NO.	137,	ORIGINAL
-----	------	----------

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

STATE OF MO	ONTANA,)			
	Plaintiff,)			
vs.)	No.	220137	ORG
STATE OF WY	YOMING and STATE)			
OF NORTH DA	AKOTA,)			
	Defendants.)			
		_			

TRANSCRIPT OF TELEPHONIC PROCEEDINGS Friday, October 11, 2013

Reported by: Kimberly A. Larsen, CSR No. 8993

1	TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES
2	
3	SPECIAL MASTER:
4	STANFORD LAW SCHOOL
5	BY: HONORABLE BARTON H. THOMPSON, JR., ESQUIRE
6	559 Nathan Abbott Way
7	Stanford, California 94305-8610
8	PHONE: 655.723.2465
9	buzzt@stanford.edu
10	
11	FOR THE PLAINTIFF STATE OF MONTANA:
12	MONTGOMERY & ANDREWS, P.A.
13	BY: JOHN B. DRAPER
14	DONNA OMEROD, PARALEGAL
15	325 Paseo de Peralta
16	Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501
17	PHONE: 505.982.3873
18	
19	FOR THE PLAINTIFF STATE OF MONTANA:
20	MONTANA ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE
21	BY: JAY WEINER
22	215 North Sanders
23	Helena, Montana 59620-1401
24	PHONE: 406.444.5894
0.5	

KRAMM COURT REPORTING Page: 2

1	TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES (Continued)
2	
3	FOR DEFENDANT STATE OF WYOMING:
4	WYOMING ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE
5	BY: JAMES KASTE
6	CHRISTOPHER BROWN
7	ANDREW KUHLMAN
8	200 West 24th Street
9	123 Capitol Building
10	Cheyenne, Wyoming 92002
11	PHONE: 307.777.7841
12	
13	FOR THE DEFENDANT NORTH DAKOTA:
14	NORTH DAKOTA ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE
15	BY: JENNIFER VERLEGER
16	500 North Ninth Street
17	Bismarck, North Dakota 58501
18	jverlegernd.gov
19	
20	
21	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS,
22	taken telephonically on Friday, October 11, 2013, before
23	me, Kimberly A. Larsen, CSR No. 8993, beginning at the
24	hour of 10:02 a.m. in the city of San Diego, County of San
25	Diego, State of California.

KRAMM COURT REPORTING Page: 3

Page: 4

1 San Diego, CA, Friday, October 11, 2013, 10:02 a.m. 2 3 TRANSCRIPT OF TELEPHONIC PROCEEDINGS 4 5 SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: So this is a hearing 6 and a status conference in Number 137 Original in the 7 Supreme Court of the United States, the State of Montana 8 versus the State of Wyoming. 9 And why don't we begin with appearances. So 10 State of Montana. 11 MR. DRAPER: Good morning, Your Honor. This is 12 John Draper. I have with me here in Santa Fe my 13 assistant, Donna Omerod, and also on the line is Jay 14 Weiner, Assistant Attorney General of the State of 15 Montana. 16 SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you, and 17 good morning. 18 So next. State of Wyoming. 19 MR. KASTE: Good morning, Your Honor. This is 20 James Kaste. I have Chris Brown and Andrew Kuhlman here 21 with me. 22 SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. Good morning, 23 Mr. Kaste. 24 And then finally, North Dakota. 25 MS. VERLEGER: Jen Verleger for North Dakota.

KRAMM COURT REPORTING

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you.

So good morning everyone. Is there anyone else on the

line who has not been identified?

Okay. If not, then I want to cover three or four different things this morning. The three things I want to make sure that we cover is, first of all, Wyoming's motion to impose time limits on the presentation of evidence at trial. Second of all, is the continuing issue of conflicts on various days over the availability of the district courtroom in Billings. And then third of all, I just want to talk briefly about opening statements.

So first of all, on Wyoming's motion to impose on time limits. So I've read everything that has been sent to me. I will also mention that over the course of the summer I actually talked to several current district court judges, who I know, about some of the various procedures that they follow. Some of them do use time limits, and I discussed that possibility with them. I was actually intrigued by that possibility at the time when I talked to them, and the ones who have used it I think have used it to good effect.

