Case 3:73-cv-00128-MMD-CSD Document 732 Filed 11/01/2013 Page 1 of 51

```
1
                      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                           DISTRICT OF NEVADA
 2
       BEFORE THE HONORABLE ROBERT C. JONES, CHIEF DISTRICT JUDGE
 3
                                ---000---
      UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
 4
 5
           Plaintiff,
                                    : No. In Equity No. C-125-RCJ
                                    : Subproceedings: C-125-B and
 6
      WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE,
                                    : C-125-C
           Plaintiff-Intervenor,
 7
                                    : 3:73-CV-125-RCJ-WCG
                                    : 3:73-CV-127-RCJ-WGC
 8
                 -vs-
                                    : 3:73-CV-128-RCJ-WGC
 9
      WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION : September 23, 2013
      DISTRICT, a corporation, et
10
      al.,
11
           Defendants.
12
13
                      TRANSCRIPT OF MOTION HEARING
14
     APPEARANCES:
15
     FOR THE PLAINTIFF: ANDREW "GUSS" GUARINO and
16
                          SUSAN L. SCHNEIDER
                          Assistant United States Attorneys
17
                          Denver, Colorado
18
                          DAVID L. NEGRI
                          Assistant United States Attorney
19
                          Boise, Idaho
20
21
22
     (Appearances continue on next page.)
23
     Reported by:
                          Margaret E. Griener, CCR #3, RDR
                          Official Reporter
24
                          400 South Virginia Street
                          Reno, Nevada 89501
25
```

Case 3:73-cv-00128-MMD-CSD Document 732 Filed 11/01/2013 Page 2² of 51

1	APPEARANCES (Continued):		
2	FOR THE WALKER RIVER	WES WILLIAMS, JR.	
3	PAIUTE TRIBE:	Attorney at Law Schurz, Nevada	
4	FOR WALKER RIVER	GORDON H. DePaoli and	
5	IRRIGATION DISTRICT:	DALE E. FERGUSON Attorneys at Law	
6		Reno, Nevada	
7	FOR U.S. BOARD OF	KAREN A. PETERSON	
8	WATER COMMISSIONERS:	Attorney at Law Carson City, Nevada	
9		carson city, Nevada	
10	FOR THE CALIFORNIA STATE WATER CONTROL	ERIN K. L. MAHANEY Deputy Attorney General	
11	BOARD:	Sacramento, California	
12	FOR MINERAL COUNTY:	SIMEON HERSKOVITS	
13	TOR HINDRED GOOKIT.	Attorney at Law El Prado, New Mexico	
14		SEAN ROWE	
15		District Attorney Hawthorne, Nevada	
16		nawenezhe, wevada	
17	FOR MONO COUNTY:	STACY SIMON Attorney at Law	
18		Mammoth Lakes, California	
19			
20	FOR LYON COUNTY:	GEORGE N. BENESCH Attorney at Law	
21		Reno, Nevada	
22			
23	FOR NEVADA DEPARTMENT WILDLIFE:	MARTA A. ADAMS AND BRYAN STOCKTON Deputies Attorney General	
24		Carson City, Nevada	
25	(Appearances continued on	next page.)	

Case 3:73-cv-00128-MMD-CSD Document 732 Filed 11/01/2013 Page 3 of 51

1	APPEARANCES (Continued.)	
2		
3		N. SWAINSTON ey at Law
4	Reno, 1	
5		
6		L ALMENDRAS AND L NEVILLE
7	Deputy	Deputy Attorney General San Francisco, California
8		
9	FOR CIRCLE BAR N RANCH THERESE AND MICA FARMS: Attorne	E URE
10		Reno, Nevada
11		
12		DON SPRINGMEYER and Attorney at Law Reno, Nevada
13	Reno, N	
14	JIM SHA	AW, WATER MASTER
15		
16		
17		
18		
19 20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
_ •		

Case 3:73-cv-00128-MMD-CSD Document 732 Filed 11/01/2013 Page 4 of 51

```
RENO, NEVADA, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 2013, 1:30 P.M.
 1
 2
                                ---000---
 3
                   THE COURT: Thank you. And please be seated.
 4
 5
     Welcome.
               This is Judge Jones. We're here in United States
 6
 7
     versus Walker River Irrigation District, and specifically what
 8
     I have on calendar, of course, is Mineral County's motion to
     intervene in 127, filed there, but petition to intervene
 9
10
     generally and also in the Tribe's petition.
11
               I need to get you all of record so let's go through
12
     the process again, please, as we make it a matter of record.
13
     Could we start here in the courtroom, please, and note your
14
     appearance for the record.
15
                   MR. HERSKOVITS: Yes. Good afternoon, your
16
    Honor. I'm Simeon Herskovits, lead counsel for Mineral
17
     County. With me today is Sean Rowe, the District Attorney for
18
    Mineral County.
19
                   THE COURT: Thank you.
20
                   MR. WILLIAMS: Good afternoon. Wes Williams,
21
     Jr., on behalf the Walker River Paiute Tribe.
22
                   THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Williams.
23
                   MR. GUARINO: Good afternoon. Guss Guarino for
24
     the United States.
25
                   THE COURT: Mr. Guarino, thank you, sir.
```

Case 3:73-cv-00128-MMD-CSD Document 732 Filed 11/01/2013 Page 5 of 51

```
MR. NEGRI: Your Honor, David Negri for the
 1
 2
     United States also.
 3
                   THE COURT: Thank you.
                   MR. NEGRI: Thank you.
 4
                   MR. DePAOLI: Good afternoon, your Honor.
 5
     Gordon DePaoli and Dale Ferguson for the Walker River
 6
 7
     Irrigation District.
 8
                   THE COURT: Thank you.
 9
                   MR. BENESCH: Good afternoon, your Honor.
10
     George Benesch for Lyon County.
11
                   THE COURT:
                               Thank you.
12
                   MR. SWAINSTON: Harry Swainston for Swainston
13
     Farms.
14
                   THE COURT:
                               Thank you.
15
                   MS. ADAMS: Good afternoon, your Honor. Marta
16
     Adams for the Nevada Department of Wildlife, and with me in
     the courtroom is Bryan Stockton.
17
18
                   THE COURT: Thank you.
19
                   MS. URE: Good afternoon, your Honor. My name
20
     is Therese Ure from the Schroeder law office representing
21
     Circle Bar N Ranch and Mica Farms.
22
                   THE COURT: Thank you.
23
                   MR. SPRINGMEYER: Good afternoon, your Honor.
24
     Don Springmeyer for National Fish and Wildlife Foundation.
25
                   THE COURT:
                               Thank you.
```

Case 3:73-cv-00128-MMD-CSD Document 732 Filed 11/01/2013 Page 6 of 51

```
MS. SIMON: Good afternoon. Stacy Simon for
 1
 2
    Mono County.
 3
                   THE COURT: Thank you.
                   MS. PETERSON: Karen Peterson, U.S. Board of
 4
     Water Commissioners, and the Water Master is here also.
 5
 6
                   THE COURT: Thank you, and welcome. Thank you,
 7
     sir.
 8
               And on the telephone, please.
 9
                   MR. NEVILLE: Yes, good afternoon, your Honor.
10
     This Michael Neville, N-e-v-i-l-l-e, with the California
11
     Attorney General's office representing the California state
12
     agencies.
13
                   THE COURT:
                               Thank you.
                   MS. ALMENDRAS: And this is an Annadel Almendras
14
15
     also with the California Attorney General's office
16
     representing the California state agencies.
17
                   THE COURT: Thank you.
18
                   MS. MAHANEY: Erin Mahaney with the California
19
     State Water Resources Control Board.
20
                   THE COURT: Thank you.
21
               All right. Do I have all appearances?
22
               Thank you. As I suggested, we're here on Mineral
23
     County's motion to intervene, and just some -- like you like
24
     to receive from state court, or some federal judges, a
25
    predilection of where we're going, as well as the past history
```

especially of this motion.

As I indicated previously, I was in accord -- even though we changed the case management order, I was in accord with Judge Reed's original direction, and that is that we have some initial issues, including jurisdiction and other matters, that need to be addressed before normal motions to dismiss. That still pertains.

And, also, in relation to this petition, this request to intervene, I was reviewing Judge Reed's original order which allowed for the bifurcation of the files, and I noted in particular, in which I'm in total accord, the initial reason and statement when he did bifurcate those files is that this is without prejudice to any parties filing or being required to file in one file or the other, that it's still one single case, and even though we may call for different rounds of briefing or whatever, it's one case, and therefore the bifurcation into separate files was without prejudice, of course, to the fact that you're moving in one single case.

And I've already told you predilection at the prior status hearing that we had with Judge Cobb that I intended to handle resolution of the merits, both the initial merits on jurisdiction and otherwise, as well as dismissal, and also the ultimate merits on the various petitions, at the same time so that they'll all be going up on appeal at the same time. We won't be getting contradictory results.

By way of predilection on this particular motion, 1 2 it's subject to your argument, of course, and persuasion otherwise, I believe I'm persuaded that we must grant this 3 motion to intervene, without addressing the merits of 4 jurisdiction, without addressing the merits of jurisdiction on 5 the groundwater users, et cetera, it's just that we have to --6 7 we must allow, because they have standing, they have status as 8 far as I'm concerned subject to your argument, the request of 9 Mineral County is timely, and no doubt about it, their 10 interests would be very much affected by the Tribe's petition, 11 and, accordingly, I believe that the best course is to grant 12 the motion to intervene without ruling at all on the efficacy, futility, jurisdiction, if you will, or merits of Mineral 13 County's petition. 14 15 And, again, with a reminder, if I do that, that while we have bifurcated files, it is still just one case. 16 17 And while I may bifurcate the briefing on motions to dismiss 18 into basic jurisdiction issues and then more merit-centered 19 issues, they will be at the same time on all of these separate 20 files. 21 We'll have some of these same issues, some different 22 issues, on jurisdiction over groundwater users, as well as 23 upstream users and groundwater users, that may be affected by 24 both Mineral County, by the Tribe's petition, by the Forest

Service's request. I will be answering those questions at the

25

```
same time, maybe in separate groups of pleadings, but very
 1
 2
     likely at the same time and maybe even in the same order.
 3
               Now, then, let's proceed, though, to your positions
     both on what we have on calendar today and your arguments, of
 4
 5
     course, on the motion to intervene, or to persuade me
     otherwise, or if you have a different view of the course of
 6
 7
     the litigation.
 8
               I'll call upon Mineral County first.
                   MR. HERSKOVITS: Thank you, and good afternoon
 9
10
     again, your Honor. Once again, this is Simeon Herskovits for
11
     Mineral County.
12
               Your Honor, I think it almost goes without saying
     that we are in complete agreement with what you've outlined as
13
14
     the Court's predilection, and it sounds like for me to argue
15
     points in which you are already inclined to agree with our
     arguments and our briefs would perhaps not be a good use of
16
17
     time. So I wonder if perhaps it would make more sense, given
18
     what you've stated --
19
                   THE COURT: That's fine. By way of response,
20
     you'll have final reply.
21
               And one other reminder, too, is that Judge Reed's
22
     general course with regard to service was that Mineral
23
     County's, the Tribe's, the Forest Service's petitions had to
24
     be served, not just on parties who were parties technically to
25
     the litigation at the time he had the case, but to all
```

```
potential users both of groundwater and surface rights.
 1
 2
               So I believe that's the current status of the
 3
     service obligation. Mineral County's petition had to be
     served in the same fashion.
 4
                   MR. HERSKOVITS: Well, your Honor, that's one
 5
     point which is actually not involved in the question of
 6
 7
     intervention.
 8
               But I would just want to respectfully disagree or
 9
     point out to the Court that, in fact, in the orders in the --
10
     on Mineral County's motion and amended complaint in
     intervention and all of the proceedings, the orders all talked
11
12
     about and our claim was only asserted against claimants to
     appropriative water rights of surface waters within the Walker
13
     River system.
14
15
               So it was only really decree right holders to
     surface waters and later claimants of appropriative water
16
17
     rights to surface holders. So we've never asserted
18
     jurisdiction or claims affecting --
19
                   THE COURT: And I respectfully disagree with
20
     you. As was apparent in our last hearing, your claim, if it
21
     were granted in any part, would obviously affect groundwater
22
     users as well and the state's obligations for recognizing and
23
     priority given to those rights.
24
               I understand we had a little bit of a disagreement
25
     at the last hearing on that, but that's my view of the case,
```

