1	IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
2	x
3	TARRANT REGIONAL WATER DISTRICT, :
4	Petitioner : No. 11-889
5	v. :
6	RUDOLF JOHN HERRMANN, ET AL. :
7	x
8	Washington, D.C.
9	Tuesday, April 23, 2013
10	
11	The above-entitled matter came on for oral
12	argument before the Supreme Court of the United States
13	at 11:10 a.m.
14	APPEARANCES:
15	CHARLES A. ROTHFELD, ESQ., Washington, D.C.; on behalf
16	of Petitioner.
17	ANN O'CONNELL, ESQ., Assistant to the Solicitor General,
18	Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.; for United
19	States, as amicus curiae, supporting Petitioner.
20	LISA S. BLATT, ESQ., Washington, D.C.; on behalf of
21	Respondents.
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	CONTENTS	
2	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	PAGE
3	CHARLES A. ROTHFELD, ESQ.	
4	On behalf of the Petitioner	3
5	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
6	ANN O'CONNELL, ESQ.	
7	For United States, as amicus curiae,	
8	supporting Petitioner	18
9	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
10	LISA S. BLATT, ESQ.	
11	On behalf of the Respondents	28
12	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF	
13	CHARLES A. ROTHFELD, ESQ.	
14	On behalf of the Petitioner	56
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	(11:10 a.m.)
3	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We will hear
4	argument next this morning in Case 11-889, Tarrant
5	Regional Water District v. Herrmann.
6	Mr. Rothfeld?
7	ORAL ARGUMENT OF CHARLES A. ROTHFELD
8	ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER
9	MR. ROTHFELD: Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice,
10	and may it please the Court:
11	In the Red River Compact, Oklahoma agreed
12	that Texas would be allowed to use a specified quantity
13	of water that is located in Oklahoma. Oklahoma is now
14	trying to back out of that bargain.
15	What its argument to this Court in support
16	of its position is essentially that the Court should
17	disregard language that appears in the Red River Compact
18	because that language is superfluous, that the Court
19	should read into the Compact language that does not
20	appear there, and that the Court should not give the
21	text of the Compact what Oklahoma in its brief describes
22	as talismanic significance.
23	Our very different view is that the plain
24	text of the Compact must control.
25	Now, in the Red River Compact, Texas and

- 1 Oklahoma, along with Louisiana and Arkansas, agreed to
- 2 allocate among themselves the waters of the Red River
- 3 Basin. The Compact divides that basin into large areas
- 4 called reaches and subdivides the reaches into
- 5 subbasins. As to some of those areas, the Compact
- 6 expressly allocates entitlement to water by State line.
- 7 It says that the States may use the water within their
- 8 boundaries exclusively.
- 9 But in the section of the Compact which is
- 10 at issue here, Reach 2, Subbasin 5, the Compact uses a
- 11 very different and unique language. That section --
- 12 that subbasin includes the territory of three of the
- 13 four compacting States. The boundaries of that subbasin
- 14 are drawn not by State lines, but by reference to the --
- 15 the last downside dam sites before tributaries to the
- 16 Red River Basin -- Red River flow into the river itself.
- 17 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Mr. Rothfeld, we are told
- 18 that in other compacts when they really mean to give one
- 19 State the right to take another State's water, the
- 20 provision in the compact is much clearer, much more
- 21 definite.
- This clause, the one that you rely on, is
- 23 kind of sketchy, isn't it? Doesn't say how they're
- 24 going to get it, if they're going to pay for it.
- 25 There's a lot to be filled in.

MR. ROTHFELD: Well, the provision that we 1 2 are relying on, I would say is not sketchy at all. It 3 is quite clear that all four of the compacting States are in the language of the Compact, have equal rights to 4 5 the use of water, defined water in a defined area of the 6 subbasin, so long as no State uses more than 25 percent 7 of the water. That -- that is quite express as to what 8 is required. 9 In -- it's difficult to read that language to mean anything other than that the States can take --10 JUSTICE SCALIA: What is the exact language? 11 12 Do you want to read the exact language just to refresh 13 our recollection? 14 MR. CLEMENT: It appears -- it is reprinted on page 8 of the blue brief in the indented text, and it 15 16 says, "Within this -- within this subbasin, the 17 signatory States have equal rights to the use of," and then it defines the water that they have the rights to 18 19 the use of, "at times of normal flow" -- with the flow 20 of the Red River at 3,000 cubic feet per second at the 21 Arkansas/Louisiana border -- "provided that no State is entitled to more than 25 percent of the water in excess 22 23 of this amount." 24 So the -- the gist of the language is States 25 have -- all -- all four signatory States have equal

- 1 rights to the use of --
- JUSTICE BREYER: It doesn't say that. It
- 3 says, "No State is entitled to more than 25 percent."
- 4 It doesn't say -- I mean that language doesn't say what
- 5 happens if in fact there's a State that because of
- 6 cliffs or something can't get the 25 percent to which it
- 7 is entitled. It just doesn't say anything about it.
- 8 MR. ROTHFELD: Well, I have to disagree with
- 9 that.
- 10 JUSTICE BREYER: Where does it say something
- 11 about it?
- 12 MR. ROTHFELD: It says that -- the section
- is designed to allocate the water of the subbasin, and
- 14 it says, "Within the subbasin, States have equal rights
- 15 to use of the runoff." That's the first part of it.
- JUSTICE BREYER: Yes.
- 17 MR. ROTHFELD: The second part of it then
- 18 says, "provided that no State is entitled to more than
- 19 25 percent" --
- JUSTICE BREYER: All right. Does that mean
- 21 that a State can, when it can't get its pipeline to the
- 22 river, go into some other State and take the water out
- 23 of that other State? I mean, I would have thought, if
- 24 that was their intent, there would be a mechanism for
- 25 doing it; that you'd have some authority set up by the

- 1 Compact that would decide where, whether it's really
- 2 true, and how are we supposed to do it, and there is no
- 3 such mechanism, rather if there is such a right, which
- 4 it doesn't say anything about, it's left to the State
- 5 courts in different States to try to do what is an
- 6 extremely complex and controversial administrative job.
- 7 MR. ROTHFELD: A couple points to say about
- 8 that. First of all, it is not at all a complex job.
- JUSTICE BREYER: It's not at all complex
- 10 when Oklahoma is going to say, Texas, go run the pipe to
- 11 the south of the Red River, and Texas is going to say,
- 12 I'm sorry, we can't get there, there's too much cactus.
- 13 And then they're going to say, don't you know that, in
- 14 fact, when you put your pipeline into Oklahoma, you are
- 15 going to be taking part of the 25 percent that belongs
- 16 to us.
- 17 And Texas will say, no, we aren't. And then
- 18 we'll have to have a way of measuring how much goes into
- 19 the river at different places and what are all these
- 20 different pipelines are going to take out. You
- 21 understand what I'm saying.
- 22 MR. ROTHFELD: Right. But --
- 23 JUSTICE BREYER: I would have thought a
- 24 mechanism would be set up to do that and there is none.
- MR. ROTHFELD: Okay. Again, several things

- 1 about that. First of all, in all these other compacts
- 2 to which Justice Ginsburg alludes that are cited by our
- 3 opponents, which expressly allow for cross-border --
- 4 virtually none of them provide any of the kinds of
- 5 details that you are describing.
- 6 JUSTICE BREYER: Fine. But they do say
- 7 expressly, and I don't know what the terrain is like in
- 8 the other areas. And here it does not say anything
- 9 about it. That's why I think we're here in the Court,
- 10 because all it says is you can't take more than
- 11 25 percent. It doesn't say what happens when Texas is
- 12 unable to get its 25 percent from the south. I'm now
- 13 repeating myself, but you point to the language that
- 14 says what I just say is not consistent with the
- 15 language.
- MR. ROTHFELD: What I say -- I guess I will
- 17 say two things about that. One, I think what you just
- 18 say is, in fact, with respect, is not consistent with
- 19 the language. I think that --
- JUSTICE BREYER: Which language is it not
- 21 consistent with?
- MR. ROTHFELD: Equal rights to use of
- 23 specified water. It -- the -- the subbasin is defined,
- 24 again, not by State lines; it's defined by -- by
- 25 downstream dam sites. So it has created a pool of water

- 1 in the -- in this subbasin, and it says that all four
- 2 States have equal rights to use of this water, provided
- 3 that none takes more than 25 percent.
- It seems to me that on the face of it, that
- 5 is saying State lines are not relevant and that what we
- 6 are looking at is a pool of water the States can come
- 7 and get it. And it is particularly so --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Excuse me.
- 9 MR. ROTHFELD: If I may just -- I'm sorry.
- 10 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: No, no. Finish.
- 11 MR. ROTHFELD: And I think to the extent
- 12 that there could be any ambiguity in the -- in that
- 13 language viewed in isolation, in the context of the rest
- 14 of the Compact, there are places where the drafters of
- 15 the Compact, in fact, did refer to State lines. They
- 16 said that States are entitled to use the water within
- 17 their State values, the respective States may use the
- 18 water within their boundaries. They did not -- the
- 19 framers did not use that language in this provision.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I think under your
- 21 argument, and you can correct me if I'm wrong, that
- 22 Louisiana could decide it doesn't want to wait for the
- 23 flow of water to come to it, and it could just go right
- 24 into Oklahoma, in which it shares no border, and I don't
- 25 know how it's going to do that, and take its 25 percent.