I ultimately concluded, though, based on the original estimates of time, that we wouldn't need to do that in this particular proceeding. And because of some of the factors that Montana has mentioned, including the

fact that a special master, what I'm doing, is preparing a record ultimately that the Supreme Court will use to resolve this matter, that it was not necessary to use time limits here. I do not believe that it is impermissible to use time limits, but if they're not necessary, my preference would be not to use them. And neither party had asked for them. That's obviously changed now.

As I said, I've gone over the various papers and just sort of totaling up some numbers, the various estimates of time that I've come up with range all the way from -- at the low end, if I take Montana's estimate of a total of 82 hours for the presentation its case in chief, including cross-examination at about the same amount of time as the direct testimony, so that's 82 hours, and then I add the 36 hours that I get from just looking at the Wyoming witnesses that are added onto the Montana list in Wyoming's motion, I get a total of 118 hours. I'll be honest, that doesn't concern me too much.

But then if I take Montana's high estimate and take, again, Wyoming's estimate -- I'll come back in a moment to get a better sense of how these estimates were made -- then I end up with 155 hours, which even if we went every day and did six hours on average every day, we still would not finish by December the 3rd. So that begins to worry me.

So one thing I would love to know at the very outset is -- just so I totally understand the numbers -- So, Mr. Draper, in coming up with your original estimates, which are attached to your opposition to Wyoming's motion -- so my understanding there is that you effectively just doubled the amount of time that you expected for direct at the low end and the high end?

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

Yes, we took our estimates for direct and doubled those to cover cross-examination and redirect.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: And there's obviously a fair amount of differences, you know, it's like a 50 percent difference, between the low number of hours that you estimate, the 82, and the high at 119. So effectively it's like about another 50 percent difference in the time estimates. And I realize that estimating exactly how time in a trial is going to go is difficult to do, but can you give me a little bit of a sense of how you came up with low-end and high-end estimates?

MR. DRAPER: Well, Your Honor, this is a tentative list, as we indicated on the face of it, when we gave it to counsel for Wyoming. So it's really very tentative. It's our best estimate. It takes into account that there may be no cross-examination in some instances, or maybe more extensive cross-examination than the time

necessary to put on the direct.

One of the things we tried to do was to -- as far as the witnesses that we knew that Wyoming intended to call, we included an estimate. There again, it's very difficult to estimate what an opposing party is going to do with putting on a witness. So it was basically looking at the issues, the expert reports, taking into account that you had not had a chance to look over the exhibits in any detail ahead of the hearing, and that there would need to be some explanation on direct with respect to every important part of the witness's testimony.

I'm not sure I can be more specific than that.

It is definitely an estimate, and we were trying to do it so that we and Wyoming might be able to make at least some educated guesses about when witnesses would be needed.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. And then, Mr.

Kaste, I'm curious on the additional witnesses that you added to the list. So you come up with basically a total of 36 hours on Wyoming's witnesses, and I know you're trying to squeeze down the time. But I'm curious as to what, if anything, you were estimating for cross-examination; in other words, were you also just doubling the amount of time that you were expecting to do the direct testimony on each of these various witnesses?

And in addition to that I notice, going back to

your pretrial memorandum, that you had originally, if I
remember, estimated a much more significant amount of time
for Wyoming's case in chief.

MR. KASTE: What did we say in the pretrial memo?

I forget off the top of my head.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: I have it right here. You said a total of ten to 12 trial days.

MR. KASTE: And that was true. But if you look at the schedule that was promulgated by Montana, a good bit of our witnesses, the ones that are sort of important to our case, for example, the folks who work in Division 2, would have been called in Montana's case in chief, and it significantly shortens the amount of time that we're on in our case in chief.

And I got to tell you that how this arose is, you know, I think we reasonably anticipated that the first three weeks of this trial, and granted some of them are short weeks, Montana would put on its case in chief, and that the second two-week block, after the first week in November, would likely be taken up by Wyoming's case in chief, and I think that's a more than fair distribution of time in this case. And then I get a schedule that says, "No, you're not going to get to put on your case until Thanksgiving or December." And I think that's wholly disproportionate to, one, the issues in the case, and

excessive in terms of its estimation of how long these things are going to take.

