NO. 137, ORIGINAL

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

STATE OF MONTANA,)	
Plaintiff,)	No. 220137 ORG
vs.)	
STATE OF WYOMING and STATE OF)	
NORTH DAKOTA,)	
Defendants.)	
)	

TRANSCRIPT OF TELEPHONIC PROCEEDINGS STATUS CONFERENCE OCTOBER 25, 2012

Reported by: Cynthia J. Vega, RMR, CSR 6640, CCRR 95

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
7	473 Via Ortega, Mail Code 4205
8	Stanford, California 94305
9	т (650) 721-1488
10	buzzt@stanford.edu
11	
12	For the State of Montana:
13	MONTGOMERY & ANDREWS, P.A.
14	BY: JOHN B. DRAPER
15	SPECIAL ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL
16	DONNA OMEROD, PARALEGAL
17	325 Paseo de Peralta
18	Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501
19	T (505) 982-3873 F (505) 982-4289
20	jdraper@montand.com
21	
22	
23	
24	
2 E	

KRAMM COURT REPORTING

1	TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES
2	
3	For the State of Montana:
4	MONTANA ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE
5	BY: JENNIFER ANDERS
6	ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL
7	215 North Sanders
8	Helena, Montana 59620-1401
9	T (406) 444-2026 F (406) 444-3549
10	janders@mt.gov
11	
12	For the State of Wyoming:
13	WYOMING ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE
14	BY: PETER K. MICHAEL
15	CHIEF DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL
16	DAVID J. WILLMS
17	CHRISTOPHER BROWN
18	JAMES KASTE
19	SENIOR ASSISTANT ATTORNEYS GENERAL
20	MATTHIAS SAYER, ESQUIRE
21	200 West 24th Street
22	123 Capitol Building
23	Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002
24	T (307) 777-7841 F (307) 777-6869
25	pmicha@state.wy.us

KRAMM COURT REPORTING

1	TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES
2	
3	For the State of North Dakota:
4	NORTH DAKOTA ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE
5	BY: JENNIFER VERLEGER
6	ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL
7	500 North Ninth Street
8	Bismarck, North Dakota 58501-4509
9	T (701) 328-3640 F (701) 328-4300
10	jverleger@nd.gov
11	
12	For Amicus The United States:
13	UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
14	ENVIRONMENT & NATURAL RESOURCES
15	DIVISION OF NATURAL RESOURCES SECTION
16	BY: JAMES J. DUBOIS
17	1961 Stout Street, 8th Floor
18	Denver, Colorado 80294
19	T (303) 844-1375
20	james.dubois@usdoj.gov
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES
2	
3	For Amicus Anadarko Petroleum Company:
4	BINGHAM, McCUTCHEN, LLP
5	BY: MICHAEL B. WIGMORE
6	2020 K Street N.W.
7	Washington, D.C. 20006
8	T (202) 373-6000 F (202) 373-6001
9	michael.wigmore@bingham.com
10	
11	* * * *
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	TELEPHONIC STATUS CONFERENCE taken on Thursday,
18	October 25, 2012, before me, Cynthia J. Vega, CSR
19	No. 6640, beginning at the hour of 11:04 a.m., at
20	401 West A Street, Suite 750, in the City of San Diego,
21	County of San Diego, State of California.
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 25, 2012
2	11:04 A.M.
3	
4	SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: This is the Special
5	Master. I'm going to ask for the various parties to
6	identify themselves for the record, and I will begin
7	with Mr. Draper representing Montana.
8	MR. DRAPER: Thank you, your Honor. This is
9	John Draper, counsel of record for Montana. Also on the
10	phone are Jennifer Anders and my assistant Donna Omerod.
11	SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Great. Thank you.
12	Next for Wyoming, Mr. Michael.
13	MR. MICHAEL: Yes, your Honor. This is Peter
14	Michael for Wyoming. I have four attorneys with me.
15	They are James Kaste, Chris Brown, Matthias Sayer and
16	David Willms. The last two are Matthias Sayer,
17	S-a-y-e-r, and David Willms, W-i-l-l-m-s.
18	SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Next, do we have
19	counsel for North Dakota?
20	MS. VERLEGER: Yes, your Honor. This is
21	Jennifer Verleger. I'm by myself.
22	SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Thank you.
23	And next will be counsel for the various Amici.
24	So first United States.
25	MR DUBOIS: This is James Dubois Good

1 morning, your Honor.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Good morning.

