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PROCEEDINGS
SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Good afternoon, everybody. For the record, this is a hearing in U.S. Supreme Court Docket Number 126 original, Kansas against Nebraska and Colorado. It's an informational hearing on the motion filed by the three states, with the support of the United States as amicus curiae, seeking approval by the Court of the final settlement stipulation entered into by the States on the date of December 15, 2002. My job now is to prepare a report for filing with the Supreme Court. This hearing is to help me in that job.

Before going further, I want to say, this first Monday of January 2003 is a very special day for all of you and for me. Just exactly three years ago, on the first Monday of January 2000, we met for the first time in the Kansas City United States Courthouse for oral argument on the groundwater motion to dismiss and for our first case conference.

Today represents the result of this splendid effort by all of you in bringing this Republican River case to what, by comparison to the other western river cases in the Supreme Court, is a remarkably speedy conclusion. I congratulate all of you.
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Today is also just about a year and a half after we all went on that -- went together on that most helpful aerial and ground tour of the Republican River basin in July 2001. Those three days of education by all of you is proving particularly -- proving particularly valuable as go about the job of producing a report to the Supreme Court. And I suspect the fact that all of you traveled together the length of the basin those three days was not unhelpful in your achieving the final settlement stipulation that is now before me. So this is a very special day, I suggest.

Let's get down to work. First, let's take appearances. Steven Scott, my invaluable case management assistant is with me. Court reporter is Amanda Maze. First, the States, could we have appearances from Kansas. And it would be helpful to me as you introduce the people from Kansas, if each would stand so l could put a name to a face.

MR. DRAPER: Your Honor, I am John Draper, counsel of record for Kansas. And I have with me the following people: Mr. Lee Rolfs, who is the legal advisor to Mr. Pope, the chief engineer of Kansas. Next to him is Mr. Pope, chief engineer and director of the Department of Water Resources in
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Kansas.
Just behind me we have Mr. David Barfield, who is on Mr. Pope's staff as an engineer. Next to him is Mr. Dale Book, who is president of the Groundwater Engineers, one of our lead consultants in this case. With Mr. Book are members of his office, Ms. Mary Kay Brengosz, Ms. Melissa Geis, and Mr. Jon Mayberry.

Thank you, Your Honor.
SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Thank you, Mr. Draper. For the State of Nebraska?

MR. COOKSON: Special Master McKusick, David Cookson. I have joining me at the table the director of the Department of Natural Resources, Roger Patterson; co-counsel, Mr. Bart McLeay from Kutak Rock; Don Blankenau, co-counsel from Fenimore Craig; Ann Bleed, deputy director of the Department of Natural Resources; Chad Kudym from the HGR Engineering, one of our outside consultants who was kind enough to bring us our blowups of the maps today; and Tom Riley from the Flat Water Group, also another one of our outside consultants. And I think that's everybody from Nebraska.

Oh, and also I'd like to -- I guess I volunteered to do this. I would also like to
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everybody.
Thank you, Your Honor.
SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Thank you very much. And now, the amicus curiae of the United States?

MS. HIMMELHOCH: Thank you, Your Honor. This is Sarah Himmelhoch on behalf of the United States. And I have with me Mr. Jeffrey Minear, who is the assistant solicitor. In the gallery is Mr. James DuBois, my co-counsel. And then from the Bureau of Reclamation, we have Mr. Ore, Mr. Dennis Allacher, Mr. Gordon Aycock, Mr. Marv Swanda. And the Department of the Interior solicitors office, we have John Chaffin. I don't -- oh, I need new glasses. We also have another of my co-counsel, I apologize, Mr. Michael Ghelata. Did I miss anyone else? And Mr. Walsh is here in spirit, though not in body, Your Honor.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: I think perhaps, Ms. Himmelhoch, you don't need to hide behind that map. The map perhaps could be moved down here farther.

MS. HIMMELHOCH: Okay.
SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: I could see it perfectly well.
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Have I missed anybody?
Well, let's get into business. Again, this is an informational hearing. We will not swear witnesses nor will we have presentation of evidence in $Q$ and $A$ form. We will follow the presentation outline that was attached to the joint statement filed by the States with me last Thursday. That goes through, and we'll plan to go through, the final settlement stipulation section by section.

I will try to direct my questions to the appropriate section and to the appropriate presenter. But let's not let formality stand in the way of your deciding who can best respond.

I do ask that when a person speak, that each time identify themselves. It's important for the court reporter.

I'm going to urge that also, particularly, that the United States, as amicus curiae, should not be bashful about speaking up when you have contributions to make.

Again, I, of course, leave it entirely up to you to pick the person or persons to answer my questions or to make presentations. And also, if you want at any time to confer before responding, just let me know.

At the conclusion of the presentation, as we walk down through the outline that the States presented, 1 plan to call upon counsel for each of the States and the amicus, United States, to make a wind-up statement on why the Supreme Court should approve the final settlement stipulation.

I do want to say also that I do plan to submit to the States and to the amicus, a draft of my report for your comments. Before we adjourn today, we'll work out a schedule for getting your comments on the draft.

I also plan, probably in an hour and a half or so, to call a recess, which might be a convenient time if some questions come up where you want to put your heads together, that'll give you that opportunity.

Are there any questions or suggestions as to how we proceed this afternoon? Any at all?

Well, let's get under way, then. The presentation outline that was attached to the States' statement goes down through the -- goes down through the final settlement stipulation by sections. And the Sections I and II on the outline said to be self-explanatory, but the state engineers or counsel can answer any questions as needed. So
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let me kick off with a question, a question or two.
First of all, the Section 1 is on general, and Section Il is on definitions. I do not find in the definitions any definition for "year" or "water year." And I do see on Page 6 a definition of "annual," as defined in the RRCA accounting procedures. Is the assumption that "year" means a calendar year and that "water year" means -- has a generally accepted meaning that doesn't have to be defined? That's my question.

MS. ANGEL: Well, Your Honor, we could ask one of the engineers. But I believe we meant to use annual to refer to anything that was yearly. And then we meant to leave the definition --

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: I can't hear you very well. There is a mic there. I hate to ask you to get up every time and come up to that --

MS. ANGEL: I'Il try and speak up.
SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: That's better.
MS. ANGEL: We meant the "annual"
definition to answer all the questions about what we meant. And I believe throughout the document, we attempted to use "annual" or "annually" when we were referring to some kind of yearly period.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: And a "water
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year" corresponds to a calendar year?
MS. ANGEL: That's the current definition in the accounting procedures. It was specifically referred to the accounting procedure in case the engineers later decided unanimously that a different water year would be more efficient.

And I'm sorry, I'm Carol Angel.
SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Well, fine.
Thank you very much.
A very small point in the definitions of federal reservoirs. Why isn't the Milford Reservoir in Kansas a federal reservoir or a -- is it not included for this purpose it isn't so treated? I notice that the Lovewell Reservoir is, which is in Kansas.

MS. HIMMELHOCH: Your Honor, I believe -this is Sara Himmelhoch on behalf of the United States. It was felt that that was outside of the area of concern for purposes of the settlement. And since none of the activities involved in the settlement affected that reservoir directly, we opted not to include it in there.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: The definition of federal reservoirs was used, it didn't make any difference if Milford was excluded?
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MS. HIMMELHOCH: Correct, Your Honor.
SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: I don't have any
other questions on Sections I and II. And why don't
we move directly to Section III, which relates to existing development. And Mr. Patterson?

MR. PATTERSON: Special Master McKusick, good afternoon. Thank you. My name is Roger Patterson. I am the director of the Nebraska Department of Natural Resources. And I will provide the overview of Section III in the settlement stipulation, which we have titled, Existing Development.

The States, after analyzing all of the available water data, came to the mutual conclusion that the water supplies of the Republican River basin were for the most part fully developed. As a result, the States have agreed that a moratorium be placed on the construction of new wells upstream of Guide Rock, Nebraska.

Rules and regulations previously adopted by Colorado and Kansas in the Republican basin above Guide Rock have created a de facto moratorium. As a result, only very limited well construction has occurred in these areas in the last several years.

In Nebraska, the moratorium applies to all
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or part of three Republican River Natural Resource
Districts. All three affected natural resource
districts have now adopted temporary suspension on the construction of new wells upstream of Guide Rock, Nebraska.

The Upper Republican Natural Resource District adopted a moratorium in I997. The Middle Republican NRD adopted a moratorium in June of 2002, the past summer. And the Lower Republican NRD adopted a moratorium in the area upstream of Guide Rock effective on December 9 th of 2002.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Are all of those upstream from Guide Rock?

MR. PATTERSON: The Middle Republican and the Upper Republican are totally situated upstream of Guide Rock. Guide Rock falls within the Lower Republican NRD. And they have adopted rules to preclude the construction of new wells in their district upstream of Guide Rock, not in their district downstream of Guide Rock.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Now, do 1 understand correctly, though, that the moratorium applies only above Guide Rock?

MR. PATTERSON: That is correct.
SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: And why cut it
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```
off there?
    MR. PATTERSON: The reason for that, which
we will -- which is laid out in Section V of the
settlement stipulation -- really ties to those
special concerns and special conditions that we have
developed for the part of the basin located upstream
of Guide Rock, particularly in these dry years. So
to make the settlement work, we did not need to put
the moratorium in the area downstream of Guide Rock
to Hardy. But the water use, the consumptive use of
that water, does count towards the consumptive use
that Nebraska or Kansas would make.
    SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: And we're going
to be talking more about Guide Rock --
    MR. PATTERSON: We will.
    SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: -- later, and
you're going to be handling that?
    MR. PATTERSON: I will do that. I will do
my best.
    The settlement provides that the
moratorium may be modified in the future by the
Compact Administration if new information would
demonstrated that additional ground water
development would not cause a State to consume more
than its respective allocation. The moratorium
```
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applies only to the Republican River basin and not to any other basin or any groundwater supply located outside of the Republican River basin.

There are a number of exceptions to the moratorium provided for in the settlement stipulation. Certain areas of the basin are generally excepted for three reasons.

One, they are an area where the United States Geological Survey has measured groundwater levels rising by at least 10 feet from a time prior to well development. This is due to the build up of groundwater mound created by water imported from the Platte River systems canals.

Second, the areas excluded are located downstream stream of Guide Rock, Nebraska, as we just discussed, or, three, they're located in natural resource districts that are generally not part of the Republican basin. In this case, we have a Twin Platte Natural Resource District and the Little Blue Natural Resource District.

Additionally, specific exceptions are provided for test holes, dewatering wells with an intended use of one year or less, replacement wells, as long as they do not consume more water than the --
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SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Will you explain to me what a dewatering well is?

MR. PATTERSON: Dewatering well would generally be associated with construction, perhaps, that you're building in an area that would have a high water table. You may need to go in and put some temporary wells in to pump out, basically dry up that foundation area.

Small wells that pump either $\mathbf{5 0}$ gallons per minute or less, or 15 acre feet per year or less are excepted; wells for certain emergency purposes and wells for expansion of municipal or industrial uses; transfers of use from an existing well are also allowed, again, as long as the new well does not consume more well than the old well consumed.

Such transfers are not allowed if they would cause an increase in depletion upstream of Trenton Dam, with special consideration I would add addressed by the United States and Trenton Dam and Swanson Lake.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Clear up for me what an augmentation well meant. Do I understand correctly that that means when a well can pump more water than it will deplete from the stream flow? Is that shorthand?
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MR. PATTERSON: In general. Hal Simpson is the expert on this, and he is going to explain augmentation wells when we get him up here. Those are wells that we did exclude.

I would point out that prior to any State developing that kind of a plan, it would have to come to the Compact Administration, and we would have to review and approve it. But Hal is going to cover that when he gets into his explanation on compact accounting.

We also addressed surface water in that the settlement recognizes that each of the three States has previously taken action that essentially results in a de facto moratorium on new surface water rights or permits. The States have agreed that they will notify the other States and the United States Bureau of Reclamation prior to lifting any surface water moratorium or granting any new surface water rights. The settlement stipulation recognizes the right of each State to grant new rights to surface water if under such rights they could make use of water within the States' compact allocation.

We did bring blow-ups of the maps that are in the settlement stipulation that cover the area of
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the moratorium. But other than if you have additional questions, I think that is my overview of what we called Existing Development, which, for the most part, is the moratorium on groundwater wells. SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Would you explain the reasons behind the provision for freezing well development above the Trenton Dam?

MR. PATTERSON: The United States, during the settlement discussions, raised a concern about further depletion to inflow to Swanson Lake, which is the lake behind Trenton Dam. And we recognized that that was a fair concern.

And the way we addressed it here is essentially to do two things. One, make permanent, if you will, the moratorium on well construction upstream of Trenton Dam. And secondly, we put in a limitation on transfers of existing wells, so you couldn't transfer a well that was depleting the stream below Trenton and replace that with a well that would now deplete upstream of Trenton. So we have those two considerations that were to address the concern about inflow to Swanson Lake.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: A very small drafting point, there are some places, particularly on Page 12 where it says, the States will not
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increase the level of development of wells as of
July 1, 2002. Obviously that means -- does not mean, does not increase the rate of development of wells, rather it means will not increase the number of wells or the capacity of wells.

MR. PATTERSON: That's right. It's not the rate.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: That provision about freezing well development above Trenton, the Trenton Dam, has a provision on Page 12 that reads, Any of the States may seek to amend this provision or this stipulation by making application to the Court upon any change in conditions making appropriate -- making modification of this Subsection III.A. 3 necessary or appropriate.

Well, first of all, this does not provide, apparently, for the States, first of all, to -- one of the States who wishes to amend the provision of going to the RRCA under the dispute resolution mechanism. And then secondly, it provides for making application to the Court, the Supreme Court of the United States.

As I -- maybe you want to turn to counsel to respond to this question. But the only way a case can be taken to the original jurisdiction of
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the Supreme Court is by filing a motion for leave to file a complaint. And is that what is contemplated here?

MR. PATTERSON: Let me give you the engineering description and then maybe Sarah can respond legally. The United States is not a party to the compact. And we wanted to address their concern. We made this a high standard, that you could not simply come to the Compact Administration, of which the United States is not a party, and do away with this protection that we included for their benefit. That's the reason, to me, that we did not leave this subject to the Compact Administration to make this decision.

We do recognize that we could have a situation in the future where something changes substantially, perhaps a reformulation of the Swanson Lake Project where Nebraska, Colorado, Kansas may want to use water in this area through new development. We would have to, in that case, go back to Congress. But also that's why we set it up to go back to the Court.

MR. COOKSON: David Cookson.
The thinking was, Your Honor, that as
Mr. Patterson stated, was to protect the interests
of the United States, who would not be a party to the Compact Administration, and to set a standard that is so high or onerous, if you will, that it was not being done -- an undertaking done lightly, understanding that all of the States -- all the States could do would be to file their motion for leave with the Court seeking to change this particular provision.

And as it is with every case, the Court will tell us whether or not they wish to exercise their jurisdiction or not. And so every -I think the States recognize that there is not only the likelihood that we wouldn't do this, but even if we do agree to do it, the Court may say they don't wish to entertain jurisdiction at which case we're stuck where we are.

But the idea was, there could be a process where, for instance, the irrigation districts that are served by the Swanson Project would no longer be in existence and the necessity of having that water or not consuming water above Swanson would change to such an extent that the States would wish to petition the Court.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: There's another problem is I -- seems to me you don't provide a
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legal standard that the Supreme Court can do anything with. Suppose the Supreme Court takes your original jurisdiction case and refers it to a Master. The Master's going to have a hard time saying what is necessary or appropriate. It is almost a legislative matter. It would seem to me the resolution in that matter might be Congress.

MR. COOKSON: And I think the reality is the Court may take that as the justification -- or its reasoning for not accepting jurisdiction. However, before we modified something that had been approved by the Court, we felt the appropriate first step would be to go to the Court.

And it could simply be a question of modifying whatever the consent judgment that they enter in this case to reflect that change. Does that -- it would almost -- it almost would have to be by unanimous agreement for it to go forward.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: On Page I5, there's a -- again, Subparagraph $G$ there is a provision that Nebraska shall not change its proposed method of calculating historic consumptive use before providing notice to the RRCA. There's no provision that the RRCA has any part in that, is there?

MR. PATTERSON: No. It's advisory. However, we -- we have in the rules and regs for both Kansas and Colorado, they have established their methodology for determining consumptive use and making transfers. The transfer of groundwater has to be done through our natural resource districts, which are have not yet promulgated rules to do that.

We have proposed in Appendix F, a methodology that we would suggest the Nebraska natural resource districts adopt to make these transfers. And then we have agreed that if we change in any way from this, that we would advise the RRCA so that they do the methodology that we were going to use.

The standard is still there. And that is the standard can't be -- the standard is that the consumptive use of the new well cannot be higher than the consumptive use of the replacement well or the use -- where the water's transferred, can't be higher than the use that was made where it was previously used.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: But the RRCA doesn't have any part in moving to a different method of computation.
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MR. PATTERSON: No. That would be
Nebraska's determination. But we have agreed to
advise the RRCA if we chose to do something
different than what's in Appendix F.
SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Another small point on Page 17 in regard to surface water limitations in the second sentence each state agrees to notify each official member of the RRCA of -before adopting changes in the current restrictions. That just simply means that each member of the RRCA does it?

MR. PATTERSON: I think it does. I think that's the only place where we used official member of the RRCA. It means member for that State. SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: You could say notify the RRCA?

Also -- that same sentence goes on to say, And provide the RRCA an opportunity for discussion. And, again, this is not a situation where the RRCA is expected to take action. It's a discussion, I take it?

MR. PATTERSON: Special Master, that's correct. It's really a heads up and a courtesy to the other members so that if they have concerns, there's an opportunity to express the concern, have

## CONFIDENTIAL EXCERPT ATORNEYS' EYES ONLY

the state proposing to make a change hear that, and decide whether they -- at their decision is correct, will go ahead after considering those concerns. So it is advisory.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: In other words, it relies upon the continued good will among the three cooperating states?

MR. PATTERSON: That's correct.
MR. COOKSON: Your Honor, I might add that the $\mathbf{6 0}$-day provision allows that under our state law, if either of the other States or the Bureau of Reclamation had an objection, that would give them time within our statutory period to make that objection known before the rule or the water right was granted.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: I'm interested in looking over the State of Nebraska statutes that were -- there was some enacted on July 20, 2002. Was that related to the moratorium?

MR. COOKSON: I believe, if you're referring to the Department of Natural Resources rules and regulations.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Yes.
MR. COOKSON: That was actually the result of -- there was a merger between the Department of
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Water Resources and the Natural Resources
Commission. And so they had to redo all of their
rules. And so they were officially merged and
adopted on July of 2002.
    SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: I see. What
kind of legal action has Nebraska had to take in
order to implement the moratorium that, as I
understand it, is already in place?
    MR. COOKSON: The -- as part of the
agreement with the other States, we had agreed back
in the agreement in principal to have these
particular suspensions and moratorium in place by
the time the final settlement agreement was
submitted to you. To do that, each of the NRDs,
under the Groundwater Management and Protection Act,
had to ask the Department of Natural Resources to
resume a study under that Act that had begun prior
to the filing of the litigation, but which had been
suspended during the pendency of the litigation.
    They then were entitled, under the
statute, to adopt rules and regulations adopting a
temporary suspension subject to going through the
notice and public hearing. So they had to publish a
notice for a period no less than 2l days. There was
a public hearing that was necessary. And then they
```
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had a board hearing at which time the rules and regulations were discussed.