Cross-examination of Montana's witnesses will not be double their direct time. I mean, if you have a guy on direct examination for an hour, it would be remarkable for Wyoming to spend another hour cross-examining the individual. I think the times that are estimated are wildly excessive. And I think the idea that "Well, we've got 1,000 exhibits listed. That's probably going to take a lot of time," well, that's just nuts.

I'll tell you what happened. The summary judgment proceedings were so close in time to the exhibit list designations, that both parties, with their hair on fire, put everything in out of an abundance of caution. And I can't imagine that we're going to put a quarter of the exhibits that are on our list into evidence. That's just not a fair approximation of the size of this case.

And I think that 54, and even 60 hours, such that we plan to complete this case on November 21st, is more than adequate time for us to discuss the factual issues that need to be addressed at trial. And those factual issues have been narrowed down fairly significantly.

This proceeding simply cannot be, you know, let's just do a free for all and put in whatever we want, and your job as the special master to just to sit there and

take good notes. I don't believe for a minute that that's what you're here for, and I think we need to exercise some good judgment based on the magnitude of what's really going on here. You know, honestly, we all know that it's just not that much water at the end of the day.

Our presentation should be reasonably proportionate to the amount at issue. It's stunning to me that we would take six weeks to try this case, and that's the schedule I got. And I've got to get people on airplanes and in hotels, and I'm reasonably believing they can do that during the second two-week block of this trial, and that doesn't appear to jive at all with what Montana believes is going to happen.

And I do appreciate you listening to us this early. I know we have a pretrial conference just a couple days away. But, like I said, we're making airplane reservations, hotel reservations, trying to get people to get in a car in the middle of winter and get to Billings, and they're all wound pretty tight about "When do I have to be there?"

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Mr. Draper.

MR. DRAPER: Your Honor, as you can imagine, I don't really agree with anything that Mr. Kaste just said. He has just, through his voice, demanded that a trial between sovereigns be limited without any basis for this

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

demand. And it seems to me that this is not like one of his garden-variety district court cases. The Supreme Court of the United States has taken a very different view of these, and to arbitrarily limit the presentation of a state case in the original jurisdiction is a very doubtful matter.

And we are, of course, planning to do this very expeditiously and efficiently and without waste of time. But for the opposing state who has continually tried to eliminate the need for trial or limit it through various motions, most recently the motions in limine on various substantive subjects, now is coming in and saying, "Well, for no reason you've just got to impose a limit on the Montana case." And it's highly irregular. inconsistent with the approach they've been taking up to now of adamantly opposing pretrial testimony. They didn't want objections to exhibits ruled on before trial. have limited the access of special master to the exhibits. And now they're saying the time that we need to take in front of you to present this evidence is -- there's a certain amount of time that it's naturally going to take. And to come in at this late date, long after the pretrial orders and pretrial memoranda have addressed these types of issues, and say that all of a sudden we've now got to change our schedule -- first of all, limit all the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

testimony, change the schedule for witness appearances, which in many cases have to accommodate their schedules, it's just -- it's far too late to be trying to place an arbitrary limit on a state.

And my suggestion would be that you simply, as we go along, keep discussing our progress and how we're doing with respect to the estimated schedules and make such accommodations and rulings as appear to you to be necessary.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Mr. Kaste.

Before we go on, I do want to make MR. KASTE: one very particular problem known to you and have it on your radar, and this is a matter of very significant concern to the State of Wyoming. Our groundwater modeling expert, Dr. Schroeder, has had in place forever a trip back to South Africa where he's from, and the very last day that he can possibly testify in these proceedings is November 13. And you'll see on the schedule -- the tentative schedule that Montana provided, they have their ground water hydrology expert -- or modeling expert designated on their tentative schedule as the very last witness. And that -- we need to ensure that Mr. Larson testifies well in advance of the 11th or 12th -- I guess the 12th -- the 11th is a holiday -- of November, and that Dr. Schroeder be allowed to testify on the 12th of

November to accommodate his trip back home to South

Africa. Obviously Dr. Schroeder cannot testify until

after Mr. Larson testifies, and that particular

accommodation just must be made. We cannot get him out of

his trip to South Africa to see his mother. That's been

in the works for him for quite sometime.