And then I did receive notice from the Northern Cheyenne tribe. Ms. Whiteing will not be joining us this morning.

And so then finally, Anadarko Petroleum Corporation, Mr. Wigmore.

MR. WIGMORE: Yes, your Honor. This is Michael Wigmore, Bingham, McCutchen for Anadarko.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Thank you.

So again, this is a status conference and there are four things that are on my agenda.

First of all, I want to discuss the September 28 memorandum opinion on Wyoming's renewed motion for partial summary judgment.

Second of all, I wanted to get an update from the parties on discovery and see how that is going. I have been following and reading the updates that you provided me and so I'm familiar with that. That all made it sound like everything was going very well. I just wanted to make sure that that was indeed all sides' perception.

Third of all, I just wanted to begin the process of setting a date for the trial next year.

And then, fourth of all, deal with any other

matters that any of the parties for Amici want to discuss.

So let's start with the September 28, 2012 memorandum opinion. I will apologize at the very outset for the fact that there are typos in the memorandum opinion. Hopefully you got notice of that when it was sent out to you. I was out of town. I wanted to get that out to you, though, as quickly as possible. And having gone through it, although I see there are a number of typos, I hope that none of those caused any ambiguity in the substance of the ruling.

After the hearing today, I will go back and correct those and issue a final version of that. And I want to have a chance to talk to you about the memorandum opinion before then.

So at this stage, what I'm most interested in is whether either Montana or Wyoming or any other parties have any questions about the memorandum opinion or what my ruling was.

Just to start out the discussion, I did, as you know, rule for Wyoming on a number of the years, including some of the years that were contested. And for those years, I have concluded that there was not sufficient evidence in the record to show a material -- regarding material fact and, therefore, for those

particular years, I have ruled in favor of Wyoming. I do not plan to change my mind on any of those.

In the other years, as I said, I think that
Montana did provide enough evidence to defeat Wyoming's
motion for partial summary judgment, but as I also
expressed in the opinion, I feel that we -- that the
evidence there is frequently relatively vague, and I do
not want to get to trial without being more specific as
to what type of notice was provided, and by whom, as
close as we can tell, when, for all the years, with the
exception of 2004 and 2006, where I think the record is
fairly clear. And so that's why I have asked Montana to
provide the supplemental evidence by December 1st.

As I mentioned in the opinion, I realized that for a lot of these years probably memories are fairly vague and hazy, but hopefully by going back and looking at some of the other paper evidence from those particular years, people's memories will get better.

And it is Montana's burden ultimately to show that it provided notice of those years.

So that's a very quick summary what the basis of the opinion was.

So at this point, I'd be happy to answer any questions or take any comments on it.

MR. MICHAEL: Your Honor, I will break the ice.

This is Peter Michael.

I don't have any comments or questions on the opinion at this point. As you mentioned typos, but presumably they will be handled.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. Thanks.

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

With regard to the December 1st deadline, I wonder if we might be given some more time on that, say, a month, given the fact that we're dealing with a lot of other scheduling issues and depositions.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: So I realize that you're concerned whether or not you would be able to meet the various deadlines that we set out in the revised case management order, Number 10, on April 17, 2012, but in those, Montana is supposed to disclose its expert reports and other exhibits no later than Friday, January 4. And presumably, before even then, you will want to know whether there is any problem with the information that you will provide with respect to the notices, but I'm willing to give you a little bit of leeway on this; but that strikes me as the major issue at this point.

MR. DRAPER: Well, your Honor, that, I think, fits -- and this is John Draper again, for the court reporter.

That is related to the other issues that come up under the next item with respect to depositions, so it may be better to consider that after we've talked about the status of discovery.

MR. MICHAEL: Your Honor, this is Peter Michael.

May I comment on the request for more time? SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: You certainly may.

MR. MICHAEL: We have heard that before. It is, as you noted, and I think it is imperative, that we've been at this for, I guess, almost going on two years, this concept of eliminating the years that were not -- where no notice was given. And it does impact discovery, although you'll hear from us in a moment, that we're ready, willing and able to keep discovery moving without any difficulty. But we do -- all the expert opinions and even discovery are impacted to some degree with years, because you do have to work on years if they're going to be in the case.