Case 3:73-cv-00128-MMD-CSD Document 732 Filed 11/01/2013 Page 11 of 51

```
and for that reason, just as suggested by the government, by
 1
 2
     the Tribe, by others, by the water district, your service
 3
     would have to be contemporaneous, coterminous with the Tribe's
     obligation to serve.
 4
               So I think it affects the same parties, the same
 5
    parties have to be made a part, and therefore I do intend as
 6
 7
     well to subject you to the same service obligations.
 8
               Again, these are bifurcated files, it is not a
 9
    bifurcated case, and, accordingly, your service would have to
10
    be coterminous with the other applicants as well.
11
                   MR. HERSKOVITS: I appreciate the clarification,
12
     your Honor. That was not something that I understood clearly
     after our last status conference.
13
                   THE COURT: Okay. You do now.
14
15
               But, of course, we'll make that service much easier
16
     for you. You know, we're converting to a website, we're
17
     converting to a method for service of your pleadings on the
18
     website, and we'll be applying those same requirements that
19
     we've previously imposed upon the Tribe with respect to your
20
    petition as well.
21
                   MR. HERSKOVITS: Okay. I understand.
22
                   THE COURT: All right? Opposition, though.
23
                   MR. HERSKOVITS: And I am -- I think you have
24
     already answered this, your Honor, but would like to reserve
25
     time to respond to whatever arguments --
```

```
THE COURT: Certainly.
 1
 2
                   MR. HERSKOVITS: Thank you.
 3
                   MR. DePAOLI: Good afternoon, your Honor.
     Gordon DePaoli on behalf of the irrigation district.
 4
 5
               Your Honor, I have a fairly high mountain to climb
     based upon your comments at the outset.
 6
 7
                   THE COURT: Right.
 8
                   MR. DePAOLI: And I will start where I had hoped
     to end which is that I do not think that the Court should or
 9
10
     that the law requires the Court to grant Mineral County's
11
     intervention here to assert what I would interpret in that
12
     context as a counterclaim against the Tribe and the United
     States and a cross-claim against some but not all of the
13
14
     defendants in the B subproceeding.
15
                   THE COURT: In particular, the water district,
     also the California board.
16
17
                   MR. DePAOLI: And, in particular, all of the
18
     many thousands of groundwater users and --
19
                   THE COURT: In other words, adding would go
20
     beyond the parties that we previously have.
21
                   MR. DePAOLI: Yes, it would, your Honor.
22
                   THE COURT: Right.
23
                   MR. DePAOLI: It seems to me it ought to be
24
     treated for what it is which is a request, either through a
25
     complaint or a motion, to modify the Walker River Decree to
```

```
adjust existing water rights to meet an alleged public trust
 1
 2
     claim for Walker Lake.
 3
               In taking that position, the district is not taking
     a position that is inconsistent with that which it took before
 4
 5
     the Nevada Supreme Court in 2001, nor is it inconsistent with
     what the supreme court said in that case.
 6
 7
               And our position there and the supreme court's
 8
     decision is that this court is the proper forum to determine
 9
     whether existing water rights need to be modified in some
10
     fashion to meet a public trust obligation to Walker Lake, and
11
     we recognize that and are not in any way contending otherwise.
12
                   THE COURT: What's the rationale of the supreme
     court for doing that, which I just want you to emphasize?
13
                   MR. DePAOLI: The rationale is that --
14
                   THE COURT: This decree and this decree court
15
     affect those rights, or would affect them.
16
17
                   MR. DePAOLI: Correct. And what was requested
18
     in that case, your Honor, was that the State Engineer step in
19
     and adjust all those water rights, and that would be a clear
     interference with this court's jurisdiction over those water
20
21
     rights. So it has to -- if anything is going to happen, it
22
     has to happen here.
23
                   THE COURT: Right. Now, that corresponds a
     little bit with my view of jurisdiction in the case, too, as I
24
25
     gave you predilections to last time.
```

```
My predilection view of the case is that with respect to Nevada users and all applicants and petitioners, this Court has both in rem and in personam jurisdiction, in personam on those that have been served, and in rem with respect to all users on the Nevada side.
```

As we detailed last time, the parties didn't think that I had, nor prior court decisions construed it as, in rem jurisdiction over users upstream on the California side, and for that reason a number of you added for that -- that's why Judge Reed required us to serve.

So my present view of the case is that I have both in rem and in personam over Nevada users. By means of in rem, I mean I have jurisdiction over the water system on this side of the river.

And whether a party was specifically named last time or not, as long as due process requirements were met, all of those people, whether parties at that time, whether parties now, will be bound by the decision of this Court.

With respect to those on the California side, my view is it's primarily in personam jurisdiction. I'm not sure but what I couldn't assert in rem jurisdiction over the watershed altogether, but basically I think everybody is in accord that that's in personam jurisdiction. They have been served, and, of course, Judge Reed required that upstream California side users, including groundwater users, be served,

Case 3:73-cv-00128-MMD-CSD Document 732 Filed 11/01/2013 Page 15 of 51

```
did he not?
 1
 2
                   MR. DePAOLI: He required clearly the water
 3
     right -- surface water right users in California who had
     rights originating in the decree to be served.
 4
                   THE COURT: Did he require groundwater users to
 5
 6
    be served?
 7
                   MR. DePAOLI: He only required in California two
 8
     categories of groundwater users, your Honor.
 9
                   THE COURT: Please.
10
                   MR. DePAOLI: The users for irrigation purposes
11
     and users for municipal and industrial use.
12
                   THE COURT: Okay.
13
                   MR. DePAOLI: He did not require service on
     domestic users, nor did he require -- and in California, in a
14
15
     groundwater sense, you have something similar to what
     California refers to as their dormant riparian water rights.
16
17
     In California, anyone who has land that overlies groundwater
18
     has, in essence, a dormant right to use that groundwater, and
19
     none of those people have been served either by the United
20
     States and the Tribe or Mineral County.
21
                   THE COURT: Okay. Now, aside from the last
22
     distinction, why did Judge Reed distinguish and not require
23
     consumers without adjacent riparian rights, why did he not
24
     require household users to be served?
25
                   MR. DePAOLI: Because in that -- when he made
```

Case 3:73-cv-00128-MMD-CSD Document 732 Filed 11/01/2013 Page 16 of 51

```
that determination, your Honor, he was looking strictly at the
 1
 2
     Tribe's claims. He did not have Mineral County's claims in
 3
    mind at all. He was looking at the claims the Tribe was
    making and --
 4
                   THE COURT: He determined that it would not
 5
     affect those parties' rights.
 6
 7
                   MR. DePAOLI: Yes, he determined, I think, two
 8
     things. One, that the groundwater claims that the Tribe and
 9
     the United States were asserting would not affect anybody
10
     using a domestic -- having a domestic right clear upstream in
11
     the Antelope Valley or --
12
                   THE COURT: Which is probably very realistic and
     worthy of re-echoing. Under the recent Ninth Circuit case
13
     that said Judge George had jurisdiction over groundwater
14
15
     rights adjacent to the Truckee because they were a supply or a
16
     source of resupply of the Truckee, that's unlikely to be
17
     present in our case.
18
               People up in Bridgeport, or in the valley up there,
19
     their household well groundwater tapping is unlikely to be a
     source of -- for the Walker to the extent it would be required
20
21
     to be tapped in for granting additional rights to the Tribe.
22
               In other words, whatever water is flowing down is
23
     flowing down through the river. No doubt about it that those
24
     groundwaters are also a source of supply to the Walker River
25
     up in Bridgeport, but by the time they get to Nevada, it's all
```

```
surface as far as the Tribe is concerned.
 1
 2
               That would be my suspicion and guess.
 3
                   MR. DePAOLI: Yeah. I think he believed that
     the groundwater rights that the Tribe was asserting would not
 4
 5
     affect those groundwater rights upstream.
 6
               On the other side, the reason he required what he
 7
     considered would be potentially large users of groundwater in
 8
     California to be involved, related to the argument that the
     Tribe and the United States make that the surface and water
 9
10
     supplies, surface and groundwater supplies, should be
     regulated as a single source of supply in priority.
11
12
                   THE COURT: Right.
                   MR. DePAOLI: And that argument could impact
13
     those groundwater -- those large groundwater users.
14
15
                   THE COURT: I appreciate that update, and
16
     basically what it brings me a little bit more solidly to is,
17
     on this side of the border, I've got both in rem and in
18
     personam to the extent they've been served, and north of the
19
     border, west of the border, I've got in personam.
20
               And, clearly, the California board has been in
21
     personam related since the beginning, or at least a long time,
22
     and, of course, the additional parties that Judge Reed
23
     required be served would be in personam jurisdiction.
24
                   MR. DePAOLI: At some point I think I would like
25
     an opportunity to, you know, get into those issues in more
```

Case 3:73-cv-00128-MMD-CSD Document 732 Filed 11/01/2013 Page 18 of 51

```
detail. I'm not sure if your Honor is indicating that your
 1
 2
     Honor is of the opinion that --
 3
                   THE COURT: That's my present opinion. I
     haven't issued it as a ruling. And, of course, will be
 4
 5
     calling for a round of motions to dismiss, for example, the
    motion to dismiss Mineral County's petition, and jurisdiction
 6
 7
     and all such remain open issues.
 8
                   MR. DePAOLI: Thank you.
                   THE COURT: Go ahead. Why else should we not
 9
10
     grant the motion to intervene, though?
11
                   MR. DePAOLI: Well, the other thing, your Honor,
12
     that I -- I'm not suggesting at all that Mineral County should
     not proceed or be allowed to participate in Subproceeding B in
13
     any fashion that it chooses, indeed, the Mineral County
14
     commissioners are already a defendant in that -- in that
15
16
    proceeding.
17
               The reason that I think these things need to be
18
     handled as entirely separate proceedings is that there is, in
19
     my judgment at least, your Honor, no relationship between the
     public trust claim that Mineral County seeks to assert and the
20
21
     claims that are at issue in Subproceeding B.
22
               I also respectfully disagree that the Mineral County
23
     claim is going to be in any way impaired or impeded by the
24
     outcome of the Tribal and federal claims.
25
               Those two things are often considered together, but
```

```
the reason I take that position, your Honor, is that the subject matter of those claims are very different than the subject matter of the Mineral County claim.
```

As your Honor knows, an implied reserved water right claim is based on federal law, it's based on factual issues as to whether -- at the time a reservation was set aside whether it's primary purpose required water, and, if so, how much water.

Implied reserved rights are deemed to exist as of the date -- exist and be fully perfected as of the date of reservation.

So what is at issue in the B case is simply the question as to whether they exist, what they -- what their quantity is and whether they should be recognized to exist.

There is no effort in that case to reconsider or change in any fashion the water rights that are already recognized and part of the Walker River Decree. That simply is not involved there, and Mineral County, in contending that it is, is simply not correct.

On the other hand, the public trust claim is a claim that is based upon state law, and it is informed and shaped by state law, state constitutions.

The most obtrusive example of that in a water rights context is the *Audubon* case in California where the California Supreme Court said that under the public trust doctrine the

```
water rights of a single party could be reconsidered on the theory that when they were granted, they were subject to that trust. So it's -- those claims are going to involve consideration of state law issues.
```

That process here is potentially going to involve hundreds of parties and existing water rights. It's going to be lengthy and complicated, and it's going to involve a different set of facts and legal issues than the Tribe and the U.S. claims.

The relationship requirement for intervention is satisfied only if resolution of the Tribe and the U.S. claims here will actually affect Mineral County's public trust claim, and the reason that, in my judgment, they will not is that that legal relationship between Mineral County's public trust claim and the claimed federal and reserved rights exists and has existed since either of those rights were -- since essentially that when the public trust doctrine became applicable and when the reservations at issue were established. They are pre-existing.

Mineral County's claim for -- under the public trust doctrine cannot affect or result in the reserved rights not being deemed to exist.

On the flip side of that, the existence of the reserved rights will not in any way defeat or impact whether or not Mineral County's public trust claim can require those

```
rights to be regulated in some fashion to meet a public trust doctrine.

And I think one of the -- perhaps the example of that is the fact that Mineral County seeks to assert its
```

public trust claim against the 1859 right that is already

6 recognized for the Walker River Indian Reservation in the

7 decree.

Just -- from just a practical standpoint, if Mineral County's public trust claim affects federal reserved rights, it's going to affect the ones that are recognized and the ones to be recognized.

On the other hand, if it doesn't, it will not -- and the recognition of those rights is not going to in any way defeat Mineral County's claim that they ought to be regulated or limited by a public trust claim, and I think from a permissive intervention analysis, that comes out even more persuasively.

What we will have here, it seems to me, is that if we proceed -- bring them together and allow them to be handled in a single proceeding, in a single matter, is we're going to be trying two entirely separate proceedings involving different law and different facts in a context where -- at least until -- and maybe I'm mistaken about this, but Mineral County is not asserting that claim against groundwater users and is not asserting that claim against groundwater users in

```
1
     California.
 2
               So we're going to have several thousand defendants
 3
     who are party to the Tribal case who have no interest one way
     or the other in the outcome of the Mineral County claim, and
 4
     that, it seems to me, is just simply going to delay
 5
     Subproceeding B, or delay Mineral County's claim and for no
 6
 7
     good reason.
 8
               They arise out of different law, different facts,
 9
     and they ought to stay separate, which is not to say that the
10
     Court clearly has -- as the decree court, clearly has the
     right to determine whether or not existing rights should or
11
12
     should not be modified to meet the public trust claim which
     Mineral County intends to assert.
13
               I'm not intending to argue that that doesn't somehow
14
15
     get heard before this Court, it simply should not be heard as
     a counterclaim or cross-claim in the B subproceeding, your
16
17
     Honor. Thank you.
18
                   THE COURT: Thank you. Further?
19
                   MS. ADAMS: Good afternoon, your Honor. Marta
20
     Adams for the Nevada Department of Wildlife.
21
               I don't have too many additions to what Mr. DePaoli
22
     arqued.
23
               As the Court may have noted, the Department of
24
     Wildlife did not object to permissive intervention of Mineral
25
     County, and, in fact, has a predilection similar to your
```

1

```
Honor's in that it seems right that the county should be
 2
     before this Court.
 3
               Now, whether it's properly before the Court in terms
     of this motion to intervene in the Tribe's and the United
 4
 5
     States' counterclaims, I am not addressing that, but I do
     believe that this Court, in administration of the water, is
 6
 7
     the proper forum to take up the claim.
 8
               Obviously, we're not getting into the public trust
 9
     elements of Mineral County's petition, but, as the Court will
10
     note from our filing, we believe that the public trust enures
11
     not only as a question of state law, but is actually the
12
     state's responsibility.
               Mr. Herskovits disparages the efforts that the
13
     Department of Wildlife has made on the lake's behalf.
14
15
     However, for purposes of this entire case, the subdockets
16
     included, the State of Nevada, through the Department of
17
     Wildlife, did enter this case based on its water rights,
18
     decreed water rights, for the Mason Valley Refuge and also its
19
     state-issued permit for the fishery in Walker Lake itself.
20
                   THE COURT: Right. I don't think he was so much
21
     disparaging the state's efforts as he was saying we, Mineral
22
     County, have some distinguishable motivations and therefore as
23
     a basis for allowing us to intervene as well.
24
                   MS. ADAMS: Right. And, certainly, I'm not
25
     going to take issue with Mineral County's unique interest in
```

Case 3:73-cv-00128-MMD-CSD Document 732 Filed 11/01/2013 Page 24 of 51

```
this case, but would state here, and certainly will argue
 1
 2
     later, that it only makes sense for the state to administer a
 3
     public trust because we obviously have another Nevada county
     in this matter who may see the public trust quite differently.
 4
               I don't think I have a whole lot to add to this,
 5
     but, again, the NDOW laments the condition of Walker Lake and
 6
 7
     is certainly doing our part to work with the National Fish and
 8
     Wildlife Foundation to facilitate water going to the lake and
 9
     certainly historically has done its part in that regard as
     well.
10
11
               So I don't have a whole lot to argue to this, but --
12
                   THE COURT: Okay.
13
                   MS. ADAMS: Okay. Thank you.
14
                   THE COURT: And reply.
15
                   MR. HERSKOVITS: Yes. Thank you again, your
16
     Honor. This is Simeon Herskovits on behalf of Mineral County
17
     once more.
18
               I think I can be quite brief in this reply.
               Mr. DePaoli makes, in essence, I think, two primary
19
20
     objections to the granting of our motion for intervention, and
21
     I think both of them are misplaced and, respectfully, just
22
     mistaken.
23
               I think his sort of formalistic approach to the idea
24
     that a claim that is properly asserted in this court and
25
     within the overall confines of the single case, the C-125
```

```
proceeding that really embraces both our claim and the claims
 1
 2
     of the Tribe and the United States agencies --
 3
                   THE COURT: Basically what we're talking about
     is B and C still remain separate files. So, for example,
 4
     points and authorities in support of your petition in C would
 5
     be filed there, also your responses to motions to dismiss your
 6
 7
     petition.
 8
               But your opposition, or affirmance, of the Tribe's
 9
     petition in B, and other federal claims in B, would be filed
10
     in that file. It's still one case, but basically we still
11
     keep that distinguishing filing system so that we know which
12
     particular petitions we're talking about.
13
                   MR. HERSKOVITS: Yes, your Honor. That's my
     understanding of what you were suggesting would be the
14
15
     management or the approach to management of the case and the
     two subproceedings, and that is exactly what has been the
16
17
     practice up until this point under Judge Reed, and it makes
18
     perfect sense.
19
               It is true that the claim that Mineral County
20
     asserts is a different claim, and there are different legal
21
     bases for that claim than the Walker River Paiute Tribe and
22
     the United States federal agencies individual claims, and that
```

is nothing exceptional, and it's also not necessarily anything

particularly different from different types of counterclaims

or cross-claims that might be asserted by parties in various

23

24

25

1 proceedings and by intervenors in various proceedings.

