pending resolution of Montana's exceptions, and there were three or four things in particular that I thought that the parties might consider in that regard.

One was to see whether or not the parties could

identify the legal and factual issues that still need to be resolved on those portions of Montana's complaint that aren't currently the subject of exception, and in that connection the nature of any discovery or evidentiary proceedings that would -- are currently contemplated in connection with those legal and factual issues.

Second, probably the easiest thing to do would be to see if the parties could come to agreement on those portions of the case management plan that aren't directly related to the specific discovery that the parties would want to pursue, so that would include rules governing discovery, in particular expert discovery, privileged logs, what all of the Rules of Civil Procedure should apply, how to deal with confidentiality, resolution of disputes, and the like.

A third possibility, and I know this might be pushing things farther than the parties feel comfortable going at this stage, but would be whether or not it would be possible to bifurcate or phase discovery so that the parties could begin discovery on some of the issues that again aren't directly related to the exceptions.

And so those I think are the three things that I'll throw out there for the moment, but I'd be interested in the various parties' initial thoughts on whether or not it might be possible to advance the case further pending

resolution of the exceptions and also the views of the United States on that issue.

So why don't I start with Montana. Do you have any initial thoughts on this?

MR. DRAPER: Your Honor, this is John Draper. I think -- I think, the questions that you had there are helpful, and of course, we would like to move things forward if we can. I think based on discussions that the states have had, we're -- we're doubtful that we can really be efficient going forward with discovery at this point, but I thought that the other items that you mentioned, for instance, the case management plan, that would be fruitful areas that the parties might well discuss in anticipation of the Court's ruling.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Any thoughts from Wyoming?

MR. MICHAEL: Your Honor, it's Pete Michael. We had a call last week, Mr. Tweeten and Ms. Anders gave me a call and expressed what Mr. Draper just mentioned.

They're pretty skeptical about efficiency if discovery begins immediately, and I didn't have any dispute with that, so I guess that that was just kind of the general thinking here. But I do think that discussion of case

Bifurcating discovery, that's a little difficult

management would be useful.

Deposition of Telephonic Hearing - Status Hearing given, I think, the parameters of where we might end up, 1 depending on what the Supreme Court does with the issues. 2 3 It makes our discovery difficult. So I think that it's 4 hard to state a position on that without probably until we 5 hear for sure what issues are in the case and what aren't. 6 But, again, as you said earlier, we do know that 7 groundwater would be in the case, some kind of groundwater analysis, something involving groundwater would typically 8 9 be in the case, so we can check into that, and so there 10 might be -- we might be able to do something with that, 11 but I don't know that bifurcating it would be 12 advantageous, but we can discuss that between ourselves if 13 that's what you had in mind before pending maybe 14 another -- another conference about the possibility of 15 some kind of bifurcation. That would be --16

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: That -- I'm sorry.

MR. MICHAEL: That would be the area. I guess groundwater is the one that comes to mind as something that surely is going to be in the case if we were going to bifurcate maybe potentially. Although, again, Montana I think was pretty skeptical about moving forward on any discovery on any issues I take from their phone call we had last week.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: I understand. And that is the -- my thought as to how -- or the issues that

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

would be discussed. As I mentioned earlier, I think at least putting the sort of the basic guts of a case management plan together would be something that would be possible at this stage, although, again, you wouldn't be able to actually set out a schedule for discovery and other proceedings.

It also struck me that it might be valuable and certainly useful for me for the parties to look at the various issues that we know will be in the case, and as you point out, groundwater is one of them, see whether or not they might be able to more precisely identify the legal and factual issues that still need to be resolved in connection with those portions of Montana's complaint.

And then as I mentioned, the final thought would be to at least discuss whether or not it would be possible to take some portions of the proceedings and efficiently begin discovery on those. Groundwater strikes me as probably the one that is most separable, but I also want to make sure that discovery is efficient. And so if the parties agree that there is enough overlap between the various issues, that the -- that there really would not make much sense to begin discovery at this stage, then I certainly would understand that, but it would be helpful for the parties to spend a little more time discussing that, so that is my current thinking.

So North Dakota, I know that you have not been active in the case, but do you have any thoughts?

MR. SATTLER: Thank you, Your Honor. We don't anticipate issuing offensive discovery, and we don't anticipate filing -- or receiving any discovery requests given our limited involvement.

We would, I think, participate in a meet and confer and want to be involved in the case management order and in discussion with parties on that and I guess also with regard to the identification of issues, but we don't anticipate to be participating in discovery.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you.

And then finally, the United States. You've had the greatest experience with a variety of different additional actions before the Court. I don't know, number one, whether you know whether or not there have been other original matters that have been in this type of a situation on what has been done there and also whether you have any thoughts on my proposal.

MR. JAY: Your Honor, this is William Jay from the Department of Justice. I think on most of these case management issues, the United States doesn't have a position or indeed much of a -- much of a stake. To the extent that we can be useful to the parties and to the Court by sharing any experience that we've had in previous

original actions, we're happy to do that.