And so, seems to me, that December 1st, given that we've been at this for a couple of years and Montana has had a number of opportunities to come forward, you know, last fall of 2011, then in June of 2012, had an opportunity to gather their evidence of notice. So, seems to me, December 1st was very

generous, overly generous, actually, we think, but it is what it is, and more time at this point seems -- we don't think it is a good idea.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: So before getting into an argument on this, because I do think the issues are all interlinked and I hear a request for changes to some of the other dates coming in a minute, why don't we move on to the discussion of discovery and also dates that are coming up for disclosure of expert reports and other exhibits.

So, Mr. Draper, since I have a feeling you're going to be the one that has the most to say on this, do you want to start?

MR. DRAPER: Yes, your Honor. This is John Draper.

You're very perceptive there. We have recently, a week or ten days ago, got free from the post-trial briefing in the other case, and we have turned our attention to the setting of depositions. We've been in discussion with Wyoming about trying to find dates. We've identified at this point, based on the information we have available currently, something in the neighborhood of 25 depositions that we need to take, and they have a similar number that they want to take of us.

And they've been -- as Mr. Michael suggested, they've been willing to, as far as their schedules would allow, accommodate us in getting those depositions done, but they have not been able to completely accommodate us in that regard. And we have a big number of depositions to get through and, as a result of the help that those depositions will provide us as we -- as our experts finalize their reports, providing information that they need to be aware of, and as we resolve some lingering production issues with Wyoming, we need -- we need some additional time before we submit our expert reports; and I would so request.

As your Honor may recall, back when we first learned that we were going to be forced into a trial in the other case in August, we did ask for more time than ultimately your Honor allowed us, but I believe it was -- the order did recognize that, depending upon the circumstances and the ability to show good cause, that we could approach your Honor again about that. And we are finding in this initial period where we're trying to set these and get them done in a time that that information can be available and helpful to our experts, that really this time, across Thanksgiving and Christmas here, is leading to the deadline of January 4th, is insufficient.

We had -- back in, I think it was March or April when we were discussing this before, we were not sure exactly how things would work out with the other trial and post-trial requirements.

It's turned out that there was something on the order of 400 pages of briefing provided post-trial, which we just finished a week or ten days ago. And so we have been completely preoccupied by that, and we're turning our -- we've turned our attention to the additional discovery that's needed in this case just as quickly as we could and trying to work that out with Wyoming. As I say, they tried to be accommodating, but they -- they're limited on how much they can do, and given the time frame that we're under, given the January 4th deadline, and that includes making their own people available. They're, I think in good faith, trying to do that. Still, it presents difficulties.

They said that, unlike us, providing the non-State employee witnesses, that we're going to need to track down the witnesses that we've identified that they have listed as having knowledge of the matters relevant to this case, that we're going to need to find those people and arrange for those people to appear for deposition. And it's just more than physically can be done in the time frame that we have.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And so I would respectfully request that we be allowed an additional two months in order to finalize our expert reports and that the pretrial schedule would be adjusted by two months. So that's -- as you suspected, that's the thought that I wanted to get across to you and I will

rest on that for the moment.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Mr. Michael.

MR. MICHAEL: Your Honor, this is Peter Michael.

I'm going to turn the mic over to James Kaste. The reason is: He has been our lead over the last two or three months in communications with Montana on our depositions, what we wanted, what Montana has asked for, and I think you'll benefit from his discussion, the chronology, and where we stand on this, since specifics are in order here, your Honor.

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

MR. KASTE: Your Honor, I'm James Kaste. We met at the hearing for the first time in July.

For the court reporter's benefit, my name is spelled K-a-s-t-e.

Like Mr. Michael has said, I've been working with the folks representing the State of Montana since I

entered my appearance in this case, attempting to schedule depositions in this case. It would be helpful for I think you to know that there hasn't been a deposition taken in this case by the State of Montana since the expiration of the stay, not because of the lack of trying on the State of Wyoming's part. In fact through the months of August and September, we had inquired several times about when we could set up the depositions that Montana had requested. They gave us a few names while the stay was in place.

Not hearing anything from them, finally in October, I sent out some dates and set up -- made arrangements for the depositions of the people on that list and asked if that would work. I got back a thank you, and then a request to take depositions of different folks at different times. And we tried to work through that. And when I said yes to that request, for the most part, I got a new list a couple of days ago that added another 17 people that had never been requested before, and so I said yes to that list as well.

In fact, I've made myself available basically every day in December and every day in November, that is not a weekend or a holiday, to conduct the depositions requested by the State of Montana.