- 1 Does that make sense in terms of the language?
- 2 MR. ROTHFELD: Well, I will --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I mean, you're talking
- 4 about Texas, but Texas shares a border and so it may be
- 5 a little easier to cross the borderline. But what's
- 6 Louisiana going to do?
- 7 MR. ROTHFELD: Well, let me make two points
- 8 about that.
- 9 First of all, I think that not only does it
- 10 make sense in the language; it's compelled by the
- 11 language, because the language says within this subbasin
- 12 all four States have equal rights. Separately, there is
- 13 another separate reach. Reach V of the Compact is
- 14 Louisiana's, and so the water flows into Louisiana.
- 15 When the water gets to Louisiana, it's no longer within
- 16 the subbasin, it's somewhere else.
- 17 So the plain language of the Compact compels
- 18 the reading -- compels the -- the point that Louisiana
- 19 could take its water from within the subbasin.
- Now, could it do that? The subbasin runs
- 21 through to Arkansas to Louisiana, so it could go to
- 22 Louisiana --
- JUSTICE BREYER: Go back to the first one,
- 24 because what you have done is you've pushed me back to
- 25 the equal rights. And now if I am going to fight you on

- 1 it, I have to say the equal rights to water means equal
- 2 rights to water arising within its boundaries. And all
- 3 you have to say is equal rights to water arising
- 4 anywhere in the subbasin.
- 5 And if I just heard that, then I might say
- 6 okay, I think yours is a little better. But -- but we
- 7 have this enormous administrative mess that would seem
- 8 to be created, and both those interpretations seem
- 9 possible.
- 10 So let's go back to that and let me hear
- 11 quite clearly, now that I've focused it: What's the
- 12 answer?
- 13 MR. ROTHFELD: If I may just finish with
- 14 Justice Sotomayor and I will turn to that?
- 15 I think the second answer to the question
- 16 is, the States are going to take the water from the
- 17 closest point where they can get it. And so Louisiana
- 18 is not going to go to Oklahoma. If it's going to go
- 19 into Subbasin 5, it's going to go to Arkansas directly
- 20 across the State line.
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: How -- how does it do it?
- 22 Does it have to apply to Texas?
- MR. ROTHFELD: It has to apply to
- 24 whichever --
- 25 JUSTICE GINSBURG: To Oklahoma.

- 1 MR. ROTHFELD: If it's going to Oklahoma,
- 2 and this is partially responsive to Justice Breyer, it
- 3 would have to apply to the water authorities within
- 4 Oklahoma. So what is going on here, Tarrant, the Texas
- 5 water district, is applying to the Oklahoma Water
- 6 Resources Board. It will seek a permit. This will
- 7 operate precisely in the same way as if an Oklahoma
- 8 applicant is seeking a permit.
- 9 You will go to -- you will go and say, I
- 10 want to take water out of this point. The Water
- 11 Resources Board will apply its ordinary standards to
- 12 determine whether or not that can be granted.
- 13 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Who -- who erects the
- 14 facilities to accomplish this diversion?
- MR. ROTHFELD: Tarrant presumably will do
- 16 that. If Tarrant needs to obtain rights of way,
- 17 Oklahoma law provides for exercise of eminent domain, or
- 18 Tarrant can simply purchase the property to do that.
- 19 JUSTICE KENNEDY: It's -- it's my
- 20 understanding that there is a place where Texas can put
- 21 a line into the river, and then a subset of that
- 22 question is, the main stem of the river, through --
- 23 without going through Oklahoma property, other than
- 24 perhaps just the bank itself.
- 25 MR. ROTHFELD: That -- that I think is not

- 1 correct as a factual matter. The -- the Red River lies
- 2 entirely within Oklahoma, and so Oklahoma, in order to
- 3 get water out of the main stem, if -- if Texas were to
- 4 do that, it would have to go into Oklahoma. And -- and
- 5 in fact, this is in response to -- in part to what --
- 6 JUSTICE KENNEDY: But you say entirely
- 7 within Oklahoma, just because of ownership of the banks?
- 8 MR. ROTHFELD: Because --
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: -- or because of there's
- 10 also some intervening property between Texas and the
- 11 bank that Oklahoma owns?
- 12 MR. ROTHFELD: The -- the border between
- 13 Oklahoma and Texas is the south vegetation line of the
- 14 Red River, so therefore it is out of the river past the
- 15 bank to the vegetation line. So in order to get water
- 16 out of the main stem, Oklahoma and -- Texas would have
- 17 to go into Oklahoma. Now, there is --
- 18 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Do -- do the current laws
- 19 prohibit that --
- 20 MR. ROTHFELD: Oklahoma's current laws
- 21 would, I would think, prevent --
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: At any point?
- 23 MR. ROTHFELD: At any point, because the
- laws that Tarrant is challenging here are laws that are
- 25 discriminatory Oklahoma laws that prevent any use of

- 1 water originating in Oklahoma outside.
- 2 JUSTICE ALITO: When you say Texas has the
- 3 right to go into Oklahoma, just -- just think about that
- 4 phrase. That's -- that's very striking. I mean, it
- 5 sounds like they are going to send in the National Guard
- 6 or the Texas Rangers.
- 7 MR. ROTHFELD: Right. And that -- if I may,
- 8 Justice Alito, that is -- that's a very misleading way
- 9 of looking at it. And I think Oklahoma's brief suggests
- 10 that the Texas Rangers are going to descend on Tulsa
- 11 and seize the water. That is not what -- what is
- 12 contemplated.
- JUSTICE ALITO: But you were saying that
- 14 Oklahoma -- that Texas has the right to force Oklahoma
- 15 to take private property in Oklahoma by eminent
- 16 domain if necessary.
- 17 MR. ROTHFELD: No, I -- there is an -- there
- is an Oklahoma statute that says in order to -- someone
- 19 who has a permit to obtain water can exercise eminent
- 20 domain. An Oklahoma person can do this. A Texas person
- 21 can do this.
- 22 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: How does -- how does
- 23 Oklahoma apply its law in this situation? I assume
- 24 there is normal priorities and they will get
- 25 applications from a lot of people. But they have to --

- 1 what do they have to give Texas? Up to 25 percent?
- I mean, they can't just say -- deny it,
- 3 because another Oklahoma user has priority, or all this.
- 4 How does that fit in with the existing administrative
- 5 structure?
- 6 MR. ROTHFELD: Well, Oklahoma cannot use
- 7 more than 25 percent of the water within the subbasin.
- 8 I think that our friends concede that, because the
- 9 language of the Compact says no State is entitled to
- 10 more than 25 percent.
- 11 Within each State's 25 percent allocation, a
- 12 resident water user of the State will apply to the
- 13 Oklahoma -- if they are seeking to take their water from
- 14 Oklahoma, it will apply to the Oklahoma Water Resources
- 15 Board, which will assess that permit precisely as it
- 16 assesses permits from Oklahoma residents.
- 17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: But it's got to give
- 18 Texas at least up to its 25 percent, right?
- 19 MR. ROTHFELD: If -- if there is a request
- 20 for that much water from a Texas user, and the Texas
- 21 user has priority as a permit applicant against others
- 22 who are seeking to take water from this particular --
- 23 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I quess what I'm
- 24 asking is, does the Compact give Texas special priority
- 25 apart from what Oklahoma -- Oklahoma's priorities would

- 1 be?
- 2 MR. ROTHFELD: No, it does not. It's --
- 3 all -- all the Compact says is that Texas is entitled to
- 4 take water from within the subbasin, its 25 percent.
- 5 Now when it applies in a particular place, as Tarrant
- 6 has done here, it's going to apply -- be consistent with
- 7 the Oklahoma Water Resources Board permit application
- 8 policies, as it has done.
- 9 The resources board will assess that permit
- 10 application just as it would assess an application
- 11 from --
- 12 JUSTICE KAGAN: And what does that mean
- 13 exactly? What would Oklahoma do to evaluate that
- 14 application and to compare it to other applications from
- 15 Oklahomans, and also maybe to compare it -- maybe there
- is more than one Texas application.
- 17 How does the Oklahoma board make those
- 18 decisions?
- 19 MR. ROTHFELD: It -- a permit applicant
- 20 submits an application, which has to demonstrate that it
- 21 satisfies the standards for obtaining the water. That
- 22 will be assessed on its merits by the Water Resources
- 23 Board.
- 24 If there are competing applications for the
- 25 same water, then it's -- it's done in the terms of

- 1 priority -- of --
- JUSTICE KAGAN: I'm really asking you to
- 3 tell me what the Oklahoma board is going to do. I mean,
- 4 why doesn't the Oklahoma board just say, you know,
- 5 sorry, we like Oklahomans? Would that be all right?
- 6 MR. ROTHFELD: Well, that is their current
- 7 policy. That would not be all right.
- 8 JUSTICE KAGAN: What -- what -- what
- 9 different kind of priorities do they have to use, and
- 10 why do they have to use them, as I think -- somewhere
- 11 along the lines of what the Chief Justice was asking?
- MR. ROTHFELD: I suppose there -- there are
- 13 two points there. One is, if there is enough water to
- 14 go around for everyone, as in fact there is, then they
- 15 simply assess it in terms of priority in time. Whoever
- 16 makes the first application will get it.
- 17 However, Oklahoma can only get -- use
- 18 25 percent of the water. And therefore, Texas has the
- 19 right, so long as there is water available and Texas has
- 20 not used its 25 percent of the subbasin water, Texas has
- 21 the right to seek that anywhere it can get it in the
- 22 subbasin.
- 23 If I may, Mr. Chief Justice.
- 24 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
- Ms. O'Connell.

1	ORAL ARGUMENT OF ANN O'CONNELL,
2	FOR UNITED STATES, AS AMICUS CURIAE,
3	SUPPORTING THE PETITIONER
4	MS. O'CONNELL: Mr. Chief Justice, and may
5	it please the Court:
6	The court of appeals concluded that Oklahoma
7	may categorically foreclose Texas water users from
8	accessing Reach II Subbasin 5 water in Oklahoma, and the
9	court reached that conclusion for reasons that in the
LO	view of the United States are wrong.
L1	First, the court of appeals erred in
L2	applying a presumption against preemption to determine
L3	whether the challenged Oklahoma laws conflict with the
L 4	Compact. The rationale for that presumption where it
L5	has been applied is one of federalism, but the States
L6	themselves created the terms of the interstate Compact,
L7	and respect for the States as sovereigns in that context
L8	requires enforcement of the Compact according to its
L9	terms.
20	Second, the court of appeals relied on
21	general Compact provisions to conclude that the Compact
22	gives States unrestricted authority to regulate the
23	water within their boundaries. But the general
24	provisions of the Compact make clear that a State's
25	regulation of water has to be consistent with the

- 1 allocations made under the Compact, and each State's
- 2 obligations under the Compact.
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: Well, I -- I am not quite
- 4 sure I agree with your reading of the court of appeals'
- 5 opinion. It seems to me the court of appeals' opinion
- 6 is consistent with the Respondents' argument that they
- 7 looked at the terms of the Compact.
- 8 And it seems to me that you may be right
- 9 that the Compact either says you get the water or you
- 10 don't, and the dormant Commerce Clause is just
- 11 irrelevant. But I read the opinion of the court of
- 12 appeals as being quite consistent with that proposition.
- 13 You win or you lose, up or down, under the Compact. The
- 14 dormant Commerce Clause doesn't -- just doesn't have
- 15 much to do with it.
- 16 MS. O'CONNELL: Well, we agree with that.
- 17 We don't think that the dormant Commerce Clause comes
- 18 into play here. We think that whether Texas can access
- 19 the water in Oklahoma through the Oklahoma permitting
- 20 process depends entirely on whether the Compact gives
- 21 them that right or not.
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: But that's the way I
- 23 read the analytic approach of the court of appeals at
- 24 39A, when it starts talking about the point of --
- 25 Section 5.05.