There were two rather contentious public hearings in the Middle Republican and the Lower Republican. And then there was a subsequent meeting of those boards at which time the temporary suspensions were adopted. In the Middle Republican, it was adopted by unanimous vote. In the Lower Republican, it was adopted by a vote of 10 to 1 . SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: It's this kind of thing that Ithink is important to bring to the attention of the Supreme Court. It shows the good faith efforts to bring this settlement about. It shows that the train is already partially leaving the station and so on.

MR. COOKSON: I might add, Your Honor, that we had advised the Middle and the Lower that we would not make the request from them until October when we were -- so that they would have sufficient time to do it before the final settlement was submitted. The Middle Republican as a sign -- not only as a sign of good faith to us, but as a sign of good faith to the other States actually acted almost immediately upon -- after the settlement in -- or agreement in principal was reached at the -- in
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April. They published their notice in May and adopted their temporary suspension in June.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: AsI understand it, Nebraska had little or no regulation of well pumping previously.

MR. COOKSON: Well, that's actually a
common misconception. The Upper Republican had
limitations beginning as far back as the early ' 80 s
on new wells in their particular district due to the
only provisions in law at that time that allowed you
to adopt a moratorium, which were declining water levels.

In the Middle Republican and the Lower Republican, they did not have that sufficient level of decline so as to have a legal justification until the Groundwater Management Act had been revised in 1995. And immediately upon doing that, the Middle Republican at least began the process that ultimately led to where we are today.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Thank you.
Well, I think that exhausts me, any way, on this one, on Section III. So we move to Section IV, Subsections $A$ and $D$ on Compact accounting.

Mr. Pope?
MR. POPE: Thank you, Your Honor.
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Good afternoon. For the record, my name is David Pope from Kansas. I will be describing the portions of the settlement as indicated on the presentation outline in Section IV, at least the first four sections of -- Subunits A through D of Section IV that deal with the overall frame work of Compact accounting under the settlement. And then later on we'll hear from others about the remaining provisions, Mr. Simpson and then again Mr. Patterson on other related items.

I think as you know, the Republican River Compact was negotiated prior to significant development of the basin's water resources, thus its provisions were prospective in nature providing a broad, overarching framework for development by the States in cooperation with the United States.

The Compact negotiators left many details of administration of the Compact to be developed by the respective successors. This settlement, and particularly this section and Section $V$ of the settlement provide the States' mutual agreement on the details of the administration of the Compact. Another way of saying that is we spent a lot of time and effort working through these accounting procedures to try to come up with a workable
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settlement.
Subsection A of the stipulation states that the States will determine virgin water supply, computed water supply, allocations, imported water supply credit, augmentation credit, and computed beneficial consumptive use based on a methodology set forth in the RRCA accounting procedures, which are attached as Appendix C. And I'Il come back to this in a few minutes.
Fundamentally, this section obligates the States to conduct an annual accounting of the basin's water supply allocations and use in accordance with the accounting procedures. These computations are used to determine compliance with the Compact and to provisions of the settlement.
Historically, the States have administered the Compact to the Republican River Compact Administration. The settlement, of course, provides that the RRCA will continue to administer the Compact.
In addition to the data explicitly needed for annual accounting, the States are obligated to annually exchange an extensive amount of supporting data used to develop their estimates of use to allow the other States the ability to understand the basis
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and if needed independently verify the estimates of use.

Further, the States are given the ability to inspect various records and to conduct accompanied or unaccompanied site inspection for purposes of verification. And that is spelled out in the accounting procedures in Pages 32 through 38. SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: I see, obviously, one virtue of this. Everybody is -three States are keeping their books on the same basis. What did you have before this? What did you have in place before settlement?

MR. POPE: There were in place, Special Master, a relatively limited set of accounting procedures that had been developed by mutual agreement of the States over the years, going back when accounting first started. But in general, the States had left to each other to develop their own estimates of how much water had been used and provide that data and information -- and there certainly were opportunities for discussions of that.

But in general, it was the acclamation of that information and to some extent we continue that. But with a lot more detail and a lot more
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opportunity for review of the underlying data and ability to monitor and evaluate that. So I think this is a much more comprehensive settlement.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: More collection of data?

MR. POPE: There will be more collection of data certainly. And the formulas are much more details. The fundamental principles are somewhat similar. But there are some differences as I'll discuss here in a few minutes.

But I think there was -- in my view at
least and the others can comment, but I believe one of the things that we thought was advantageous to the settlement was to have a much more comprehensive and well-defined set of procedures that would hopefully serve us well in the future and avoid conflict and disagreement.

I would note that the accounting procedures lay out the details of how the annual computations will be made, both generally and to each designated drainage basin. I will return to most -- the most significant features of the accounting procedures after Section IV.B, C, and D of the stipulation which addresses the sub-basin flexibility, the determination of groundwater
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depletions, and averaging.
Now, with regard to Subsection B, which
deals with sub-basin accounting, this section defines the States' flexibility in the use of their allocation geographically. This section allows the States to use what's been referred to as otherwise unallocated waters at locations of their choosing so long as the following conditions are met.

Basically, a State may not impair the ability of a downstream State to use its specific sub-basin allocation within that sub-basin. Secondly, a State, of course, may not use more than its state-wide allocation. And then, thirdly, in water-short years, additional constraints apply as will be discussed in the Guide Rock section by Mr. Patterson in a few minutes.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Stopping there before you go to IV. Does this -- first of all, when it says, Water derived from sub-basins in excess of a State's specific sub-basin allocations as available, does that mean any State, even though it's not a State within which any part of the sub-basin is located?

And I'm leading up to my next question is, if more than one State could make a demand on this
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```
unallocated water, does it become simply first
come/first serve, the first one that gets there?
    MR. POPE: I think the answer to the first
question is that it would be only States within that
sub-basin that would be using water from that
sub-basin. I believe l've not missed anything when
I say that.
    And secondly, the protection that's really
embodied is in part so that the practical aspects in
terms of where water's used and how much water's
used in the basin under the current status of
existing development -- but an example would be in a
sub-basin shared by two States, this settlement
agreement provides that the upper'State would not
use any more water than that amount that would still
leave available the amount allocated to the
downstream State.
    SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: I can see that.
Take Red Willow Creek, which, I believe, is
completely in Nebraska.
MR. POPE: Correct.
SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: And I believe that Kansas is allocated some water from that. Could Kansas, if it called on the water first, ahead of Nebraska, could it take unallocated water out of
```

that sub-basin?
MR. POPE: Well, when you have a sub-basin of that nature -- Sarah may have a comment here in a minute -- the unalloc -- so-called unallocated waters are really allocated to the main stay. They are really the waters that are relied upon in the Compact to make up the main stem allocations in part.

And Kansas would not have a specific claim to individual tributary, but it would have a claim to all of the water that's allocated to it in its main stem allocation. And whether Nebraska would use part of the unallocated water in that particular sub-basin or whether it would use more or less from the main stem, wouldn't matter as long as it doesn't directly interfere within this case, the Kansas use of water.

MS. HIMMELHOCH: If I may, Your Honor? This is the Compact, as I understand it, contemplates use by each state within its own state boundaries. The exception being that Kansas is being given the option to divert its water at Guide Rock. That general provision applies here as well, so Kansas would divert whatever portion of the otherwise unallocated water it wished to use within
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```
Kansas or at Guide Rock. Nebraska within Nebraska
and Colorado within Colorado.
    What would happen on a creek which only
appears -- which only flows in one state, like Red
Willow, is that Nebraska is obliged to let flow into
the main stem that portion which has been allocated
to Kansas so that Kansas can divert it either at
Guide Rock or in the state of Kansas.
    MR. POPE: I know this is --
    SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: I find it rather
complicated.
MR. POPE: It is somewhat complicated. We spent many days and days working on ways to try to get this accomplished that would protect all interested and be consistent with the Compact.
Let me go on for a minute and see if it would help with your questions and we can go further as may be needed.
In regard to the test of impairment of a downstream State's specific sub-basin allocation, the accounting procedures require specific calculations to determine Kansas and Colorado compliance with this requirement. And the reason I say Kansas and Colorado is because all of the sub-basins in Nebraska are not shared sub-basins.
```
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They are all within Nebraska. But there are others that are shared between either two or three of the States.

These calculations require that States' use in a specific sub-basin be less than the sum of its allocation from that sub-basin, any remaining allocation from an upstream State in that sub-basin, and the unallocated waters of that sub-basin. So it's a sum of those three components.

And, again, as I said, Nebraska's in a little different situation.

Fundamentally, each -- for each sub-basin, the test prohibits an upstream State from, again, using a specific allocation from a downstream sub-basin.

Similarly, the accounting procedures include calculations to determine whether on a five-year running average basis, each States" statewide use is within its statewide allocation. And, again, the details of the special case in the water-short years will be discussed in a few minutes.

Let me pause and see if there's any further questions on that component or maybe this will become --
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SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Do any of the rest of you have comments on that?

MS. HIMMELHOCH: Your Honor, I realized I forgot to answer the second half of your question, which was, Is it first come/first serve. And the answer to that with respect to the otherwise unallocated is yes, it is first come/first serve.

As a practical matter with the moratorium in place, we are essentially fixing the world as it exists today and there is unlikely to be any question as to who gets to use the otherwise unallocated water because everybody that has their development in place. But the fundamental principle is with respect to otherwise unallocated water, first come/first serve.

MR. POPE: There are some unique sort of physical circumstances in some of the shared sub-basins, that I think, help make this work.

MR. PATTERSON: Your Honor, if I could, just add one thing, the example of Red Willow where it is a sub-basin entirely within one state, there is a specific allocation to Nebraska. There is no specific allocation to Kansas. But the unallocated is split between the two.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: I missed that.
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MR. PATTERSON: So there would be no obligation on Nebraska in Red Willow Creek. We could use our specific and we could use all of the unallocated. However, that means that we would have to use, less, obviously, somewhere else in the basin.

MR. POPE: With respect to Subsection C about the groundwater modeling component. Last April, in the settlement principles, the States agreed that a comprehensive groundwater model was needed to properly account for stream flow depletions due to groundwater pumping from both the alluvial pumping and upland and highplains, sometimes known as Ogallala pumping, as well as to determine credit for imported water. And that was the imported water Mr. Patterson spoke of in terms of the groundwater mound issue.