So I wholeheartedly object to the idea that

there is too much to do in this little bit amount of time. I think it is worthwhile to know that while we have about 20-some folks on our list of individuals we would like to depose, I told the State of Montana yesterday that we will forego taking any of those depositions before the end of the year so that we can accommodate all the depositions they'd like to complete -- we'll do them all. We'll do them all before the beginning of the year because this litigation needs to stay on track.

The State of Wyoming objects to any extension of the expert designation deadline. This has not been a secret. This deadline has been in place for quite some time, and Montana's failure to get depositions done up to this point is their own concern, but we'll do everything we can to finish what they want to get done so that we can meet these deadlines.

Finally, with regard to this sort of bizarre statement that we've turned them loose in the wilderness to find certain witnesses that aren't State employees, those witnesses' identities and phone numbers and things like that were disclosed on our witness list. And if you want me to provide them again, I'll be happy to do that.

What I've done to facilitate scheduling these

depositions is authorized the State of Montana to contact these witnesses directly, work with them without an intermediary, to set up dates that work for them, and I'll be there.

So I don't know what more the State of Wyoming could possibly do to assist Montana in maintaining this deadline. And there is, thus far, no evidence, in my opinion, of good cause that would require an extension of the current schedule.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Let me just ask a follow-up question. So I notice, at all of the various hearings and status conferences, that Wyoming has had a number of attorneys who are involved in this case. Have the two sides discussed at all having simultaneous depositions? Is that something that is possible?

MR. KASTE: This is James Kaste from the State of Wyoming.

I believe that is something that has been discussed in the past that hasn't been suggested for the completion of the depositions that -- this list of 17 or 18 new witnesses I got on October 23rd, it hasn't been discussed for those purposes, but we'd be happy to do it. We've got five attorneys in this room who are ready, willing and able to defend depositions.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: So that was exactly

what I wanted to know. So the bottom line is, you are willing to put additional attorneys, other than yourself and Mr. Michael, on to depositions, if necessary, and one thing that you are willing to discuss is the possibility of doing simultaneous depositions?

MR. KASTE: Yes.

MR. MICHAEL: Your Honor, this is Pete Michael.

I may add, we have -- one of the attorneys here, Matthias Sayer, just became eligible to apply to the court. He should be admitted in no time, within a couple of weeks. All five of us will definitely be available. I mentioned that possibility back at the hearing in July, so that's, I think, where you recall hearing that from.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: So Mr. Draper?

MR. DRAPER: Yes, your Honor. This is John
Draper.

I think the major basis for our request is for -- is based on the exigencies that we were subjected to because of the other case. As far as the availability of attorneys, I think I heard that the availability of attorneys, they were -- Wyoming is now saying that they would not insist on certain attorneys being at certain depositions. That has -- in our trying to think through when we can do this has been a

limitation that has been a problem, but I hear that that's being removed.

As far as simultaneous depositions, I think that that is -- that is a possibility. We have some capability of doing that. I think it's not unlimited, but yes, we can do some of that.

MR. KASTE: This is James Kaste on behalf of the State of Wyoming.

I'd really like to clear up the idea that the State of Wyoming has ever insisted on the presence of a particular attorney at a deposition. That's never been stated and it's never been a limitation on the conduct of discovery in this case.

MR. DRAPER: Well, your Honor -- this is John Draper -- if you want me to cite the situation, I'll be glad to, but if they're saying they're not going to do that, that's good enough for me.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Thanks.

Let me -- just putting aside for a moment the question of dates, I would like to get both sides' view on how discovery is currently going. Are there any concerns or issues, other than the amount of time that these deadlines currently provide?

MR. DRAPER: Your Honor, this is John Draper.
We do -- we do need to get back to Wyoming on

some concerns that we have about the sufficiency of the production that they have made at this point, and we're doing our best to marshal that set of issues and get with them about that to see if we can't resolve that.

MR. KASTE: Your Honor, this is James Kaste on behalf of the State of Wyoming.

I heard that same statement in July in my first foray into this case and I've heard it at every status report since, have not received any communications from the State of Montana identifying what their particular concerns are with regard to the State of Wyoming's discovery production. When we finally get that, we'll fix our discovery, if there was something lacking in it, but without any information about what the concerns are over the last four months, I can't really address how we can fix this asserted problem.