And I guess I, in the main, disagree completely that this is wholly unlike any district court case simply because of the venue. I think the good sense and the good rules that the district courts apply have their place here, and I frankly think that a clock focuses the mind and would be beneficial to all involved.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. Mr. Draper.

MR. DRAPER: Your Honor, I want to say that we'd be glad to work with Wyoming. As I understand what Mr. Kaste just said, the 13th of November is the last day that Mr. Schroeder can conveniently testify. So we're happy to work with that. And it was that kind of thing that we were hoping would be worked out based on the schedule that we provided, and we're certainly happy to do that. But, again, I don't think we should be put on any artificial deadline that has chosen by defendants' counsel.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. So just really quickly a number of different points. The first one is

that -- Mr. Kaste, just to make it clear, my own view is that I do have a responsibility to try to make this proceeding move expeditiously, and it's not simply to permit any evidence to come in. At the same time, because of the nature of the proceedings, where I think there are any type of close issues, I will tend to defer towards putting the evidence in, simply because of the fact that the Supreme Court, again, will ultimately hear this. And the last thing any of us will want to see is for this to be remanded for further proceedings on this part of the case. So I don't in any way want to be interpreted as saying anything comes in.

The second thing is is that when I look at the original dates that Montana has on its list, again the lower estimates look pretty good to me because there you come pretty close, even under Montana's estimate, to finishing up during that -- during that third week of the proceedings. And particularly if cross-examination is not the exact same length as direct -- and I agree with you, Mr. Kaste, that would be somewhat surprising to me, too -- then we actually would come in well within the estimates. As I say, the problem is if those high estimates are there.

What I -- I want to take a look at all these numbers and -- so I'm not actually going to decide today

to set a time limit or a particular time limit, but I want to discuss it more with you all on Tuesday. I'll tell you right now, though, that I will -- you will not have a happy special master if it goes that higher length of time. So even if I end up not setting a time limit, my hope is that Montana can work to keep us on that lower end of the estimate rather than at the higher end.

And, Mr. Kaste, in working with Mr. Draper, I'm hoping that Mr. Draper will be accommodating in that respect so that you can give your witnesses a little bit more in the way of a sense of when they are likely to be testifying, other than basically an eight-day swing. So hopefully, you know, that will give you a sense of where I would like to see this come out. And at the end of the day on Tuesday, depending on how the in limine motions go and how the rest of our discussions in the pretrial conference goes, I am reserving the right to establish a total time limit on the trial.

Although, Mr. Draper, just so that you have a little bit more comfort, it will not be the -- it would be a higher time limit than what Wyoming has proposed in this particular case.

So I know that doesn't resolve Wyoming's motion, but, as I said, I want to take a look at these papers.

And, furthermore, I haven't read the various in limine

motions yet, so I want to take a look at all of it before ruling on this particular motion. But, again, my expectation will be that the parties will try to be as expeditious on this. We will end up at the low end of Montana's time estimate, even without a time limit, but I reserve the right to set a time limit at the end of Tuesday, if I think one is necessary, after I've gone over all the record here and we have dealt with the in limine motions.

A second thing that hopefully will help on this, as I suggested earlier, what I would like as part of the trial, once the trial gets going, is for the parties to have identified what the exhibits are likely to be that they will be using for each of the various witnesses so that we can clear up any likely objections before we actually have the witnesses on the stand for each of the various dates. That will also permit me to read those exhibits the night before so that I'll have some familiarity with them and you won't have to wait for me to be thumbing through them on the stand. So that will help a little bit.

Now, this raises a couple of other points, though. The first is that we face, unfortunately, this continuing problem with the courtrooms not always being available when we want it to be. As I mentioned, we were

able to escape the problem of a conflict for that entire week of October 21st, but it looked like one of the judges would be doing a hearing on one of those days, and now it looks like he might be doing a hearing on two of the days.

And particularly given the schedule, the need to bring witnesses in, what I'm going to propose to Ms.

Carter is that we go ahead and reserve a hotel room for those two days. We might not need them, and there might be a cost incurred, but the cost won't be large, and I think it will be less costly than the cost of a delay in this particular proceeding.