This is consistent with the conclusions of your first report. The settlement principles obligated the States to work aggressively and cooperatively in consultation with the United States to develop the model between then and July I of 2003 with a number of specific interim requirements during the period between the signing of the settlement principles and November 15 th or
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```
essentially, finally, December when we reached the
final settlement.
    The States created a technical modeling
committee to carry out this work. The modeling
committee is composed of modeling and other experts
of each State, the United States Geological Survey
and the Bureau of Reclamation.
    Modeling committee was given the following
assignments for the period through November 15th of
2002: First, they were to meet with the U.S.
Geological Survey personnel to become throughly
familiar with the work that they had done thus far
on the modeling effort. Secondly, decide whether to
adapt the U.S. Geological Survey model or to develop
another model acceptable to the States for the
purposes set forth in the settlement principles.
    And thirdly, to identify issues and set
deadlines for discussing the issues for adaptation
or development of a selected model and adopt
milestones to adopt, run, and calibrate the model.
And fourthly, work on the necessary steps to
accomplish this adopting, running, and calibrating
the model, and to agree on fundamental model issues
next, including what's known as calibration
parameters and targets, and procedures for
```
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determining the pumping and recharge. These are sort of key issues that had to be resolved before settlement could take place.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: And this -- and you had a November 15 th deadline for that?

MR. POPE: Yes. This was the internal deadline we had agreed upon in the principles for that status of work to be done. So we knew where we were on the groundwater model issue and then could proceed to finalize other remaining issues. That -basically during that time frame, then, the -- we received that progress report on the modeling effort.

Basically, I would summarize by saying that the modeling committee began its meetings, met numerous times very intensely. U.S.G.S. did provide a detailed briefing regarding its modeling work, and at this meeting committed to providing the States with its model as of that date and all its supporting data, which did occur, I think as you recall from some of the status reports. And they provided that model and supporting information during June of 2002.

After receipt of these data and the model, the committee did decide to develop its own model of
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the basin using components of the U.S. Geological Survey model as a starting point.

The committee, for example, used the U.S.G.S. model grid, stream flow network, land surface elevations as a starting point. Nebraska did propose and ultimately it was agreed to extend the model boundary to include the full extent of the area of the groundwater mound that we spoke of produced by the Platte River diversions into the Republican River basin and areas just north of the Republican River were then included.

And there is a map over here, a blow-up of the model domain. I think there is one in the materials as well. But as you can see, the model domain includes all of the basin plus a little piece to the northeast there that take care of this mound area in Nebraska. And then some areas that are a part of the physical boundaries of the basin that extend south and east of the basin into Kansas there.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Would you explain to me the mound?

MR. POPE: Yes. I can do that. And
Mr. Patterson may want to point out sort of where that occurs with another map there. But
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fundamentally, as I understand it, and, again, Roger's more familiar with this than I, but some of the projects that divert water through canals and onto irrigated land from the Platte River, that application of land, or water onto land, has return flows that add to the water table.

And because these return flows and these lands are located geographically right near the boundary of the Platte River basin and the Republican River basin, that increase in water level has occurred historically for a number of years. And that's what's referred to as the mound.

Roger, would you like to supplement that?
MR. PATTERSON: I think that's good. The U.S.G.S. has monitored these groundwater levels for many, many years in this area. And when we refer to the mound, we adopted their -- basically their working definition of a $\mathbf{1 0}$-foot rise in the water tables since predevelopment. And these -- this cross-hatched blue area on the map here is what we refer to as the mounds that are also multiple areas. But they are relatively concentrated in these two large ones here.

MR. POPE: So essentially what we have, is, then, unlike some other areas of the basin where
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water levels tend to go down rather than up with use over years or stay stable, in the mound area, it's higher. And then that results in certain areas, at least, increased discharge from the groundwater system to streams, to tributary streams, that add water into streams in the Republican River basin that otherwise would not have been there were it not for this additional water diverted into the basin.

Does that --
SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Yes, that's
fine. When I interrupted you, you were in the process of describing the work that had to be done leading up to November I5th. Here we are a month and a half beyond that. Where is the modeling committee in its work now?

MR. POPE: The modeling committee worked very intensely up through the time period of the settlement. I think there's been a work -- mainly working individually on review of a large amount of data that has been exchanged and was used as a part of the process that they have thus far gone through.

They have made a lot of progress in regard to putting the model together thus far. However, I think there has been a little bit of a hiatus over the holidays here. And they're reviewing this data
and they will be getting together the week after next --

UNKNOWN: That's correct.
MR. POPE: Week after next. And they will now be sharing their results of the review of this data and moving into the next steps of finalizing some of the matter.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: You described what happened up to November I5th. Now describe what has to be completed to complete the job.

MR. POPE: Okay. Well, I think -- let me see. I think the key thing would be to finalize the analysis and estimates that have been made on a number of matters that include pumping estimates and mostly some of the things in the model that will be used as calibration parameters.

The model has not yet been calibrated, even though it is operational. It has .preliminary runs have been made. But now there are -- you have got all this data and all this structure of the model. And the calibration process refining those things that are unknowns that will be used as variables is the big task.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Is that data collection?
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MR. POPE: Most of the data has already been collected. There may be a few places where they would collect some more or analyze data in terms of how it would be used in the modeling process. But it's largely sort of finishing up the model.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Is that engineers sitting in their office? Will they do this calibration? I don't grasp really what's happening.

MR. POPE: That part really does get technical for all of us from this standpoint. But the modeling committee meets and reviews output from runs of the model that have been made to see what is replicating the actual known historic stream flow as compared to what the model predicts.

They work individually in their offices based on assignments by the committee to refine certain elements that need more work. And then they get together and discuss and talk about those things. There's a lot of shared data sets and model runs that are reviewed and evaluated by each of the members of the committee.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Ms. Angel, you have something to add?

MS. ANGEL: Thank you, Your Honor. If you want a great deal of detail about exactly where the model is and what they are planning to do in the next few months, we could offer Mr. Knox, who has been the head of the modeling committee, to give you a more detailed report. It's a matter of how much detail you want. And I think Mr. Pope is doing fine. I just didn't know if you wanted --

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: I think that would be valuable. Basically what my question is leading up to is, how much remains to be done? What is the certainty that it'll be done on a time schedule as suggested here, well prior to June $\mathbf{3 0 t h}$ and that sort of thing? That would be fine. I would be happy to hear him.

MR. POPE: I would be happy to have
Mr. Knox up here. Mr. Knox and his people, they have spent a great deal more time on this than the State engineers. Why don't you come forward, Ken, and give a little summary.

MR. KNOX: Good afternoon. For the record, my name is Ken Knox for the State of Colorado.

For your second question, as to the certainly, with every fiber in our bodies, we will
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hope and pray, and we do - we do, sir, anticipate completing this on time.

Sir, I believe there are two main components that we have to work on. First, is in regards to the model itself. As Mr. Pope accurately described, the model is not fully calibrated. It does not fully represent all the physical conditions throughout the basin. However, l do hasten to add, it is calibrated for a large -- most of the area, predominantly, especially in the western part of the basin, we have achieved calibration. There are certain refined areas that Mr. Pope and Mr. Patterson referred to in the mound area that we have a bit of technical work to do.

During the hiatus, we are reviewing those data sets and our methodologies. The intent is to make sure we are all on the same page, that we have a consistent, scientifically proven, adopted and recognized method that we could proceed from.

The second component, sir, is
documentation of the model. That is something we -throughout this process, folks were working in a very collegial, as well as collaborative manner. And we need to document that for understanding and presentation to the Court, but candidly, also for
successive generations so that they could see where we got to, how we did, and they can build upon it in the future as well. I hope that helps.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Yeah. Thank you very much, Mr. Knox.

I have another --
MS. ANGEL: Your Honor, one more thing. I just asked Mr. Knox, and the next modeling committee meeting is January 20th through 22nd. So they are continuing on a fairly tight schedule.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Pushing. Okay.
MR. POPE: Your Honor, one thing that I would note is I believe most of us have observed this process, even though many of us have focused on many of the other matters related to this but have been very, very interested and we all understand that this modeling effort is very critical.

We think there's, perhaps, almost an unprecedented level of cooperation between the experts of three states that have been involved in major litigation. We're very pleased that they have come as far as they have. But that doesn't mean that there aren't issues and matters that have to --

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Still a lot to do.
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That leads me to another question. On Page 19, in regard to the groundwater model project, it says, the States agree to devote the necessary time and resources to complete the model subject to legislative appropriations. That makes one kind of shudder in this time of tight budgets. But we are now less than six months away from when the thing was supposed to be completed. Do you have any slightest qualms about having that appropriation? MR. POPE: Well, I think --

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: And I would turn to each of the three states on that score.

MR. POPE: Well, you know, clearly I have to say --

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: For the model program?

MR. POPE: Clearly we have --
SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: How about

## Kansas?

MR. POPE: We have to clearly recognize that we are all going through very difficult budget situations. But I think the level of commitment is very much there, and hopefully there will be sufficient dollars to do it. Some of that will depend on whether there are unresolved disputes that
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we have to continue to pursue with. But as far as we know, we're committed. And we think we're okay to get that accomplished.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: And you're giving it your priority?

MR. POPE: Absolutely giving it the priority.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: How about

## Nebraska?

MR. PATTERSON: Special Master, money for
Nebraska to continue through the end has been
appropriated by our legislature. And we're suffering some economic hardships like the other states. But we have the money appropriated. And I don't anticipate any problem being able to hang on to that to complete the job.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: And Colorado?
MR. SIMPSON: For the record, Hal Simpson.
Our appropriation year ends June 30 th.
And we have sufficient funds to complete the modeling of the target date of July Ist. So we're in fine shape at the current time.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: I appreciate that.

MR. POPE: I think the few additional

[^0]
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comments I would make about this, I think it's
important to note that the modeling committee has come to agreement on many of the major components about the structure and calibration targets. I'm not going to dwell on that further. I think Mr. Knox has pretty well covered things and has -- 1 would note, of course, as I think you know, there's a fairly detailed summary in the settlement package itself in Appendix J about the status of the modeling effort.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Yes.
MR. POPE: Would note, for example, that there were 57 stream gauges throughout the basin that were selected by the model committee as base flow targets. Ultimately, the committee agreed on the estimated monthly flows for each gauge. These are included in the settlement documents. There could be minor modifications to the base flow targets in the coming months based on unanimous action of the committee.

But the thing, the point here is that we had set forth in the principles that we had to have a good, clear understanding of the model structure and the methodologies and key data sets and targets to get where we are now. That's the hard part.

That really was the hard part in my view.
I guess the remaining work, and we may
have covered this now that I have listed here was in addition to making reference to the Appendix $J$ is a description of the status, but would be to finalization of the data sets and methods to be used in the model, refining previous estimates of groundwater pumpage, pumping recharge, surface water recharge, and precipitation recharge.

Each State will review the final estimates developed by the others. A lot of work has been done in this area. It will be finalizing things like phreatophyte coverage and methods for estimating evapotranspiration. And complete the model testing, as Mr. Knox indicated.

I would note at this point that the settlement does include a provision to resolve any model disputes. And I would just note briefly that it is expected that the modeling committee will continue to work cooperatively to complete the model by July I.

If at any time members of the committee cannot reach an agreement, the committee shall report the nature of the dispute to the States, and the States will resolve the disputes as soon as
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possible. If the States cannot reach agreement regarding the dispute issue, the stipulation provides for binding arbitration, including a cooperative process to select an arbitrator. If the States cannot agree on an arbitrator, the stipulation provides that Special Master would select the arbitrator.

Then I would also note that the settlement provides that the modeling committee shall submit the final groundwater model to the three States with sufficient time for the three States to agree to the model by July 1.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: How much lead time is that?

MR. POPE: That's not a specifically defined, but I think we would probably need something like 30 days or something of that sort to review it. But we have really not explicitly defined that. I think the Republican River Compact Administration is prepared to meet as necessary, because ultimately it will be adopting the model as part of its accounting processes. I see some shaking heads, so apparently that's right.

That's all I had on the model. I would
like to move to another area unless you have any
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questions.
SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Yeah.
MR. POPE: On Subsection D deals with accounting and the -- what is referred to as averaging. Subsection $D$ provides that all compliance tests under Section IV, which we're now discussing, are to be done on a five-year running average basis. And Mr. Patterson again will discuss some of the Section $V$ provisions during water-short years when additional tests shorter than that period will be used.

Averaging has long been discussed in connection with the Compact. Within the Compact itself, the original allocations were based upon the, quote, computed average annual water supply, end of quote, determined by the negotiators using the available gage records. In addition, the RRCA's annual assignments to its engineering committee has included the computation of 5- and $\mathbf{1 0}$-year average water supplies and allocations, at least for informational purposes.

I will note that this provision was one of the more difficult ones to negotiate. Averaging provides greater predictability and flexibility in the use of water. Recognizing that groundwater
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pumping may cause stream depletions a year or more after the pumping occurs, the use of averaging in the accounting allows the States to manage groundwater and surface water together. However, these advantages must be balanced by the need to protect downstream demands for the same water.

Ultimately, the balance we framed in the settlement concerning multi-year averaging was three-fold. Number I, a compromise average length, five years for overall accounting. Number 2 , a shorter averaging period and more strict use criteria above Guide Rock in water-short years. And, Number 3, the removal of a portion of large flood events from the computed water supply and allocations.

With regard to --
SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Pardon. Counsel may want to respond to this too, but Article 4 in allocating, the beneficial consumptive -- for beneficial consumptive use in each of the states, it says, It is hereby allocated for beneficial consumptive use in Colorado, it starts; annually, a total of 54,100 acre feet of water. Iguess my question is, how can that be changed into over a period of five years if you use an average only a
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total of 54,100 acre feet of water.
MR. POPE: Well, again, counsel may want to comment on this. The numbers are computed annually. But it's a matter of what type of methodology is used in the accounting. Mr. Cookson?

MR. COOKSON: I think that is the first major point is we'd still do an annual accounting. But the original Compact allocations were from an averaged supply from the period of 1929 to 1940 was the basis of the water supply in Article 3. So while not express, implicitly the Compact allocated an average amount, because in 1943, the actual virgin water supply was not the virgin water supply that existed in Article 3.

And, in fact, in order to make the books balance, so to speak, it makes a practical and we think consistent with the Compact to do averaging for both aspects, because otherwise you have a supply that is average and an allocation that's not. And the physical reality is they may not match.

But we still do it annually in terms of measuring compliance, we use a five-year averaging, which is consistent both with -- we believe, with the terms of the Compact and with the historical

## CONFIDENTIAL EXCERPT ATORNEYS' EYES ONLY

basis that the Compact worked off of since the very beginning.

And it allows us to address the practical concerns of not only using groundwater, which has delayed effects over time, but it also allows us to account for the changes to the flow that are caused by the storage in the reservoirs which did not exist at the time the original allocations were averaged in Article 3.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Ms. Angel?
MS. ANGEL: If I could just add, the specific words at the beginning of Article 3, which is, The basis for the water supply that is allocated, state that the allocations are derived from the computed average annual virgin water supply. So that's a -- you read Article 3 and Article 4 together in our view. So we think that's consistent. It's also consistent with the practice of the RRCA, which has looked at annual figures, 5-year averages, and 10-year averages.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: In other words, in Article 4, you're reading as if the word "averages" was put in, does hereby allocated for unofficial consumptive use in Colorado annually on the average?
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MS. ANGEL: Because of Article 3, yes.
MS. HIMMELHOCH: And I would also note, Your Honor, that there was anticipation that supply would fluctuate and that there would have to be accommodation made for that fluctuation. There is an explicit provision for variations greater than 10 percent. And so it is clear the language of the Compact was intended to give the RRCA the ability to account in a way that reflected the realities of the system, which probably would change from the time the Compact was drafted through the operation of the Compact.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Okay.
MR. POPE: I might just note back to the issue of flood flows that there are certain flows that will be removed from the determinations of computed water supply and allocations as specified in the accounting procedures. These are flood waters that are greatly in excess of the basin's storage capacity and current needs for beneficial consumptive use.

And, again, I would note that this practice of removing flood flows has some parallel in the original negotiation of the Compact where the 1935 flood flows were not included in the
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determination of the average water supplies of the article -- of Article 3 of the Compact. And, again, to try to make the system of averaging fair and workable, we had to deal with the large floods.

The State will be considered in compliance with Section IV as long as the five-year running average, statewide computed beneficial consumptive use does not exceed that State's five-year running statewide allocation, and as long as any upstream State's sub-basin use does not impair the ability of a downstream State to use its allocation from the same sub-basin. Imported water will be allowed to be used as a credit to offset Nebraska's computed beneficial consumptive use when determining Compact compliance. And that's built into the formulas.

So far, I have focused on provisions of the stipulation related to Compact accounting. Much of the details of how accounting will be done is in Appendix C of the stipulation of the RRCA accounting procedures. I will seek to explain each of the formulas briefly starting on Page 10 of the accounting procedures, if you would like. And I will make this fairly brief.

Essentially the first -- starting there on
Page 10 , the first basic formula is the computation
of virgin water supply. Its definition is derived from the Compact itself. And with the exemption of removal of the imported water supply credits and the inclusion of all groundwater depletions to stream flow and the inclusion of evaporation from nonfederal residence varies storing more than 15 acre feet, this computation of virgin water supply in the accounting procedure is unchanged from the historic methods of the RRCA.

So those are really the differences -- and they are important differences. It is calculated for each, designated drainage basin by summing the downstream gauge plus the sums of all beneficial consumptive uses by the States plus the changes in federal reservoir storage in that sub-basin plus any imported water supply credits. The imported water supply credits will be discussed by Mr. Simpson when discussing Section IV.F. And these imported water supply credits are excluded as they are not part of the water supply of the basin.

The second basic formula is the computation of computed water supply. It is defined in the accounting procedures to be the virgin water supply less the change in federal reservoir storage in any designated drainage basin less the flood
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flows. The computed water supply is the basis of future allocations under the settlement.

The definition provides for two adjustments to virgin water supply to calculate the computed water supply. The second of these flood flows we have already talked about.

And then the next is, the other one is the change in federal reservoir storage. And I would indicate that the historic methods used in this term in the computation of virgin water supply and, therefore, the determinations of allocations, was done. However, change in federal reservoir storage is not used in the computation of beneficial consumptive use.

Of particular concern is that under the historic method, the water is released from storage typically in years of high use. The inclusion of change in storage term reduces the allocations by the amount of water released for use and, yet, consumptive use from the storage release increases the computed consumptive use for that year.

So it was somewhat of a problem practically speaking. The adopted formulas remove change in federal reservoir storage from the determination of allocations.

To implement this decision and to not conflict with the definition of "virgin water supply," a new term was created called "computed water supply." In effect, the States are allocating the water supply as regulated by the federal reservoirs.

The practical effect of this decision is to increase allocation in years of release from storage and decrease allocations in years of decrease in storage, at least as compared to the historic method. This allows for a better match between allocations and use. The long-term average water supply and allocations are unchanged by this.

The third basic formula is the computation of the allocations. Table 2 of the accounting procedures on Page 40, each State's sub-basin allocations have been expressed as a percent of the virgin water supply of the sub-basin. State allocations in a particular sub-basin are found by multiplying the computed virgin supply -- excuse me, multiplying the computed water supply for the sub-basin by the percentage allocated to the State in the sub-basin.

So then the final basic formula is the computation of computed beneficial consumptive use.
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Settlement provides that computed beneficial consumptive use is depletions to stream flow in the basin resulting from irrigation of lands in excess of 2 acres, nonirrigation uses diverting more than 50 acre feet, net evaporation from federal reservoirs, and evaporation from nonfederal reservoirs with a storage capacity greater than 15 acre feet.

And as we have already discussed, the joint groundwater model currently being developed by the States will be used to determine the depletions to stream flow resulting from groundwater use.

The accounting procedures provide significant details on the computations of consumptive uses, both surface water and groundwater. These procedures provide both general guidance on methods as well as specific formulas for the application of these methods to each designated drainage basin.

An additional difference that I would note in the methods of accounting procedures as compared to the historic methods is that the virgin water supply and allocations are adjusted every year for every designated drainage basin, whether or not the values within 10 percent of the Compact value. Of
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course, I think as you recall, the Compact provides for this adjustment when the departure's greater than 10 percent. We have simply agreed that that should be done each year so that the accounting matches up, so that we can balance the books, so to speak. So that is sort of a practical administration that we think is consistent with the provisions of the Compact.

Finally, in connection with the accounting procedures, I would note that they can be modified by action of the RRCA, and that's found in the stipulation section -- I.F, Page 5. While the settlement teams have worked hard to make the document comprehensive and significant changes are not expected, it is expected that there will be some modifications with the completion of the model to fully conform with its output and other changes may occur from time to time, as well as the possibility that advances in technology, for example, could allow for improved methods.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Those adjustments you see as within the normal powers of administration of the RRCA, I take it?

MR. POPE: Again --
SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: To be consistent
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with the Compact having that little looseness in the joints?

MR. POPE: That's right. We have worked long and hard and these are very comprehensive, but we can't anticipate everything that might occur.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: But you still can't arrive at those changes except for unanimity among of the States.

MR. POPE: That's right. Those would require an action which would require unanimity from the States.

With that, Your Honor, hat concludes my portion of the Section IV unless you have further questions.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: I have none other. Does anybody have anything to add to Mr. Pope's presentation? Let's proceed to Mr. Simpson, then, for the balance of Section IV. Subsections Ethrough H.

MS. ANGEL: Your Honor, did you say we would be taking a break? Would it be possible to not break up Mr. Simpson's presentation?

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: I appreciate your raising that. And it is time that we have a break.
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MS. ANGEL: Thank you.
SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Thank you, Ms. Angel, for reminding me.

Before we do recess, I have a general question for counsel that I would like possibly for you to have an opportunity to consider during recess and confer about. And it relates to Section $X$, the Retention of Jurisdiction by the Special Master.

That provision is to provide -- it says, The Special Master shall retain jurisdiction for two things, to resolve discovery disputes that come up during the course of making the groundwater model, and, secondly, to -- if there is a complete breakdown among the States, that -- even on choosing a groundwater arbitrator, to pick the arbitrator. I do not have any problem with performing those responsibilities.

The United States' statement addressed what I would call the Virginia against New York problem. That is, the Supreme Court in that original jurisdiction case said that a Special Master should not be given impermissible arbitral functions, rather as the United States' statement suggested, the function that you see here for the Special Master is similar to what a trial judge in
the course of an ongoing case before the trial judge
would do to help the parties get together to settle
the case.
My problem is a different problem. And
that is how I have jurisdiction or can keep the
jurisdiction once 1 file a final report. At that
point, normally, the Special Master will have been
discharged. Mind you that my jurisdiction comes
from the Court. It doesn't come from the litigants.
Now, the Courts' order in the first
paragraph of the proposed consent judgment would
approve and adopt the following final settlement and
stipulation executed by the parties. But that
doesn't incorporate into the decree of the Court the
terms of the final settlement stipulation.
I'm not sure that I can retain
jurisdiction after $I$ file the final report. And
also, suppose 1 do likely go ahead, what do I --
what do I do -- this revision contemplates the
proposed consent judgment of the Court anticipates
that the end of the case will be brought by the
parties filing a notice with the Clerk. What does
the Special Master do to get discharged, to wind up
his function?
Now, I have a proposal. And do please --
obviously, I'm going to do everything that I can to -- my recommendation to the Court is obviously going to be to recommend this settlement. And I'm going to -- I'm prepared to do everything that I can to be in a position to perform this function. But I have a proposal that perhaps might get around the difficulty that I have been pointing out here.

And Steve -- we have made up a proposal for a substitute second paragraph of the decree, the proposed decree to be entered with the Court and by the Court. And I would modify only the second paragraph, only to the extent of the Court specifically recognizing my continuing jurisdiction. And let me read it.

It says, This action is recommitted -this is the Supreme Court speaking after they have approved the final settlement stipulation -- this action is recommitted to the Special Master for the sole purpose of monitoring the completion, by the State parties of the RRCA groundwater model pursuant to the binding procedures of the final settlement stipulation.

And then the next sentence is basically what you have in the second sentence -- second paragraph now, All claims, counterclaims, and
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```
cross-claims for which leave to file was or could
have been sought in this case arising prior to
December 15, 2002, are hereby dismissed with
prejudice effective upon the filing by the Special
Master of a final report certifying adoption by the
RRCA ground -- of the RRCA groundwater model by the
State parties.
    Anyway, during the recess, would you folks
want to take a look at that? Are there any
questions?
    MR. COOKSON: Yes, can l ask a
clarification?
    SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Yes.
    MR. COOKSON: As I read this, and I want
to make sure I'm reading this correctly, you're
anticipating you would actually file two final
reports?
    SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: No. That's a
very good question. I would file what -- what I'm
going to file recommending approval of the -- would
be my second report, recommending approval of the --
but to be perfectly -- but this would be in the
appendix to my report, same as this first report.
    In the appendix of the report, the only
thing left to be done was for me to monitor the --
```