In fact, it's clearly the case, that intervenors, particularly intervenors of right, have an appropriate right to raise additional issues or claims in a case if they're appropriately brought forward in the proceeding. They don't have to be specifically tailored only to the claims already asserted by the plaintiff when the intervenor comes into the case.

So I think that the argument that intervention should be denied and the exact same claim should be brought to the Court to be managed and resolved by the Court within the confines of the C-125 general proceeding, maybe a new subfile would be created, I think it really only would serve to burden and obstruct progress in the efficient resolution or disposition of the county's public trust claim.

I also would say that Mr. DePaoli overstates, quite frankly, I think, the differences or his characterization as the facts and law being completely unrelated and dissimilar in these cases.

I think the fact of the matter is, as the Nevada

Supreme Court seemed clearly to have recognized, and as -notwithstanding what he has said here, both the State of

Nevada and the Walker River Irrigation District did maintain
before the supreme court, the resolution of Mineral County's

public trust claim is essentially inextricable from the

```
disposition of -- or the decision how to manage and go forward
 1
 2
     with the enforcement of or the treatment of existing water
 3
     rights.
               So both with regard to the new claims being asserted
 4
 5
     by the Tribe and the United States, and the existing water
 6
     rights claims under the decree or otherwise, they are affected
 7
     inevitably by the public trust claim of Mineral County.
 8
               And, by the same token, the disposition of the
 9
     resolution of new claims for water rights, whether they're
10
     characterized as federal reserved water rights under the
     Winters Doctrine for the Tribe, or other reserved water rights
11
12
     of the federal agencies, there is an interplay and there is
     some aspect of considering the existence of state water
13
     rights, the relative priority of rights and the overall
14
15
     capacity or constraints that are properly held to apply to
     this system, the Walker River system as a whole.
16
17
               So I don't think it accurate at all to describe
18
     these as entirely separate and unrelated types of claims or
19
     issues, and I think that that is consistent with the record.
20
     It's consistent, in my reading at least, with both what with
21
     filings before the Nevada Supreme Court said --
22
                   THE COURT: Okay.
23
                   MR. HERSKOVITS: -- the supreme court's ruling
24
     and Judge Reed --
25
                   THE COURT: Okay. Taking that just a step
```

```
further, and trying to explore a little bit the underlying
 1
 2
     theory of your case, how does your right arise and what is the
 3
     priority of it?
               It arises upon the existence of the territory and/or
 4
     the state four years later, a couple of years later, and the
 5
     fact that you are entrusted then now as the new governing
 6
 7
     entity over prior federal lands or lands that were acquired by
 8
     way of treaty from others.
               You now hold in trust any and all incidents of
 9
     ownership and administration that come to you from the federal
10
11
     government. Is that the basis of your trust doctrine?
12
                   MR. HERSKOVITS: Well, roughly speaking, your
13
     Honor, I think that is.
               I think that as we read the law, the public trust
14
15
     doctrine, or the public trust duty and obligation that applies
     to the sovereign who governs or manages this water resource,
16
17
     is paramount to and precedes appropriative water rights that
18
     are permitted or that were vested before the creation of the
19
     water code in Nevada.
20
                   THE COURT: So, in other words, even if Nevada
21
     law at the time, or soon thereafter, did not contemplate in
22
     situ, without a withdrawal source, recognition of rights,
23
     rights in the river itself, or for recreation in a natural,
```

long-existing lake, or fisheries, a natural fishery that

24

25

existed in that lake.

```
Even if Nevada law at the time, or shortly
 1
 2
     thereafter when it was holding in trust, nevertheless -- and
 3
     it was in the process of granting recognized water rights to
     all those up and down the river during that period of time, it
 4
     nevertheless held in trust those obligations for such usage
 5
     and such protection all during the early years of its trust or
 6
 7
     trustee placement.
 8
               Is that consistent with what you're telling me?
 9
                   MR. HERSKOVITS: Well, yes, your Honor, although
10
     I would add that I think that the trust duties and obligations
     were in effect and did apply to either the state sovereigns
11
12
     that control the different portions of the Walker River Basin,
13
     or --
                   THE COURT: Well, I'm trying to explore why in
14
15
     the world you're bringing a trust theory. Because Nevada law
16
     now recognizes that you can get -- and federal law, that you
17
     can get in situ, you don't have a source, have to have a
18
     source of removal of the water. You can get in situ
19
     recognition, right?
20
               So why are you bringing a trust theory? Why don't
21
     you just make application from history day one and preceding
22
     history day one of the State of Nevada's involvement, this was
23
     a natural lake, it was a natural fishery, and there were usage
```

of waters from day one and before, and therefore we ask you,

Court, simply to require the State Engineer to recognize the

24

25

Case 3:73-cv-00128-MMD-CSD Document 732 Filed 11/01/2013 Page 30 of 51

```
right and to declare a priority way back when? Why aren't you
 1
 2
    bringing that theory rather than a trust theory?
 3
                   MR. HERSKOVITS: Well, your Honor, let me try
     and answer that in a couple of ways.
 4
 5
               One is that, in effect, we did bring essentially
     that kind of a claim or theory before the state supreme court
 6
 7
    because the state supreme court would be the appropriate
 8
     court, I think, if it were simply a matter of the State
 9
     Engineer needing to enforce state water rights.
10
               But because this is an interstate stream in this
11
     court, I don't believe --
12
                   THE COURT: And the supreme court recognized
     that there was a proceeding here.
13
14
                   MR. HERSKOVITS: Right.
15
                   THE COURT: And this was the best forum for the
     answering of the question anyway. That's why they said no, we
16
17
     think the federal court is the best place to answer that
18
     question.
19
                   MR. HERSKOVITS: Well, there are two things.
20
               First, in terms of framing the case as an
21
     application for some kind of a new right, or some right with a
22
    priority --
23
                   THE COURT: Well, I can see that you're not
24
     going to directly answer my question, so let me put it to you
25
     as the devil's advocate.
```

```
You want to avoid the in rem conclusion of res
 1
 2
     judicata. You want to avoid the prospect that you could not
 3
     obtain a right at this late date, or a declaration of a right
     at this late date, therefore you're pursuing constructive
 4
     trust -- or not constructive trust, but the public trust
 5
 6
     doctrine.
 7
                   MR. HERSKOVITS: Your Honor, that's not the
 8
    motivation for filing the case as a public trust doctrine
 9
     claim. I think it's actually an understanding that this is an
10
     obligation or a constraint on the system that is outside of,
11
     or paramount to, the entire priority hierarchy in the system,
12
     and also I would --
                   THE COURT: Assuming I accept your answer, or
13
     what I really think is maybe a nonanswer, let me again be the
14
15
     devil's advocate on your trust doctrine.
               If it's true, as what I'm thinking, the Court had in
16
17
     rem jurisdiction back in 1936, and certainly the whole world
18
     was bound with respect to the water course that the Court was
19
     decreeing, the State of Nevada was bound, too, and the State
20
     of Nevada was bound with respect to its public trust. It was
21
    bound by that decree.
22
               Now, it's true that you may be free to claim those
23
     rights, but they could not be claimed in derogation of rights
24
     that have already been declared with a priority date declared
25
     in the decree.
```

```
So even assuming you're claiming the trust doctrine,
 1
 2
     you, State of Nevada, and you, Mineral County, by virtue of
 3
     your party position relative to State Engineer proceedings,
     you were certainly parties or on notice that upstream users
 4
     were being granted permits, both groundwater permits, but,
 5
     more importantly, surface water permits.
 6
 7
               And, of course, I don't want this to be a
 8
     disparagement of your position because I recognize you're
     saying some more recent events is what has really caused the
 9
10
     problem for Walker Lake. I realize that. In fact, in the
     original petition in '95, '94, you're saying that the board,
11
12
     the California board's recent regulations and restrictions are
13
     creating a large problem for you.
               Nevertheless, I don't know how, even with the public
14
15
     trust doctrine, you can defend yourself against a claim that
     that original decree is binding upon you.
16
17
                   MR. HERSKOVITS: Well, your Honor, I think if we
18
     are going to address and brief and argue jurisdictional
19
     questions and res judicata questions at another time, I would
20
     prefer to go into those --
21
                   THE COURT: We are at another time.
22
                   MR. HERSKOVITS: -- in-depth and in detail.
23
               But respectfully, of course, Mineral County
24
     disagrees with the understanding the Court has just
     articulated for a couple of reasons.
25
```

```
One, I think it's a simple fact in the record that
 1
 2
     neither Mineral County nor the State of Nevada actually were
 3
     parties, and Mineral County did not receive any kind of notice
     of the original decree litigation.
 4
               And I think it's fair, and I was going to point this
 5
     out earlier --
 6
 7
                   THE COURT: But Mineral County was a user -- you
 8
     know, I don't want to argue the point finally with you today
 9
     because, like you say, it's another day. But Mineral County
10
     was a user, you were in existence at the time of the decree,
11
     right?
12
                   MR. HERSKOVITS: Mineral County was certainly in
     existence. I don't think --
13
                   THE COURT: You were enjoying the same benefits
14
15
     that you cite in your petition for intervention. You were
     enjoying the same benefits, the taxation rights that existed
16
17
     at the time of the original decree?
18
                   MR. HERSKOVITS: Yes, that is correct, your
19
     Honor.
20
                   THE COURT: So I just think you're bound. You
21
     may not be the only one arguing against this, the State of
22
     Nevada, for example, Wildlife.
23
               You know, there's lots of new avenues to protect
24
     rights in the river including the Endangered Species Act. The
25
     implication -- nasty implication that I'm giving that this was
```

```
and is an in rem proceeding with respect to this side of the
 1
 2
    border is that any and all parties, any and all parties that
 3
     have endangered species claims affecting the river should now
     stand up or forever hold their peace.
 4
 5
               I can't say that with respect to a future endangered
 6
     species, one that's declared hereafter, of course, but any
 7
     that exist now, to the extent this is an in rem proceeding,
 8
     now is the time to stand up and file not only a B and C, but a
 9
     D, E and F.
10
               If they want to be heard otherwise, as far as I'm
     concerned, they'll be bound. Even if they're a French
11
12
     organization or anybody else. This is an in rem proceeding
     with respect to this side of the border on the water course
13
     and the surface rights, not on the groundwater rights, but on
14
15
     the surface rights.
16
               So that has some very broad implications. I think
17
     that I am dealing with the world over this water course from
18
     the border down to the lake. That's my present impression.
19
               And, again, I'm not -- that is one of the reasons
20
21
```

I'm granting the motion to intervene, but I'm not making final ruling on that, I'm reserving your opportunity to talk about, but the main reasons I would be granting your petition in B, your motion to intervene in B -- I think you've got a right to file it in C anyway.

22

23

24

25

MR. HERSKOVITS: It's the other way -- oh, in C,

```
I understand.
 1
 2
                   THE COURT: But in B you've got the right to
 3
     intervene because your rights, regardless of Mr. DePaoli's
     arguments, are going to be affected when I grant the B
 4
    petition.
 5
 6
                   MR. HERSKOVITS: Yes.
 7
                   THE COURT: And you'll either want to affirm
 8
     their rights or oppose them in certain respects because there
 9
     is an effect upon you.
10
               And I think -- so undoubtedly your rights, certainly
     even under the public trust doctrine, will be affected by what
11
12
     happens in B, and therefore I think I have to grant your
     motion.
13
               But I also think for a second reason, that this side
14
15
     of the border, because it is and was an in rem, proceeding as
     well as in personam, I also have to grant your right to
16
17
     intervene because those issues will come up in B, let alone in
18
     C, and you have to be heard on those questions when they come
19
     up.
20
               So those would be the two major reasons I would be
21
     granting your motion.
22
                   MR. HERSKOVITS: Well, your Honor, of course, we
23
     agree with that.
                   THE COURT: Yeah, maybe not with the
24
25
     jurisdiction issues.
```