What I propose -- and, again, we can talk more about this at the pretrial conference -- is that if, you know, we're going to lose, like, an afternoon, then I think we lose that afternoon. If, on the other hand, we lose an entire day or more, that's where I'm going to be looking to move it to a courtroom so that we can keep this proceeding moving and don't have any delays.

Now, on the possibility of moving into a hotel room -- and, again, my hope is that none of this comes to pass, but if it does, it does -- one possibility is moving out to the Montana Hotel & Convention Center, if I remember, or is it the Billings Hotel & Convention Center? But anyway, if we were moving for an entire week that sounded very attractive, and it might be the only room

that's available to reserve at this point for those two days, in which case that would -- that sounds fine to me. But I'm really tempted, if it's like just a day or two days, to see whether or not one of the downtown hotels can take us, including the Best Western ClockTower. The room there is about -- I think about or a little over 1,000 square feet, and so --

And I know you're a little bit worried about whether or not that would be big enough, Mr. Draper. And I realize there's no easy spot that you can rent for -- a room for counsel, but my thought is it would just be a lot easier if we're downtown to stay downtown rather than going out to a hotel that we would all have to transport ourselves to.

I guess on that I'm looking for thoughts.

MR. DRAPER: Your Honor, this is John Draper. If it's on the order of a thousand square feet, that's 30 or 40 feet on the side, if it was square, which seems pretty darn small for accommodating you and the parties and witnesses and that kind of thing; equipment, briefcases, et cetera, boxes, exhibits. So I saw that as being smaller than what's really going to be comfortable to use, but, of course, we can squeeze into whatever you want us to. But it just didn't seem to be conducive to the kind of proceeding that could go quickly and not be delayed

while people sort through things or step over things and so on. So that's why I was looking at that larger space as being more suited to our needs.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. Mr. Kaste.

MR. KASTE: Well, since I'm staying at the Best Western, it's convenient for me.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Do you know what the size of that room is? I know the square footage, but I just don't know whether it's square or -- you know 20 by 50 sounds better to me than --

MR. KASTE: No, I am not familiar with the dimensions of the room. But if we're moving in there for one day, I don't care how big the room is. It's going to be sort of a logistic pain in the butt.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Yeah.

MR. KASTE: And if we're in close quarters for one day, it doesn't bother me a bit. I mean, it's a lot like doing depositions in a little tiny hotel room. We've all done it. It hasn't been fun, but it was necessary. And if it's more convenient to be downtown and we have to snuggle, that's fine.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Yeah. And let me just ask, so what type of equipment will we need in a conference room? I assume what we will need is some type of a projector and screen so that you can project

1 exhibits.

MR. KASTE: Well, Your Honor, this is Mr. Kaste, and I was talking with Andrew about that this morning and the possibility of doing this in a hotel room, and we're going to try and bring a projector. The screen, I don't know that we have one on hand, but we can either use the wall or we can assess whether they have one at the hotel. Other than that, the only equipment I think people will need is their computer to plug into that, and we'd be happy to share that if it turns out that it was during Montana's portion of the case and wanted to plug in to put their exhibits up.

I can tell you that we have planned to utilize the courtroom technology, and so we haven't made blowups of our exhibits for demonstrative purposes because they have such great screens in the courtroom. It just doesn't make any sense to spend the money you used to spend on blowups. But if we don't have that available, I think we can muddle through without too much trouble.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. And either Mr. Kaste or Mr. Draper, anything other than basically the video equipment in terms of the ability to actually be able to project onto a screen?

MR. DRAPER: Your Honor, this is John Draper. I think, as I understand, you'll have a computer with all

the exhibits -- or an iPad with all the exhibits available to you on that scale.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: That's correct. I will. And I plan to use that; although, I'll probably be using my iPad for this purpose, but I plan to test out both this weekend.

Okay. I'm going to have Ms. Carter check the
Best Western and see whether or not, Number 1, it's
available, and if it's available, what the exact size of
the room is. I'll be honest, I've been thinking more in
the range of a rectangle than in terms of a square. And
whatever it is, we will reserve the room for those two
days because I'm just worried this is coming upon us
quickly, and I want to make sure that we don't have a gap
in the proceedings while witnesses have to cool their
heels and all of you have to figure how to work from afar.
So I will go ahead and do that so that hopefully we don't
lose any time on the trial.