I can tell you that the State of Wyoming served some supplemental discovery requests on the State of Montana at the conclusion of the stay. I don't expect that we will receive satisfactory answers to that in light of the specious objections that we got the other day. And I fully anticipate filing a motion to compel in the next few weeks when I receive answers to our second set of interrogatories. And I think the court ought to be aware that that's coming.

1 | SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Thank you.

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

Mr. Kaste cites the indications that we have placed in the status reports to you, and that's quite right. But as I think your Honor's aware, we've been involved in a trial, post-trial briefing, during the very period that he's complaining about and realize that we need to get that to them. But you asked what outstanding matters there were and that's definitely outstanding.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. So at the moment, I am not inclined to change the deadlines for the disclosure of expert reports. Based on what I've heard so far, I'm not willing to do that.

Instead, I want the parties to work together to see whether or not the necessary discovery can be conducted and the expert reports disclosed as currently scheduled.

I am not foreclosing the possibility,

Mr. Draper, if you believe that, despite all best

efforts, that it is impossible to meet those deadlines,

you are certainly free to file a motion -- and it can be

in a relatively simple form, but a motion that would

request additional time, but I'm very serious about

these deadlines and I'm very loathe to extend them any

further than I already did.

And my hope is, is that given all of the attorneys that Wyoming is willing to put on this matter and the fact that Montana has both its in-house counsel and its external counsel, that there would be enough attorneys on the Montana side also to try to move the discovery forward.

I realize that this is a very compressed period of time. And so again, I'm not foreclosing another motion, but at least -- I'm not going to extend the deadlines.

Similarly, I'm more than happy, if you need, for example, an additional week for the declarations showing the dates of notices, I'm perfectly happy to give Montana that period of time, but my view is any further time than that, we get too close to the other deadlines and, in addition to the fact, it gets into a period where probably going to be even more difficult for you to actually get those declarations produced and signed.

So that's my -- that's what I would be willing to do. As I say, about a week more, but that's it. If that will be helpful, I will provide that.

MR. DRAPER: Your Honor, this is John Draper. We would appreciate the additional week.

1 Thank you very much.

MR. KASTE: Let me bring up an issue, your Honor, if I may.

James Kaste. Sorry. I forget to do that.

I can tell you, with regard to the discovery that I sent out at the conclusion of the stay, it preceded your ruling on the renewed motion for summary judgment, but at least one of the questions in the interrogatories, it mirrors very much the additional information that you have asked Montana to provide in your most recent ruling. The answers to that discovery, just by virtue of the deadlines that have been set by preexisting case management order, are due before December 1. And I'd kind of like them answered. I'd hate to see an objection to answering the questions that I've propounded on the basis that, "Well, my responses aren't really due until December 7th or 8th." I think it might be worthwhile to address that issue up front.

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

I think Mr. Kaste's discovery requests are due before January 1st; in other words, trying to preempt the December 1 deadline. And I have expected that we would provide the answer that we're able to provide at that time. And if I'm subject to that, those would simply be updated as necessary when we submit the

1 response to your Honor's order.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: So I'm not sure that responded to Mr. Kaste's question.

Mr. Kaste, you wanted -- I don't want to speak for you.

MR. KASTE: Well, your Honor, if I had my druthers, what I would like is for him to answer for -- or not him -- excuse me -- the State of Montana to answer the interrogatories that I propounded in conformity with the deadlines in the case management orders and not put off responding to those discovery requests with the excuse that, "Hey, I don't have to provide this information until the week after December 1st."

This information that I've requested, frankly, is just fundamental, elemental information about the nature of Montana's claims that we haven't been provided to this point.

As you well know, the dates on which calls were made is pretty darn important and not information currently in my possession and fundamental to the continuation of discovery in this case.

What am I really looking at? What should my experts really be looking at? What years? What dates? Those kinds of things. And I'd like to have that in

1 | conformity with the case management orders.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: So when -- first of all, when are the interrogatory answers due?

MR. KASTE: Next Friday.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: What are the specific questions that were asked?

MR. KASTE: This is James Kaste.

I believe the interrogatory answers, if I remember correctly, are due next Friday, so

November 2nd. They were propounded prior to the issuance of your ruling, so they're not duplicative of the ruling. They are -- serendipitously, we asked the same questions, because the questions that really matter in this case really aren't that hard. So I'd just like to have straightforward answers to those questions in conformity with the time frames that apply to interrogatories.