Case 3:73-cv-00128-MMD-CSD Document 732 Filed 11/01/2013 Page 36 of 51

```
MR. HERSKOVITS: Well, I appreciate your
 1
 2
     explanation of at least your current perspective or
 3
     inclination --
                   THE COURT: Right.
 4
                   MR. HERSKOVITS: -- with regard to jurisdiction,
 5
     and I don't consider that an invitation to engage in further
 6
 7
     argument on that issue right now.
 8
                   THE COURT: That's right.
 9
                   MR. HERSKOVITS: And I am finished except I
10
     would just point out that -- well, I think we've argued it in
11
     our brief, and it seems like, your Honor, that the Court is
12
     inclined to agree with us.
               I think the state -- basically the track record here
13
     just simply doesn't back up an argument that it provides
14
15
     adequate representation of the same interests or claims
16
     that --
17
                   THE COURT: Right. You're not disparaging their
18
     representation, but you're just saying you have different
19
     interests.
20
                   MR. HERSKOVITS: Yes. And I understand why
21
     Ms. Adams characterized it as disparagement. I think from the
22
     county's perspective, the state simply has not aggressively or
23
     effectively defended or protected the rights or --
24
                   THE COURT: They do have every motivation to
25
    protect Walker Lake and especially the stream flowing into it
```

```
and the fishery rights. They're with you on that one. But no
 1
 2
     doubt about it they have some broader interests, including
 3
     upstream and upstream of Mineral County. So no doubt about
     it, they have some broader interests as well just like the
 4
     government does with regard to the Tribe --
 5
 6
                   MR. HERSKOVITS: Yes.
 7
                   THE COURT: -- that I pointed out to counsel
 8
     last time.
 9
               Okay. So I'm going to grant this petition. I'll
10
     ask you for a simple order. I've given my reasons here on the
11
              There will need to be a transcript of this proceeding
12
     docketed into the file, please, both B and C.
               And I've given my reasons. They are for the four
13
     reasons, assessment of motions to intervene contained in the
14
15
    moving parties' papers, and they're for the two substantial
     reasons that I've given here, one, because your rights are
16
17
     substantially affected by whatever we do in B, and because I
18
    believe this to be an in rem proceeding, and to that extent,
19
     and to the extent we're arguing those issues in B, your rights
20
     in C will be substantially affected as well, therefore I must
21
     grant the motion to intervene.
22
               And I'll call, please, for just a simple order that
23
     grants the motion to be docketed in all of those separate
24
     files.
25
               What other matters should we address today?
```

```
MR. HERSKOVITS: There are none that I have to
 1
 2
    present to the Court, your Honor.
 3
                   THE COURT: Okay. Please, Mr. DePaoli.
                   MR. DePAOLI: Your Honor, Gordon DePaoli on
 4
 5
    behalf of the district.
 6
               A question that I have in my mind is that once that
 7
     order is entered -- and my understanding with intervention is
 8
     that at that point the proposed amended complaint in
     intervention would be filed.
 9
10
               And I guess the question I would have is we will
11
     need to make it clear whether folks and, if so, what folks
12
     need to respond to that complaint and when and all that sort
     of thing.
13
14
                   THE COURT: Very good point.
15
               Now, B is the tribes, right? C is this motion in
16
     intervention the way Judge Reed delineated it, right?
17
                   MR. DePAOLI: Yes, your Honor.
18
                   THE COURT: So that complaint should be filed in
19
     C. I'm allowing you to intervene for purposes of filing that
20
     complaint in C, but I'm also allowing you to intervene in B so
21
     that in any and all positions relative to the Tribe's right
22
     you have the ability to stand up.
23
               With regard to service, my view is, to the extent
24
     that Mineral County's rights, if recognized and granted by
25
     this Court, would affect all upstream users, including some of
```

```
the groundwater users to the same extent that Judge Reed
 1
 2
     identified them for the Tribe's use, that they should serve
 3
     the same people.
               We will make it as easy as possible, but -- through
 4
     website, through other -- the service through the means that
 5
     we've already established, we'll make it much easier than
 6
 7
     personal service.
 8
               You'll be able to serve those same people, for
 9
     example, that have entered appearances on the website who want
10
     to be served by mail, or who want to be served simply by the
11
     website. You'll be able to use those same abilities,
12
     processes to do your service.
               And I am expanding the order that applied to B to C
13
     as well. Both discovery, website, service, I'm expanding it
14
15
     to C as well as B. That's the primary implication of granting
16
     the motion.
17
               And in answer to your question, they'll have to go
18
     through the same processes and services visited upon the Tribe
19
     themselves, but hopefully it will be a lot easier and a lot
20
     less costly at this late date.
21
               What else? Do we need to clarify that further?
22
                   MR. DePAOLI: Well, I guess when that service
23
     takes place, will parties be notified that they must respond
24
     to that complaint with an answer, your Honor, within 20 days
```

or -- that's kind of the question that I'm thinking we need to

25

```
1
     address so that everyone knows what they should do or not do.
 2
                   THE COURT: It is by way of complaint, and just
 3
     using it to normal cases where we have cross-claims and new
     third-party defendants, they're required to file an answer,
 4
     aren't they?
 5
 6
                   MR. HERSKOVITS: Your Honor --
 7
                   THE COURT: Judge Reed, of course, held off the
 8
     requirement. There is no requirement that anybody even answer
 9
     the Tribe's complaint yet, is there?
10
                   MR. HERSKOVITS: No, that's correct, your Honor.
11
               And even in the C case Judge Reed entered an order
12
     requiring people or defendants who were served to enter
     appearances but not to file any answer to the complaint or any
13
     response to the motion until further direction from the Court.
14
15
                   THE COURT: Now, this is for another day, but
16
     shouldn't I ultimately abrogate the need for defendants in any
17
     of these cases to answer?
18
               I am requiring them to enter appearance. And, of
19
     course, to the extent they don't enter appearance, we do need
20
     dates certain, by dates certain, I will deem them to be
21
     subject to the Court's jurisdiction. And I've already
22
     implicated that -- implied that with respect to the Tribe's
23
     petition.
24
               Those who don't respond, I think my in rem attitude
25
     covers them. In other words, those that don't respond, or who
```

```
could argue at some later date we were never validly served
 1
 2
     under federal or state service rules, I think we do need to
 3
     have a final service required by publication that makes it
     very clear that anybody who might hereafter claim that due
 4
     process -- under due process they were not served, that they
 5
     were served for in rem purposes.
 6
 7
               I can't apply that so far to the California side or
 8
     upstream beyond who has already been served as part of this
 9
     lawsuit, but I can with respect to the water stream and the
10
     watersheds below the border.
11
               So I think the in rem theory covers the rest.
12
               So it's for another day, but be thinking about that.
     Shouldn't I abrogate altogether an obligation that these
13
     thousands of people answer, and, if they don't answer, they
14
15
     default.
16
               I think what I do, rather, is give them the right to
17
     appear, and I make it very clear to them that if they don't
18
     appear, either by mail or website or e-mail service, they will
19
     be bound regardless. Then I've satisfied the ends of due
20
     process.
21
               So be thinking about that one, and answer -- I don't
22
     think I can answer the question yet. Judge Reed put it off,
23
     he did not require an answer at this juncture, but one way to
     satisfy it is to abrogate the need.
24
```

We just say these are the people that clearly have

25

Case 3:73-cv-00128-MMD-CSD Document 732 Filed 11/01/2013 Page 42 of 51

```
appeared, these are the people that haven't. As to those that
 1
 2
     haven't, I have in rem jurisdiction over their rights in the
 3
     river, but otherwise I don't have in personam jurisdiction
     over them, and I'm not going to take default against them.
 4
     Think about that one.
 5
 6
               What else needs to be clarified today?
 7
               Okay. We're on kind of a new course, but hopefully
 8
    we can deal with it.
 9
                   MR. HERSKOVITS: Your Honor, I do actually have
10
     one last question. Again, this is Simeon Herskovits for
11
     Mineral County.
12
               And it's just -- I want to make sure, my sense from
     what you said earlier is that you'd prefer me to keep the
13
    proposed order for the ruling on the motion for intervention
14
15
    very simple.
                  The --
16
                   THE COURT: Simple. My reasons are here on the
17
     record.
18
                   MR. HERSKOVITS: These separate issues can be
19
     addressed with both your Honor and Magistrate Judge Cobb in
20
     crafting a modified or new case management order applying it
21
     to the C as well as the B case.
22
                   THE COURT: Yeah. I just want you to give me a
23
     simple order that grants the motion.
24
                   MR. HERSKOVITS: Yes, your Honor, I'll do that.
25
                   THE COURT:
                               Thank you, folks.
```