1 MS	. 0	'CONNELL:	Right.	And	we	don'	t
------	-----	-----------	--------	-----	----	------	---

- 2 disagree with that, that the -- that the commerce clause
- 3 shouldn't come into play here.
- 4 Where we disagree with the Court of Appeals
- 5 is with the Court of Appeals' conclusion that,
- 6 regardless of whether a State law would frustrate the
- 7 purpose or pose an obstacle to a State obtaining its
- 8 share of water under the Compact, that that State law
- 9 should prevail under the Compact. So the Compact makes
- 10 clear that those general provisions preserving State
- 11 water law need to be consistent with each State's
- 12 obligations under the Compact.
- 13 And if I could --
- 14 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, where, if
- 15 you're relying on the Compact and its language, where do
- 16 you come up with this idea that States first have to try
- 17 to get their 25 percent from water within their borders?
- 18 I don't see that anywhere.
- 19 MS. O'CONNELL: Well, first of all, we think
- 20 that that's an issue that, if the Court decided that --
- 21 that there are errors in the court of appeals opinion
- that should be corrected, we think that's something the
- 23 court of -- that the lower courts could consider on
- 24 remand.
- 25 But I'll tell you where it comes from, which

- 1 is Sections 2.01 and 2.10(a) of the Compact, which
- 2 preserve the application of State water law. Section
- 3 2.01 says that, "Each State may freely administer water
- 4 rights and uses in accordance with the laws of that
- 5 State, but that such -- such uses shall be subject to
- 6 the availability of water in accordance with the
- 7 Compact."
- 8 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, it seems to me
- 9 that you like some provisions of State law, but not
- 10 others.
- MS. O'CONNELL: No. What we're saying is
- 12 that if there's a State law that conflicts with the
- 13 allocation or poses an obstacle to the allocation of
- 14 water under the Compact, then it's preempted.
- But, for example, if Texas could access
- 16 25 percent of the water from within its State, then
- 17 the -- the application of a State law that would bar
- 18 Texas water users from obtaining a portion of its water
- 19 in Oklahoma wouldn't necessarily be preempted, because
- it wouldn't pose an obstacle to the allocation.
- 21 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: What do you do --
- 22 what do you do with a situation -- let's say there's
- 23 Oklahoma water available to Tarrant that is closer than
- 24 the water they would get from somewhere else in Texas.
- 25 Do they have to incur the additional expense to get

- 1 Texas water, or can they take the cheaper route and get
- 2 Oklahoma water?
- MS. O'CONNELL: Well, we think -- again, we
- 4 think this is a -- an issue for the court of -- for the
- 5 lower courts to look at on remand, but we think there's
- 6 a -- there's a good argument to be made that, so long as
- 7 Texas could access 25 percent of the water within its
- 8 boundaries, then application of an Oklahoma law that
- 9 would prohibit Texas from going through the Oklahoma
- 10 permitting process wouldn't necessarily be preempted.
- 11 And again, we -- these -- there are
- 12 lots of issues, as we point out in our brief and we did
- 13 at the invitation stage, that would need to be
- 14 addressed, perhaps, in further proceedings or perhaps
- 15 before the --
- 16 JUSTICE KAGAN: Ms. O'Connell, isn't that a
- 17 reason why we shouldn't accept your basic view? I mean,
- 18 if -- if you think of all the issues that you laid out
- 19 that are going to have to be decided and the difficulty
- 20 of those issues -- I mean, you read this brief that you
- 21 submitted, it gives you kind of a headache. That --
- 22 that -- you know, and it -- it suggests how difficult
- 23 the process is.
- And then you look at this provision, and
- 25 maybe this provision can be read as an entitlement, but

- 1 it can just as easily, as -- as Justice Breyer
- 2 suggested, be read as a cap, "no more than 25 percent."
- 3 So as between those two possible readings,
- 4 the complexity of your way of reading this, which would
- 5 have -- why?
- 6 MS. O'CONNELL: Justice Kagan, I'd like to,
- 7 if I could, go to the second point, which is on the --
- 8 the -- whether you read this as a 25 percent entitlement
- 9 or a cap, and I would like to point the Court, not just
- 10 to the language of the Compact, which we think weighs in
- 11 favor of the idea that each right -- each State has an
- 12 equal right and that the -- the equal right to use the
- 13 water in the subbasin implies an equal right, not just
- 14 an opportunity.
- 15 But the interpretive comments that follow
- 16 Section 5.05(b) -- this is at page 30 of the is Joint
- 17 Appendix -- refer to a "right." The first full
- 18 paragraph there says, "When the flows" -- I'm sorry;
- 19 it's the -- the second line. "If the States have
- 20 competing uses and the amount of water available in
- 21 excess of 3,000 cubic feet per second cannot satisfy all
- 22 such uses, each State will honor the other State's right
- 23 to 25 percent of the excess flow."
- The Red River Compact Commission also
- 25 approved rules and regulations, and those say -- they're

1	on page	, I	think,	19	of	the	Joint	Appendix.	I might
---	---------	-----	--------	----	----	-----	-------	-----------	---------

- 2 have that page -- yeah, I have that page wrong.
- 3 But the -- the Red River Compact
- 4 Commission's rules and regulations say that when the
- flow is above 12,000 cubic feet per second, so that
- 6 Louisiana could get its 3,000 cubic feet per second,
- 7 "each of the signatory States shall be entitled to
- 8 25 percent of the total runoff in undesignated flow."
- 9 So I think it -- it's pretty clear that
- 10 based on the -- both the text of the Compact and the
- 11 interpretive comments in the rules that the Red River
- 12 Compact Commission came up with, that there is not just
- 13 that you can take whatever is in your borders even if
- 14 that doesn't amount to 25 percent, but -- but that each
- 15 State is entitled to 25 percent of the water, and that
- 16 if that involves going into another State within this
- 17 geographic area that's not defined with respect to State
- 18 boundaries, then that is permissible under the Compact.
- 19 And as the Petitioner pointed out, when the
- 20 States wanted to impose a State boundary restriction in
- 21 the Compact, they did so. There are several subbasins
- 22 that span more than one geographic -- or more than one
- 23 State, and the Compact in those provisions says that you
- 24 can take whatever you want within your boundaries.
- 25 And I also don't think that this is going to

- 1 be particularly troublesome to administer. I mean,
- 2 there may need to be some further proceedings on that,
- 3 but Oklahoma law provides the backdrop for what would
- 4 happen when a Texas water user goes in to -- to ask for
- 5 a permit to appropriate and divert water from within
- 6 Oklahoma.
- JUSTICE KAGAN: And what does that mean?
- 8 What would Oklahoma do?
- 9 MS. O'CONNELL: Well, the Oklahoma Water
- 10 Resources Board would just apply its normal procedures
- 11 and laws to determine whether this particular use of
- 12 water could be put to beneficial use. If -- they would
- just apply whatever laws they would apply to any
- 14 applicant, regardless of whether they are from Texas or
- 15 Oklahoma.
- JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, people keep on saying
- 17 that, and I -- I guess I just still don't understand
- 18 quite what it means.
- MS. O'CONNELL: Well --
- JUSTICE KAGAN: I mean, let's say Oklahoma,
- 21 the board is sitting there and it gets lots of
- 22 applications from Oklahoma users. And let's say it also
- 23 gets multiple applications from Texas users. That it's
- 24 not just one county, it's four counties. What does
- 25 Oklahoma do to -- to decide who gets the water?

- 1 MS. O'CONNELL: Well, I think just as -- as
- 2 Petitioner's counsel pointed out, there's a -- a
- 3 priority in water law, where whoever submits the
- 4 application first would -- would get the water if it's
- 5 available and they can put it to beneficial use.
- And I -- and I -- the Court shouldn't be
- 7 concerned. I know all -- I know there are amicus briefs
- 8 submitted by other Texas entities that would like to
- 9 have water from this particular subbasin as well.
- 10 They're all part of the same Region C, and they -- I
- 11 think they have some way to work it out. It's not like
- 12 they --
- 13 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, I don't understand
- 14 your answer. If -- if you're correct, wouldn't the
- 15 Oklahoma board have to give priority to the Texas
- 16 applicants in order to make sure that Texas got its
- 17 share of the water? It couldn't just treat -- it
- 18 couldn't just be indifferent as to whether it was an
- 19 Oklahoma or Texas applicant.
- MS. O'CONNELL: That -- true, to the extent
- 21 that Texas was not receiving its water. I mean,
- 22 under -- under our theory, which we think could be
- 23 developed more in the lower courts, if Texas was already
- 24 receiving 25 percent of the water, then Oklahoma would
- 25 not have to give it any kind of special priority. But

- 1 if it -- if it was not, then the Oklahoma Water
- 2 Resources Board would treat it just like an Oklahoma
- 3 applicant.
- 4 JUSTICE ALITO: Is it correct that -- that
- 5 there are reservoirs in Texas that flow into -- from
- 6 which water is released into the Red River?
- 7 MS. O'CONNELL: Yes.
- 8 JUSTICE ALITO: Okay. And --
- 9 MS. O'CONNELL: And in Oklahoma as well.
- 10 JUSTICE ALITO: And what if Texas didn't --
- 11 what if Texas could get -- could -- could release that
- 12 water and increase the flow of the river, but it chose
- 13 not to do so, so it could take other water out of the
- 14 river?
- 15 MS. O'CONNELL: This -- this is the last
- 16 point made in the Respondent's brief --
- 17 JUSTICE ALITO: Yes.
- 18 MS. O'CONNELL: -- and -- and the response
- 19 to that would just be that all of the States would have
- 20 the opportunity to do that. In fact, the whole subbasin
- 21 is defined by the last major dam site on the tributaries
- 22 that are running in. So Oklahoma could do the same
- 23 thing.
- And also, when the reservoirs are full,
- 25 they're full. It's not like Texas could keep all of the