And then the other question I had was, I did not know whether or not either of you planned to make any type of an opening statement.

MR. DRAPER: Your Honor, this is John Draper. We do plan to have an opening statement, I think less than half an hour. And I'll be sharing that with Attorney General Fox.

MR. KASTE: This is Mr. Kaste. I had asked for on our pretrial memo and plan to give a brief opening statement in the nature of a half an hour or less as well.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: I'm sorry. I'm actually looking at Page 10 where, indeed, Mr. Kaste you are absolutely right. You did actually already say that you planned to make an opening statement. Probably Mr. Draper did too. I just didn't look back at that.

Okay. If they were longer I was going to, you know, suggest we try to do those the afternoon of the day of the final pretrial conference. But if they're just half and hour, we can just put them at the very beginning of that first day of trial, because I assume it would make more sense there and -- so we'll just go ahead and do that in the normal course.

Okay. So the only other thing I will say is that -- and this is just so that both sides know now -- that I probably will be asking questions of some of your witnesses. We can talk more about the process for that on Tuesday. You will be free to object to any question I ask, and then I'll evaluate whether or not that objection is a legitimate one. And if so, I will withdraw my question. So you can treat me just like counsel from that perspective.

MR. KASTE: I'm a little nervous about that, Your

1 Honor.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: I just wanted to warn you now that I'll do that. We can talk more about that on Tuesday.

MR. KASTE: We've already told all of our witnesses that you can ask, and probably will at various times, any questions that you're interested in, and so they're all ready and able.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. I promise it won't add another 40 hours to the trial proceeding.

MR. DRAPER: Your Honor, this is John Draper. I might add that questions by the special master in these proceedings is quite normal and we're expecting it as well.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. Great.

So, again, I am not ruling on Wyoming's motion this morning, but if I do not set time limits, I just want to make sure Montana understands that my expectation will be that the length of their case in chief, including cross-examination, should be towards the lower end of that 82- to 119-hour spectrum, and I reserve the right to set a time limit at the end of the final pretrial conference, if it seems necessary. But, as I say, at this point 'til I've looked at everything, I'm not going to do that.

MR. KASTE: This is James Kaste. I just had one

KRAMM COURT REPORTING

more question about a different matter. You submitted
your order, I want to say, three or four weeks ago with
regard to your interim fees. I have not had it come
across my desk, an order from your Supreme Court motion.

Am I missing something?

SPECIAL MASTER

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Probably not. What the Court will do is they will take that up at one of their first conferences and then issue an order at that point in time. And given that they just had their very first day this last -- two Mondays ago and given that the conference -- I doubt whether they even looked at it in the conferences before that first Monday in October. It does not surprise me they haven't gotten to that yet. I would expect it to be probably later this month.

MR. KASTE: Okay. Well, I just wanted to make sure that it had not escaped my attention and that you weren't sitting there harboring a grudge because Wyoming's a deadbeat and won't pay your bill.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: No, you don't have to worry about that.

MR. KASTE: Good.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: I will see you all on Tuesday morning. I gather it's going to snow on Monday.

MR. DRAPER: Oh, really?

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Yes. So hopefully

KRAMM COURT REPORTING

Τ	we'll all be able to get in.
2	MR. KASTE: Well, we're leaving tomorrow so
3	SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay.
4	MR. KASTE: Thank you very much for your time
5	this afternoon, Your Honor.
6	SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. Thanks a lot,
7	everyone. Have a great weekend, and I will see you on
8	Tuesday morning.
9	(At 10:42 a.m., the proceedings were concluded.)
10	-000-
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Τ	STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
2	COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO)
3	
4	I, Kimberly A. Larsen, a Certified Shorthand
5	Reporter for the State of California, do hereby certify
6	that the foregoing telephonic proceedings were taken
7	before me at the time and place herein set forth; that the
8	telephonic proceedings were reported stenographically by
9	me and later transcribed by computer-aided transcription
10	under my direction; that the foregoing is a true record of
11	the telephonic proceedings taken at that time.
12	I further certify that I am a disinterested
13	person and that I am in no way interested in the outcome
14	of said action.
15	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have subscribed my name
16	this 23rd day of October, 2013.
17	
18	
19	
20	Kimberly A. Larsen, CSR No. 8993
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	