Case 3:73-cv-00128-MMD-CSD Document 732 Filed 11/01/2013 Page 43 of 51

```
The government doesn't have anything to say?
 1
 2
                   MR. GUARINO: No, your Honor, thank you.
 3
                   THE COURT: Awesome. Okay. Thank you so much.
 4
     I appreciate your attention today.
 5
                   MR. HERSKOVITS: Thank you, your Honor.
 6
                                  -000-
 7
 8
              I certify that the foregoing is a correct
              transcript from the record of proceedings
 9
              in the above-entitled matter.
10
              /s/Margaret E. Griener
                                              11/1/2013
               Margaret E. Griener, CCR #3, RDR
11
               Official Reporter
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

				 1
	22:20, 36:21	3:6, 6:14	10:13, 10:16, 28:17	became [1] - 20:17
-	·		, ,	
101	ADAMS [5] - 2:23,	Almendras [1] - 6:14	argue [7] - 9:14,	BEFORE [1] - 1:2
'94 [1] - 32:11	5:15, 22:19, 23:24,	almost [1] - 9:12	22:14, 24:1, 24:11,	beginning [1] - 17:21
'95 [1] - 32:11	24:13	alone [1] - 35:17	32:18, 33:8, 41:1	behalf [5] - 4:21, 12:4,
	add [2] - 24:5, 29:10	altogether [2] - 14:22,	argued [2] - 22:22,	23:14, 24:16, 38:5
/	added [1] - 14:9	41:13	36:10	below [1] - 41:10
-	adding [1] - 12:19	amended [2] - 10:10,	arguing [2] - 33:21,	benefits [2] - 33:14,
/s/Margaret [1] - 43:10	additional [3] - 16:21,	38:8	37:19	33:16
G 13	17:22, 26:4	AMERICA [1] - 1:4	argument [7] - 8:2,	BENESCH [2] - 2:20,
1	additions [1] - 22:21	analysis [1] - 21:16	8:8, 17:8, 17:13,	5:9
· '	address [3] - 32:18,	AND [4] - 2:23, 3:6,	26:9, 36:7, 36:14	Benesch [1] - 5:10
11/1/2013 [1] - 43:10	37:25, 40:1		arguments [4] - 9:4,	
127 [1] - 4:9	,	3:9, 3:12	•	best [3] - 8:11, 30:15,
1859 [1] - 21:5	addressed [2] - 7:6,	ANDREW [1] - 1:15	9:16, 11:25, 35:4	30:17
	42:19	Annadel [1] - 6:14	arise [2] - 22:8, 28:2	between [2] - 18:19,
1936 [1] - 31:17	addressing [3] - 8:4,	ANNADEL [1] - 3:6	arises [1] - 28:4	20:14
1:30 [1] - 4:1	8:5, 23:5	answer [15] - 30:4,	articulated [1] - 32:25	beyond [2] - 12:20,
	adequate [1] - 36:15	30:17, 30:24, 31:13,	aside [2] - 15:21, 19:6	41:8
2	adjacent [2] - 15:23,	39:17, 39:24, 40:4,	aspect [1] - 27:13	bifurcate [2] - 7:12,
	16:15	40:8, 40:13, 40:17,	assert [5] - 12:11,	8:17
20 [1] - 39:24	adjust [2] - 13:1,	41:14, 41:21, 41:22,	14:21, 18:20, 21:4,	bifurcated [3] - 8:16,
2001 [1] - 13:5	13:19	41:23	22:13	11:8, 11:9
2013 [2] - 1:9, 4:1	administer [1] - 24:2	answered [1] - 11:24	asserted [6] - 10:12,	· ·
23 [2] - 1:9, 4:1			,	bifurcation [2] - 7:10,
[_],	administration [2] -	answering [2] - 8:25,	10:17, 24:24, 25:25,	7:17
3	23:6, 28:10	30:16	26:7, 27:4	binding [1] - 32:16
3	advocate [2] - 30:25,	Antelope [1] - 16:11	asserting [4] - 16:9,	bit [4] - 10:24, 13:24,
3 [2] - 1:23, 43:10	31:15	anyway [2] - 30:16,	17:4, 21:24, 21:25	17:16, 28:1
3:73-CV-125-RCJ-	affect [10] - 10:21,	34:24	asserts [1] - 25:20	Board [2] - 6:4, 6:19
	13:16, 16:6, 16:9,	apparent [1] - 10:20	assessment [1] -	BOARD [2] - 2:7, 2:11
WCG [1] - 1:7	17:5, 20:12, 20:21,	appeal [1] - 7:24	37:14	board [3] - 12:16,
3:73-CV-127-RCJ-	21:10, 38:25	appear [2] - 41:17,	Assistant [2] - 1:16,	17:20, 32:11
WGC [1] - 1:7	affected [7] - 8:10,	41:18	1:18	board's [1] - 32:12
3:73-CV-128-RCJ-	8:23, 27:6, 35:4,	appearance [3] - 4:14,	assuming [2] - 31:13,	Boise [1] - 1:19
WGC [1] - 1:8	35:11, 37:17, 37:20	40:18, 40:19	32:1	border [8] - 17:17,
	affecting [2] - 10:18,	APPEARANCES [3] -	attention [1] - 43:4	17:19, 34:2, 34:13,
4	34:3	1:14, 2:1, 3:1	attitude [1] - 40:24	34:18, 35:15, 41:10
	affects [2] - 11:5, 21:9	appearances [3] -	Attorney [16] - 1:18,	bound [8] - 14:18,
400 [1] - 1:24	affirm [1] - 35:7	6:21, 39:9, 40:13	2:2, 2:8, 2:10, 2:13,	31:18, 31:19, 31:20,
	affirmance [1] - 25:8		2:15, 2:17, 2:20,	
8	afternoon [13] - 4:15,	Appearances [2] - 1:22, 2:25	2:23, 3:3, 3:7, 3:9,	31:21, 33:20, 34:11, 41:19
_	• • •			
89501 [1] - 1:24	4:20, 4:23, 5:5, 5:9, 5:15, 5:10, 5:22, 6:1	appeared [1] - 42:1	3:12, 4:17, 6:11, 6:15	Bridgeport [2] - 16:18,
	5:15, 5:19, 5:23, 6:1,	applicable [1] - 20:18		16:25
Α	6:9, 9:9, 12:3, 22:19	applicants [2] - 11:10,	Attorneys [2] - 1:16,	brief [3] - 24:18,
	agencies [5] - 6:12,	14:2	2:5	32:18, 36:11
abilities [1] - 39:11	6:16, 25:2, 25:22,	application [2] -	Audubon [1] - 19:24	briefing [2] - 7:16,
ability [1] - 38:22	27:12	29:21, 30:21	authorities [1] - 25:5	8:17
able [2] - 39:8, 39:11	AGENCIES [1] - 3:6	applied [1] - 39:13	avenues [1] - 33:23	briefs [1] - 9:16
above-entitled [1] -	aggressively [1] -	applies [1] - 28:15	avoid [2] - 31:1, 31:2	bring [2] - 21:19, 30:5
43:9	36:22	apply [3] - 27:15,	awesome [1] - 43:3	bringing [3] - 29:15,
abrogate [3] - 40:16,	agree [3] - 9:15,	29:11, 41:7		29:20, 30:2
	35:23, 36:12	applying [2] - 11:18,	В	brings [1] - 17:16
41:13, 41:24	agreement [1] - 9:13	42:20	_	broad [1] - 34:16
accept [1] - 31:13	ahead [1] - 18:9	appreciate [4] - 11:11,	Bar [1] - 5:21	broader [2] - 37:2,
accord [4] - 7:2, 7:3,	al [1] - 1:10	17:15, 36:1, 43:4	BAR [1] - 3:9	37:4
7:11, 14:23	alleged [1] - 13:1	approach [2] - 24:23,	based [5] - 12:6, 19:5,	brought [2] - 26:5,
accordingly [2] - 8:11,	allow [2] - 8:7, 21:19	25:15	19:21, 23:17	26:10
11:9	allowed [2] - 7:10,		bases [1] - 25:21	
accurate [1] - 27:17	18:13	appropriate [2] - 26:3,	basic [1] - 8:18	Bryan [1] - 5:17
acquired [1] - 28:7		30:7	Basin [1] - 29:12	BRYAN [1] - 2:23
Act [1] - 33:24	allowing [3] - 23:23,	appropriately [1] -		burden [1] - 26:13
Adams [3] - 5:16,	38:19, 38:20	26:5	basis [2] - 23:23,	
Adams [3] - 5:16,	38:19, 38:20 ALMENDRAS [2] -	26:5 appropriative [३] -	28:11	

8:24, 9:8, 9:11,

15:20, 18:12, 18:14,

18:20, 18:22, 19:3,

C

C-125 [2] - 24:25, 26:12 C-125-B [1] - 1:5 C-125-C [1] - 1:6 C-125-RCJ [1] - 1:5 calendar [2] - 4:8, 9:4 CALIFORNIA [2] -2:10, 3:6 California [24] - 2:11, 2:18, 3:7, 6:10, 6:11, 6:15, 6:16, 6:18, 12:16, 14:8, 14:19, 14:25, 15:3, 15:7, 15:14, 15:16, 15:17, 17:8, 17:20, 19:24, 22:1, 32:12, 41:7 cannot [1] - 20:21 capacity [1] - 27:15 Carson [2] - 2:8, 2:24 case [34] - 7:3, 7:15, 7:16, 7:18, 8:16, 9:25, 10:25, 11:9, 13:6, 13:18, 13:24, 14:1, 14:11, 16:13, 16:17, 19:12, 19:15, 19:24, 22:3, 23:15, 23:17, 24:1, 24:25, 25:10, 25:15, 26:2, 26:4, 26:8, 28:2, 30:20, 31:8, 40:11, 42:20, 42:21 cases [3] - 26:19, 40:3, 40:17 categories [1] - 15:8 caused [1] - 32:9 CCR [2] - 1:23, 43:10 centered [1] - 8:18 certain [3] - 35:8, 40:20 certainly [9] - 12:1, 23:24, 24:1, 24:7, 24:9, 31:17, 32:4, 33:12, 35:10 certify [1] - 43:8 cetera [1] - 8:6 change [1] - 19:16 changed [1] - 7:3 characterization [1] -26:17 characterized [2] -27:10, 36:21 CHIEF [1] - 1:2 chooses [1] - 18:14 **CIRCLE** [1] - 3:9 Circle [1] - 5:21 Circuit [1] - 16:13 cite [1] - 33:15

City [2] - 2:8, 2:24

claim [39] - 10:12, 10:20, 12:13, 13:2, 18:20, 18:23, 19:3, 19:5, 19:20, 20:12, 20:15, 20:20, 20:25, 21:5, 21:9, 21:14, 21:15. 21:24. 21:25. 22:4, 22:6, 22:12, 22:16, 23:7, 24:24, 25:1, 25:19, 25:20, 25:21, 26:10, 26:15, 26:25, 27:7, 30:6, 31:9, 31:22, 32:15, 41.4 claimants [2] - 10:12, 10.16 claimed [2] - 20:15, 31:23 claiming [1] - 32:1 claims [24] - 10:18, 16:2, 16:3, 16:8, 18:21, 18:24, 19:2, 20:3, 20:9, 20:11, 25:1, 25:9, 25:22, 25:25, 26:4, 26:6, 27:4, 27:6, 27:9, 27:18, 34:3, 36:15, 40:3 clarification [1] -11:11 clarified [1] - 42:6 clarify [1] - 39:21 clear [5] - 13:19, 16:10, 38:11, 41:4, 41:17 clearly [8] - 11:12, 15:2, 17:20, 22:10, 26:2, 26:21, 41:25 climb [1] - 12:5 Cobb [2] - 7:20, 42:19 code [1] - 28:19 Colorado [1] - 1:17 comments [1] - 12:6 COMMISSIONERS [1] - 2.8 Commissioners [1] -6:5 commissioners [1] -18:15 complaint [10] - 10:10, 12:25, 38:8, 38:12, 38:18, 38:20, 39:24, 40:2, 40:9, 40:13 complete [1] - 9:13 completely [1] - 26:18 complicated [1] - 20:7 concerned [3] - 8:8, 17:1, 34:11

conclusion [1] - 31:1

condition [1] - 24:6

conference [1] - 11:13 confines [2] - 24:25, 26:12 consider [1] - 36:6 consideration [1] -20.4 considered [2] - 17:7, 18:25 considering [1] -27:13 consistent [3] - 27:19, 27:20, 29:8 constitutions [1] -19:22 constraint [1] - 31:10 constraints [1] - 27:15 constructive [2] -31:4, 31:5 construed [1] - 14:7 consumers [1] - 15:23 contained [1] - 37:14 contemplate [1] -28:21 contemporaneous [1] - 11:3 contending [2] -13:11, 19:18 context [3] - 12:12, 19:24, 21:22 continue [1] - 1:22 Continued [2] - 2:1, continued [1] - 2:25 contradictory [1] -7.25 Control [1] - 6:19 control [1] - 29:12 **CONTROL** [1] - 2:10 converting [2] - 11:16, 11:17 corporation [1] - 1:9 correct [5] - 13:17, 19:19, 33:18, 40:10, corresponds [1] -13:23 costly [1] - 39:20 coterminous [2] -11:3, 11:10 counsel [2] - 4:16, 37:7 counterclaim [2] -12:12, 22:16 counterclaims [2] -23:5, 25:24 COUNTY [3] - 2:12, 2:17, 2:20 county [2] - 23:1, 24:3 County [33] - 4:17, 4:18, 5:10, 6:2, 8:9,

19:18, 21:4, 21:24, 22:4, 22:13, 22:25, 23:22, 24:16, 25:19, 27:7, 32:2, 32:23, 33:2. 33:3. 33:7. 33:9, 33:12, 37:3, 42:11 county's [2] - 26:15, 36:22 County's [20] - 4:8, 6:23, 8:14, 9:23, 10:3, 10:10, 12:10, 16:2, 18:6, 20:12, 20:14, 20:20, 20:25, 21:9, 21:14, 22:6, 23:9, 23:25, 26:24, 38:24 couple [3] - 28:5, 30:4, 32:25 course [21] - 4:8, 7:18, 8:2, 8:11, 9:5, 9:6, 9:22, 11:15, 14:24, 17:22, 18:4, 31:18, 32:7, 32:23, 34:6, 34:13, 34:17, 35:22, 40:7, 40:19, 42:7 Court [26] - 10:9, 12:9, 12:10, 13:5, 14:3, 14:18, 19:25, 22:10, 22:15, 22:23, 23:2, 23:3, 23:6, 23:9, 26:11, 26:21, 27:21, 29:25, 31:16, 31:18, 32:24, 36:11, 38:2, 38:25, 40:14 court [15] - 6:24, 13:6, 13:8, 13:13, 13:15, 14:7, 22:10, 24:24, 26:24, 30:6, 30:7, 30:8, 30:11, 30:12, 30:17 COURT [74] - 1:1, 4:4, 4:19, 4:22, 4:25, 5:3, 5:8, 5:11, 5:14, 5:18, 5:22, 5:25, 6:3, 6:6, 6:13, 6:17, 6:20, 9:19, 10:19, 11:14, 11:22, 12:1, 12:7, 12:15, 12:19, 12:22, 13:12, 13:15, 13:23, 15:5, 15:9, 15:12, 15:21, 16:5, 16:12, 17:12, 17:15, 18:3, 18:9, 22:18, 23:20, 24:12, 24:14, 25:3, 27:22, 27:25, 28:20, 29:14, 30:12, 30:15,