so it's a penultimate report, if you will. But it wouldn't be the final report. If I filed a final report, I think I'm all done.

MR. COOKSON: Understanding that dilemma, let me share with you -- I'll come up.

The reason -- one of the primary driving reasons behind this sort of unusual approach coming to you now asking the Court to approve the settlement and not having the model finished is in order for the States, and particularly Nebraska, to implement many of the parts of the settlement, we need to have the litigation resolved.

And so from our perspective, whether you call it your second report or the penultimate report, or however you deem the report recommending approval, as long as that process goes forward, and hopefully with a quick acquiescence by the Court, then that is the reason that we're striving to get that done now, is so that we can begin further implementation of the settlement agreement. But we have to have the Court's approval on 90 -- the bulk of $i t$.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: I understand that very well. And I want to cooperate in every way I can to make this just as fine as possible.
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And that's often part of the presentation to the Court. The Court doesn't want to have it come to them piecemeal. They don't want any loose ends, as we have called it in our discussions earlier.

So this -- I have tried to put in the -all it is is just monitoring the completion pursuant to the binding procedures. They have got to -- it has only one place to end up. But the Court has to have some way of being informed that it's happened, that -- anyway, talk about it and we'll talk about when we come back.

Why don't we take a recess for .-. until five minutes of 3 .
(Recess taken.)
SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: So far as that proposal in regard to decree, why don't we defer until the end discussion of that and what I will put in my draft report.

Mr. Simpson?
MR. SIMPSON: Thank you, Your Honor. For the record, I'm Hal Simpson, Colorado state engineer.

I'm going to continue discussion on
Compact accounting, Section IV, beginning with
Subsection E that deals with system improvements and
operations study. I'll try to help you understand that brief section.

Basically during negotiations, the States and the United States discussed the possibility of improving the water supply to the Kansas Bostwick Irrigation District and to a lesser degree, to the Nebraska Bostwick Irrigation District, as well as improving the water supply below Hardy during the summer months for the benefit of Kansas.

The Bureau of Reclamation, with some technical assistance from the States, evaluated it on a limited basis, 13 alternatives that would improve the water supply in this lower part of the river below, basically, Harlan County Reservoir.

They looked at the cost and benefits in an approximate way, and based on those 13 possibilities, which was provided to us in what was referred to as a value study presentation report, the States then identified three -- at least three options that they thought were very promising that, in fact, did merit additional study.

And the Bureau of Reclamation is initiating what we referred to as an appraisal study focusing on those three alternatives as a minimum that we hope would provide a way to better use the
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supplies of water originating below Harlan County Reservoir.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: This is -- this is relating to the use of water rather than increasing the supply of water.

MR. SIMPSON: In a way, it's increasing the supply. And let me give you the flavor of what we're talking about. The first option would be to automate the headgate of the Courtland Canal -- you were there on our field trip -- so that it would track the rise and fall of the river so that water would not spill over the diversion dam and not be usable to the Bostwick districts.

Another option is to increase the canal capacity of the Courtland Canal from 400 cubic feet per second to 600 cubic feet per second. So that can divert more water, especially in leaner years. And the third option or way they wanted to improve the Courtland Canal is to allow it to be operated in the winter months to capture return flows originating below Harlan County reservoir and putting that water into storage in the Lovewell reservoir.

The second option we looked at was actually increasing the capacity of Lovewell

Reservoir by raising the dam or raising the spillway at the dam to capture additional water so either coming down the drainage, but primarily from Courtland Canal, by being more efficient and operating in the winter months. That increased capacity would be looked at at two options, $\mathbf{1 6 , 0 0 0}$ acre feet or, under the ultimate maximum storage, 35,000 acre feet.

And, finally, to improve the water supply to Hardy, under a tributary in Kansas and as part of the Cortland water canal, there is a little tributary called Beaver Creek that has the capacity of about 8,500 acre feet where water from Courtland Canal would be diverted into it. That water then could be released for the benefit of the water users in the Courtland Canal or down to the Republican River for the benefit of water users below Hardy. So those are the options that are going to be looked at in this appraisal level study. And if the States can gain federal support, obviously, it would be desirable to move ahead with construction of one or more of these alternatives.

Related to these alternatives, as referenced in Subsection $E$ is an operations study. And what we would do there would be look at the
potential benefits of these increased and improved water supply options, in a number of ways, increasing supply to the Bostwick Districts, reducing the demand on Harlan County Reservoir, therefore making water available to be carried over into future years, and making water available below Hardy.

This operations study would take a long period of historical records where we have stream flow, storage, and diversions and superimpose on that these new facilities and reoperate the system in an accounting way to look at the benefits to either increased carry-over storage in Harlan County Reservoir or increased water supply below Harlan County Reservoir. And this operations study would be completed after the appraisal study has been finished, so that we would have a way to look at the benefits of the appraisal study.

As an option, the States have agreed that, based on the operations study, we would revisit the five-year running average and determine if it could be adjusted. We aren't saying which way. We're just saying that it might be that the five-year running average could be adjusted.

Well, that concludes my discussion on

Subsection E. And I can move on unless you have questions.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Well, I applaud the interest of the chief engineer of Colorado in Kansas problems. And I think that's wonderfully illustrative of the kind of collaboration that's going on here. I applaud you.

MR. SIMPSON: If we can satisfy their needs, we should try to do so.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: They will reciprocate some time.

MR. SIMPSON: Subsection F deals with how we account for the consumptive use and accounting of imported water supply. We have had some discussion this morning about that imported water supply. Currently, that exists as return flows from diversion just north of the Republican River basin from the Platte River and very large canals that were constructed after the Compact was negotiated, creating these groundwater mounds that we have been talking about, which part of those mounds are migrating southward into the Republican River basin.

This mound of imported water provides a source of supply for groundwater wells and also discharges into some surface streams in Nebraska. I
believe Mr. Pope and Mr. Patterson both discussed these mounds cause increased stream flow.

The States agree that this water should not count as virgin water supply or as a computed beneficial consumptive use. Additionally any mound should be recognized as a credit against depletions to virgin water supply. And then in Section V, or Roman numeral V, Subsection B.2.b, this credit is further limited during water-short year administration. And I believe Mr. Patterson will talk about that in his discussions at that time.

Well, how do we determine this credit?
Well, basically we have to use, again, the Republican River Compact Administration's groundwater model to evaluate the benefit of this credit. And we do it with two runs of the model so that we can evaluate an historical condition. And in the second run, the recharge from these diversions from the Platte are, in a sense, turned off, and a second run is made and then the two models subtract the results from them. And then you see the net benefit of the credit from this imported water supply.

And this accounting is set forth in
Section III of the accounting procedures in
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Subsection A, and that's set forth on Page II of the accounting procedures manual. I would be glad to answer any questions with respect to the accounting of imported water supply.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: On Page 24, the second line from the bottom, there's a phrase, whether determined expressly or by implication, which stopped me short. It says, Determinations of beneficial consumptive use from imported water supply whether determined expressly or by implication.

MR. SIMPSON: I would turn to legal counsel for explanation of that term.

MR. COOKSON: Your Honor, you've hit on something that was the subject of much discussion.

Our agreement is that if you are consuming imported water and not virgin water supply, it shouldn't count, and that if after that consumption occurs, there's still imported water supply getting into the streams, we should get a credit.

The practical reality is the way the model's constructed, you don't make two separate determinations. You make a net determination, which is how much extra water is getting in. So we expressly determined the latter. By implication, we
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have eliminated the former, the consumption by the well.

So in order to reflect that, we reached a compromise language, which was, Whether it was determined expressly or by implication. So it's determined, but not expressly determined. It comes out in the wash.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Fine. Thank you very much. I guess I understand.

MR. COOKSON: That's the same response I
got from everyone else in the group.
SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: That's all that I had on your --

MR. SIMPSON: Okay. Moving on quickly to Subsection G on Page 25.

We agree that the measurement techniques need to be clearly identified, as well as data collection and reporting. And we feel, through the use of the procedures set forth in the stipulation as well as in the accounting procedures, we have very specific and detailed procedures for core measurement for data collection and for reporting.

The purpose of this, of course, is to prevent any future disagreements on reporting and verification. And this is been discussed in quite a
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bit of detail in Section Roman numeral Von Page 32 of the accounting procedures manual.

And, again, Mr. Pope has discussed that when he provided his explanation of the accounting procedures. We thought it was important to very clearly lay out what we would report, when we would report it, and all the details so that there would not be future disagreement.

Finally, moving to Subsection H, also on Page 25, we talk about augmentation credit. And in particular, the States have agreed that a State could acquire existing wells, eliminate the consumptive use of water by these wells, and pump groundwater from these wells or even a new well to a stream to be used as an offset to depletions caused by other consumptive uses or wells in the basin. The purpose of this is to bring about compliance with the Compact.

We have agreed that the use of these augmentation wells shall not cause any new net depletions to the stream system either annually or long term. And the basis, again, for determining the net effect of this pumping is the Republican River Compact Administration's groundwater model. And you asked how these wells would work.

Let's say you had a series of wells 3 miles from the north fork of the Republican River in Colorado. Part of the water that is pumped by these wells and has been used, say, to irrigate crops comes from storage and a part comes from the impact upon the north fork of the Republican River. Let's say that ratio is $\mathbf{8 0}$ percent from storage, $\mathbf{2 0}$ percent from stream flow. I'm just picking numbers.

We stop that irrigation, no longer irrigate, turn those pump wells on, and pump that water in a pipe to the stream. We get all the water that is pumped into the stream above a gauge and, therefore, we view that we are offsetting the long-term effect of $\mathbf{2 0}$ percent depletion as well as an additional amount of water that's being pumped from storage, the 80 percent, that will help offset depletions.

It's something we would not want to do unless a last resort to come into compliance under the Compact based on the five-year average. Colorado brought this idea up. We thought it was something that should be considered. We do it in other parts of the state as way to offset the effect of other well depletions. It's usually a short-term, interim pumping, not a permanent
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Iong-term pumping, but we felt we should be able to do that. And we did get concurrence from the United States and the other States. But I want to make it clear, we just can't do it without first having the Compact Administration's approval in advance of the plan and how it would operate.

That concludes my comments on this.
SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: I have one question on accounting.

MR. SIMPSON: Sure.
SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: On Page 36 in the accounting procedures. There's a word, "kriging."

MR. SIMPSON: Kriging.
SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: K-r-i-g-i-n-g. It says, Potentially evapotranspiration rate is set at a uniform rate for all classes and so on. The amount is $X$ at $Y$ claimant stations and is interpolated specially using kriging.

MR. SIMPSON: You're pronouncing it kriging. But it could be kriging.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: I didn't know how to pronounce it.

MR. SIMPSON: It's a statistical technique to interpolate data from different points where you
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have evaporation, data and one location needs counting. You can interpolate that data from kriging. We have people in the room that can give you a great more detail about how it operates, rather than myself, but it is a statistical way of interpreting data.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: In other words, the specialist knows what that means?

MR. SIMPSON: Mr. Knox can define it or explain it if you would like.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: And it is specifically defined?

MR. SIMPSON: But it is a standard procedure.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Fine. Well, let's go to Guide Rock. Mr. Patterson?

MR. PATTERSON: Your Honor, I think we call it making the data fit.

I will summarize Section $V$ of the final settlement stipulation, which we have referred to as Guide Rock. This section was developed in response to concerns with less-than-full water supply years.

Article 4 of the Compact provides that
Kansas may take all or a portion of her allocation from the main stem and any unallocated sub-basin
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supply at or near Guide Rock, Nebraska. The States disagreed in the lawsuit whether and how this would occur. We believe the settlement agreement resolves this issue by providing for water administration in Nebraska above Guide Rock at times when it will provide a needed benefit to Kansas.

In general, Nebraska has agreed to provide for regulation of natural flow between Harlan County Lake and the Superior Diversion Dam near Guide Rock. Nebraska will also recognize a priority date of February 26, 1948 --

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Explain what the significance of that is to me.

MR. PATTERSON: Part Kansas Bostwick irrigation at a time date -- this is pat -- this is the same priority date that is held by the Nebraska Bostwick Irrigation on the Courtland Canal. And the priority date is generally the date that is assigned to a water right which determines where you fall in the priority system. And the way water administration works in our state, as well as in Colorado and Kansas, is the more senior date gets the water first.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: And who would be -- who would typically be the persons with lower
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## priority?