The question that comes to mind is: Tell me when you made calls and what portions of the year that you made calls you claim the State of Wyoming is liable to the State of Montana. That's -- I'm not reading it, but that's the gist of the first or second question in there. I think I only asked eight, and every one of them goes to the elements of Montana's claims.

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

I don't think anything I said was inconsistent with answering those interrogatories on time, that the suggestion that we'll say, "Hey, we're not going to do it until a week after December 1st."

We are under an obligation, we feel, to answer questions, unless the time frame's extended, at the time that those are due pursuant to the case management plan. And if that information needs to be updated at a later time, that's also provided for.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. So let me -- I think this is consistent with what both parties are saying, is that the requirements and the deadlines under the case management plan, Number 1, remain in place and are not superseded by my request for declarations in support of Montana's notices to Wyoming that I've requested in my September 28, 2012 memorandum opinion. And if, after receiving the interrogatory answers, Wyoming has any motions that it wants to make in connection with those or any efforts to supplement them, then it is free to do that at that time.

MR. KASTE: This is James Kaste.

Thank you, your Honor. I just wanted to try and avoid any potential problem there.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Understood.

MR. DRAPER: This is John Draper.

1 Thank you, your Honor. I think that's all 2 consistent with the case management plan. 3 SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: And consistent with what you just told me. I appreciate your comments, 4 5 Mr. Draper. So I think that, unless other people 6 7 have questions, resolves the questions with respect to the supplemental opinion and the discovery. 8 9 And just to be clear on the record, I'm just looking at the -- on the dates, and so it turns out that 10 11 December 1st was a Saturday, so December 8th is a 12 Saturday. 13 So, Mr. Draper, I propose the 7th, so you don't 14 have to be in there on a Saturday. I'm willing to make 15 it the 8th, if you want to be there on Saturday. 16 MR. DRAPER: The 7th will be fine, your Honor. 17 Thank you very much. 18 For the record, this is John Draper. 19 SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. And so the 20 next -- is there anything else with respect to discovery 21 at this point? 22 Nothing from the State of Wyoming. MR. KASTE: 23 This is James Kaste. 24 SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Thank you. 25 So that brings us to the question of the

setting of the trial. So under the current deadline as set out in our case management order, Number 10, the date for -- the final date for motion would be May 10, 2013, and that can include dispositive motions. So my guess is that we are talking about having a trial somewhere probably in the second half of the summer. And so, of course, that can all change. I recognize that, but I'm just curious as to -- I recognize that from the standpoint of both sides -- or let me take that back.

From the standpoint of Montana, you still might want more time, you might request it, but let's assume for the moment that, in fact, these deadlines hold current, that motions have to be filed by May 10.

Thoughts from both sides as to when trial should be set. I'm not asking for specific dates. I'm just talking about general time of the year.

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

The motion deadline of May 10 would lead to certain responsive briefing, which presumably would occur during June, so the latter part of the summer or early fall may be an appropriate time to think about setting the trial.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Mr. Michael?

MR. MICHAEL: Yes, your Honor, Peter Michael.

I guess I agree with that to some extent. It would be 21 -- three weeks in May for the responses.

The motions would actually be filed on May 10. So I don't know how much of June actually gets chewed up with that. But I think it is an important point to be made that where we go with trial is heavily affected by dispositive motions. So it is very helpful, especially if you're going to call a lot of witnesses, to have an idea how big the case is with some lead time before you start the trial.

And I would add just one other point. I'm not looking right at the case management order right now. I should be, but I'm sorry, I'm not. We have last days for motions and you say including dispositive motions, but it is often, when it comes time to trial, motions, such as motions in limine and stuff, a lot of times it is beneficial to have those closer to the trial date than with the dispositive motions. And I think -- you know, you don't know which witnesses you're going to bother to file a motion in limine on or what evidence you might do that if you don't even know if you need the witness or the evidence.

So I think splitting those is a normal thing, and I would suggest you might think about that, keep that in mind as a possible amendment if we need to, to

the case management plan, to push those trial-based motions back from the dispositive motions. It just saves people a lot of extra effort that may be unnecessary.

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

I don't disagree with that. Motions in limine may be appropriate and we should look at how we provide for that. And there are probably other constituent deadlines that we will want to discuss among the parties and propose to you.

One other consideration that occurs to me in this context is that the case that went to trial on the Republican River in August, and that we just now finished the post-trial briefing on, may be subject to exceptions that would be briefed during the -- during the spring and that would lead to an argument setting probably in October.