30:23, 31:13, 32:21, 33:7, 33:14, 33:20, 35:2, 35:7, 35:24, 36:4, 36:8, 36:17, 36:24, 37:7, 38:3, 38:14, 38:18, 40:2, 40:7, 40:15, 42:16, 42:22, 42:25, 43:3 court's [3] - 13:7, 13:20, 27:23 Court's [2] - 9:14, 40:21 courtroom [2] - 4:13, 5:17 covers [2] - 40:25, 41:11 crafting [1] - 42:20 created [1] - 26:13 creating [1] - 32:13 creation [1] - 28:18 cross [4] - 12:13, 22:16, 25:25, 40:3 cross-claim [2] -12:13, 22:16 cross-claims [2] -25:25, 40:3 current [2] - 10:2, 36:2

D

Dale [1] - 5:6 **DALE** [1] - 2:5 date [7] - 19:10, 31:3, 31:4, 31:24, 39:20, 41:1 dates [2] - 40:20 **DAVID** [1] - 1:18 David [1] - 5:1 days [1] - 39:24 deal [1] - 42:8 dealing [1] - 34:17 decision [3] - 13:8, 14:18, 27:1 decisions [1] - 14:7 declaration [1] - 31:3 declare [1] - 30:1 declared [3] - 31:24, 34:6 decree [13] - 10:15, 13:15, 15:4, 21:7, 22:10, 27:6, 31:21, 31:25, 32:16, 33:4, 33:10, 33:17 Decree [2] - 12:25, 19:17 decreed [1] - 23:18 decreeing [1] - 31:19 deem [1] - 40:20 deemed [2] - 19:9, 20:22

effectively [1] - 36:23

efficacy [1] - 8:12

efficient [1] - 26:14

default [2] - 41:15, 42:4 defeat [2] - 20:24, 21:14 defend [1] - 32:15 defendant [1] - 18:15 Defendants [1] - 1:11 defendants [5] -12:14, 22:2, 40:4, 40:12, 40:16 defended [1] - 36:23 delay [2] - 22:5, 22:6 delineated [1] - 38:16 denied [1] - 26:10 Denver [1] - 1:17 DePaoli [30] - 2:4, 5:5, 5:6, 12:3, 12:4, 12:8, 12:17, 12:21, 12:23, 13:14, 13:17, 15:2, 15:7, 15:10, 15:13, 15:25, 16:7, 17:3, 17:13, 17:24, 18:8, 18:11, 22:21, 24:19, 26:16, 38:3, 38:4, 38:17, 39:22 **DePaoli's** [1] - 35:3 Department [5] - 5:16, 22:20, 22:23, 23:14, 23:16 **DEPARTMENT** [1] -2:23 depth [1] - 32:22 **Deputies** [1] - 2:23 Deputy [2] - 2:10, 3:7 derogation [1] - 31:23 describe [1] - 27:17 detail [2] - 18:1, 32:22 detailed [1] - 14:6 determination [1] -16:1 determine [2] - 13:8, 22.11 determined [2] - 16:5, 16:7 devil's [2] - 30:25, 31:15 differences [1] - 26:17 different [15] - 7:15, 8:21, 9:6, 19:2, 20:8, 21:22, 22:8, 25:20, 25:24, 29:12, 36:18 differently [1] - 24:4 direction [2] - 7:4, 40:14 directly [1] - 30:24 disagree [3] - 10:8, 10:19, 18:22 disagreement [1] -10:24

disagrees [1] - 32:24

discovery [1] - 39:14 dismiss [5] - 7:6, 8:17, 18:5, 18:6, 25:6 dismissal [1] - 7:22 disparagement [2] -32:8, 36:21 disparages [1] - 23:13 disparaging [2] -23:21, 36:17 disposition [3] -26:15, 27:1, 27:8 dissimilar [1] - 26:18 distinction [1] - 15:22 distinguish [1] - 15:22 distinguishable [1] -23:22 distinguishing [1] -25:11 District [5] - 2:15, 4:7, 4:17, 5:7, 26:23 district [5] - 11:2, 12:4, 12:15, 13:3, **DISTRICT** [5] - 1:1, 1:1, 1:2, 1:9, 2:5 docketed [2] - 37:12, 37:23 doctrine [12] - 19:25, 20:17, 20:21, 21:2, 28:11, 28:15, 31:6, 31:8, 31:15, 32:1, 32:15, 35:11 Doctrine [1] - 27:11 domestic [3] - 15:14, 16:10 Don [1] - 5:24 **DON** [1] - 3:12 done [1] - 24:9 dormant [2] - 15:16, 15:18 doubt [4] - 8:9, 16:23, 37:2, 37:3 down [4] - 16:22, 16:23, 29:4, 34:18 due [4] - 14:16, 41:4, 41:5, 41:19 during [2] - 29:4, 29:6

Ε

duties [1] - 29:10

duty [1] - 28:15

e-mail [1] - 41:18 early [1] - 29:6 easier [3] - 11:15, 39:6, 39:19 easy [1] - 39:4 echoing [1] - 16:13 effect [3] - 29:11, 30:5, 35:9 effort [1] - 19:15 efforts [2] - 23:13, 23:21 either [6] - 12:24, 15:19, 20:16, 29:11, 35:7, 41:18 EI [1] - 2:13 elements [1] - 23:9 embraces [1] - 25:1 emphasize [1] - 13:13 end [1] - 12:9 Endangered [1] -33:24 endangered [2] - 34:3, 34:5 ends [1] - 41:19 enforce [1] - 30:9 enforcement [1] - 27:2 engage [1] - 36:6 Engineer [4] - 13:18, 29:25, 30:9, 32:3 enjoying [2] - 33:14, 33:16 enter [4] - 23:17, 40:12, 40:18, 40:19 entered [3] - 38:7, 39:9, 40:11 entire [2] - 23:15, 31:11 entirely [3] - 18:18, 21:21, 27:18 entitled [1] - 43:9 entity [1] - 28:7 entrusted [1] - 28:6 enures [1] - 23:10 **Equity** [1] - 1:5 ERIN [1] - 2:10 Erin [1] - 6:18 especially [2] - 7:1, 36:25 essence [2] - 15:18, 24:19 essentially [3] - 20:17, 26:25, 30:5 established [2] -20:19, 39:6 et [2] - 1:9, 8:6 events [1] - 32:9 exact [1] - 26:10 exactly [1] - 25:16 example [6] - 18:5, 19:23, 21:3, 25:4, 33:22, 39:9 except [1] - 36:9

exist [6] - 19:9, 19:10, 19:13, 19:14, 20:22, 34:7 existed [3] - 20:16, 28:25, 33:16 existence [5] - 20:23, 27:13, 28:4, 33:10, 33:13 existing [8] - 13:1, 13:9, 20:6, 20:19, 22:11, 27:2, 27:5, 28:24 exists [1] - 20:15 expanding [2] - 39:13, 39:14 explanation [1] - 36:2 explore [2] - 28:1, 29:14 extent [8] - 16:20, 17:18, 34:7, 37:18, 37:19, 38:23, 39:1, 40:19

F

facilitate [1] - 24:8

fact [9] - 7:18, 10:9,

21:4, 22:25, 26:2,

26:20, 28:6, 32:10,

facts [4] - 20:8, 21:22,

22:8, 26:18

fair [1] - 33:5

fairly [1] - 12:5

34:10, 41:7

far [4] - 8:8, 17:1,

factual [1] - 19:5

33:1

FARM [1] - 3:3 Farms [2] - 5:13, 5:21 **FARMS** [1] - 3:9 fashion [5] - 10:4, 13:10, 18:14, 19:16, 21.1 federal [14] - 6:24, 18:24, 19:5, 20:15, 21:9, 25:9, 25:22, 27:10, 27:12, 28:7, 28:10, 29:16, 30:17, 41:2 **FERGUSON** [1] - 2:5 Ferguson [1] - 5:6 file [8] - 7:14, 25:10, 34:8, 34:24, 37:12, 40:4, 40:13 filed [5] - 4:9, 25:6, 25:9, 38:9, 38:18 files [8] - 7:10, 7:12, 7:17, 8:16, 8:20, 11:8, 25:4, 37:24 filing [5] - 7:13, 23:10,

filings [1] - 27:21 final [3] - 9:20, 34:20, 41:3 finally [1] - 33:8 fine [1] - 9:19 finished [1] - 36:9 first [2] - 9:8, 30:20 FISH [1] - 3:12 Fish [2] - 5:24, 24:7 fisheries [1] - 28:24 fishery [4] - 23:19, 28:24, 29:23, 37:1 flip [1] - 20:23 flowing [3] - 16:22, 16:23, 36:25 folks [3] - 38:11, 42:25 **FOR** [13] - 1:15, 2:2, 2:4, 2:7, 2:10, 2:12, 2:17, 2:20, 2:23, 3:3, 3:6, 3:9, 3:12 foregoing [1] - 43:8 Forest [2] - 8:24, 9:23 forever [1] - 34:4 formalistic [1] - 24:23 forum [3] - 13:8, 23:7, 30:15 forward [2] - 26:5, 27:1 FOUNDATION [1] -3:12 Foundation [2] - 5:24, 24.8 four [2] - 28:5, 37:13 framing [1] - 30:20 Francisco [1] - 3:7 frankly [1] - 26:17 free [1] - 31:22 French [1] - 34:11 fully [1] - 19:10 futility [1] - 8:13 future [1] - 34:5

25:11, 31:8, 38:19

G

general [2] - 9:22, 26:12 General [3] - 2:10, 2:23, 3:7 General's [2] - 6:11, 6:15 generally [1] - 4:10 GEORGE [1] - 2:20 George [2] - 5:10, 16:14 given [5] - 9:17, 10:23, 37:10, 37:13, 37:16 GORDON [1] - 2:4 Gordon [3] - 5:6, 12:4, 38:4

exceptional [1] -

25:23

governing [1] - 28:6 government [4] - 11:1, 28:11, 37:5, 43:1 governs [1] - 28:16 grant [9] - 8:3, 8:11, 12:10, 18:10, 35:4, 35:12, 35:16, 37:9, 37:21 granted [4] - 10:21, 20:2, 32:5, 38:24 granting [7] - 16:21, 24:20, 29:3, 34:20, 34:22, 35:21, 39:15 grants [2] - 37:23, 42:23 Griener [3] - 1:23, 43:10, 43:10 groundwater [26] -8:6, 8:22, 8:23, 10:1, 10:21, 12:18, 14:25, 15:5, 15:8, 15:15, 15:17, 15:18, 16:8, 16:14, 16:19, 17:4, 17:5, 17:7, 17:10, 17:14, 21:24, 21:25, 32:5, 34:14, 39:1 groundwaters [1] -16:24 groups [1] - 9:1 **GUARINO** [3] - 1:15, 4:23, 43:2 Guarino [2] - 4:23, 4:25 guess [3] - 17:2, 38:10, 39:22 Guss [1] - 4:23 GUSS [1] - 1:15

н

hand [2] - 19:20, 21:12 handle [1] - 7:21 handled [2] - 18:18, 21.19 HARRY [1] - 3:3 Harry [1] - 5:12 Hawthorne [1] - 2:15 heard [4] - 22:15, 34:10, 35:18 **HEARING** [1] - 1:13 hearing [3] - 7:20, 10:20, 10:25 held [3] - 27:15, 29:5, 40.7 hereafter [2] - 34:6, 41:4 Herskovits [5] - 4:16, 9:10, 23:13, 24:16,

42:10

HERSKOVITS [36] -2:12, 4:15, 9:9, 10:5, 11:11, 11:21, 11:23, 12:2, 24:15, 25:13, 27:23, 28:12, 29:9, 30:3. 30:14. 30:19. 31:7. 32:17. 32:22. 33:12. 33:18. 34:25. 35:6, 35:22, 36:1, 36:5, 36:9, 36:20, 37:6, 38:1, 40:6, 40:10, 42:9, 42:18, 42:24, 43:5 hierarchy [1] - 31:11 high [1] - 12:5 historically [1] - 24:9 history [3] - 6:25, 29:21, 29:22 hold [2] - 28:9, 34:4 holders [2] - 10:15, 10.17 holding [1] - 29:2 Honor [48] - 4:16, 5:1, 5:5, 5:9, 5:15, 5:19, 5:23, 6:9, 9:10, 9:12, 10:5, 11:12, 11:24, 12:3, 12:5, 12:21, 13:18, 15:8, 16:1, 18:1, 18:2, 18:11, 18:19, 19:1, 19:4, 22:17, 22:19, 24:16, 25:13, 28:13, 29:9, 30:3, 31:7, 32:17, 33:19, 35:22, 36:11, 38:2, 38:4, 38:17, 39:24, 40:6, 40:10, 42:9, 42:19, 42:24, 43:2, 43:5 Honor's [1] - 23:1 **HONORABLE** [1] - 1:2 hoped [1] - 12:8 hopefully [2] - 39:19, 42:7 household [2] - 15:24, 16:19 hundreds [1] - 20:6

Idaho [1] - 1:19 idea [1] - 24:23 identified [1] - 39:2 impact [2] - 17:13, 20:24 impaired [1] - 18:23 impeded [1] - 18:23 implicated [1] - 40:22 implication [3] -33:25, 39:15 implications [1] -

34:16 implied [3] - 19:4, 19:9, 40:22 importantly [1] - 32:6 imposed [1] - 11:19 **impression** [1] - 34:18 in-depth [1] - 32:22 incidents [1] - 28:9 inclination [1] - 36:3 inclined [2] - 9:15, 36:12 included [1] - 23:16 including [5] - 7:5, 14:25, 33:24, 37:2, 38:25 inconsistent [2] -13:4, 13:5 indeed [1] - 18:14 Indian [1] - 21:6 indicated [1] - 7:2 indicating [1] - 18:1 individual [1] - 25:22 industrial [1] - 15:11 inevitably [1] - 27:7 inextricable [1] -26:25 informed [1] - 19:21 initial [3] - 7:5, 7:11, 7:21 intend [1] - 11:6 intended [1] - 7:20 intending [1] - 22:14 intends [1] - 22:13 interest [2] - 22:3, 23:25 interests [5] - 8:10, 36:15, 36:19, 37:2, 37:4 interference [1] -13:20 interplay [1] - 27:12 interpret [1] - 12:11 interstate [1] - 30:10 intervene [18] - 4:9, 6:23, 7:9, 8:4, 8:12, 9:5, 18:10, 23:4, 23:23, 34:20, 34:23, 35:3, 35:17, 37:14, 37:21, 38:19, 38:20 Intervenor [1] - 1:7 intervenor [1] - 26:7

involve [3] - 20:3, 20:5, 20:7 involved [3] - 10:6, 17:8, 19:18 involvement [1] -29:22 involving [1] - 21:21 **IRRIGATION** [2] - 1:9, irrigation [2] - 12:4, 15:10 Irrigation [3] - 4:7, 5:7, 26:23 issue [5] - 18:21, 19:12, 20:18, 23:25, 36:7 issued [2] - 18:4, 23:19 issues [16] - 7:5, 8:18, 8:19, 8:21, 8:22, 17:25, 18:7, 19:5, 20:4, 20:8, 26:4, 27:19, 35:17, 35:25, 37:19, 42:18 itself [2] - 23:19, 28:23 J **JIM** [1] - 3:14 JONES [1] - 1:2 Jones [1] - 4:6 Jr [1] - 4:21

JR [1] - 2:2 JUDGE [1] - 1:2 Judge [18] - 4:6, 7:4, 7:9, 7:20, 9:21, 14:10, 14:24, 15:22, 16:14, 17:22, 25:17, 27:24, 38:16, 39:1, 40:7, 40:11, 41:22, 42:19 judges [1] - 6:24 judgment [2] - 18:19, 20.13 judicata [2] - 31:2, 32:19 juncture [1] - 41:23 jurisdiction [25] - 7:5, 7:22, 8:5, 8:13, 8:18, 8:22, 10:18, 13:20, 13:24, 14:3, 14:8, 14:13, 14:20, 14:21, 14:23, 16:14, 17:23, 18:6, 31:17, 35:25, 36:5, 40:21, 42:2, 42:3 jurisdictional [1] -32:18