MR. PATTERSON: The last person in the basin that came in and made application for a water right and put the water right to use. So it really is a priority system. For the most part, in this section of the river, the canals have older priority dates. So the Franklin Canal, the Superior Canal, the Courtland Canal, most of the individual water users in this section of the river are actually later or what we call junior priority dates, that would be junior to this 1948 date.

And that's significant here because what we have agreed to do is when times are short on water supply, Nebraska will shut off these junior users to allow the water to be available to the more senior canals.

Nebraska's also agreed to protect any storage water that is released out of Harlan County Lake from diversion by a user that does not have a contract for that water.

Additionally, the States and the United States have agreed to take action to minimize bypass flows at the Superior/Courtland Diversion Dam. The process that we have worked out for how that will occur is laid out in Appendix L.
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There are two levels of projected water supply that trigger these actions by the States. The first -- and this is based on Bureau of Reclamation forecasting. So when the Bureau of Reclamation is forecasting an irrigation supply from Harlan County Lake that is less than $1 \mathbf{3 0 , 0 0 0}$ acre feet, that's the number that is available to the Nebraska District and the Kansas Bostwick District under their new contracts when Harlan County Lake is full.

So when the Bureau's forecasting less than that amount and water is needed for direct irrigation at Guide Rock, then Nebraska will go out and we will close or shut off any of these water rights that are junior to the February 26th, 1948, date.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Now, where does I30,000 acre foot figure come from?

MR. PATTERSON: It is included in the consensus plan that was worked out between the Bureau of Reclamation and Corps of Engineers. It is generally the amount of water that would be available to the two districts together when Harlan County Lake is full. So we picked that up. We tried as best we could in this settlement to stay
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consistent with the consensus plan between those two federal agencies, as well as the contracts the Bureau of Reclamation has entered into with the two irrigation districts.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: And then where does the 119,000 for triggering the water-short year administration?

MR. PATTERSON: That number is also included in the consensus plan between the Corps and the Bureau and was collaborated on, I believe, if you will, by the two irrigation districts. So we, again, picked up that number as indicative of a water-short year, sometimes when under this agreement we've agreed to take additional actions. So we picked it up.

I'm sure we could get somebody up here and tell you a little bit more of the history of where that came from. But, again, we tried to work with that number since it had previously been worked out.

When the Bureau is -- so when we hit the I 30 or less forecast from the Bureau, Nebraska will notify our junior users to this 1948 date that they should expect to be shut off that summer if conditions don't improve. And then we will follow through and do that. The time frame we worked out
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as part of the settlement is we will begin this particular action starting in 2003, so this year.

When the Bureau is projecting an actual -a projected or actual supply from Harlan of less than 119,000 acre feet, which we have called water-short administration, then Nebraska has agreed to take further action to limit our beneficial consumptive use above Guide Rock to no more than the amount of our allocation, Nebraska's allocation, that is derived above Guide Rock.

Where in normal years, if you will, we will be able to use our allocation on a statewide basis. In these water-short years, we will then have to limit our consumptive use above Guide Rock to the part of our allocation that is derived above Guide Rock.

We have agreed that we will do this on a two-year average as opposed to the five-year average that David Pope talked about.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Now, would you explain why the shift from five year?

MR. PATTERSON: The shift from the five year -- again, we're talking about times when we're in water-short years. So there is basically not enough water --
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SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: You hope it won't last too long. MR. PATTERSON: Not enough to go around. And the concern there, particularly from Kansas's standpoint was if you are still in a five-year average, you may have two of these water-short years -- if Nebraska used heavily in these two short years, get a lot of rain in year three or in year four, all of a sudden we're in compliance on a five-year basis, but there were two very short years that Nebraska was using more and Kansas was receiving less.

And we understood that dynamic. So what we have agreed to here in these conditions is to use this two-year averaging. And we do have an alternative to that that I will get to in just a second.

We have also agreed in these water-short years that we will limit the consumptive use in the sub-basins above Harlan County Lake to the two-year running average of the sum of the specific sub-basin allocations plus $\mathbf{4 8} \mathbf{4} \mathbf{9}$ percent of the sum of the unallocated supply from these sub-basins.

In these years, Kansas will also limit its consumptive beneficial use in the sub-basins in
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northwest Kansas to no more than the two-year running average of the sum of its specific allocations, and 5 I .1 percent of the sum of the unallocated supply from those same sub-basins; 51.1 percent of any unused Colorado allocation from any of those same sub-basins that may be available.

In water-short years, Colorado will limit its five-year running average sub-basin use above Swanson Lake, which is Trenton Dam, to the sum of the five-year running average specific allocations from those sub-basins. In other words, Colorado cannot use its allocation from Beaver Creek, which flows into the Republican River below Swanson Lake to offset any computed beneficial consumptive use in the other three Colorado sub-basins.

So each State during water-short years has different and tighter criteria that we have agreed to all live with.

During water-short years, Nebraska has the discretion to determine how we will comply. And we have agreed to advise the other States and the United States each year by April 30th of any measures that Nebraska plans to take to limit our consumptive use, and by June 30 th of that year of the final decision that we have made.
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In water-short administration years, only imported water derived from sources above Harlan County Lake or imported water from below Harlan County Lake that can be diverted at Guide Rock for irrigation or to fill Lovewell Reservoir may be used to offset Nebraska depletions above Guide Rock.

Appendix $M$ describes an alternative that Nebraska may choose to use. The alternative provides that in lieu of the two-year running average compliance schedule in water-short year administration, Nebraska may elect to implement a plan for reduction of computed beneficial consumptive use above Guide Rock when the projected or actual water supply in Harlan is less than 130,000 acre feet. These plans must be previously approved by the Compact Administration.

If Nebraska chooses to implement such a plan, compliance above Guide Rock will then be based on a three-year running average as opposed to the two. For any year in which Nebraska implements an approved plan, the plan shall be in effect for the remainder of the year unless the projected supply rises above $1 \mathbf{3 0 , 0 0 0}$ acre feet.

I acknowledge that this section is rather complicated. And I would be happy to answer

## CONFIDENTIAL EXCERPT ATORNEYS' EYES ONLY

questions.
SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Here we are talking about calendar years?

MR. PATTERSON: Again, we are talking about calendar year. That is correct.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: On Page 28 in the Paragraph B, the provision that states situations when Nebraska may offset any computed beneficial consumptive use in excess of its allocation that is derived from sources above Guide Rock with imported water supply credit. Now -- and then it says, Nebraska will receive credit only for imported water supply that -- and it lists three things.

And Number 4 seems to be an unrelated item. It requires -- it receives credit only if it produces water above Harlan County Lake, produces -two, produces water below Harlan County Lake and above Guide Rock that can be diverted during the Bostwick irrigation season, three, produces water that can be stored or as needed to fill Lovewell Reservoir. And four says, Kansas and Nebraska will explore crediting water that is otherwise usable by Kansas.

Is this just an expression of good will?
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Or will there be other situations where that credit will be allowed. :

MR. PATTERSON: I think, Special Master, one through three really remit to water that would be available to the Bostwick Irrigation District in Kansas. And four, it really is a place holder that if Kansas could otherwise make use of some water that we would import, either for Bostwick or some other use that they may have, then we would talk about getting credit for that. So really four is in there pretty much as a place holder.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: I guess the overall question in regard to the - - is a water-short year administration the same as it is on the five-year averaging? And how is this consistent with the Compact?

Perhaps may I ask whether the position of the States seems to be that it's not inconsistent with the Compact. You have situations where you use five-year and then you can shift to two-year or you may shift to three-year.

MR. PATTERSON: I think it's the same answer we gave before.

MR. COOKSON: Obviously, one of the areas of dispute, as you will recall from the issues that
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you had identified for resolution, was what does the provision about Guide Rock mean? In terms of an annual or even an averaged annual Compact allocation for Kansas's perspective, they're really interested in water being available when they needed it.

What we tried to address here was a practical solution within the general principles of the Compact, without being inconsistent with its terms, such that we could address their practical concerns in a way that didn't, in the others State's view, unduly burden us with non-Compact allocations.

So it was a compromise that we tried, in the spirit of Article 9 which allows the Compact Administration to adopt rules and regulations that are not -- that are consistent with the terms of the Compact.

So we tried to address the dispute over Guide Rock and what that meant in a way that addressed the needs of Kansas in a practical way and addressed the concerns of the upstream States so, such that we aren't burdened with what we would consider to be non-Compact obligations.

And you're right, and when it all comes down to it, we tried to find something that wasn't inconsistent with the terms of the Compact because
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the Compact doesn't expressly address this issue.
It's one of the areas where it's silent.
SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Thank you,
Mr. Peterson.
We should move to Section VI on soil and water conservation. Mr. Simpson?

MR. SIMPSON: For the record, I'm Hal
Simpson, Colorado state engineer. I'm going to discuss Section VI, which begins on Page 30 and carries over onto Page 31 and 32.

First, in Subsection A, the States spell out or set forth how they're going to account for evaporation from federal reservoirs. And these are residence varies that are greater than 1,500 feet in. The States have not included in previous Compact accounting of consumptive use. Beginning in 2003, the States will, in fact, determine the evaporation from these reservoirs greater than 15 acre feet in accordance with procedures set forth in Section Roman numeral IV.A.2.f on Page 23 of the accounting procedures.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Maybe we have talked about this before, but why do you restrict this to nonfederal reservoirs above Harlan County Lake? Are there nonfederal reservoirs downstream
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that are inconsequential?
MR. SIMPSON: I believe that is the case.
I would have to ask Mr. Pope. But I think the concern was the impact on the inflow to Harlan

County Reservoir and the storage for the Bostwick Irrigation District.

Moving on to Subsection B, dealing with soil and water conservation measures. During the negotiations, it became clear that the apparent reduction of surface runoff from some of the sub-basins could not be fully explained by changes in precipitation or from depletions resulting from groundwater pumping and use. Therefore, the States and the United States have agreed to study the impacts of nonfederal reservoirs and the land terracing on the virgin water supply of the basin.

The States and the United States will form a committee by January 31 st of 2003 to be known as the Conservation Committee. By April 30th, 2004, the conservation committee will submit to the Republican River Compact Administration a proposed study to quantify the effects of evaporation and land terracing practices on water supplies.

If the Republican River Compact
Administration accepts the proposed study plan, the
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States and the United States will undertake the study at a cost not to exceed $\$ 1$ million, with United States responsible for 75 percent of the cost and the States responsible for one-third -- each State responsible for one-third of the remaining 25 percent.

The States portion may be provided by in-kind contributions, in other words, salaries of staff who assist in that study. Study must be completed within five years of the date the study is accepted by the Compact Administration. The participation in the study does not commit any State or the RRCA to take any action or include the impact of soil and water conservation measures in Compact accounting.

Participation in the joint study by the
States or the United States is contingent upon the appropriation of funds by the respective State legislatures and Congress.

Any questions?
SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: I don't want to minimize the importance of this, but isn't it true that these measures that are -- that the parties and the United States have committed themselves to, really don't have very much to do with the -- with
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settling the controversies in this action, but are valuable add-ons, so to speak?

MR. SIMPSON: That is correct.
SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Thank you very much, Mr. Simpson.

Now go on to Section VII on dispute
resolution. Mr. Pope?
MR. POPE: Thank you, Your Honor. For the record, again, my name is David Pope, chief engineer for Kansas.

Section VII deals with the issue of
dispute resolution. It's set out in some detail, and I'm simply going to summarize, I think, what some of the key elements of this are.

All disputes must first be submitted to the Compact Administration for its consideration and action. The State raising the issue must define the dispute, provide supporting materials related to the dispute, and propose a schedule for resolution.

If a State raising the issue believes the issue requires immediate attention, they may designate it as a fast-track issue, in quotes, which must be addressed by the Compact Administration within 30 days, unless, I think, by agreement to extend that vote.
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As in the past, each State has one vote in each decision, and the decisions by the Compact Administration must be unanimous.

Any issue which cannot be resolved by the
Compact Administration shall be submitted to nonbinding arbitration unless otherwise agreed to by the States with an actual interest in the dispute. The States involved in the dispute may agree to another method of dispute resolution or that arbitration shall be binding, but no State shall be subject to binding arbitration without its express written consent.

For issues submitted to arbitration, the settlement outlines a process to define and amend the scope of the dispute, the process to identify the skills needed of an arbitrator, and for his or her selection and the contents of the decision by the arbitrator. Each State is required to indicate its acceptance or rejection of the arbitrator's decision within 30 days.

And, finally, after a State has participated in dispute resolution, the settlement provides that it has exhausted all administrative remedies and can then seek relief from the United States Supreme Court for resolution of the dispute.
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The arbitrator's decision can be admitted to the Court, but shall not be deemed as conclusive.

There is a lot of detail, of course, in these provisions that I'm sure you can read through. But those are kind of the key elements. And I think this was an attempt by the parties to try to resolve disputes, if possible, through the Compact Administration, and then through other alternative dispute resolution methods, if possible.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: This provision, again, is something which is not directly related to this dispute, but perhaps awfully good if this had been in place before the dispute came along. And it is a very valuable add-on in this final settlement stipulation.

MR. POPE: Yes. I think that was the view of the parties to try to develop a mechanism that will help deal with issues and help avoid future cases of this nature, if possible.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Back in the definitions section, there's a definition of "submitted to the RRCA" and a definition of "reasonable opportunity."

What do you understand -- if a matter is submitted to the RRCA, according to this definition,
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```
and if the RRCA has a reasonable opportunity to
investigate and act upon that matter and -- but the
RRCA does nothing, is the implication that the
request has been denied?
MR. POPE: In general, and there may be some comments that counsel who worked on this may want to make, but I think the attempt was to make the language mandatory in the sense that the RRCA will do something with it.
SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Will act on it?
MR. POPE: Will act on it. I think that's pretty clear in the provisions. If they do not act within the time frames that are set out, I suppose it would be by default denied. That seems to be the counsel's position.
SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: I see counsel shaking their heads affirmatively.
MR. POPE: It's framed in a substantial amount of detail to try to provide a process that leads to some decision during the course of the process.
And, again, there's really two types of disputes. There are those things that are probably not necessarily a short-term quick problem that needs immediate resolution versus those that are
```
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more complex that are going to require some fairly extensive consideration. I guess I have nothing further unless there's questions or further supplementation.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Fine. Thank you, Mr. Pope.

Now, the remaining sections, we turn to counsel to comment on. Section VIll is nonseverabilty of the agreement; IX is the entirety of the agreement; and $X$ is the retention of jurisdiction by the Special Master.

And leaving $X$ for the moment, going back to VIII, nonseverabilty of the agreement and, IX, entirety of the agreement, do counsel have any comments?

MR. COOKSON: Unless you have specific questions.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: This is a standard provision. Do they have any particular significance here?

MS. ANGEL: Your Honor, Carol Angel.
The nonseverabilty provision, I would say, is very particularly significant in that this was a very complex settlement put together piece by piece with different pieces of great importance to each of
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```
the parties. And so nonseverabilty is just such a
vital part of this entire agreement. I would just
like to underline that. I hope the language pretty
well speaks for itself.
    SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Any further
comment on that?
    And the entirety of the agreement, there
aren't any oral site agreements, so that's
understandable.
Let's go finally to the retention of
jurisdiction by the Special Master. And this
relates specifically to the form of the proposed
consent judgment and the modification that I passed
out to you by way of suggestion.
Your comments now do not need to be final, by any means, at least as of now. Unless I hear something strongly to the contrary, I would propose to send this out in my draft second report.
Could I hear from each counsel, first starting with Kansas, what your view is on it?
MR. DRAPER: Yes, Your Honor. I'm John Draper, counsel for Kansas.
Our first reaction to your proposed change to the language of the proposed consent order is favorable. I think that would be an improvement.
```
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And I think it does address something that we had overlooked in putting the documents together. It would be helpful.

There's one item I would mention just so that we're all aware of it. We're currently under an order to make some final production by January 15th. And we have made substantial -SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Kansas is? MR. DRAPER: Kansas. Just Kansas. And Kansas has made substantial progress. We are prepared to produce over 12,000 pages of scanned documents with coding and indexes. There is, however, a part of the production that has proved impossible to complete by that date. And I checked with the other states this morning and obtained their agreement to my request to you today to allow us two extra months to finish this.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: You say two?
MR. DRAPER: Two extra months, yes, Your Honor. This is primarily large format maps that have been used in county assessor offices and other information that they are actively using it. It has not been possible for us to get sufficient access to those documents.

And so I would be requesting, and I do
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request, that we be allowed to make the production that I have mentioned by the due date of January 15th, but be allowed to complete that production not later than two months from that date.

This ties somewhat to the language that we're looking at here. This would -- the language talks of recommitting it to the Special Master, the case, for purposes of monitoring the finalization of the groundwater model.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Are these documents due to be produced relevant to what the groundwater modeling committee is doing?