- water that's -- that's there from flowing into the
- 2 bottom portion of that tributary.
- JUSTICE BREYER: Well, we're only
- 4 considering the instance where there isn't enough water
- 5 to meet the 25 percent in Texas. And in that instance,
- 6 I guess there are 50,000 places, not just in Oklahoma,
- 7 but also in Arkansas, where they might get some. And
- 8 all my question, and I think that was being asked, is
- 9 there anything else you want to say as to why that's an
- 10 easy matter to decide?
- MS. O'CONNELL: Well, I -- it's -- we don't
- 12 think it needs to be decided in this particular
- 13 proceeding. I think there are two errors that the court
- of appeals made in applying a presumption against
- 15 preemption and in concluding that a Texas water user
- 16 could never divert water from outside of its State.
- 17 Those could be developed -- those additional problems
- 18 could be dealt with by the Oklahoma Water Resources
- 19 Board or as you said, perhaps in the original action.
- 20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
- 21 Ms. Blatt?
- 22 ORAL ARGUMENT OF LISA S. BLATT
- 23 ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENTS
- MS. BLATT: Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice,
- 25 and may it please the Court:

1 If I could	just	address	two	sort	οf	factual
--------------	------	---------	-----	------	----	---------

- 2 questions.
- 3 Under the -- the actual Red River Boundary
- 4 Compact, the lawyer for Tarrant was wrong. There's
- 5 actually a strip called Shawnee Creek, from the Denison
- 6 Dam to the Shawnee Creek, that actually belongs to
- 7 Texas. So there's a piece of the Red River in this very
- 8 subbasin that is -- it's in the express Boundary
- 9 Compact.
- 10 Moreover, all of the Red River and Lake
- 11 Texoma that is in Texas is part of the main stem, and
- 12 that is not only in the land of Texas, Texas users draw
- 13 water, quite a lot of water, from Lake Texoma. So
- 14 that's two places on the main stem.
- 15 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Are they licensed?
- 16 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So I'm sure -- you're --
- 17 you're saying that the State of Texas can take water
- 18 directly from the main stem?
- MS. BLATT: It can and does.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: That's my point, yes.
- 21 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Anywhere close to of
- 22 the 25 percent they claim entitlement to?
- MS. BLATT: Well, who knows?
- 24 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I was hoping you
- 25 did.

1	(Laughter.)	

- MS. BLATT: Who knows? Texas has more than
- 3 a dozen fresh tributaries running from Subbasin 2 and
- 4 Subbasin 4.
- 5 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I'm talking about
- 6 Subbasin 5.
- 7 MS. BLATT: Subbasin 5, these are all --
- 8 excuse me -- these are tributaries that run into
- 9 Subbasin 5. There is more than a dozen tributaries in
- 10 Subbasin 5.
- 11 For 30 years no one has ever kept track of
- 12 any kind of accounting whatsoever, so when we say "who
- 13 knows?" that is the way the drafters -- it's not only
- 14 the way the drafters intended, but that has been the
- 15 state of play for 30 years.
- 16 So nobody -- and in the laws of Louisiana
- 17 and Arkansas don't even track diversions. So --
- 18 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Just to be clear, in your
- 19 view, Texas can, without going on Oklahoma property,
- 20 take water from the main stem in Basin 5?
- 21 MS. BLATT: In Subbasin 5, there is only up
- 22 from Denison Dam east to Shawnee Creek. So that's just
- 23 anywhere from a half a mile to three-quarters. It runs
- 24 from the -- from the middle of the channel.
- 25 East -- excuse me, west is Lake Texoma, and

- 1 if you want to look at the map, it's a big old lake.
- 2 That is a lot of water. And they definitely do take --
- 3 and that's in the brief -- they take lots of water from
- 4 that lake from the Texas side.
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: But my question was, can
- 6 they take it from the main stem --
- 7 MS. BLATT: Only in that -- that little slip
- 8 of land to Shawnee Creek. It's -- it's a part of
- 9 Texas --
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: Is that the part that,
- 11 under their allegation at least, is saline?
- 12 MS. BLATT: Well, again, they drink the
- 13 water in Subbasin 5.
- 14 JUSTICE KENNEDY: All right. Is that the
- 15 part that --
- MS. BLATT: Yes. They think --
- 17 JUSTICE KENNEDY: -- they are referring
- 18 to --
- MS. BLATT: Yes.
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: -- when they say it's too
- 21 saline?
- MS. BLATT: Yes. They think all the water
- 23 that their residents drink is salty, but they still are
- 24 drinking it.
- 25 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Texans.

- 1 MS. BLATT: They're drinking it. In fact,
- 2 they're -- footnote 3 and footnote 4, their water
- 3 planning documents, say this is a -- quite a -- a
- 4 drinkable source of water.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: When they --
- 6 MS. BLATT: I understand they think it's
- 7 salty, but they drink it.
- 8 JUSTICE SCALIA: When they take water from
- 9 the main stream of the Red River, how do they know how
- 10 much of that water is from Reach V?
- MS. BLATT: Well, the --
- 12 JUSTICE SCALIA: They are -- they are
- 13 entitled to -- to no more than 25 percent from Reach V.
- 14 Is everything that -- that comes into Texas in the main
- 15 channel of the Red River water from Reach V?
- 16 MS. BLATT: So if you look at the -- if you
- 17 look at the map in the red brief that's got all the --
- 18 the colors, and the pink is Subbasin 5. So where they
- 19 divert water from is all up and down those blue
- 20 tributaries that are in pink south of the Red River.
- 21 JUSTICE SCALIA: Now what page are you
- 22 looking at?
- MS. BLATT: This is 33A --
- JUSTICE SCALIA: Yeah, okay.
- MS. BLATT: -- this map.

- 1 JUSTICE SCALIA: Yeah, yeah, yeah. I didn't
- 2 know --
- 3 MS. BLATT: So they -- and then if you look
- 4 at that -- that blue lake that looks like a dragon, that
- 5 is also where they are -- they are taking water.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: What --
- 7 MS. BLATT: That just happens to be in Reach
- 8 I.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: Reach I. Okay.
- 10 MS. BLATT: But their water planning
- 11 documents show that all the water in the pink on the
- 12 Texas side is a very valuable source of drinking water.
- 13 And if you see, all the way down to Lake Texarkana, they
- 14 can -- they are taking that water, too.
- 15 And when we say about what we know, no one
- 16 has ever done any accounting because the Equal Rights
- 17 Clause has always been read as equal rights to the use
- of the water without prejudice to or from each other's
- 19 State, and, in that sense, it means that if one State
- 20 took an earlier use of the water, it wouldn't gain a
- 21 priority indefinitely over the other States.
- 22 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, it never -- it
- 23 never says that. I mean, that's why we have a case. It
- 24 never says it has to be from your State.
- 25 And I appreciate your -- the focus in your

- 1 argument on State sovereignty, but this is an interstate
- 2 Compact. And the whole point of interstate compacts is
- 3 that we have to -- each State has to give up a little
- 4 here or a little there to solve a problem.
- 5 So I -- I guess it's -- I don't know why
- 6 these basic principles of State sovereignty apply in the
- 7 context of an interstate compact.
- 8 MS. BLATT: Right. I mean, it is our
- 9 position that the States would have never agreed to this
- 10 extraordinary right without an -- an unequivocal
- 11 explicit statement.
- But I do think it is absolutely critical to
- 13 understand that what they are asking for is
- 14 unprecedented, Mr. Chief Justice. There has never been
- 15 a cross-border diversion -- ever -- under any State
- 16 water compact. And the two examples they cite in their
- 17 reply brief are inexplicable -- absolutely inexplicable.
- 18 They cite the Niobrara Compact with no cite. They --
- 19 they cite the Compact, but they never say there has been
- 20 a cross-border diversion.
- 21 And if you look on the map --
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: Say that again, because
- 23 we have a green brief that gives us samples of
- 24 provisions for cross border.
- MS. BLATT: Yeah, under explicit right.

- 1 There has never been a cross-border diversion without an
- 2 explicit statement. Not only --
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: Because there have been
- 4 many, many --
- 5 MS. BLATT: Many with explicit statements
- 6 and then the essential bells and whistles as to eminent
- 7 domain, points of diversion, and which choice of law.
- 8 And what they tried to say, because we have
- 9 been saying all along how unprecedented this would be to
- 10 sort of read in silence on borders, they tried to come
- 11 up with two examples in their reply brief.
- 12 And that's what I'm talking about. The
- 13 reply brief is not only -- is devoid of a citation, but
- 14 Nebraska and Wyoming told both us, and Wyoming told
- 15 Tarrant's counsel, that there have never been
- 16 diversions. And Nebraska was quite -- like, "Wow, we
- 17 hadn't known that." And it shows the danger of their
- 18 position. They think if it's silent as to borders, the
- 19 State of Wyoming can go hundreds of miles into Nebraska
- 20 and take the water across the border.
- 21 The other example they cite is fascinating
- 22 because it's a lawsuit before you. They cite the Rio
- 23 Grande Compact as a basis of saying El Paso can walk
- 24 into New Mexico, but their lawsuit to you is based on
- 25 the notion that Texas can't go into New Mexico. It's

- 1 New Mexico has a downstream delivery. So --
- 2 JUSTICE BREYER: But there was a point, it
- 3 seems to me, to favor them, which is go back to 1970 --
- 4 the '70s, when they drafted this.
- 5 MS. BLATT: I'm there.
- 6 JUSTICE BREYER: So they are in the room,
- 7 and there are representatives of all four States, and as
- 8 they argue, there is going to be more than 3,000 feet,
- 9 what happens? And Louisiana would say, we want at least
- 10 25 percent; done. Arkansas, 25 percent; done.
- 11 Oklahoma, same; done. Texas, same; done.
- 12 But everybody in the room knows that Texas
- 13 could never get more than 12 percent within its borders.
- 14 And since it could never get 12 -- more than 12 percent,
- 15 Louisiana would be sitting there with not really
- 17 MS. BLATT: But with all due -- sorry.
- 18 JUSTICE BREYER: -- that would suggest that,
- 19 hey, no, they all knew this and so they meant there must
- 20 be some way for Texas to get the extra; otherwise, why
- 21 were they saying 25 percent for Texas? If --
- MS. BLATT: Justice Breyer. Justice Breyer.
- 23 It's just not true. What they cite to is a 1970
- 24 engineering report --
- 25 JUSTICE BREYER: You know, this is an