I can't off the top of my head for an example of a previous original action that has moved forward on a parallel track while exceptions are pending, but United States is usually an amicus rather than a party in original actions, and we don't always participate as actively in Special Master proceedings, at least before there's a Supreme Court decision as we have in this case, oh, and to the Supreme Court having asked for our views in the case. So to the extent that we can be useful to the Court and to the parties, we're happy to do so, but at this point, I don't have much to add.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you.

And, Mr. Draper, I know that you've been involved as counsel in a number of actions. Are you aware of any other cases where a Special Master has confronted this type of a situation where there are exceptions on a limited portion of the case, but we know for sure that the case will be coming back to the Special Master?

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

My experience is that in every case I'm aware of that

the proceedings before the Special Master have essentially

been ended while the case is pending before the Court, at

least any formal activity before the Special Master, even

where the exceptions that they typically do address only

seen it happen.

- part of the case if it's going to be factual in nature.

 So I don't think there's any hard and fast rule against

 doing something while the case is pending. Just -- just

 in terms of my experience, I have never -- I have never
- SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. I have looked
 around and talked to some of the former Special Masters to
 see whether or not I could find any good examples.
- 9 Unfortunately, there's none quite like this situation.
 - So again what I would propose, and I can put this into an order, is that the parties meet and confer by telephone and see whether or not they can agree on what, if any, procedure can proceed pending resolution of Montana's exceptions.

And as I mentioned, I will set out the three specific questions that I mentioned earlier. Number one, whether or not the parties for -- come up with the guts again of a proposed case management plan; second of all, whether or not it would be useful, again, pending resolution of Montana's exceptions, for the parties to see whether or not they can agree on identification of the legal and factual issues that will need to be resolved on the other portions of Montana's disputes and whether or not those will require discovery or evidentiary proceedings; and third of all, a consideration of whether

or not it would make any sense and whether or not it would be efficient to conduct any discovery pending, again, the resolution of Montana's exceptions, and if so, what the nature of that discovery would be. And then what I propose is that the parties have about a month to do that, and that the parties then submit letters to me setting out any agreement they've reached, and to the degree that there's disagreement, to include that also.

So, again, it would be the appropriateness of any steps of that nature and whether or not the parties agree that it would be efficient to do that so that the case can be further along at the time that the Court resolves the exceptions.

So does that -- any disagreement or dissent from that?

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

No dissent from that from Montana. If we could have until
the end of August given people's schedules that I'm aware
of, that would be helpful if you could allow us that.

And I think the way you just expressed it was very helpful, and it reminded me of how Special Master McKusick had handled matters in the Republican River litigation when it was at that similar stage.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you, that's very helpful. And I have no problem at all giving

- people until the end of August, and what about if we say 1 September 3rd, that would the Friday before Labor Day 2 3 weekend. 4 MR. MICHAEL: That would fine with Wyoming, Your 5 Honor, September 3rd. MR. DRAPER: That's fine -- I'm sorry, this is 6 7 Montana. That would be fine with us, Your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. 8 Great. 9 And North Dakota? 10 MR. SATTLER: That would be fine with North 11 Dakota. Thank you. 12 SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. So as I said, 13 I'll put all of that in an order and get you that 14 tomorrow, and so again we would have then the letters due 15 on September 3rd of this year, and then the meet and 16 confer requirement would involve Montana, Wyoming, and 17 North Dakota, the three parties to the action. 18 So any other thoughts on that question? 19 That was the only thing on my agenda, but I also 20 want to give the parties an opportunity to raise anything 21 else that they think is appropriate.
 - MR. DRAPER: Your Honor, this is John Draper.

 One housekeeping matter that I would like to suggest is that on our contact list forward, it would be helpful to continue to include Jeanne Whiteing who is counsel for the

23

24

25

```
amicus, the Northern Cheyenne Tribe, who has been
1
 2
     participating to some degree as the case is proceeding.
 3
               SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: All right. I will
 4
     make sure that is the case. She is not then consciously
5
     removed. So if she didn't get one of the pleadings or
6
     notices, that is my fault, and I'll correct that.
7
               MR. DRAPER:
                            Thank you very much.
8
               SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Any other issues?
9
               MR. MICHAEL: Nothing further from Wyoming, Your
10
     Honor.
11
               SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. Under those
12
     circumstances, then I think that we're concluded, so let's
13
     go ahead and we'll conclude this particular session, and I
14
     hope that all of you have a continued great time.
15
16
               (End of proceedings at 11:24 A.M.)
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
2) ss COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO)
3	
4	I, ANTONIA SUEOKA, Certified Shorthand Reporter
5	No. 9007, State of California, do hereby certify:
6	That said proceedings were taken at the time and
7	place therein named and were reported by me in shorthand
8	and transcribed by means of computer-aided transcription,
9	and that the foregoing pages are a full, complete, and
10	true record of said proceedings.
11	And I further certify that I am a disinterested
12	person and am in no way interested in the outcome of said
13	action, or connected with or related to any of the parties
14	in said action, or to their respective counsel.
15	The dismantling, unsealing, or unbinding of the
16	original transcript will render the reporter's certificate
17	null and void.
18	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
19	this 29th day of July, 2010.
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	Antonia Sueoka, RPR, CSR NO. 9007