MR. DRAPER: I don't believe so, Your Honor. To my knowledge, they are not relevant to that.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Of course, I want to hear from the other states. Let's -perhaps let's put aside -- well, you suggested that this was in some way related to the form of the consent judgment or the proposed -- the proposed decree that I would put in my report, recommend to the Supreme Court in my report?

MR. DRAPER: Yes, I think in some way it's related. But upon consideration, I don't believe that it would require any amendment of the language
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you have proposed.
But I wanted to raise the fact that we would be asking for an extension on part of that production for two months. And presumably, if Your Honor is agreeable to that, that would be an order that would be entered soon, but effective -- it might be effective after you have submitted this report to the Court, depending on with what speed you proceed.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Let's, if I may, put aside the question of your extension and just talk about the form of the decree. And I understand your reaction is generally favorable.

MR. DRAPER: Yes. Thank you.
SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Nebraska?
MR. COOKSON: Your Honor, in reviewing this, and with the clarification that you gave me before the break, I think this satisfies our needs.

The first paragraph approves and adopts the terms of the final settlement stipulation. Your paragraph refers to them as binding procedures of that stipulation, which are the things that we need to get out of this consent judgment as quickly as we can so we can move forward.

I don't think -- we also were momentarily.
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concerned that this might have a conflict with the severability provision; however, all we are doing in terms of the States is providing a proposal, which you are free to disregard, regard, or do whatever you like, as is the Court. And so we don't believe that it is in violation.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: I worried about the nonseverabilty clause. And it seems to me that what I'll call my proposal implements Section $X$ and saying the Special Master will retain jurisdiction and do two things and doesn't this proposed decree be issued by the Supreme Court do just that?

MR. COOKSON: I would agree 100 percent, Your Honor. And, in fact, what the States -- our view is in terms of the severability agreement that we are making a proposed consent judgment. You will make your proposed consent judgment. And on behalf of the State of Nebraska, if this is the language, I can indicate that we will consent to your proposal as opposed to the one the States came up with. So from our perspective, that works.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Thank you, Mr. Cookson. Ms. Angel for Colorado?

MS. ANGEL: I agree with Mr. Cookson that this doesn't present a severability problem. And in
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general, we think it's a good idea to make it clear that you have retained jurisdiction for this.

The only clarification that perhaps we might ask is you refer to a final report certifying adoption of the groundwater model. And that to me implies essentially an administerial act and not a full-blown report that we have had on groundwater or will have on this settlement. Is that a proper understanding?

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Absolutely. What I visualize the final report being, literally that, the parties have adopted the RRCA groundwater model in accordance with the binding procedures of the binding settlement and please discharge me.

MS. ANGEL: And presumably please pay you.
Yes, sir. This looks fine. Thank you.
SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: The United
States?
MS. HIMMELHOCH: Your Honor, Sarah
Himmelhoch. We have no objection to the proposal. In fact, we think it's a good solution to a problem we hadn't spotted.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Thank you very much.

I do think that -- and clearly Mr. Knox
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and his colleagues on the groundwater modeling committee are very, very conscious of it. It does it seems to me there's great pressure put on completing the groundwater model as quickly as possible or identifying problems along the way to success there, as early as possible. So getting about resolving them by the mechanism that the -that is set up in the final settlement stipulation.

I guess we're really at the point now to consider your request, Mr. Draper. Again, what relationship does this have to the proposed decree?

Suppose -- what relationship does this have to the proposed Supreme Court decree that I expect I will be putting into my report to the Supreme Court?

Suppose I am -- in the very happy event am able to file my report on the 15 th of February, which was within your two month extension? How would the -- whether or not there was an extension or not be affected?

MR. DRAPER: I don't think there would, Your Honor. 1 think --

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: You think it would be?

MR. DRAPER: I think that would be an acceptable situation. In other words, if you were
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to agree to our request for a two-month extension with the support of the States, but enter your -- or submit your report to the Court before the two months is up, 1 think it's still a standing order, which, of course, we would be complying with. But I just wanted to raise it in this context since it did cross that potential boundary.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: I guess I -- and obviously I have got to hear from the people who are anxious to have the production of this stuff. I supervised discovery all the way through while settlement discussions were going on. And there were two purposes of that.

Number I, you had to know the facts in order to know what you're settling. And, in other words, at least, I'm sure at least in some respects the data was relevant to the settlement discussion. The other thing was to get ready for trial in the case the settlement fell on its face. Now we have a settlement.

And I guess -- and both of those uses are out the window, except for the construction of the groundwater model. And I guess you aren't really the one to ask, but I guess I -- why don't we hear from what the position of the other people may be.
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And let me --
MR. DRAPER: Your Honor?
SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Yes.
MR. DRAPER: I might say that the reason
that we are complying with it is because you have ordered us to.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Excuse me, I didn't hear you.

MR. DRAPER: The reason we are complying with your order and asking for an extension --

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Because it's outstanding?

MR. DRAPER: Because it is a standing order and we intend to do it. I don't understand it to have any relevance to the completion of the groundwater analysis.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Mr. Cookson?
MR. COOKSON: We -- again, we have agreed to the extension. That is fine. With the understanding that on the $\mathbf{I} 5 \mathrm{th}$, we are going to get everything that they have now that is encoded and scanned and ready to go, which Mr. Draper has indicated is approximately $\mathbf{I} 2,000$ pages.

That information is much like the information that Kansas requested from us in the
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formal discovery process that we were obligated to provide last November in that while it may not be directly related to the groundwater model, it is data and information that can be used to verify the data and inputs that are going into the model. It is underlying records, while not the actual data itself, it does go to our ability as one of the tasks that Mr. Pope identified that remains to be done, which is to verify the other States' data.

And so to the extent we get what they have told us is coming on the $\mathbf{I} 5$ th and understanding the practical problems that they have getting the rest of it, we felt it was reasonable to agree to the extension. But I want to make it clear, we do view this as potential verification information for what they have provided as their data and input to the model.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: In other words, it is -- you do view it as essential that you get it, but you're willing to have the two-month extension.

MR. COOKSON: With the understanding that they are giving us a substantial portion of it --

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: -- on the I5th.
MR. COOKSON: On the I5th.
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SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: And then get the rest of it by the 15 th of March?

MR. COOKSON: Right. That is reasonable. We understand their practical problems, the logistical problems they have to deal with and want to be reasonable in trying to work that out. But we don't want it to appear that this information is not necessary. We requested it for a particular reason, one of which was to understand some of the information that would ultimately go into the model.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Do you consider that the delay on at least part of the produced materials will in any way delay the groundwater model?

MR. COOKSON: No. There is sufficient work for all of the people that we have working on the modeling for them to accomplish other things while we wait for that to come on the 15 th.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Could we hear from Colorado?

MS. ANGEL: I agree with everything Mr. Cookson has said. I have nothing to add. It is important for verification. I think we can agree to the extension. I don't think it should delay the groundwater modeling work.

## CONFIDENTIAL EXCERPT ATORNEYS' EYES ONLY

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: The United States have anything to add?

MS. HIMMELHOCH: No view, Your Honor.
SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Is that satisfactory, Mr. Draper, that we'll amend the order to provide that whatever is available by the 15 th will be produced and the balance will be produced by March I5th?

MR. DRAPER: Yes. That would be very satisfactory, Your Honor.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Fine. Thank you very much.

I think we're ready now, if we may, to hear from counsel on a wind-up. Today has been very useful to me, and I think I would appreciate hearing from each of counsel to -- on the question, what do you have to say -- what do you have to suggest to me to go into the report to do a selling job for the settlement that you have arrived at? That's the -the Court wants to know how this jives with the Compact, how it serves public interest, et cetera, et cetera. Anyway, that's what lask you. Do you want to start, Mr. Draper?

MR. DRAPER: Very good, Your Honor.
SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: You have been in
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this position before of having draft reports from original jurisdiction going that you have had to comment on. Now we look to you for anything you have to say to us.

MR. DRAPER: Well, it is a great pleasure to be able to comment on this anticipated report. We support this settlement. As you can see from the documents that have been filed, it has been the result of a great deal of work by all three States and the United States in a very cooperative fashion.

It seems to me that it serves the public purpose whenever a controversy among States can be appropriately laid to rest without expending a great deal of the time and energy of the United States Supreme Court, which has many important duties. And I think that's what we have achieved here.

This settlement, in our view allows, the perceived ambiguities in the application of the 1943 Compact to present and future conditions to be resolved in a manner that is not inconsistent with the Compact and that satisfies the prime concerns of the three States and the United States in this basin that are related to the Compact.

Most important among these, from our point of view, is the embrace of the ruling of the Special
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Master in his first report that groundwater use in the basin must -- and affecting the waters of the Republican River must be accounted for to the extent of any affect it has.

We think we made a tremendous leap forward when you made that decision. That has been adopted for purposes of this settlement as the core of the settlement. And in our view, is the central pillar on which this stands. And we heartly recommend it to you and to the Court.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Thank you very much. Nebraska?

MR. COOKSON: I agree with Mr. Draper that your ruling on the first fundamental issue that was placed before you put us in a position where things started to fall into place. But when I sat down to ultimately evaluate this settlement for both the -and provide an analysis for both the governor and the attorney general of Nebraska, I looked back at the issues that you had identified for pretrial resolution after you addressed those initial set of issues.

And I'll paraphrase them, but there were six basic issues. First, what do the '49 to '94 Republican River Compact Administration numbers mean
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in practical terms? And maybe more importantly, what do we do about past actions? Your ruling on the ' 49 to ' 94 numbers being binding was sort of the second leg of our stool.

To make the stool stand, the parties got together to make the third leg. So the other questions we needed to address were, may a complaining State recover damages for water overuse in a year in which a complaining State would not have been able to put it to use.

The third was whether a State was free to consume its total allocation without regard to specific sub-basin allocations. The fourth issue was whether Nebraska was required to deliver Kansas' entire main stem allocation at Guide Rock, Nebraska. The fifth was, what is the criteria to determine whether well pumping water is subject to Compact accounting. And the sixth was how do we attribute contributions to stream flow from the groundwater mound.

I think as you listened to those questions and you juxtaposed those with the sections of the settlement agreement, you see where we've come from and how we got to where we were. And so we have, in effect, addressed those issues in terms of how does
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the Compact apply to those issues, how should it be interpreted.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: And it is so much better for you to have resolved them with a little give and take along the way than to have them resolved by square-cornered decisions from the Special Master who might well have gone wrong in the process. You have got it right now.

MR. COOKSON: And I think the added benefit, as you have pointed out several times is, we have added on significant parts to this settlement that weren't part of our initial controversy but will allow this process to work in the manner that was envisioned in 1943, but frankly was not put into detail at that time.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: And also you could give and take on those other issues to resolve the heartland of the case.

MR. COOKSON: Right. And what we've done is we have created an interwoven product that we believe -- I think all of the States agree not only is consistent with the terms of the Compact but provides a meaningful way for us to get along in the future and administer the Compact in a way that's beneficial to all three States.
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I think I happen to catch a little bit of
Mr. Pope's statement on a local television
statement, and I think he was right. This is one of
those unique situations where this settlement is a
win-win-win for all three States, and hopefully also
for the U.S. in that we have addressed their
concerns.
SPECIAL MASTER MCKUsICK: You mentioned
groundwater model, Number I, that the past damages
for past years, '94 and before. One thing that
interests me is here we now have eight years
subsequent to I994.
And when -- and all the issues of water
quantities, of consumptive use, and all the
difficult -- even if we determine violations, the
cry out, what are the damages and so on. I
understand in another case that is being tried out
at great length, for those eight years, that's
another reason why this nonseverable settlement is
of significance here.
You have -- you have settled out any
possible claims that would have been exceedingly
difficult and lengthy to try relating to possible
violations in these eight years.
MR. cooksoN: Yes. I think all three
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States recognize that very point that while --
before' 94 we had a framework within which we were going to be working, there really wasn't anything from '94 to the present.

We were fortunate in that that period happened to be a period in the basin that was relatively wet, so to speak. But I think the urgency of the drought that we are now under and have been for the past year or so, sort of made it clear to us that we needed to get together and get this resolved for the benefit of all three States, as we went into what is a very dry period.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Thank you very much, Mr. Cookson. Colorado?

MS. ANGEL: Your order asked us to address why the settlement is consistent with the Compact and an effective and beneficial resolution of the dispute. And from Colorado's perspective, this is indeed consistent with the Compact and a very effective and beneficial resolution.

Our perspective is a little different. We are the driest part of the basin. We have II percent of the water supply and our agricultural economy is based almost entirely upon wells that were put in between $65-1965$ and 1980,30 to 15
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years before this whole controversy erupted. So what we needed to work towards was a settlement that allowed Colorado to bring those wells into the Compact accounting and consistent with your order, and still protect the interests -- the important interests of the other States.

And I think through compromise, that's exactly what we've been allowed to do. As you said yourself, Special Master, just a few minutes ago, it works so much better when you can do these things through compromise, through administrative and engineering considerations rather than square-cornered legal decisions.

At the same time, it is very consistent with the Compact. As Mr. Pope said earlier, the Compact was a prospective and overarching broad document. It was entered into almost $\mathbf{6 0}$ years ago and the engineers that entered into it --

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: It was 60 years ago. It's only a few months short of 60 years.

MS. ANGEL: That's correct. And the engineers who negotiated it expressly acknowledged that there were details of administration that would need to be, needed to be worked out, and I think that's what this settlement does. It sets out very
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specifically agreements on administration and
accounting that are consistent with the Compact that fit within the spaces in the Compact where things are not clearly defined or are ambiguous or simply not addressed.

And I think it fits within Article 9, which says that it's the duty of the three States to administer the Compact through the state engineers. And it gives the officials the ability to adopt rules and regulations consistent with the Compact. And, in fact, that's what the accounting procedures, which are not part of this settlement do.

We have taken great pains to take your ruling on the inclusion of depletions from Ogallala groundwater and make it work in Compact accounting, which is not a simple procedure. If you look at the accounting procedures, there's a lot of thought that has gone into taking the groundwater model runs and describing exactly what model runs will be done, what will be compared and then how that will be put into Compact accounting.

And then as Mr. Cookson mentioned, we've taken those other issues where we did not agree on the precise way the Compact should be administered, and we've come to a compromise, an agreement on how
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that will work. One of the more important things
for Colorado is the agreement on use of specific sub-basin allocations.

Because Ogallala groundwater depletions are now included, we are faced with including depletions from wells that don't confine themselves to any particular sub-basin, necessarily. They don't obey those sub-basin boundaries. They don't confine themselves to any particular water year. And so to make that work, we have the agreements on sub-basin allocation use, we have the agreements on averaging.

We have also agreed, of course, on the
Guide Rock administration, which was a great controversy, which we thankfully were not terribly involved with, but that, of course, is a major part of it.

As to why this is a beneficial and effective settlement, it's given us the opportunity to create solutions just not possible in litigation. I mean, the best example is the groundwater model. This was a model put together in record time, specifically because the very high-powered experts hired by each State, instead of fighting each other and testifying --
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SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: The battle of experts. One shudders to think of that being tried out in a court of law.

MS. ANGEL: Exactly. With your background, perhaps you could make sense of it.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: From Maine, because I know all about it.

MS. ANGEL: But Mr. Knox who has advanced engineering degrees and chaired the groundwater modeling committee told me that when they got going, it was like they were speaking in a different language. They were able to communicate directly with each other, speaking in partial differential equation-ese as opposed to English and we didn't have to filter it through a lawyer asking questions to you weighing it and then weighing it against someone else. And so Ithink we have made an amazing progress.

And the cooperation and the level of effort they put into it gives me great confidence that we will have a model that is far superior because it's a cooperative model to anything that could come out of litigation. And it will certainly be at least cost and far less time. You only need to compare it to the Arkansas case or even the
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discovery that went into Nebraska v Wyoming before the settlement.

We have also, I think, Mr. Cookson noted this and you've noted this, we've gone beyond the issues that were directly at -- in dispute and we've looked at other things that could be a problem. And we have tried to cooperatively built a framework for the future. We have the dispute resolution provision.

We have the accounting procedures, which were largely the product of a committee that consisted of the three engineering advisors from each State, the people who will be doing this in the future. But they also took care to make it very, very detailed, including tables and formulas, so that their successors will be able to hopefully administer this Compact without leading into the kinds of disagreements that brought us before you.

This, of course, dismisses all the claims. It releases us from the threat of damages. And when you are dealing with public entities and the kind of budget crisis that has struck all three states, that's a very significant achievement. It saves us, of course, the litigation costs.

It's overall, I just think, a very
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beneficial achievement. It's -- I think it really parallels the achievement that led to the Compact, the three -- essentially the three engineers from each state sitting down and working it out. AndI think the fact that we are here is a testament to the characters of the three state engineers we have now.