- 1 example I made up, because I think --
- MS. BLATT: Oh. Well, the --
- JUSTICE BREYER: -- an imaginary
- 4 conversation.
- 5 MS. BLATT: Oh.
- 6 JUSTICE BREYER: But if in an imaginary
- 7 conversation --
- 8 MS. BLATT: Well, okay. 34 percent of the
- 9 watershed is in Texas, so there is no reason to think
- 10 anyone thought Texas couldn't get its share.
- JUSTICE BREYER: Why?
- 12 MS. BLATT: There's no -- because there's no
- 13 evidence there was any discussion about any State and
- 14 whether -- Texas never complained. No one ever said
- 15 Texas couldn't get its water.
- 16 JUSTICE BREYER: Wouldn't that be a fairly
- 17 easy thing to check going back to 1970 --
- MS. BLATT: If you --
- 19 JUSTICE BREYER: -- to found out whether,
- 20 you know, Texas was just on some little salt flat --
- MS. BLATT: Sure.
- JUSTICE BREYER: -- near the river and --
- 23 MS. BLATT: We did. They did in their
- 24 brief, and they came up with an 11 to 16 percent. Our
- 25 engineers ran the numbers after correcting their

- 1 three-series method -- methodological errors, and we
- 2 came up with 29 percent.
- 3 They -- they double-counted streams. They
- 4 forgot that Subbasin 5 is not only runoff but also rain.
- 5 And then -- this one's humorous -- they didn't count the
- 6 excess. So all the -- all the math that they did
- 7 favored Texas, so the math didn't come out that way.
- 8 But what's interesting about the Tarrant's
- 9 view in juxtaposing with the United States' view,
- 10 Tarrant's view is it could have all the water, but they
- 11 could get all of it still from Oklahoma. So Louisiana,
- 12 Arkansas, and -- and Texas could come take all their
- 13 share from Oklahoma, forcing Oklahoma to have to go
- 14 south.
- Now the United States' view, and this is
- 16 I -- they read a border limitation in there. They say,
- 17 "Look, borders are here, but if Texas really needs it,
- 18 you got to let them come in. " That -- that's the United
- 19 States.
- 20 They definitely -- which I don't understand
- 21 their reliance on the Russello principle, because they
- 22 read borders into this. Texas has actually disavowed
- 23 this view. Tarrant's disavowed it. They disavowed it
- 24 to the Tenth Circuit when the Tenth Circuit asked for
- 25 what their standing would to be to press it. They said,

- 1 "We've never claimed this."
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So what do you think is
- 3 the remedy? Meaning --
- 4 MS. BLATT: The remedy?
- 5 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I -- let me just posit
- 6 the point; okay? I understand your point to the Chief
- 7 that there's been no proof that Texas doesn't get its
- 8 25 percent or that it couldn't get it from the main stem
- 9 or somewhere. I accept that.
- But let's, for the hypothetical, say that
- 11 there's a major drought and Texas can't get it from its
- 12 portion. What's its remedy?
- MS. BLATT: Okay. Yeah.
- 14 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So that -- that it's not
- 15 getting --
- MS. BLATT: Okay.
- 17 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- 25 percent --
- MS. BLATT: Yeah. So let's --
- 19 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- as the Compact
- 20 entitles it to.
- 21 MS. BLATT: Okay. It's the last statement.
- 22 The Compact no way, no how entitles the parties to equal
- 23 25 percent. It just doesn't say equal rights to a
- 24 numerical share. It doesn't say equal rights to a
- 25 numerical quantity.

- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: It says "shall have
- 2 equal rights to the use of runoff originating in
- 3 Subbasin 5."
- 4 MS. BLATT: Right. And you and I could have
- 5 equal rights to the use of the family car or equal
- 6 rights to the use of the highway. That doesn't tell me
- 7 anything about how many hours I can spend on the
- 8 highway.
- 9 But here's the problem. The real problem is
- 10 with the cap. Okay? Their view is that the first
- 11 clause gives you an absolute equal right to a fixed
- 12 25 percent; no exceptions. But then you have this
- 13 provided clause which does no work for them. The
- 14 provided clause, which says you don't get any more than
- 15 25 percent, they are saying, "Well, by definition, if
- 16 you get exactly 25 percent, the State can take no more
- 17 than 25 percent." So they actually just sort of combine
- 18 the two.
- 19 The other -- I hate to point this out,
- 20 because I -- I feel a lot of affinity for the United
- 21 States, but their proof --
- 22 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You feel a lot of
- 23 what?
- MS. BLATT: Affinity for them.
- 25 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Oh.

- 1 MS. BLATT: But listen to their proof for
- 2 why there's an equal 25 percent.
- 3 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You are representing
- 4 Oklahoma.
- 5 MS. BLATT: I am, but I used to work for
- 6 them.
- 7 They say well, we're guaranteed an equal
- 8 25 percent share, and they cite the compliance rules on
- 9 page 19. And entertainingly so, the rules that they
- 10 cite just disprove what they said.
- 11 The first rule they cite only gave 3 States.
- 12 They divided it by 3 instead of 4. Their view, the
- 13 United States' view, is there's a guarantee of
- 14 25 percent of any amount that's in excess of 3,000.
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: Well, this is a -- a
- 16 perfectly legitimate argument for you to make, but I
- 17 want to go back to Justice Sotomayor's question.
- 18 At least as I understood it, it's this: I
- 19 want you to assume -- I know you don't agree with
- 20 that -- I want you to assume that the Compact gives
- 21 Texas a right to 25 percent of the -- of the excess --
- 22 of the water above the cubic foot.
- MS. BLATT: The excess, yeah.
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: I want you to assume that.
- 25 Now, wouldn't the Compact be meaningless if Texas

- 1 couldn't actually reach that water?
- 2 MS. BLATT: That is -- that is the United
- 3 States' view, and they'd have to go above it. What they
- 4 would have to do, which no one else -- no one has
- 5 done -- and I think the drafters thought it was
- 6 ultimately impossible because of Arkansas and Louisiana,
- 7 is call for an accounting and actually figure out what
- 8 the total was, figure out what the excess was, divvy up
- 9 the 4 shares, do exactly what Tarrant wants I guess to
- 10 happen, which has never happened, and it's not clear to
- 11 the drafters of the compliance rules that it could in
- 12 fact ever happen because of the riparian laws of
- 13 Arkansas and Louisiana.
- 14 But -- so in other words, if we lost this
- 15 case, which is probably why Tarrant is disavowing the
- 16 United States' view, is Texas would be in quite of a
- 17 pickle trying to prove they couldn't get their
- 18 25 percent. And so I read Tarrant as saying, don't you
- 19 dare send us back to try to prove that. We want to be
- 20 able to go whole hog into Oklahoma.
- 21 And if I could get to the point that Justice
- 22 Kagan was talking about, what's on the ground happening,
- and why Oklahoma would have never agreed to this type of
- 24 cross-border right, because what Tarrant is doing is
- 25 exploiting Oklahoma's law, which proceeds on the

- 1 assumption that water in Oklahoma is a public trust
- 2 that's held for the exclusive benefits of Oklahoma.
- 3 And there are three ways where Oklahoma
- 4 would not have agreed to this, and it would have been
- 5 carefully articulated in a Compact.
- The first is prior appropriation. There are
- 7 4 Texas entities that have signed up for permits: The
- 8 Upper Trinity, the North Texas Municipal Water District,
- 9 Irving and Tarrant. And poor Oklahoma City got
- 10 sandwiched in the middle. It beat -- it beat Trinity to
- 11 the permit office by 24 hours.
- 12 And so, not surprisingly, it's open season
- 13 for Oklahoma water, all of north Texas has come in and
- 14 sought a permit and there's priority.
- 15 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: But that's the same
- 16 problem. Even if you take within State, all of these
- 17 people, if they were applying for water in Texas as
- 18 well, there'd be the same issue there. One of them
- 19 would beat the other one. It's a question of priority.
- 20 You're just claiming that everybody from Oklahoma should
- 21 have -- well, not absolute priority, but --
- MS. BLATT: Well, I have two points. First,
- 23 had -- had Oklahoma seen this coming, since they hadn't
- 24 heard about this until Tarrant filed its application,
- 25 Oklahoma City certainly would have gotten in line

- 1 faster. And second of all, the whole point of this
- 2 Compact -- and if you think about your equitable
- 3 apportionment doctrines, which whoever gets to the water
- 4 first gets a prior -- gets a priority permanently --
- 5 this was the point of the Compact. Louisiana and
- 6 Arkansas wouldn't have to develop their water, Texas and
- 7 Oklahoma were much more economically developed States,
- 8 and the equal rights prevented a race to the permit
- 9 office.
- 10 Let me get to the second aspect what's a
- 11 problem, and that is, compacts usually spell out the
- 12 points of diversion. The last place Oklahoma would have
- 13 picked as the point of diversion is the Kiamichi River,
- 14 and Tarrant is saying, not surprisingly, it's the most
- 15 desirable.
- 16 And the third is the eminent domain.
- 17 Eminent domain law in Oklahoma proceeds on the
- 18 assumption that those are Oklahomans who got the permit,
- 19 and thus can exercise a core sovereign power, and
- 20 Tarrant, not surprisingly, would like to come in and do
- 21 that.
- 22 And none of this is happening with the
- 23 normal political checks in Oklahoma. Oklahoma can't
- 24 vote out of office the Tarrant officials. It cannot
- 25 vote out of office the Upper Trinity or the North Texas

- 1 Municipal Water District.
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: Ms. Blatt, does Oklahoma
- 3 law in any circumstance permit an appropriation of
- 4 water -- water in Oklahoma for out-of-State use?
- 5 MS. BLATT: Well, it's -- if it's compacted
- 6 water, you have to get legislative approval and --
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: Just here and now, does
- 8 Oklahoma ever --
- 9 MS. BLATT: Yes, it can.
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: -- permit out-of-State
- 11 use of its water?
- MS. BLATT: It has not. It could, but
- 13 the -- but Tarrant is correct that there are facial
- 14 differences with respect to out-of-State. So
- 15 out-of-State users would have to get the water going
- 16 faster, it's subject to a review. And there's a
- 17 statement in there that you need to look and see if
- 18 there's a better use for Oklahoma.
- 19 Now, I hope you ask them this, because I
- 20 gather their view is under the dormant Commerce Clause
- 21 is all of those laws are constitutional with respect to
- 22 99 percent of the Compact, which is it's allocated to --
- 23 to Oklahoma for its free and unrestricted use. So
- they're basically saying there's 1 percent of this
- 25 Compact that's unconstitutional.