Κ

KAREN [1] - 2:7 Karen [1] - 6:4 keep [2] - 25:11, 42:13 kind [5] - 30:6, 30:21, 33:3, 39:25, 42:7 knows [2] - 19:4, 40:1

L

Lake [6] - 13:2, 13:10, 23:19, 24:6, 32:10, 36:25 lake [5] - 24:8, 28:24, 28:25, 29:23, 34:18 lake's [1] - 23:14 Lakes [1] - 2:18 laments [1] - 24:6 land [1] - 15:17 lands [2] - 28:7 large [3] - 17:7, 17:14, 32:13 last [9] - 10:20, 10:25, 11:13, 13:25, 14:6, 14:15, 15:21, 37:8, 42:10 late [3] - 31:3, 31:4, 39.20 Law [9] - 2:2, 2:5, 2:8, 2:13, 2:17, 2:20, 3:3, 3:9. 3:12 law [15] - 5:20, 12:10, 19:5, 19:21, 19:22, 20:4, 21:22, 22:8, 23:11, 26:18, 28:14. 28:21, 29:1, 29:15, 29.16 lawsuit [1] - 41:9 lead [1] - 4:16 least [5] - 17:21, 18:19, 21:23, 27:20, 36:2 legal [3] - 20:8, 20:14, 25:20 lengthy [1] - 20:7 less [1] - 39:20 likely [1] - 9:2 limited [1] - 21:15 litigation [3] - 9:7, 9:25, 33:4 long-existing [1] -28:24 looking [2] - 16:1, 16:3 LYON [1] - 2:20 Lyon [1] - 5:10

intervenors [3] - 26:1,

10:7, 10:11, 12:11,

20:10, 21:16, 22:24,

24:20, 26:9, 33:15,

38:7, 38:9, 38:16,

invitation [1] - 36:6

26:2, 26:3

42.14

intervention [13] -

notice [2] - 32:4, 33:3

notified [1] - 39:23

N	/1	

Magistrate [1] - 42:19 Mahaney [1] - 6:18 **MAHANEY** [2] - 2:10, mail [3] - 39:10, 41:18 main [1] - 34:22 maintain [1] - 26:23 major [1] - 35:20 Mammoth [1] - 2:18 manage [1] - 27:1 managed [1] - 26:11 management [4] - 7:3, 25:15, 42:20 manages [1] - 28:16 Margaret [2] - 1:23, 43:10 MARTA [1] - 2:23 Marta [2] - 5:15, 22:19 Mason [1] - 23:18 MASTER [1] - 3:14 Master [1] - 6:5 matter [8] - 4:12, 19:2, 19:3, 21:20, 24:4, 26:20, 30:8, 43:9 matters [2] - 7:5, 37:25 mean [1] - 14:13 means [2] - 14:12, 39:5 meet [4] - 13:1, 13:10, 21:1, 22:12 merit [1] - 8:18 merit-centered [1] -8:18 merits [6] - 7:21, 7:23, 8:4, 8:5, 8:13 met [1] - 14:16 method [1] - 11:17 Mexico [1] - 2:13 Mica [1] - 5:21 MICA [1] - 3:9 Michael [1] - 6:10 MICHAEL [1] - 3:6 might [2] - 25:25, 41:4 mind [2] - 16:3, 38:6 MINERAL [1] - 2:12 Mineral [51] - 4:8, 4:16, 4:18, 6:22, 8:9, 8:13, 8:24, 9:8, 9:11, 9:22, 10:3, 10:10, 12:10, 15:20, 16:2, 18:6, 18:12, 18:14, 18:20, 18:22, 19:3, 19:18, 20:12, 20:14, 20:20, 20:25, 21:4, 21:8, 21:14, 21:23, 22:4, 22:6, 22:13, 22:24, 23:9, 23:21,

23:25, 24:16, 25:19, 26:24, 27:7, 32:2, 32:23, 33:2, 33:3, 33:7, 33:9, 33:12, 37:3, 38:24, 42:11 misplaced [1] - 24:21 mistaken [2] - 21:23, 24:22 modified [3] - 13:9, 22:12, 42:20 modify [1] - 12:25 MONDAY [1] - 4:1 Mono [1] - 6:2 MONO [1] - 2:17 most [1] - 19:23 **MOTION** [1] - 1:13 motion [24] - 4:8, 6:23, 7:1, 8:1, 8:4, 8:12, 9:5, 10:10, 12:25, 18:6, 18:10, 23:4, 24:20, 34:20, 34:23, 35:13, 35:21, 37:21, 37:23, 38:15, 39:16, 40:14, 42:14, 42:23 motions [5] - 7:6, 8:17, 18:5, 25:6, 37:14 motivation [2] - 31:8, 36:24 motivations [1] -23:22 mountain [1] - 12:5 moving [2] - 7:18, 37:15 MR [66] - 4:15, 4:20, 4:23, 5:1, 5:4, 5:5, 5:9, 5:12, 5:23, 6:9, 9:9, 10:5, 11:11, 11:21, 11:23, 12:2, 12:3, 12:8, 12:17, 12:21, 12:23, 13:14, 13:17, 15:2, 15:7, 15:10, 15:13, 15:25, 16:7, 17:3, 17:13, 17:24, 18:8, 18:11, 24:15, 25:13, 27:23, 28:12, 29:9, 30:3, 30:14, 30:19, 31:7, 32:17, 32:22, 33:12, 33:18, 34:25, 35:6, 35:22, 36:1, 36:5, 36:9, 36:20, 37:6, 38:1, 38:4, 38:17, 39:22, 40:6, 40:10, 42:9, 42:18, 42:24, 43:2, 43:5 MS [9] - 5:15, 5:19, 6:1, 6:4, 6:14, 6:18,

22:19, 23:24, 24:13

municipal [1] - 15:11 must [4] - 8:3, 8:7, 37:20, 39:23 Ν name [1] - 5:19 named [1] - 14:15 nasty [1] - 33:25 **NATIONAL** [1] - 3:12 National [2] - 5:24, 24:7 natural [4] - 28:23, 28:24, 29:23 **NDOW**[1] - 24:6 need [13] - 4:11, 7:6, 13:9, 18:17, 37:11, 41:2, 41:24 needing [1] - 30:9 needs [1] - 42:6 Negri [1] - 5:1 NEGRI [3] - 1:18, 5:1, 5:4 Nevada [31] - 1:24, 2:3, 2:6, 2:8, 2:15, 3:13, 5:16, 13:5, 14:2, 14:5, 14:12, 24:3, 26:20, 26:23, 29:1, 29:15, 31:19, 31:20, 32:2, 33:2, 33:22 **NEVADA** [3] - 1:1, 2:23, 4:1 Nevada's [1] - 29:22 never [2] - 10:17, 41:1 nevertheless [3] -29:2, 29:5, 32:14 **Neville** [1] - 6:10 6:10 New [1] - 2:13 new [9] - 26:12, 27:4, 27:9, 28:6, 30:21, 33:23, 40:3, 42:7, 42:20 next [2] - 1:22, 2:25 Ninth [1] - 16:13 nonanswer [1] - 31:14 none [2] - 15:19, 38:1 **normal** [2] - 7:6, 40:3 north [1] - 17:18

notwithstanding [1] -26.22 number [1] - 14:9 0 object [1] - 22:24 objections [1] - 24:20 obligation [6] - 10:3, 11:4, 13:10, 28:15, 31:10, 41:13 obligations [4] -10:22, 11:7, 29:5, necessarily [1] - 25:23 29:10 obstruct [1] - 26:14 obtain [1] - 31:3 38:11, 38:12, 39:21, obtrusive [1] - 19:23 39:25, 40:16, 40:19, obviously [3] - 10:21, 23:8, 24:3 **OF** [4] - 1:1, 1:4, 1:13, 2:7 office [3] - 5:20, 6:11, 6:15 Official [2] - 1:23, 43:11 often [1] - 18:25 2:21, 2:24, 3:4, 3:10, once [3] - 9:10, 24:17, 38:6 one [25] - 7:14, 7:16, 16:25, 22:20, 23:16, 7:18. 8:16. 9:21. 10:5. 16:8. 21:3. 27:21, 28:19, 28:20, 22:3, 25:10, 29:21, 29:22, 29:24, 30:5, 33:1, 33:21, 34:6, 34:19, 37:1, 37:16, 41:21, 41:23, 42:5, 42:10 ones [2] - 21:10 open [1] - 18:7 opinion [2] - 18:2, 18:3 opportunity [2] -**NEVILLE** [3] - 3:6, 6:9, 17:25, 34:21 oppose [1] - 35:8 opposition [2] - 11:22, order [11] - 7:3, 7:10, 9:2. 37:10. 37:22. 38:7. 39:13. 40:11. 42:14, 42:20, 42:23 orders [2] - 10:9, 10:11 organization [1] -34:12 original [6] - 7:4, 7:9,

otherwise [7] - 7:22, 8:3, 9:6, 13:11, 27:6, 34:10, 42:3 ought [3] - 12:23, 21:14, 22:9 outcome [2] - 18:24, 22.4 outlined [1] - 9:13 outset [1] - 12:6 outside [1] - 31:10 overall [2] - 24:25, 27:14 overlies [1] - 15:17 overstates [1] - 26:16 ownership [1] - 28:10

Р

P.M [1] - 4:1 page [2] - 1:22, 2:25 Paiute [2] - 4:21, 25:21 **PAIUTE** [2] - 1:6, 2:2 papers [1] - 37:15 paramount [2] -28:17, 31:11 part [6] - 10:21, 11:6, 19:17, 24:7, 24:9, 41.8 participate [1] - 18:13 particular [5] - 7:11, 8:1, 12:15, 12:17, 25:12 particularly [2] -25:24, 26:3 parties [17] - 7:13, 9:24, 11:5, 11:6, 12:20, 14:6, 14:17, 17:22, 20:6, 25:25, 32:4, 33:3, 34:2, 39:23 parties' [2] - 16:6, 37:15 PARTNERSHIP [1] party [5] - 14:15, 20:1, 22:3, 32:3, 40:4 past [1] - 6:25 peace [1] - 34:4 people [9] - 14:17, 15:19, 16:18, 39:3, 39:8, 40:12, 41:14, 41:25, 42:1 perfect [1] - 25:18 perfected [1] - 19:10 perhaps [3] - 9:16, 9:17, 21:3 period [1] - 29:4 permissive [2] -21:16, 22:24

note [2] - 4:13, 23:10

nothing [1] - 25:23

noted [2] - 7:11, 22:23

32:11, 32:16, 33:4,

originating [1] - 15:4

33:17

permit [1] - 23:19 permits [3] - 32:5, 32:6 permitted [1] - 28:18 personal [1] - 39:7 personam [11] - 14:3, 14:4, 14:12, 14:20, 14:23, 17:18, 17:19, 17:21, 17:23, 35:16, 42:3 perspective [2] - 36:2, 36:22 persuade [1] - 9:5 persuaded [1] - 8:3 persuasion [1] - 8:2 persuasively [1] -21.17 pertains [1] - 7:7 **PETERSON** [2] - 2:7, Peterson [1] - 6:4 petition [19] - 4:9, 4:10, 7:8, 8:10, 8:14, 8:24, 10:3, 11:20, 18:6, 23:9, 25:5, 25:7, 25:9, 32:11, 33:15, 34:22, 35:5, 37:9, 40:23 petitioners [1] - 14:2 petitions [3] - 7:23, 9:23, 25:12 place [2] - 30:17, 39.23 placement [1] - 29:7 plaintiff [2] - 1:5, 26:7 Plaintiff [1] - 1:7 **PLAINTIFF** [1] - 1:15 Plaintiff-Intervenor [1] - 1:7 pleadings [2] - 9:1, 11:17 point [9] - 10:6, 10:9, 17:24, 25:17, 33:5, 33:8, 36:10, 38:8, 38:14 pointed [1] - 37:7 points [2] - 9:15, 25:5 portions [1] - 29:12 position [6] - 13:3, 13:4, 13:7, 19:1, 32:3, 32:8 positions [2] - 9:3, 38:21 possible [1] - 39:4 potential [1] - 10:1 potentially [2] - 17:7, 20:5 practical [1] - 21:8 practice [1] - 25:17 Prado [1] - 2:13

pre [1] - 20:19 pre-existing [1] -20:19 precedes [1] - 28:17 preceding [1] - 29:21 predilection [6] - 6:25, 7:19, 8:1, 9:14, 14:1, 22.25 predilections [1] -13:25 prefer [2] - 32:20, prejudice [2] - 7:13, 7:17 present [5] - 14:11, 16:17, 18:3, 34:18, previously [3] - 7:2, 11:19, 12:20 primarily [1] - 14:20 primary [3] - 19:7, 24:19, 39:15 priority [8] - 10:23, 17:11, 27:14, 28:3, 30:1, 30:22, 31:11, 31:24 problem [2] - 32:10, 32:13 proceed [3] - 9:3, 18:13, 21:19 proceeding [12] -18:16, 21:20, 25:1, 26:5, 26:12, 30:13, 34:1, 34:7, 34:12, 35:15, 37:11, 37:18 proceedings [7] -10:11, 18:18, 21:21, 26:1, 32:3, 43:8 process [7] - 4:12, 14:16, 20:5, 29:3, 41:5, 41:20 processes [2] - 39:12, 39:18 progress [1] - 26:14 proper [2] - 13:8, 23:7 properly [3] - 23:3, 24:24, 27:15 proposed [2] - 38:8, 42:14 prospect [1] - 31:2 protect [2] - 33:23, 36:25 protected [1] - 36:23 protection [1] - 29:6 provides [1] - 36:14 public [29] - 13:1, 13:10. 18:20. 19:20. 19:25, 20:12, 20:14, 20:17, 20:20, 20:25,

21:1, 21:5, 21:9,

21:15, 22:12, 23:8, 23:10, 24:3, 24:4, 26:15, 26:25, 27:7, 28:14, 28:15, 31:5, 31:8, 31:20, 32:14, 35:11 publication [1] - 41:3 purpose [1] - 19:7 purposes [4] - 15:10, 23:15, 38:19, 41:6 pursuing [1] - 31:4 put [2] - 30:24, 41:22 Q quantity [1] - 19:14 questions [4] - 8:25, 32:19, 35:18 quite [3] - 24:4, 24:18, 26:16 R raise [1] - 26:4 Ranch [1] - 5:21 **RANCH** [1] - 3:9 13:14 re [1] - 16:13 read [1] - 28:14 realize [1] - 32:10

rather [2] - 30:2, 41:16 rationale [2] - 13:12, **RDR** [2] - 1:23, 43:10 re-echoing [1] - 16:13 reading [1] - 27:20 realistic [1] - 16:12 really [5] - 10:15, 25:1, 26:13, 31:14, 32:9 reason [9] - 7:12, 11:1, 14:9, 17:6, 18:17, 19:1, 20:13, 22:7, 35:14 reasons [9] - 32:25, 34:19, 34:22, 35:20, 37:10, 37:13, 37:14, 37:16, 42:16 receive [2] - 6:24, 33:3 recent [3] - 16:13, 32:9, 32:12 recognition [3] -21:13, 28:22, 29:19 recognize [3] - 13:11, 29:25, 32:8 recognized [9] -19:14, 19:17, 21:6, 21:10, 21:11, 26:21, 29:3, 30:12, 38:24 recognizes [1] - 29:16 recognizing [1] -10:22