And I also really want to give our thanks and give credit to our mediators who have made substantial contributions throughout the entire process.

And also, I'd like to thank you for -even though it wasn't always pleasant, keeping our feet to the fire because we wouldn't be here otherwise.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: It was very pleasant.

MS. ANGEL: So in case you have any doubt, we really -- we heartly support this settlement and would ask that you would recommend that the Supreme Court approve it.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Thank you, Ms. Angel. The United States?

MS. HIMMELHOCH: Sarah Himmelhoch again,
Your Honor.
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I would echo what each of the States' representatives have said here today. If you look at the two questions that you posed to us, is this consistent with the Compact, and why is this a good idea, why is this in the public interest, I think the resounding answer to both is positive.

With respect to the Compact, the Compact states that its overriding purpose is the efficient use of water in the Republican River basin. And by addressing not only the current disputes but by building a framework by which future disputes could be resolve and additional information could be gathered as necessary, the States have implemented that fundamental purpose of the Compact. And they have done so while recognizing the plain language of the Compact and addressing the ambiguities in the Compact in the manner that's consistent with the plain language and the intent.

And I would like to say on behalf of the United States, they have also recognized one of the basic purposes of this Compact, which was to make federal development within this basin possible. And they have achieved a method of ensuring the sustainability of that federal development, by addressing, sometimes at great cost, the interests
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of the United States in protecting those projects that are already there.

They have promised to ensure the continued viability of federal projects that were at the heart of what the States were trying to accomplish when they implemented this Compact. And we appreciate, and I believe they did it in the public interest, that they did it in a manner consistent with existing promises made in consensus plans made between federal agencies and in contracts with irrigation users throughout the district.

So we think it is consistent with the Compact, consistent with the purposes. And it's in the public interest because it achieves that efficient use of the water so that everybody is served to the maximum extent possible.

The other reason that it's consistent with the public interest is one that every State has echoed, and I would just like to reiterate, which is these cases can be enormous, as everybody knows. And this case was resolved in record time and with as little expense as possible. And where the money was spent was often spent in leveraging knowledge to achieve a goal rather than to fight each other.

The amount of effort that went into
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developing the groundwater model and the expertise that was shared in developing the accounting principles is money that perhaps we would have had to spend in litigation. But instead of coming up with a result, we would have been giving you a problem to resolve. And so in addition to achieving good things on the ground, they have achieved it in a way that serves the public interest by minimizing the amount of money we spent on litigation.

And I think, to echo everybody else here,
the -- sometimes difficult deadlines that you
imposed on us in the case management and the early resolution of core issues were a key part of why we got here. And we took that head start you gave us and I think we got to a point that has achieved the purposes of the Compact and serves the public interest both fiscally and through the water services.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Thank you very much. I want to take this opportunity to thank the United States in its role as amicus curiae in this case. Obviously, you have a very big function in the management of water in the Republican River basin and you stepped up to bat and done-- sorry to mix a metaphor, but you have been a great help in
this case, just tremendous. We appreciate it.
Are we ready to talk about a schedule on
the draft second report? The -- Amanda, the court reporter, tells me that she can have this out by e-mail before the end of the day Friday, this

Friday, the 10 th , the transcript of today.
I think, and we'll have to do some heavy work, but I think we could have a draft report out to you, again, by e-mail, before the end of the day on the following Thursday, which is the 16th. And then the question comes, when could you have the -your comments back to us? And I would suggest one day short of two weeks, which would be the 29 th of January.

Now, I don't want to push you on that. I think to the extent that you could, it would be valuable if you could coordinate your comments. The only -- that would be much better than to have to have a second round of comments on comments. And e-mail is a wonderful speedy thing of immediate access. And anyway, could we talk about whether that kind of a schedule would be practical.

MR. COOKSON: Your Honor, in keeping with our negotiation practices, could we ask Kansas what their trial schedule is?
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SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Excuse me?
MR. COOKSON: In keeping with our
negotiation practice, most scheduling, the first
question we ask is what is Kansas's trial schedule
because that will dictate Mr. Draper's availability.
SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Right. Yes.
MR. DRAPER: Thank you, Your Honor. That
case is going to be in trial next week, all week.
SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: All week. And so that you wouldn't be around when the end of the day on Thursday you got our draft report.

MR. DRAPER: Yes. We will not be available at that time.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Suppose we let it out the end of the day on Friday?

MR. DRAPER: I'll be on an airplane somewhere, but I suppose there is technical availability at that point.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: It's more important the date of -- suppose we move it back one day to the 30 th of January, Thursday the 30 th of January, for the response? What is your situation between the 17 th of January and the $\mathbf{3 0}$ th of January?

MR. DRAPER: Your Honor, we'll be working on -- I presume, on post-trial briefs at that point.
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But I don't see any reason that that should greatly affect our schedule here. I would suggest you might give us one more day to the $\mathbf{3}$ Ist of January. It is kind of a neat ending.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: All right. Friday the 31 st.

MR. COOKSON: Your Honor, that would be fine. What I would like to do is while we are here, a lot of the final drafting of this document was done by conference call. So if we're going to put together a collective set of comments, we should schedule the conference call so that we can do that. And I'll volunteer to stay in the script role.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Are you suggesting to try to coordinate now?

MS. ANGEL: Off the record? Or do you want to schedule it now?

MR. COOKSON: We can do it after the hearing. But before we leave today, I would like to coordinate that so we do that. The 31 st is fine with that caveat that the parties agree to a conference call to put our collective thoughts together.

MR. DRAPER: And I think Mr. Cookson's premise that we aim to submit one response is the
right way to go.
SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: Fine. That would be much appreciated. And obviously would save a week or so on the other end to us.

Is there -- so you don't want to try to settle the conference time now, but...

MR. COOKSON: We'll do it before we leave or perhaps over coffee.

SPECIAL MASTER MCKUSICK: I'II just leave that to you.

Well, I think one thing that I should do before I adjourn is to thank the mediators. One thing that obviously I was shut off from was the inner workings of the settlement negotiations. But I see the end product of your work, the work of the mediators. And I am sure they were very beneficial. And I want to thank you.

With this, I think we had a good days' work. And we are finishing up before 4:30. And I thank you all very much indeed. And I don't know how to say to say thank you firmly enough.