- 1 And not only is it 1 percent, the minute it
- 2 drops below 3,000, all of a sudden, it became. And on
- 3 this, we'd like to talk to the Russello principle. I
- 4 also hope you ask them, this is on page 15A of -- 14A of
- 5 the 15A brief. There are border references arbitrarily
- 6 and they're missing, they're there. It's completely
- 7 inconsistent.
- 8 And this -- their view would make complete
- 9 mincemeat out of 4 other provisions of the Compact. And
- 10 ironically, it would march a lot of States into Texas.
- 11 But back to (b) -- (b)(2) and 5.05(c) operate identical
- in that they're basically downstream delivery, where all
- 13 States have to release 40 percent of the water
- 14 downstream. So they -- they're the same. They're
- 15 absolutely identical.
- 16 You hold on to 60, you let 40 percent go.
- 17 But only (c) contains that border reference. Only (c)
- 18 says "within their respective States." And yet even in
- 19 (c), it's completely redundant and unnecessary, because
- 20 you can't release water from without your State.
- 21 JUSTICE SCALIA: Where is this? Where is
- 22 this? Where is this?
- 23 MS. BLATT: This is on page 14A and 15A --
- 24 sorry -- of the red brief. So only (c) says within
- 25 their respective States, but (b)(2) is the exact same

- 1 functioning provision, and it's missing the border
- 2 reference. And I -- you don't have time now to ask the
- 3 United States' view, but I think the United States would
- 4 agree with us that if you give this border thing kind of
- 5 the magical meaning, borders kind of appear and
- 6 disappear with the water flow, which is very strange.
- 7 Tarrant thinks that there's some heretofore
- 8 unheard of crediting system, but they don't have an
- 9 explanation on how (b)(2) and (c) -- but more
- 10 importantly, if you could just turn to 9A for just a
- 11 minute, which is 402, I want to walk you through this --
- 12 I'm sorry, 401(b). This is a provision that -- this is
- 13 water wholly within Texas. And you don't have to
- 14 understand much to know that Texas keeps 60, Oklahoma
- 15 gets 40.
- 16 So you have a big chunk of Texas, and Texas
- 17 is allocated 60 and Oklahoma is allocated 40. Now,
- 18 under Tarrant's view, because this is silent as to
- 19 borders and because Oklahoma is not in this reach, it's
- 20 not actually located within the subbasin, Oklahoma
- 21 either is entitled to or has to go get all of its water
- 22 from Texas. And this pattern repeats itself -- this is
- 23 on page 41 of our brief -- throughout the Compact, where
- 24 the Compact is silent as to borders, and under their
- 25 view -- and their Louisiana view is somewhat

- 1 entertaining.
- 2 I can't tell if they think Louisiana can go
- 3 into Oklahoma or has to move one inch up to the border
- 4 to take it out as opposed to just waiting, but under
- 5 this view -- and again, it repeats itself throughout the
- 6 contract -- the State that's not in the basin, because
- 7 there are no borders and because, I guess under their
- 8 view, the only way that Oklahoma to get its water would
- 9 be to go into Texas, and that's why they're sort of
- 10 taking this bit about, oh, this Russello principle, if
- 11 it's here, it must mean -- it must have had
- 12 significance, would make a complete mess of the Compact.
- If I could also just turn to the remand of
- 14 the United States. I just wanted to make -- to make
- 15 three points. And that is, I do think it is significant
- 16 that it's pointed -- it is addressed to a problem that
- 17 Texas itself has never asserted. They're saying well,
- 18 poor Texas can't get its water. And remember, Texas is
- 19 upstream, so this sort of poor Texas is only to Texas.
- 20 No other State is going to have this problem because the
- 21 rest are downstream.
- 22 So this you have to be able to get to your
- 23 25 percent is a uniquely pro-Texas provision that
- 24 apparently at the same time for 20 years of drafting
- 25 history when Texas was trying to buy this water, and the

- 1 three States were saying "no way, no how," they either
- 2 subconsciously or unconsciously or unintentionally
- 3 enacted this provision for Texas's benefit.
- 4 JUSTICE BREYER: In Subbasin 1, that's
- 5 mostly in Oklahoma, but Texas gets a lot of the water or
- 6 the other way around? It looked to me like Subbasin 1's
- 7 in Oklahoma.
- 8 MS. BLATT: Which reach?
- 9 JUSTICE BREYER: Subbasin 1. It says
- 10 Subbasin 1.
- MS. BLATT: Are you talking about 401?
- JUSTICE BREYER: Yes, 401.
- MS. BLATT: Okay. So that's in Reach 1. So
- 14 that's on this map -- the next map. So none of it --
- 15 it's all within the green, the same with the panhandle
- 16 of Texas.
- 17 JUSTICE BREYER: Okay. I get it. I get it.
- 18 Anyway --
- MS. BLATT: Yes.
- JUSTICE BREYER: -- because of that and
- 21 because during the time when, let's say, there's
- 22 5,000 feet of the -- of the 2,000 extra, you know,
- 23 Louisiana has to get 500. Okay. How do they know
- 24 whether they're getting it? I mean, how -- there must
- 25 be some system of measurement going on or how does this

- 1 all work?
- MS. BLATT: Justice Breyer, you have to
- 3 trust me. There has never been an accounting ever,
- 4 ever, ever, ever under this Compact.
- 5 JUSTICE BREYER: So, so -- in other
- 6 words --
- 7 MS. BLATT: No measurements have ever been
- 8 taken with respect to this.
- 9 JUSTICE BREYER: Fine. So that -- I don't
- 10 know how that cuts, because certainly the people who
- 11 drew this must have thought at least in those other
- 12 provisions they are going to develop a measurement
- 13 system in case of controversy.
- MS. BLATT: Well, there are gauges. So
- 15 they -- I mean, it would not be impossible, although
- 16 very expensive. And just so you know, Section 211, and
- in the interpretive comments of 211, the State said the
- 18 last thing we want is this accounting because it's
- 19 expensive and burdensome. And Louisiana and Arkansas,
- 20 if you look at the minutes, they are complaining because
- 21 their laws are not set up for accounting. They are
- 22 riparian States, so they don't track diversions. They
- 23 just -- they don't do it.
- So this was -- this is -- when you talk
- 25 about how this cuts, you have 20 years of silence --

- 1 JUSTICE SCALIA: I -- I don't understand
- 2 what you just said: They're riparian States, so they
- 3 don't track diversions.
- 4 MS. BLATT: Okay. So when you comment --
- 5 JUSTICE SCALIA: Why does that follow?
- 6 MS. BLATT: Right. Okay. So in the -- the
- 7 Oklahoma and Texas, in their permitting system, what
- 8 they permit, they track how much you take under the
- 9 permit. They measure.
- 10 JUSTICE SCALIA: Okay.
- 11 MS. BLATT: Louisiana, if you are a
- 12 landowner, you just draw from the water and it's a --
- it's a voluntary reporting system, so you don't
- 14 necessarily have to tell the State how much you took
- 15 out.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: Okay.
- 17 MS. BLATT: So one is a permitting system,
- 18 and in Louisiana and Arkansas -- and, I think, again,
- 19 the minutes just talk about we hope Louisiana and
- 20 Arkansas will develop their laws to do better tracking
- 21 of diversions. But again, this would be the problem of
- 22 an accounting.
- 23 But I -- so in terms of the 20 years of
- 24 history, you have complete silence on this, even though,
- 25 under our view, it always --

- 1 JUSTICE BREYER: The relevant legal
- 2 argument, I think, is look at what you just cited to us
- 3 about this reach in the subbasin. 60 percent goes to
- 4 Texas, 40 percent to Oklahoma.
- 5 MS. BLATT: Right.
- 6 JUSTICE BREYER: Okay. Now, they've never
- 7 measured it. That's because they never fought about it,
- 8 I guess. And now we have a fight. So why is it any
- 9 easier to develop the necessary measuring system
- 10 there --
- MS. BLATT: Well --
- 12 JUSTICE BREYER: -- than it would be here?
- MS. BLATT: -- the --
- 14 JUSTICE BREYER: And that argues against you
- 15 because your main point, really, is that this is all too
- 16 complicated.
- 17 MS. BLATT: Justice Breyer, the disaster
- 18 would be and the affront to sovereignty is throughout
- 19 the Compact, not so much the measuring that's a problem:
- 20 Oklahoma would be able to insist on crossing Texas's
- 21 borders to draw that 40 percent. And no one has ever,
- 22 ever envisioned any of the Compact as not applying
- 23 borders. It's not so much the measurement.
- 24 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, I thought that
- 25 was what your -- the other side does envision, that it

- 1 doesn't -- it's not bound by the borders but it's bound
- 2 by the agreement, the Compact. Compacts compromise the
- 3 individual State sovereignty. That's the whole point of
- 4 them.
- 5 MS. BLATT: Okay. But their view -- I mean,
- 6 it is that they have to -- again, our view is that if
- 7 they had wanted, like all the other cross-border
- 8 rights, to allow for an extraordinary right, they would
- 9 have made an explicit statement and then spelled out
- 10 exactly what that meant, most importantly the point of
- 11 diversion. Here, at most you have silence on the issue.
- Now, the Government reads into borders
- 13 sometimes, because they say you do have borders unless
- 14 there is a need. Under Tarrant's view, which I think is
- 15 the most jarring and remarkable view, this is all a
- 16 borderless common, and every State could have
- 17 criss-crossing pipelines into every State, because you
- 18 don't have an exhaustion requirement. So Texas, even
- 19 though it's got plenty of water in its fresh water
- 20 streams and currently uses them, could take their whole
- 21 25 percent from Oklahoma; Oklahoma could take its whole
- 22 25 percent from Texas; Arkansas could come into
- 23 Oklahoma -- and that's their view of the world.
- 24 And I think the United States thought, no,
- 25 that doesn't make too much sense. Let's at least make