reconsider [1] - 19:15 reconsidered [1] -20:1 record [9] - 4:11, 4:12, 4:14, 27:19, 33:1, 36:13, 37:11, 42:17, 43.8 recreation [1] - 28:23 Reed [11] - 14:10, 14:24, 15:22, 17:22, 25:17, 27:24, 38:16, 39:1, 40:7, 40:11, 41:22 Reed's [3] - 7:4, 7:9, 9:21 refers [1] - 15:16 Refuge [1] - 23:18 regard [6] - 9:22, 24:9, 27:4, 36:5, 37:5, 38:23 regardless [2] - 35:3, 41:19 regulated [3] - 17:11, 21:1, 21:14 regulations [1] - 32:12 related [2] - 17:8, 17:21 relation [1] - 7:8 relationship [3] -18:19, 20:10, 20:14 relative [3] - 27:14, 32:3, 38:21 rem [18] - 14:3, 14:4, 14:7, 14:12, 14:21, 17:17, 31:1, 31:17, 34:1, 34:7, 34:12, 35:15, 37:18, 40:24, 41:6, 41:11, 42:2 remain [2] - 18:7, 25:4 reminder [2] - 8:15, 9:21 removal [1] - 29:18 **RENO** [1] - 4:1 Reno [6] - 1:24, 2:6, 2:21, 3:4, 3:10, 3:13 reply [3] - 9:20, 24:14, 24.18 Reported [1] - 1:23 Reporter [2] - 1:23, 43:11 representation [2] -36:15, 36:18 representing [3] -5:20, 6:11, 6:16 request [4] - 7:9, 8:8, 8:25, 12:24 requested [1] - 13:17

require [8] - 15:5,

15:13, 15:14, 15:22,

15:24, 20:25, 29:25,

41:23 required [11] - 7:14, 14:10, 14:24, 15:2, 15:7, 16:20, 17:6, 17:23, 19:7, 40:4, 41:3 requirement [3] -20:10, 40:8 requirements [2] -11:18. 14:16 requires [1] - 12:10 requiring [2] - 40:12, 40:18 res [2] - 31:1, 32:19 Reservation [1] - 21:6 reservation [2] - 19:6, 19:11 reservations [1] -20:18 reserve [1] - 11:24 reserved [8] - 19:4, 19:9, 20:15, 20:21, 20:24, 21:9, 27:10, 27:11 reserving [1] - 34:21 resolution [5] - 7:21, 20:11, 26:14, 26:24, 27:9 resolved [1] - 26:11 resource [1] - 28:16 **Resources** [1] - 6:19 respect [11] - 11:19, 14:2, 14:5, 14:19, 31:18, 31:20, 34:1, 34:5, 34:13, 40:22, 41:9 respectfully [5] - 10:8, 10:19, 18:22, 24:21, 32:23 respects [1] - 35:8 respond [5] - 11:25, 38:12, 39:23, 40:24, 40:25 response [2] - 9:19, 40:14 responses [1] - 25:6 responsibility [1] -23.12 rest [1] - 41:11 restrictions [1] - 32:12 result [1] - 20:21 results [1] - 7:25 resupply [1] - 16:16 reviewing [1] - 7:9 rights 1601 - 10:1. 10:13, 10:17, 10:23, 13:1, 13:9, 13:16, 13:19, 13:21, 15:4, 15:16, 15:23, 16:6, 16:15, 16:21, 17:4,

17:5, 19:9, 19:16, 19:23, 20:1, 20:6, 20:15, 20:16, 20:21, 20:24, 21:1, 21:9, 21:13, 22:11, 23:17, 23:18, 27:3, 27:6, 27:9, 27:10, 27:11, 27:14. 28:17. 28:22. 28:23, 29:3, 30:9, 31:23, 33:16, 33:24, 34:14, 34:15, 35:3, 35:8, 35:10, 36:23, 37:1, 37:16, 37:19, 38:24, 42:2 riparian [2] - 15:16, 15:23 RIVER [4] - 1:6, 1:9, 2:2, 2:4 River [12] - 4:7, 4:21, 5:6, 10:14, 12:25, 16:24, 19:17, 21:6, 25:21, 26:23, 27:16, 29:12 river [7] - 14:14, 16:23, 28:23, 29:4, 33:24, 34:3, 42:3 ROBERT [1] - 1:2 roughly [1] - 28:12 round [1] - 18:5 rounds [1] - 7:15 **ROWE** [1] - 2:14 Rowe [1] - 4:17 rules [1] - 41:2 ruling [5] - 8:12, 18:4, 27:23, 34:21, 42:14

S

Sacramento [1] - 2:11 San [1] - 3:7 satisfied [2] - 20:11, 41:19 satisfy [1] - 41:24 **SCHNEIDER** [1] - 1:16 Schroeder [1] - 5:20 Schurz [1] - 2:3 Sean [1] - 4:17 **SEAN** [1] - 2:14 seated [1] - 4:4 second [1] - 35:14 see [2] - 24:4, 30:23 seeks [2] - 18:20, 21:4 sense [5] - 9:17, 15:15, 24:2, 25:18, 42.12 separate [10] - 7:17, 8:19, 9:1, 18:18, 21:21, 22:9, 25:4, 27:18, 37:23, 42:18

SEPTEMBER [1] - 4:1

10:3, 11:2, 11:7, 11:9, 11:15, 11:17, 15:13, 38:23, 39:5, 39:7, 39:12, 39:14, 39:22, 41:2, 41:3, 41:18 Service's [2] - 8:25, 9:23 services [1] - 39:18 set [2] - 19:6, 20:8 several [1] - 22:2 shaped [1] - 19:21 **SHAW** [1] - 3:14 shortly [1] - 29:1 side [12] - 14:5, 14:8, 14:13, 14:19, 14:25, 17:6, 17:17, 20:23, 34:1, 34:13, 35:14, 41:7 Simeon [4] - 4:16, 9:10, 24:16, 42:10 **SIMEON** [1] - 2:12 similar [2] - 15:15, 22:25 SIMON [2] - 2:17, 6:1 Simon [1] - 6:1 simple [6] - 33:1, 37:10, 37:22, 42:15, 42:16, 42:23 simply [10] - 19:12, 19:17, 19:19, 22:5, 22:15, 29:25, 30:8, 36:14, 36:22, 39:10 single [7] - 7:15, 7:18, 17:11, 20:1, 21:20, 24:25 situ [3] - 28:22, 29:17, 29:18 solidly [1] - 17:16 soon [1] - 28:21 sort [2] - 24:23, 38:12 sounds [1] - 9:14 source [7] - 16:16, 16:20, 16:24, 17:11, 28:22, 29:17, 29:18 South [1] - 1:24 sovereign [1] - 28:16 sovereigns [1] - 29:11 speaking [1] - 28:12

September [1] - 1:9

26:13, 39:2, 39:8

10:4, 14:4, 14:24,

14:25, 15:4, 15:6,

41:1, 41:5, 41:6,

service [17] - 9:22,

41.8

15:19, 15:24, 17:18,

17:23, 39:10, 40:12,

served [18] - 9:24,

serve [5] - 11:4, 14:10,

Species [1] - 33:24 species [2] - 34:3, 34:6 specifically [3] - 4:7, 14:15, 26:6 Springmeyer [1] -5.24 SPRINGMEYER [2] -3:12, 5:23 Stacy [1] - 6:1 STACY [1] - 2:17 stand [3] - 34:4, 34:8, 38:22 standing [1] - 8:7 **standpoint** [1] - 21:8 start [2] - 4:13, 12:8 state [20] - 6:11, 6:16, 6:24, 19:21, 19:22, 20:4, 23:11, 23:19, 24:1, 24:2, 27:13, 28:5, 29:11, 30:6, 30:7, 30:9, 36:13, 36:22, 41:2 **STATE** [2] - 2:10, 3:6 State [13] - 6:19, 13:18, 23:16, 26:22, 29:22, 29:25, 30:8, 31:19, 32:2, 32:3, 33:2, 33:21 state's [3] - 10:22, 23:12. 23:21 state-issued [1] -23:19 **statement** [1] - 7:12 **STATES** [2] - 1:1, 1:4 States [12] - 1:16, 1:18, 4:6, 4:24, 5:2, 12:13, 15:20, 16:9, 17:9, 25:2, 25:22, 27:5 States' [1] - 23:5 status [4] - 7:20, 8:7, 10:2, 11:13 stay [1] - 22:9 step [2] - 13:18, 27:25 still [6] - 7:7, 7:14, 8:16, 25:4, 25:10 **STOCKTON** [1] - 2:23 Stockton [1] - 5:17 stream [3] - 30:10, 36:25, 41:9 Street [1] - 1:24 strictly [1] - 16:1

18:13, 18:21, 22:6 subproceeding [2] -12:14, 22:16 subproceedings [1] -25:16 Subproceedings [1] -1.5 **substantial** [1] - 37:15 substantially [2] -37:17, 37:20 suggested [2] - 6:22, 11:1 suggesting [2] -18:12, 25:14 supplies [2] - 17:10 supply [3] - 16:15, 16:24, 17:11 **support** [1] - 25:5 Supreme [4] - 13:5, 19:25, 26:21, 27:21 **supreme** [8] - 13:6, 13:7, 13:12, 26:24, 27:23, 30:6, 30:7, 30:12 surface [11] - 10:1, 10:13, 10:16, 10:17, 15:3, 17:1, 17:9, 17:10, 32:6, 34:14, 34:15 SUSAN [1] - 1:16 suspicion [1] - 17:2 **SWAINSTON** [3] - 3:3, 5:12 **Swainston** [2] - 5:12 system [7] - 10:14, 14:13, 25:11, 27:16, 31:10, 31:11 Т

tailored [1] - 26:6 tapped [1] - 16:21 tapping [1] - 16:19 taxation [1] - 33:16 technically [1] - 9:24 telephone [1] - 6:8 terms [2] - 23:3, 30:20 territory [1] - 28:4 THE [77] - 1:2, 1:15, 2:2, 2:10, 4:4, 4:19, 4:22, 4:25, 5:3, 5:8, 5:11, 5:14, 5:18, 5:22, 5:25, 6:3, 6:6, 6:13, 6:17, 6:20, 9:19, 10:19, 11:14, 11:22, 12:1, 12:7, 12:15, 12:19, 12:22, 13:12, 13:15, 13:23, 15:5, 15:9, 15:12, 15:21, 16:5, 16:12,

17:12, 17:15, 18:3, 18:9, 22:18, 23:20, 24:12, 24:14, 25:3, 27:22, 27:25, 28:20, 29:14, 30:12, 30:15, 30:23, 31:13, 32:21, 33:7, 33:14, 33:20, 35:2. 35:7. 35:24. 36:4, 36:8, 36:17, 36:24, 37:7, 38:3, 38:14, 38:18, 40:2, 40:7, 40:15, 42:16, 42:22, 42:25, 43:3 themselves [1] - 39:19 theory [8] - 20:2, 28:2, 29:15, 29:20, 30:2, 30:6, 41:11 thereafter [2] - 28:21, therefore [7] - 7:16, 11:6, 23:22, 29:24, 31:4, 35:12, 37:20 Therese [1] - 5:20 THERESE [1] - 3:9 they've [1] - 17:18 thinking [4] - 31:16, 39:25, 41:12, 41:21 third [1] - 40:4 third-party [1] - 40:4 thousand [1] - 22:2 thousands [2] - 12:18, 41:14 timely [1] - 8:9 today [6] - 4:17, 9:4, 33:8, 37:25, 42:6, 43:4 together [2] - 18:25, 21:19 token [1] - 27:8 took [1] - 13:4 total [1] - 7:11 track [1] - 36:13 TRANSCRIPT [1] -1:13 transcript [2] - 37:11, treated [1] - 12:24 treatment [1] - 27:2 treaty [1] - 28:8 Tribal [2] - 18:24, 22:3 **Tribe** [19] - 4:21, 11:2, 11:19, 12:12, 15:20, 16:3, 16:8, 16:21, 17:1, 17:4, 17:9, 20:8, 20:11, 25:2, 25:21, 27:5, 27:11, 37:5, 39:18 TRIBE [2] - 1:6, 2:2 Tribe's [12] - 4:10,

8:10, 8:24, 9:23,

subdockets [1] -

subfile [1] - 26:12

subject [7] - 8:2, 8:8,

11:7, 19:2, 19:3,

Subproceeding [3] -

20:2, 40:21

23:15

8

11:3, 16:2, 23:4, 25:8, 38:21, 39:2, 40:9, 40:22 tribes [1] - 38:15 Truckee [2] - 16:15, 16:16 true [3] - 25:19, 31:16, 31.22 trust [43] - 13:1, 13:10, 18:20, 19:20, 19:25, 20:3, 20:12, 20:14, 20:17, 20:20, 20:25, 21:1, 21:5, 21:9, 21:15, 22:12, 23:8, 23:10, 24:3, 24:4, 26:15, 26:25, 27:7, 28:9, 28:11, 28:14, 28:15, 29:2, 29:5, 29:6, 29:10, 29:15, 29:20, 30:2, 31:5, 31:8, 31:15, 31:20, 32:1, 32:15, 35:11 trustee [1] - 29:7 try [1] - 30:3 trying [3] - 21:21, 28:1, 29:14 two [9] - 15:7, 16:7, 18:25, 21:21, 24:19, 25:16, 30:19, 35:20, 37:15 types [2] - 25:24, 27:18

U

U.S [4] - 2:7, 6:4, 20:9, 20:11 ultimate [1] - 7:23 ultimately [1] - 40:16 under [9] - 16:13, 19:25, 20:20, 25:17, 27:6, 27:10, 35:11, 41:2, 41:5 underlying [1] - 28:1 understood [1] -11:12 undoubtedly [1] -35:10 unique [1] - 23:25 **UNITED** [2] - 1:1, 1:4 United [13] - 1:16, 1:18, 4:6, 4:24, 5:2, 12:12, 15:19, 16:9, 17:9, 23:4, 25:2, 25:22, 27:5 unlikely [2] - 16:16, 16:19 unrelated [2] - 26:18, 27:18 up [13] - 7:24, 16:18,

16:25, 23:7, 25:17, 29:4, 34:4, 34:8, 35:17, 35:19, 36:14, 38.22 update [1] - 17:15 upstream [10] - 8:23, 14:8, 14:24, 16:10, 17:5, 32:4, 37:3, 38:25, 41:8 **Ure** [1] - 5:20 URE [2] - 3:9, 5:19 usage [2] - 29:5, 29:23 user [2] - 33:7, 33:10 users [27] - 8:6, 8:22, 8:23, 10:1, 10:22, 12:18, 14:2, 14:5, 14:8, 14:12, 14:25, 15:3, 15:5, 15:8, 15:10, 15:11, 15:14, 15:24, 17:7, 17:14, 21:24, 21:25, 32:4, 38:25, 39:1

V

validly [1] - 41:1 Valley [2] - 16:11, 23:18 valley [1] - 16:18 various [3] - 7:23, 25:25, 26:1 versus [1] - 4:7 vested [1] - 28:18 view [7] - 9:6, 10:25, 13:24, 14:1, 14:11, 14:20, 38:23 Virginia [1] - 1:24 virtue [1] - 32:2 visited [1] - 39:18 vs [1] - 1:8

W

Walker [19] - 4:7, 4:21, 5:6, 10:13, 12:25, 13:2, 13:10, 16:20, 16:24, 19:17, 21:6, 23:19, 24:6, 25:21, 26:23, 27:16, 29:12, 32:10, 36:25 **WALKER** [4] - 1:6, 1:9, 2:2, 2:4 Water [3] - 6:5, 6:19 **WATER** [3] - 2:8, 2:10, 3:14 water [42] - 10:13, 10:16, 11:2, 12:15, 13:1, 13:9, 13:19, 13:20, 14:13, 15:2, 15:3, 15:16, 16:22,

17:9, 19:4, 19:7, 19:8, 19:16, 19:23, 20:1, 20:6, 23:6, 23:17, 23:18, 24:8, 27:2, 27:5, 27:9, 27:10, 27:11, 27:13, 28:16, 28:17, 28:19, 29:3. 29:18. 30:9. 31:18, 32:6, 34:13, 34:17, 41:9 waters [3] - 10:13, 10:16, 29:24 watershed [1] - 14:22 watersheds [1] -41:10 ways [1] - 30:4 website [7] - 11:16, 11:18, 39:5, 39:9, 39:11, 39:14, 41:18 welcome [2] - 4:5, 6:6 Wes [1] - 4:20 **WES** [1] - 2:2 west [1] - 17:19 whole [4] - 24:5, 24:11, 27:16, 31:17 WIGGINS [1] - 3:3 Wildlife [8] - 5:16, 5:24, 22:20, 22:24, 23:14, 23:17, 24:8, 33:22 WILDLIFE [2] - 2:23, 3:12 WILLIAMS [2] - 2:2, 4:20 Williams [2] - 4:20, 4:22 Winters [1] - 27:11 withdrawal [1] - 28:22 wonder [1] - 9:17 words [4] - 12:19, 16:22, 28:20, 40:25 world [3] - 29:15, 31:17, 34:17 worthy [1] - 16:13

Y

years [3] - 28:5, 29:6 yourself [1] - 32:15