This has really been a fun case for me to be involved in in every way. I've learned a lot about western water law, at least at the moment I think I know something about it. How long it'll
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13
last, I don't know. And I do thank you all very much indeed. We'll stand adjourned.
(The hearing concluded at 4:27 p.m.)
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| describes 92:7 | 15:11 18:3,7 19:1 | discussed 15:16 | diverting 64:4 | 4:20,20 5:11 |
| describing 29:2 | 19:3,9 20:20 | 27:2 33:15 37:21 | Division I: 11 | 104:21,22 105:9 |
| 44:12 123:19 | 29:13,15 34:12 | 55:12 61:17 64:9 | Docket 3:4 | 105:19 106:13,23 |
| description 20:5 | 38:13 40:19 | 73:4 78:1 80:25 | document 6:24 | 107:14 110:10,20 |
| 53:5 | 128:22,24 | 81:3 | 10:22 48:24 65:14 | $110: 24 \mid 12: 2,4,9$ |
| designate 99:22 | devote 50:3 | discussing 40:18 | 122:17 133:9 | 112:13,22 \|15:5,9 |
| designated 32:21 | dewatering 15:22 | 55:761:18 | documentation | \| 15:23,24 |16:5 |
| 61:12,25 64:18,24 | 16:2,3 | discussion 24:18,20 | 48:21 | 117:13 132:7,12 |
| desirable 75:21 | dictate 132:5 | 72:17,23 76:25 | documents 52:17 | 132:16,24 133:24 |
| detail 31:25 47:2,7 | difference 11:25 | 77:14 79:15 | 105:2,12,24 | Draper's 132:5 |
| 81:1 84:499:12 | 64:20 | 111:17 | 106:11 116:8 | driest 121:22 |
| 101:3 102:19 | differences 32:9 | discussions 18:9 | doing 6:1 28:17 | driving 71:6 |
| 119:15 | 61:10,1 | $31: 2172: 478: 11$ | 47:7 106:12 108:2 | drought 121:8 |
| detailed 41:17 47:6 | different II:5 | 111:12 | 126:13 | dry 14:7 16:7 |
| 52:8 80:21 126:15 | 23:24 24:4 37:11 | dismiss 3:19 | dollars 50:24 | 121:12 |
| details 29:17,22 | 68:4 83:25 91:17 | dismissed 70:3 | domain 42:13,15 | DuBois 7:10 |
| 32:8,19 37:20 | 103:25 121:21 | dismisses 126:19 | Don 5:16 | due 15:1] 28:9 |
| 60:18 64:14 81:7 | 125:11 | dispute 2:11 19:19 | done 21:4,4 23:6 | 39:12 106:2,11 |
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| duly 137:12,13 | efficient 11:675:4 | 90:3 134:21 | even $21: 13$ 33:21 | exist 58:7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| during 18:8 26:19 | 128:8 129:15 | ensure 129:3 | 45:18 49:14 67:14 | existed 57:15 |
| 39:24 41:11,23 | effort 3:21 29:24 | ensuring 128:23 | 81:14 95:3 120:15 | existence 21:20 |
| 48:15 55:9 67:6 | 40:13 41:13 49:17 | enter 22:16 111:2 | 125:25 127:13 | existing 2:5 12:5,11 |
| 67:12 70:8 73:3,8 | 52:10 125:20 | entered 3:9 69:10 | event 110:15 | 16:13 18:3,17 |
| 78:9 91:16,19 | 129:25 | 88:3 107:6 122:17 | events 56:14 | 34:12 81:12 129:9 |
| 93:19 97:8102:20 | efforts 27:13 | 122:18 | every 10:1721:9,11 | exists 38:10 77:16 |
| duties 116:15 | eight $120: 11,18,24$ | entertain 21:15 | 47:25 64:23,24 | expansion 16:12 |
| duty 123:7 | either 16:9 25:11 | entire 104:2 118:15 | 71:24 129:18 | expect $88: 23$ |
| dwell 52:5 | 36:7 37:2 75:2 | 127:10 | 134:23 | 110:13 |
| dynamic 90:13 | 76:13 81:21 94:8 | entirely 8:21 38:21 | everybody 3:3 5:23 | expected 24:20 |
|  | el | 121:24 | 7:1 31:9 38:12 | 53:19 65:15,15 |
| E | elements 46:19 | entirety 103:9,14 | 129:15,20 130:10 | expending 116:13 |
| E 1:182:1 3:1,1 | 99:14 101:5 | 104:7 | everyone 80:11 | expense 129:22 |
| 66:19 72:25 75:24 | elevations 42:5 | entities | everything 66:5 | expert 17:2 |
| 77:1 | eliminate 81:12 | entitled 26:20 | 69:1,4 \|12:21 | expertise 130:1 |
| each 4:18 8:15 9:3 | eliminated 80:1 | 137:7 | \|14:2| | experts 40:5 49:20 |
| 17:12,20 24:7,8,10 | embodied 34:9 | envisioned 119:14 | evidence 8:4 | 124:23 125:2 |
| 26:14 31:18 32:21 | embrace 116:25 | equation-ese | exactly 3:15 47:2 | expires $136: 16$ |
| 35:20 37:12,12,18 | emergency 16:11 | 125:14 | 122:8 123:19 | explain 16:1 17:2 |
| 40:6 46:22 50:12 | employed 136:1] | erupted 122:1 | 125:4 | 18:6 42:22 60:20 |
| 52:16 53:10 56:20 | enacted 25:18 | especially 48:10 | example 34:12 | 84:10 85:12 89:21 |
| 60:20 61:12 63:16 | enclosed 137:7, 11 | 74:17 | 38:20 42:3 52:12 | explained 97:11 |
| 64:18 65:4 91:16 | Enclosures 137:22 | Esq 1:18,18,20,20 | 65:19 124:21 | explanation 17:9 |
| 91:22 98:4 100:I | encoded 112:21 | 1:22,22,24,24 | exceed 60:898:2 | 79:13 81:4 |
| 100:2,18 103:25 | end 51:11 55:16 | essential 113:19 | exceedingly | explicit 59:6 |
| 104:19 115:16 | 68:21 72:8,17 | essentially 17:13 | 120:22 | explicitly 30:21 |
| 124:24,24 125:13 | 131:5,9 132:10,15 | 18:14 38:9 40:1 | except 66:7 \|11:22 | 54:18 |
| 126:13 127:4 | 134:4, 15 | 43:24 60:24 109:6 | excepted $15: 7$ | explore 93:23 |
| 128:1 129:24 | ending 133:4 | 127:3 | 16:11 | express $24: 25$ |
| earlier 72:4 122:15 | ends 51:19 72:3 | established 23:3 | exception 35:21 | 57:12 100:11 |
| early 28:8 110:6 | energy 116:14 | estimated 52:16 | exceptions 15:4,21 | expressed 63:17 |
| 130:12 | engineer $4: 23,24$ | estimates 30:24 | excess 33:20 59:19 | expression 93:25 |
| east 42:19 | 5:3 6:9,15 72:22 | 31:1,19 45:13,14 | 64:3 93:9 | expressly 79:7,10 |
| echo 128:1 130:10 | 77:4 96:8 99:9 | 53:7,10 | exchange $30: 23$ | 79:25 80:5,6 96:1 |
| echoed 129:19 | engineering 5:19 | estimating 53:14 | exchanged 44:20 | 122:22 |
| economic 51:13 | 20:5 55:18 122:12 | et II5:21,22 | exclude 17:4 | extend 42:6, 19 |
| economy 121:24 | 125:9 126:12 | evaluate 32:2 | excluded 11:25 | 99:25 |
| education 4:5 | engineers 5:5 9:24 | 78:15,17117:17 | 15:14 61:19 | extension 107:3,11 |
| effect 63:4,7 81:23 | $10: 1211: 546: 8$ | evaluated 46:22 | excuse 63:20 / 12:7 | $110: 17,18$ I $11: 1$ |
| 82:14,24 92:21 | 47:19 87:21 | 73:11 | 132:1 | 112:10,19 113:14 |
| 118:25 | 122:18,22 123:8 | evaporation 61:5 | executed 68:13 | \||3:2| |14:24 |
| effective 13:11 | 127:3,6 | 64:5,6 84:1 96:13 | exemption 61:2 | extensive 30:23 |
| 70:4 107:6,7 | English 125:14 | 96:18 97:22 | exercise 21:10 | 103:2 |
| 121:17,20 124:19 | enormous 129:20 | evapotranspirat... | exhausted 100:23 | extensively 6:23 |
| effects 58:5 97:22 | enough 5:20 89:25 | 53:14 83:16 | exhausts 28:21 | extent 21:22 31:24 |
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| 42:7 69:12 113:10 | feet 15:10 16:10 | finally 40:1 65:9 | 59:18,23,25 61:25 | 136:7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 117:3 129:16 | 56:23 57:1 61:7 | 75:9 81:9 100:21 | 62:5 | fortunate 121:5 |
| 131:16 | 64:5,8 74:15,16 | 104:10 | floods 60:4 | forward 22:18 |
| extra 79:24 105:17 | 75:7,8,13 87:7 | find 10:3 36:10 | Floor 137:4 | 47:1971:16 |
| 105:19 | 89:5 92:15,23 | 95:24 | flow 16:24 36:5 | 107:24 117:5 |
| E-H 2:7 | 96:14,19 127:14 | fine I 1:844:11 47:8 | 39:11 42:4 46:15 | Forwarding 137:8 |
| e-mail 131:5,9,20 | fell 111:19 | 47:14 51:22 71:25 | 52:15,18 58:6 | found 63:19 65:11 |
|  | felt 11:18 22:12 | 80:8 84:15 103:5 | 61:5 64:2,12 | foundation 16:8 |
| F | 83:1 113:13 | 109:16 112:19 | 76:10 78:2 82:8 | four 29:5 90:9 |
| F $23: 9$ 24:4 77:12 | Fenimore 5:16 | \|15:|| 133:8,20 | 85:8 118:19 | 93:22 94:6,10 |
| face 4:19 111:19 | few 30:9 32:10 | 134:2 | flows 36:4 43:6,7 | fourth 118:13 |
| faced 124:5 | 33:16 37:21 46:2 | finish 105:17 | 52:16 59:15, 15,23 | fourthly 40:21 |
| facilities 76:11 | 47:4 51:25 122:9 | finished 71:9 76:17 | 59:25 62:1,6 | frame 29:6 41: 11 |
| fact 4:8 57:16 73:21 | 122:20 | finishing 46:5 | 74:21 77:16 86:23 | 88:25 |
| 96:18 107:2 | fiber 47:25 | 134:19 | $91: 13$ | framed 56:7 102:18 |
| 108:14 109:21 | field 74:10 | fire 127:14 | fluctuate 59:4 | frames 102:13 |
| 123:11 127:5 | fifth 118:16 | firm 6:20 | fluctuation 59:5 | framework 29:15 |
| facto 12:22 17:14 | fight 129:24 | firmly 134:21 | focused 49:14 | 121:2 126:7 |
| facts 111:14 | fighting 124:24 | first 3:14,16,17,19 | 60:16 | 128:11 |
| fair 18:12 60:3 | figure 87:18 | 4:13,16 6:10 10:2 | focusing 73:24 | Franklin 86:7 |
| fairly 49:10 52:8 | figures 58:19 | 19:16,17 22:12 | folks 48:22 70:8 | frankly 119:14 |
| 60:23 103:1 | file 20:2 21:6 68:6 | 29:5 31:17 33:18 | follow 8:5 88:24 | free 108:4 118:1] |
| faith 27:13,22,23 | 68:17 70:1,16,19 | 34:1,2,3,24 38:5,7 | following 4:22 33:8 | freezing 18:7 19:9 |
| fall 74:11 85:19 | 70:20 110:16 | 38:15 39:19 40:10 | 40:8 68:12 131:10 | Friday $131: 5,6$ |
| 117:16 | filed 3:6 8:7 71:2 | 48:4 57:7 60:24 | foot 87:18 | 132:15 133:6 |
| falls 13:16 | \| $16: 8137: 8$ | 60:25 68:10 70:23 | forecast 88:21 | from 4:17,185:15 |
| familiar 40:12 43:2 | filing 3:11 20:1 | 74:8 83:4 85:23 | forecasting 87:4,5 | 5:16,18,21,23 6:3 |
| far 28:8 40:12 44:21 | 26:18 68:22 70:4 | 87:3 96:11 99:15 | 87:11 | 6:20 7:10 13:13 |
| 44:23 49:22 51:1 | fill 92:5 93:21 | 104:19,23 107:19 | foregoing 136:8 | 15:10,12 16:13,24 |
| 60:16 72:15 | filter 125:15 | I 17:1, 14,24 132:3 | forgot 38:4 | 23:13 27:18 29:2 |
| 125:21,24 | final 3:9 4:1 \| 8:9 | fiscally $130: 17$ | fork 82:2,6 | 29:8 33:19 34:5 |
| farther 7:22 | 9:6,22 26:13 | fit 84:18 123:3 | form 8:5 97:17 | 34:23 35:14 37:6 |
| fashion 116:10 | 27:20 40:2 53:10 | fits 123:6 | 104:12 106:19 | 37:7,13,14 39:12 |
| fast-track 99:22 | 54:10 63:24 68:6 | five $56: 10,2572: 13$ | 107:12 136:8 | 41:21 43:4 44:4 |
| favorable 104:25 | 68:12,15,17 69:17 | 89:21,22 98:10 | formal \| $13: 1$ | 46:12,13 48:19 |
| 107:13 | 69:21 70:5,16 | five-year 37:18 | formality 8:12 | 50:7 56:14 57:9 |
| features 32:22 | 71:2,2 84:19 | 55:7 57:23 60:6,8 | format 105:20 | 57:10 58:15 59:10 |
| February 85:11 | 91:25 101:14 | 76:21,23 82:20 | former 80:1 | 59:16 60:11 61:2 |
| 87:15 110:16 | 104:15 105:6 | 89:1890:5,10 | formula 60:25 | 61:5,8 62:16,20,24 |
| federal II:II, 12,24 | 107:20 109:4, 11 | 91:8,10 94:15,20 | 61:21 63:14,24 | 63:8 64:3,5,6,12 |
| 61:15,24 62:8,12 | $110: 8133: 9$ | fixing 38:9 | formulas $32: 7$ | 65:18 66:10 68:9 |
| 62:24 63:5 64:5 | finalization 53:6 | Flat 5:21 | 60:15,21 62:23 | 68:971:13 73:11 |
| 75:20 88:2 96:13 | 106:8 | flavor 74:7 | 64:17 126:15 | 74:15 75:3,13 |
| 128:22,24 129:4 | finalize 41:10 45:12 | flexibility 32:25 | forth $30: 7$ 40:16 | 77:16,1878:18,19 |
| 129:10 | finalizing 45:6 | 33:4 55:24 | 52:22 78:24 79:1 | 78:21,22 79:6,9 |
| feel 80:18 | 53:12 | flood 56:14 59:15 | 80:19 96:12,20 | 80:11 81:14 82:1 |
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| 82:4,5,7,7,16 83:2 | gage 55:17 | 25:3 33:18 36:16 | greatly 59:19 133:1 | 51:18 72:21 96:7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 83:25 84:2,25 | gain 75:20 | 36:17 44:168:18 | grid 42:4 | half 4:1 9:13 38:4 |
| 86:19 87:5,18 | gallery 7:9 | 84:16 87:13 90:3 | ground 4:3 14:23 | 44:14 |
| 88:18,21 89:4,21 | gallons 16:9 | 99:6 104:10 | 70:6 130:7 | hand 136:15 |
| 89:22 90:4,23 | gathered 128:13 | 112:22 \|13:7 | groundwater 3:18 | handling 14:17 |
| 91:4,5,11,12 92:2 | gauge 52:16 61:13 | 114:10115:18 | 5:5 15:2,9,12 18:4 | Hand-delivered |
| 92:3 93:10 94:25 | 82:12 | 134:1 | 23:5 26:15 28:16 | 137:20 |
| 96:13,18 97:10,12 | gauges 52:13 | goal 129:24 | 32:25 39:8,10,12 | hang 51:15 |
| 97:12 100:24 | gave 94:23 107:17 | goes 8:8 9:21,21 | 39:17 41:9 42:8 | happen 36:3 120:1 |
| 104:19 106:4,17 | 130:14 | 24:17 71:16 | 43:15 44:4 50:2 | happened 45:9 |
| 108:21 \| | 1:9,25 | Geis 5:7 | going 3:13 8:17 | 53:8 54:10 55:25 | 72:9 121:6 |
| 112:25 114:20 | general 6:9,11,11 | 14:13,17 17:2,8 | 56:4 58:4 61:4 | happening 46:10 |
| 115:14,16 116:1,7 | 6:12 10:2 17:1 | 19:19 22:4 23:15 | 64:10,12,16 67:12 | happy 47:15,16 |
| 116:24 118:19,23 | 31:17,23 35:23 | 26:22 31:16 50:21 | 67:15 69:20 70:6 | 92:25 110:15 |
| 119:6 121:4,18 | 64:16 67:4 85:7 | 52:5 69:1,3,4 | 77:20,24 78:15 | hard 22:4 52:25 |
| 123:14 124:6 | 95:7 102:5 109:1 | 70:20 72:23 75:18 | 81:14,24 97:13 | 53:1 65:13 66:4 |
| 125:6 126:12,20 | 117:19 | 77:796:8, 12 | 106:9,12 109:5,7 | hardships $51: 13$ |
| 127:3 134:13 | generally 10:9 15:7 | 99:13 103:1,12 | 109:12 110:1,4 | Hardy 14:10 73:8 |
| full 42:7 87:10,24 | 15:17 16:4 32:20 | \| | 1:12 || $2: 20$ | 111:23 112:16 | 75:10,1776:7 |
| fully 12:16 48:6,7 | 85:18 87:22 | 113:5 \|16:2 121:3 | 113:3 \||4:13,25 | Harlan 73:14 74:1 |
| 65:17 97: 11 | 107:13 | 125:10 132:8 | 117:1 118:19 | 74:21 76:4,13,14 |
| full-blown 109:7 | generations 49:1 | 133:10 | 120:9 123:15,18 | 85:8 86:18 87:6,9 |
| fun 134:22 | geographically | gone 44:21 \|19:7 | 124:4,2\| 125:9 | 87:23 89:4 90:20 |
| function 67:24 | 33:5 43:8 | 123:18 126:4 | 130:1 | 92:2,3,14 93:17,18 |
| 68:24 69:5 130:22. | Geological 15:9 | good 3:2 12:7 25:6 | group 5:2180:11 | 96:24 97:4 |
| functions 67:23 | 40:6, 11, 14 42:1 | 27:12,22,23 29:1 | guess 5:24 53:2 | Harty 6:2 |
| fundamental 32:8 | gets 17:9 34:2 | 43:14 47:21 52:23 | 56:23 80:9 94:12 | hasten 48:8 |
| 38:13 40:23 | 38:11 85:22 | 70:19 93:25 | 103:2 \|10:9 111:8 | hat 66:12 |
| 117:14 128:14 | getting 9:10 45:1 | 101:12 109:1,21 | \| | | $121,23,24$ | hate 10:16 |
| fundamentally | 79:19,24 94:10 | \| 15:24 128:4 | guidance 64:17 | having 21:20 50:9 |
| 30:10 37:12 43:1 | 110:6 113:12 | 130:7 134:18 | Guide 2:8 12:19,22 | 66:1 71:9 83:4 |
| funds 51:20 98:18 | Ghelata 7:16 | Gordon 7:12 | 13:4,10,13,16,16 | 116:1 |
| further 3:13 18:10 | give 9:15 20:4 25:12 | governor 117:18 | 13:19,20,23 14:7,9 | head 47:5 130:14 |
| 31:3 36:17 37:24 | 47:5,20 59:8 74:7 | grant 17:20 | 14:14 15:15 33:15 | headgate $74: 9$ |
| 52:5 66:13 71:19 | 84:3 119:5,17 | granted 25:15 | 35:22 36:1,8 | heads 9:15 24:23 |
| 78:9 89:7 103:3,3 | 127:8,9 [33:3 | granting 17:18 | 56:12 84:16,2] | 54:23 102:17 |
| 104:5 136:10 | given 31:3 35:22 | grasp 46:9 | 85:1,5,9 87:13 | hear 10:15 25:1 |
| future 14:21 20:16 | 40:8 67:22 124:19 | great 47:2, 18 84:4 | 89:8,10,14,16 92:4 | 29:8 47:15 104:16 |
| 32:16 49:3 62:2 | 137:12,13 | 103:25 110:3 | 92:6,13,1893:10 | 104:19: 106:17 |
| 76:6 80:24 81:8 | gives 123:9 125:20 | $116: 5,9,13120: 18$ | 93:19 95:2,18 | 111:9,24 \|| $2: 8$ |
| 101:18 116:19 | giving 51:5,6 | 123:13 124:14 | 118:15 124:14 | 114:19 115:14 |
| 119:24 126:8,14 | 113:23 130:5 | 125:20 128:25 |  | hearing $1: 103: 3,6$ |
| 128:11 | glad 79:2 | 130:25 | H | 3:12 8:3 26:23,25 |
|  | glasses 7:15 | greater 55:24 59:6 | H 66:19 81:9 | 27:1 115:15 |
| G | go 4:7 6:17 8:8 16:6 | 64:7 65:2 96:14 | Haiti 6:25 | 133:19 135:3 |
| G 3:1 22:20 80:15 | 20:20,22 22:13,18 | 96:19 | Hal 1:23 6:8 17:1,8 | 136:5 137:7. |


| hearings 27:4 | holder 94:6, 11 | impacts 97:15 | include 11:22 37:17. | I \| 2:24,25 || $3: 4$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| heart 129:4 | holes 15:22 | impair 33:9 60:10 | 42:7 45:14 53:17 | \| 3 3:15 ||4:7,10 |
| heartland 119:18 | holidays 44:25 | impairment 36:19 | 98:13 | 128:12 |
| heartly 117:9 | Honor 4:20 5:9 6:6 | impermissible | included 11:13 | informational 3:6 |
| 127:19 | 7:2,6,18 10:11 | 67:22 | 20:11 42:11 52:17 | 8:3 55:21 |
| heavily 90:7 | 11:16 12:1 20:24 | implement 26:7 | 55:19 59:25 87:19 | informed 72:9 |
| heavy 131:7 | 25:9 27:16 28:25 | 63:171:11 92:11 | 88:9 96:15 124:5 | initial 117:21 |
| held I:11 85:16 | 35:18 38:3,19 | 92:17 | includes 42:15 | 119:12 |
| help 3:12 36:17 | 47:1 49:7,12. 59:3 | implementation | including 40:24 | initiating 73:23 |
| 38:18 68:2 73:1 | 66:12,20 72:20 | 71:20 | 54:3 124:5 126:15 | inner 134:14 |
| 82:16 101:18,18 | 79:14 84:1799:8 | implemented | inclusion 61:4,5 | input 1/13:16 |
| 130:25 | 103:21 104:21 | 128:13 129:6 | 62:17 123:14 | inputs 113:5 |
| helpful 4:3,17 105:3 | 105:20 106:14 | implements 92:20 | inconsequential | inspect 31:4 |
| helps 49:3 | 107:5,16 108:14 | 108:9 | 97:1 | inspection $31: 5$ |
| Helton 6:20,21 | 109:19 \|| $0: 21$ | implication 79:7 | inconsistent 94:18 | instance 21:18 |
| Hendricks 6:23 | \| 12:2 | | 5:3, 10,24 | 79:11,25 80:5 | 95:8,25 116:20 | instead 124:24 |
| her 84:24 100:17 | \|27:25 131:23 | 102:3 | incorporate 68:14 | 130:4 |
| hereunto 136:14 | 132:7,24 133:7 | implicitly 57:12 | increase 16:17 19:1 | intend 112:14 |
| HGR 5:18 | Honorable 137:3 | implies 109:6 | 19:3,4 43:10 63:8 | intended 15:23 |
| hiatus 44:24 48:15 | hope 48:1 49:3 | import 94:8 | 74:14 | 59:8 |
| hide 7:20 | 73:25 90:1 104:3 | importance 98:22 | increased 44:4 | intensely 41:16 |
| high 16:6 20:8 21:3 | hopefully 32:16 | 103:25 | 75:5 76:1,13,14 | 44:17 |
| 62:17 | 50:23 71:17 120:5 | important 8:15 | 78:2 | intent 48:16 128:18 |
| higher 23:18,21 | 126:16 | 27:11 52:2 61:1 | increases 62:20 | interest 77:4 100:7 |
| 44:3 | hour 9:12 | 81:5 114:23 | increasing 74:5,6 | II5:2\| 128:5 |
| highplains 39:13 |  | 116:15,24 122:5 | 74:25 76:3 | 129:7,14,18 130:8 |
| high-powered | I | 124:1 132:20 | indeed 121:19 | $130: 17$ |
| 124:23 | idea 21:1782:21 | importantly 118:1 | 134:20 135:2 | interested 25:16 |
| him 4:24 5:4 17:3 | 109:1 128:5 | imported 15:12 | independently | 36:15 49:16 95:4 |
| 47:15 | identified 73:19 | 30:4 39:15,16 | $31: 1$ | 136:13 |
| Himmelhoch 1:24 | 80:17.95:1 113:8 | 60:12 61:3,16,16 | indexes 105:12 | interests 20:25 |
| 2:16 7:6,7,20,23 | 117:20 | 61:18 77:14,15,23 | indicate 62:9 | 120:11 122:5,6 |
| 11:16,17 12:1 | identify 8:15 40:17 | 78:22 79:4,9,17,19 | 100:18 108:19 | 128:25 |
| 35:18 38:3 59:2 | 100:15 | 92:2,3 93:11,13 | indicated 29:3 | interfere 35:16 |
| 109:19,20 \|15:3 | identifying 110:5 | imposed 130:12 | 53:15 \||2:23 | interim 39:23 |
| 127:24,24 | II 2:4 9:23 10:3 12:3 | impossible 105:14 | indicative 88:12 | 82:25 |
| hired 124:24 | III 1:11 2:5 12:4,10 | improve 73:13 | individual 35:10 | Interior 7:13 |
| historic 22:22 | 28:22 78:25 | 74:19 75:9 88:24 | 86:8 | internal 41:6 |
| 46:15 61:9 62:9 | III.A. 3 19:15 | improved 65:20 | individually 44:19 | interpolate 83:25 |
| 62:16 63:11 64:22 | illustrative 77:6 | 76:1 | 46:17 | 84:2 |
| historical 57:25 | immediate 99:21 | improvement | industrial 16:12 | interpolated 83:19 |
| 76:9 78:17 | 102:25 131:20 | 104:25 | inflow 18:10,22 | interpreted 119:2 |
| historically 30:16 | immediately 27:24 | improvements | 97:4 | interpreting 84:6 |
| 43:11 | 28:17 | 72:25 | information 1:9 | interrupted 44:11 |
| history 88:17 | impact 82:5 97:4 | improving 73:5,8 | 14:22 31:20,24 | interwoven 1 19:20 |
| hit 79:14 88:20 | 98:13 | INC 137:1 | 41:22 105:22 | introduce 4:18 6:1 |
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