- 1 Texas exhaust.
- 2 But the provision -- the Compact doesn't say
- 3 this. Again, the United States and Tarrant proceed on
- 4 the assumption that there is a numerical share, that
- 5 it's equal rights to an exact 25 percent, exact
- 6 25 percent. Well, that's not what it says. It just
- 7 says equal rights to the use subject to a cap, and we
- 8 think a cap by limiting the use is not a guarantee that
- 9 you can reach the cap, much less that you can cross
- 10 borders to reach the cap.
- 11 And if I could just make one more sense --
- 12 JUSTICE KAGAN: Ms. Blatt, the solicitor
- 13 general here today spoke of lots of different examples
- 14 where the language of entitlement and rights was used.
- 15 Do you have a view as -- as to that?
- 16 MS. BLATT: So they -- you mean the two
- 17 compliance rules they cited? They cited -- so they
- 18 say -- that's what I was saying that was sort of sad is
- 19 because what they cited disproved what they were trying
- 20 to assert it for.
- 21 So if you -- you don't even have to read
- 22 the -- you don't even have to read the compliance rules.
- 23 Just read page 19 of their brief. They say in the same
- 24 sentence that we have an equal -- there's an equal right
- to one-fourth of an excess above 3,000. So that means

- 1 you take whatever is above 3,000 and divide by four
- 2 equally. And then they cite a provision that only
- 3 divides by 3. And then the next provision they cite
- 4 didn't divide the excess, it divided the total water.
- I don't know why they -- it's inexplicable.
- 6 I can't tell you why they did that.
- 7 And the only other thing I want to say on
- 8 the extrinsic evidence, and I do think -- if you think
- 9 there's any ambiguity in here, which I think there
- 10 clearly is, you have 30 years of post ratification,
- 11 which the States immediately did long-term water
- 12 planning without so mentioning of this right. And
- 13 Tarrant actually offered to buy the same water for
- 14 \$1.7 billion in 2002, which is a little bit inconsistent
- 15 with the notion that they had this right all along.
- 16 They just, in 18 months of negotiating history, never
- 17 mentioned that they thought they owned the water, they
- 18 were actually offering to pay 1.7 million. And the
- 19 amicus brief filed by the Tribes, on page 4, says we
- 20 were at the negotiating table and we never heard Tarrant
- 21 mention this right.
- 22 And the other thing, I do think the water
- 23 planning documents are highly significant because not so
- 24 much Louisiana and Arkansas, but Oklahoma and Texas take
- 25 water planning very seriously because of their prior

- 1 appropriation systems. There are hundreds of thousands
- 2 of pages on the Internet and none of them mention this
- 3 right. Again, they cited something in their reply
- 4 brief, but if you go look at it, it doesn't come close
- 5 to mentioning a right of Subbasin 5. Again, ironically
- 6 it mentioned a portion of Oklahoma where Texas would
- 7 have to actually buy the water.
- 8 We'd ask you to affirm. Thank you.
- 9 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
- 10 Mr. Rothfeld, you have four minutes
- 11 remaining.
- 12 REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF CHARLES A. ROTHFELD
- 13 ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER
- 14 MR. ROTHFELD: Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice.
- 15 A couple of points. First, my friend, Ms.
- 16 Blatt, said that it would make mincemeat and a complete
- 17 mess out of the Compact to apply its terms as they were
- 18 written. We think that this Compact was negotiated over
- 19 a period of 25 years. If you look at the Joint
- 20 Appendix, you will very painfully see that there are
- 21 reams and reams of commentary on the -- on the
- 22 negotiations.
- 23 I think the Court has to assume that when
- 24 the drafters of the Compact used language and referred
- 25 to State lines in one place and not in another place,

- 1 they had some idea of what they were doing and they made
- 2 these different choices intentionally. So I think the
- 3 Court simply should read the terms of the Compact --
- 4 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So how do you deal with
- 5 all the provisions she was mentioning with respect to
- 6 the 60/40 division? I can't make rhyme or reason of
- 7 those provisions that don't use within State boundaries,
- 8 but it has to mean that.
- 9 MR. ROTHFELD: Well, I don't think that it
- 10 has to mean that. If Oklahoma wants to enter Texas to
- 11 take -- if it makes more sense for them to do it, they
- 12 can. If not, they can just wait for the water to flow
- 13 down.
- I think one thing which -- which Ms. Blatt
- 15 did not address is the practicalities of how Subbasin 5
- 16 operates. If you look at the map that was pointed out
- 17 to you, Subbasin 5, which is what we're talking about
- 18 here, is a very wide -- hundreds of miles wide, but
- 19 extremely narrow. It's 10 to 20 miles wide -- north to
- 20 south for most of its length.
- 21 The reason the drafters drew this is because
- 22 the States all take -- the assumption was all of the
- 23 water in this Subbasin was going to be surplus water,
- 24 literally excess water. The States all take the water
- 25 that they want to use outside of Subbasin 5, and so

- 1 the -- the allocations that Ms. Blatt was referring to
- 2 by Oklahoma are all in Subbasin 1; they are not in
- 3 Subbasin 5. The water that flows into Subbasin 5 is
- 4 water that the States assumed was going to be surplus.
- 5 And so it would make no sense, having divided this water
- 6 evenly between the compacting States, to think that the
- 7 drafters would have required a water user in Texas at
- 8 the far west end, which would get its portion of the
- 9 25 percent share two miles across the border in
- 10 Oklahoma, instead to have to go 200 miles to the east to
- 11 get it out of Texas.
- 12 That is not what the drafters intended to
- 13 accomplish by this. They created, by the plain terms of
- 14 the -- of the language, a common pool of water defined
- 15 by dam site, not by State line, and gave each State
- 16 equal rights to access that water so long as they did
- 17 not use more than 25 percent.
- 18 Your response to a question which was raised
- 19 by Justice Kagan both to me and Ms. Blatt, I think the
- 20 practical application of this is very simple. One
- 21 simply has to apply to the permitting authorities,
- 22 wherever you're submitting your application from, they
- 23 will apply their ordinary standards. Oklahoma Water
- 24 Resources Board does that now for applications from
- 25 within Oklahoma; it can do it just as well for

- 1 applications from Texas or other from other States.
- 2 And, again, the practicality of this is,
- 3 water users are going to want to use water as close to
- 4 where they are located as they can. They're going to go
- 5 right across the State line within Subbasin 5 if that's
- 6 the place to get the water. It makes no sense to
- 7 require them to go hundreds of miles distant to get it.
- 8 Ms. Blatt suggested that we are reading the
- 9 25 percent limitation out of the Compact. I think her
- 10 reading reads the equal rights language out of the
- 11 Compact. They read the Subbasin 5 language as being all
- 12 capped and no entitlement. It does two things: It
- 13 gives equal rights to the water, and then says that you
- 14 can't take more than 25 percent within your State. So
- 15 it's designed to do two things. It's designed to give
- 16 you an entitlement and to say you can only use
- 17 25 percent of it.
- 18 And finally, Ms. Blatt raised questions of
- 19 sovereighty and political concern. As the Chief Justice
- 20 suggested, this is a Compact that's an agreement between
- 21 coordinate sovereigns. They have decided what they want
- 22 to do. And the thing that gives respect to sovereignty
- is to read the plain language of the Compact as the
- 24 framers wrote it. Again, they spent 25 years writing
- 25 it. They took considerable care, as you can tell if you

1	look at the negotiating history, in using the words for
2	each provision. Those words should be given meaning.
3	If there are no further questions.
4	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
5	The case is submitted.
6	(Whereupon, at 12:08 p.m., the case in the
7	above-entitled matter was submitted.)
8	
9	
LO	
L1	
L2	
L3	
L 4	
L5	
L6	
L7	
L8	
L9	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	i	i	i	
A	allegation 31:11	16:20 17:16	42:6,13 44:6	banks 13:7
able 42:20 48:22	allocate 4:2 6:13	21:2,17 22:8	50:19 51:18,20	bar 21:17
52:20	allocated 45:22	26:4 43:24	53:22 55:24	bargain 3:14
above-entitled	47:17,17	58:20,22	Arkansas/Loui	based 24:10
1:11 60:7	allocates 4:6	applications	5:21	35:24
absolute 40:11	allocation 15:11	14:25 16:14,24	articulated 43:5	basic 22:17 34:6
43:21	21:13,13,20	25:22,23 58:24	asked 28:8 38:24	basically 45:24
absolutely 34:12	allocations 19:1	59:1	asking 15:24	46:12
34:17 46:15	58:1	applied 18:15	17:2,11 34:13	basin 4:3,3,16
accept 22:17	allow8:3 53:8	applies 16:5	aspect 44:10	30:20 48:6
39:9	allowed3:12	apply 11:22,23	assert 54:20	basis 35:23
access 19:18	alludes 8:2	12:3,11 14:23	asserted 48:17	beat 43:10,10,19
21:15 22:7	ambiguity 9:12	15:12,14 16:6	assess 15:15	behalf 1:15,20
58:16	55:9	25:10,13,13	16:9,10 17:15	2:4,11,14 3:8
accessing 18:8	amicus 1:19 2:7	34:6 56:17	assessed 16:22	28:23 56:13
accomplish	18:2 26:7 55:19	58:21,23	assesses 15:16	bells 35:6
12:14 58:13	amount 5:23	applying 12:5	Assistant 1:17	belongs 7:15
accounting 30:12	23:20 24:14	18:12 28:14	assume 14:23	29:6
33:16 42:7 50:3	41:14	43:17 52:22	41:19,20,24	beneficial 25:12
50:18,21 51:22	analytic 19:23	apportionment	56:23	26:5
action 28:19	ANN 1:17 2:6	44:3	assumed 58:4	benefit 49:3
actual 29:3	18:1	appreciate 33:25	assumption 43:1	benefits 43:2
additional 21:25	answer 11:12,15	approach 19:23	44:18 54:4	better 11:6 45:18
28:17	26:14	appropriate 25:5	57:22	51:20
address 29:1	Anyway 49:18	appropriation	authorities 12:3	big 31:1 47:16
57:15	apart 15:25	43:6 45:3 56:1	58:21	billion 55:14
addressed 22:14	apparently 48:24	approval 45:6	authority 6:25	bit 48:10 55:14
48:16	appeals 18:6,11	approved 23:25	18:22	Blatt 1:20 2:10
administer21:3	18:20 19:4,5,12	April 1:9	availability 21:6	28:21,22,24
25:1	19:23 20:4,5,21	arbitrarily 46:5	available 17:19	29:19,23 30:2,7
administrative	28:14	area 5:5 24:17	21:23 23:20	30:21 31:7,12
7:6 11:7 15:4	appear 3:20 47:5	areas 4:3,5 8:8	26:5	31:16,19,22
affinity 40:20,24	APPEARANC	argue 36:8	a.m 1:13 3:2	32:1,6,11,16
affirm 56:8	1:14	argues 52:14		32:23,25 33:3,7
affront 52:18	appears 3:17	argument 1:12	B	33:10 34:8,25
agree 19:4,16	5:14	2:2,5,9,12 3:4,7	b 46:11,11,25	35:5 36:5,17,22
41:19 47:4	Appendix 23:17	3:15 9:21 18:1	47:9	37:2,5,8,12,18
agreed 3:11 4:1	24:1 56:20	19:6 22:6 28:22	back 3:14 10:23	37:21,23 39:4
34:9 42:23 43:4	applicant 12:8	34:1 41:16 52:2	10:24 11:10	39:13,16,18,21
agreement 53:2	15:21 16:19	56:12	36:3 37:17	40:4,24 41:1,5
59:20	25:14 26:19	arising 11:2,3	41:17 42:19	41:23 42:2
AL 1:6	27:3	Arkansas 4:1	46:11	43:22 45:2,5,9
Alito 14:2,8,13	applicants 26:16	10:21 11:19	backdrop 25:3	45:12 46:23
26:13 27:4,8,10	application 16:7	28:7 30:17	bank 12:24 13:11	49:8,11,13,19
27:17	16:10,10,14,16	36:10 38:12	13:15	50:2,7,14 51:4
	l	l	l	l