Typically, one needs essentially a month to get ready for one of those Supreme Court arguments. And so I would ask that we keep that in mind as we begin to think about when trial would be set, and we may know more about that as we get into the spring as to whether there will be exceptions or not and on what schedule the argument might be put.

MR. MICHAEL: Your Honor, this is Peter

Michael.

Just a quick response to that. There is a lot of frustration here, as you probably can understand, with -- from us, from us attorneys, and the State itself with having a wagon hitched to the Republican River horses, which we really didn't create that situation. I think that's something that -- I don't want to be harsh, but I understand counsel has to have more than one case going, but we certainly feel at some point we're going to have to get back on our own horse and not be hitched to that horse.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: I understand the positions of both sides on this issue. What I would like to be able to do is to look over the next couple of weeks at a tentative time frame for trial next year, recognizing that it can change, but also hoping that by setting a tentative time frame, we can at least avoid vacations that could be scheduled at different times, being scheduled in a way that makes it very difficult by the time we get, for example, to late spring of next year to actually find the date that works for everybody.

And so what I would like to ask is that if both sides could, within the next week, say by a week from tomorrow, which is November 2nd, if you could simply provide Susan Carter by e-mail with any dates that you

know right now would be impossible for the lead counsel on either side between, say, the beginning of August and the end of October. And then what I can do is then take a look to see what time periods might be remaining and check potential courtroom availability and that will then give us at least an initial date that we can all try to keep free for next year.

And in responding to that, my view is that at this point the only things that would prevent a trial from being scheduled are weddings, anniversaries, things that are -- or if you already have a vacation planned and your tickets issued, that's what I want to know about at this date.

MR. DRAPER: This is John Draper.

Very good, your Honor. Glad to do that.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Thanks, John.

MR. DUBOIS: This is Jim Dubois.

I just was wondering as far as what the -- have the parties tried to estimate how long the trial's going to -- I mean, sort of thinking in terms of trial scheduling, have the parties estimated how long the trial is going to take and are -- is direct testimony -- is all testimony going to be live or is direct testimony going to be written, things like that all affect sort of how long you need to plan for and, therefore, where you

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 can slot things in.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: No. I agree with you entirely. Thanks for bringing that up. I was about to ask the two sides if they had any just rough estimate at this point in time as to the likely length of the trial. We have not discussed -- or at least I have not discussed with the parties the question as to whether or not all testimony will be live. And I don't think we're really in a position to do that today, but we will need to start doing that fairly soon. But at the moment, I don't think that is necessary, but I would be interested in the two parties' just very rough estimate, based on any experience that you had before in these types of cases, as to what you think the likely length of trial I know it is difficult, because we're still -will be. we still have discovery to conduct.

MR. DUBOIS: This is Jim Dubois again.

I will just point out that Mr. Draper's got a variety of experiences that go from a couple of weeks to -- what was Kansas versus Colorado, 200-some days, John?

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

Yes, the extremes are out there, from two weeks this past summer to 272 trial days in the Arkansas case between Kansas and Colorado. That 272 days was spread

1 over 13 years.

But to then take the next step and answer your Honor's question as to whether we have any even rough estimate of the trial required for this case; unfortunately, my answer is: No, I don't have an estimate for you. I'm sorry.

MR. KASTE: Your Honor, this is James Kaste for the State of Wyoming.

I agree, we are in a difficult position at this point. We know so little about the plaintiff's case that we -- it's impossible to identify how long it might take to defend against it. I can tell you right now that we are adamantly opposed to prepared testimony and we would very much like to have all testimony be presented live.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: So Mr. Draper and Mr. Dubois, if you want to chime in here also. I could obviously call around to some of the former Special Masters. And again, I realize this is just impossible to do any type of refined estimate at this point in time, but in terms of the most -- of the various trials that you've had, could you just give me sort of an estimate about the amount of time that you've had for each of them. I realize it is a range. I'm hoping it is not in the 13-year, 270-plus-day range, but I would

1 be surprised if it is.

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

Those two examples that Mr. Dubois and I just referred to are some of the more recent examples that we have. I'm aware of some other cases. I can think, for instance, the one over Ellis Island went to trial. I think it was a month or two of trial in that case. I'd have to run down the list of cases in my mind to see if there were other trials that we might at least be able to point to.

The first time that the Republican River case went through, it settled before trial, so there actually was no trial in that first phase of that case. But I'd be glad to think through the list of at least ones in the last couple of decades that I might be aware of and describe those in some kind of joint filing with the other parties, but those are what I think of at the moment.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. So based on this, if you could give Ms. Carter the dates that you're unavailable from August through the end of the year.

MR. MICHAEL: Your Honor, this is Peter Michael.

We can give it to you now. We're fine.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay.

MR. MICHAEL: So if that helps, but we can follow up with an e-mail so you have it in writing.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: That would be great. If you can just let Ms. Carter know.

Let me also ask: At the very end of the last status conference, there was a little bit of discussion about location.

And, Mr. Michael, you had suggested that maybe it could be hosted by the two states.

And, Mr. Draper, you raised the concern that that was -- that would not be a neutral location, and the trials have been historically held in neutral locations, although you go back to the dispute between California and Arizona, I think that was actually tried in San Francisco. But you're certainly right, in recent decades, it's always been a neutral location.

Any other thoughts on that particular subject, other than what was said before?

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

Typically, what we've seen, and I think it would be fine with us, is the trials have been held where the Special Master resides. That's what we did in August. That trial was in Portland, Maine, before a Special Master Kayatta, who is located there.

The Arkansas River litigation between Kansas

and Colorado was held in Pasadena. Special Master

Arthur Littleworth lives in that area.

So that has been a common practice in recent times.

MR. KASTE: Your Honor, this is James Kaste.

On behalf of the State of Wyoming, I can tell you, we will give up our home-field advantage and we'll consent to do this in Billings. There are a whole bunch of people from the state of Wyoming and the state of Montana that probably need to come in and testify in this case, and making them get their way all the way out to California versus having you travel all the way out to Wyoming, all by your lonesome, just doesn't make good sense. And if that means that we have to try this case in the state of Montana, in their backyard, we're happy to do so. The imposition on our witnesses and the additional cost of conducting this case in California just makes no sense. So we suggest and strongly urge you to have this case in Billings.

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

We feel that that needs to be -- that may be fine, but it needs to be balanced against the availability of the Special Master, and we're certainly willing to accommodate anything that will make it easier for the Master.

1 SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. Thanks.

So this is very helpful information and so we don't -- we won't resolve that particular question right now. I'm going to do a little bit of additional research and thinking on that question, but I certainly understand the issues on both sides, but if you could send me that information or send Ms. Carter that information, that would be very useful.

So are there any other matters for the conference today?

MR. MICHAEL: Peter Michael from Wyoming.

None, your Honor, from Wyoming.

MR. DRAPER: Your Honor, John Draper.

Nothing from State of Montana.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: So what I'm going to suggest is, moving forward, that we do have a conference call once a month. I hate to put another thing on your calendar, but I think we're getting close enough to all of these various dates that it is going to be important for me to be available if there are any concerns and also for me to make sure that things are running smoothly.

So what I will ask Ms. Carter to do is to try to find a date, probably in mid-November, when we can talk again.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The order and the case management plan, the monthly updates will remain in effect. What I would propose is that for the remainder of this pretrial period, that we have a status conference a week or so after each of those responses are due. And so that will be mid-November and another one in mid-December of this So expect that e-mail from Ms. Carter on that. So unless there is anything else, I hope everybody has a wonderful remainder of the day, and I will look forward to talking to you all next month, if

not sooner. I will, as I said, send out, at the beginning

of next week, a revised version of the September 28, 2012 opinion that corrects the typos, and I'll also include a separate sheet with that that actually lists where the various corrections have been made so that you can look back and see what corrections were actually made to the document itself. Okav.

MR. DRAPER: Your Honor, John Draper.

Thank you very much.

SPECIAL MASTER THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you all.

(Proceedings adjourned at 12:02 p.m.)

24

25

1	

2.

3

4

5

6 7

9

8

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

20

19

21

2.2

23

24

25

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Cynthia J. Vega, a Certified Shorthand Reporter for the State of California, do hereby certify that the above-referenced proceedings were reported by me on Thursday, October 25, 2012, at 401 West A Street, Suite 750, San Diego, California; were taken by me stenographically and were transcribed through computerized transcription under my direction, and the foregoing is a true and correct record of the proceedings taken at that time.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties in the foregoing proceeding and caption named or in any way interested in the outcome of the cause in said caption.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have subscribed my name this 6th day of November, 2012.

CYNTHIA J. VEGA, CSR NO. 6640