51:6,11,17 52:5	52:17	checks 44:23	close 29:21 56:4	44:2,5 45:22,25
52:11,13,17	brief 3:21 5:15	Chief 3:3,9 14:22	59:3	46:9 47:23,24
53:5 54:12,16	14:9 22:12,20	15:17,23 17:11	closer 21:23	48:12 50:4
56:16 57:14	27:16 31:3	17:23,24 18:4	closest 11:17	52:19,22 53:2
58:1,19 59:8,18	32:17 34:17,23	20:14 21:8,21	colors 32:18	54:2 56:17,18
blue 5:15 32:19	35:11,13 37:24	28:20,24 29:15	combine 40:17	56:24 57:3 59:9
33:4	46:5,24 47:23	29:21,24 30:5	come 9:6,23 20:3	59:11,20,23
board 12:6,11	54:23 55:19	31:25 33:22	20:16 35:10	compacted 45:5
15:15 16:7,9,17	56:4	34:14 39:6	38:7,12,18	compacting 4:13
16:23 17:3,4	briefs 26:7	40:22,25 41:3	43:13 44:20	5:3 58:6
25:10,21 26:15	burdensome	43:15 52:24	53:22 56:4	compacts 4:18
27:2 28:19	50:19	56:9,14 59:19	comes 19:17	8:1 34:2 44:11
58:24	buy 48:25 55:13	60:4	20:25 32:14	53:2
border 5:21 9:24	56:7	choice 35:7	coming 43:23	compare 16:14
10:4 13:12		choices 57:2	comment 51:4	16:15
34:24 35:20	<u>C</u>	chose 27:12	commentary	compelled 10:10
38:16 46:5,17	c 2:1 3:1 26:10	chunk 47:16	56:21	compels 10:17
47:1,4 48:3	46:17,17,19,24	Circuit 38:24,24	comments 23:15	10:18
53:7 58:9	47:9	circumstance	24:11 50:17	competing 16:24
borderless 53:16	cactus 7:12	45:3	commerce 19:10	23:20
borderline 10:5	call 42:7	citation 35:13	19:14,17 20:2	complained
borders 20:17	called 4:4 29:5	cite 34:16,18,18	45:20	37:14
24:13 35:10,18	cap 23:2,9 40:10	34:19 35:21,22	Commission	complaining
36:13 38:17,22	54:7,8,9,10	36:23 41:8,10	23:24 24:12	50:20
47:5,19,24 48:7	capped 59:12	41:11 55:2,3	Commission's	complete 46:8
52:21,23 53:1	car 40:5	cited 8:2 52:2	24:4	48:12 51:24
53:12,13 54:10	care 59:25	54:17,17,19	common 53:16	56:16
bottom 28:2	carefully 43:5 case 3:4 33:23	56:3	58:14	completely 46:6
bound 53:1,1	42:15 50:13	City 43:9,25	compact 3:11,17	46:19
boundaries 4:8	60:5,6	claim 29:22	3:19,21,24,25	complex 7:6,8,9
4:13 9:18 11:2	categorically	claimed 39:1	4:3,5,9,10,20	complexity 23:4
18:23 22:8	18:7	claiming 43:20	5:4 7:1 9:14,15	compliance 41:8
24:18,24 57:7	certainly 43:25	clause 4:22	10:13,17 15:9	42:11 54:17,22
boundary 24:20	50:10	19:10,14,17	15:24 16:3	complicated
29:3,8 Provence 10 16	challenged 18:13	20:2 33:17	18:14,16,18,21 18:21,24 19:1,2	52:16
Breyer 6:2,10,16 6:20 7:9,23 8:6	challenging	40:11,13,14 45:20	· · · · · ·	compromise 53:2 concede 15:8
8:20 10:23 12:2	13:24	clear 5:3 18:24	19:7,9,13,20 20:8,9,9,12,15	concern 59:19
23:1 28:3 36:2	channel 30:24	20:10 24:9	21:1,7,14 23:10	concern 39.19 concerned 26:7
36:6,18,22,22	32:15	30:18 42:10	23:24 24:3,10	concerned 26:7 conclude 18:21
36:25 37:3,6,11	CHARLES 1:15	clearer 4:20	24:12,18,21,23	concluded 18:6
37:16,19,22	2:3,13 3:7	clearly 11:11	29:4,9 34:2,7	concluding 28:15
49:4,9,12,17	56:12	55:10	34:16,18,19	conclusion 18:9
49:20 50:2,5,9	cheaper 22:1	CLEMENT 5:14	35:23 39:19,22	20:5
52:1,6,12,14	check 37:17	cliffs 6:6	41:20,25 43:5	conflict 18:13
J2.1,0,12,17		CHILS U.U	T1.20,23 T3.3	10.13

				6
conflicts 21:12	57:3	defines 5:18	disavowing	42:11 56:24
consider 20:23	courts 7:5 20:23	definite 4:21	42:15	57:21 58:7,12
considerable	22:5 26:23	definitely 31:2	discriminatory	drafting 48:24
59:25	created 8:25	38:20	13:25	dragon 33:4
considering 28:4	11:8 18:16	definition 40:15	discussion 37:13	draw29:12 51:12
consistent 8:14	58:13	delivery 36:1	disprove 41:10	52:21
8:18,21 16:6	crediting 47:8	46:12	disproved 54:19	drawn 4:14
18:25 19:6,12	Creek 29:5,6	demonstrate	disregard 3:17	drew50:11 57:21
20:11	30:22 31:8	16:20	distant 59:7	drink 31:12,23
constitutional	criss-crossing	Denison 29:5	district 1:3 3:5	32:7
45:21	53:17	30:22	12:5 43:8 45:1	drinkable 32:4
contains 46:17	critical 34:12	deny 15:2	diversion 12:14	drinking 31:24
contemplated	cross 10:5 34:24	Department 1:18	34:15,20 35:1,7	32:1 33:12
14:12	53:7 54:9	depends 19:20	44:12,13 53:11	drops 46:2
context 9:13	crossing 52:20	descend 14:10	diversions 30:17	drought 39:11
18:17 34:7	cross-border8:3	describes 3:21	35:16 50:22	due 36:17
contract 48:6	34:15,20 35:1	describing 8:5	51:3,21	D.C 1:8,15,18,20
control 3:24	42:24	designed 6:13	divert 25:5 28:16	
controversial 7:6	cubic 5:20 23:21	59:15,15	32:19	E
controversy	24:5,6 41:22	desirable 44:15	divide 55:1,4	E 2:1 3:1,1
50:13	curiae 1:19 2:7	details 8:5	divided 41:12	earlier33:20
conversation	18:2	determine 12:12	55:4 58:5	easier 10:5 52:9
37:4,7	current 13:18,20	18:12 25:11	divides 4:3 55:3	easily 23:1
coordinate 59:21	17:6	develop 44:6	division 57:6	east 30:22,25
core 44:19	currently 53:20	50:12 51:20	divvy 42:8	58:10
correct 9:21 13:1	cuts 50:10,25	52:9	doctrines 44:3	easy 28:10 37:17
26:14 27:4		developed 26:23	documents 32:3	economically
45:13	D	28:17 44:7	33:11 55:23	44:7
corrected 20:22	D 3:1	devoid 35:13	doing 6:25 42:24	either 19:9 47:21
correcting 37:25	dam 4:15 8:25	differences	57:1	49:1
counsel 17:24	27:21 29:6	45:14	domain 12:17	El 35:23
26:2 28:20	30:22 58:15	different 3:23	14:16,20 35:7	eminent 12:17
35:15 56:9 60:4	danger35:17	4:11 7:5,19,20	44:16,17	14:15,19 35:6
count 38:5	dare 42:19	17:9 54:13 57:2	dormant 19:10	44:16,17
counties 25:24	deal 57:4	difficult 5:9	19:14,17 45:20	enacted 49:3
county 25:24	dealt 28:18	22:22	double-counted	enforcement
couple 7:7 56:15	decide 7:1 9:22	difficulty 22:19	38:3	18:18
court 1:1,12 3:10	25:25 28:10	directly 11:19	downside 4:15	engineering
3:15,16,18,20	decided 20:20	29:18	downstream 8:25	36:24
8:9 18:5,6,9,11	22:19 28:12	disagree 6:8 20:2	36:1 46:12,14	engineers 37:25
18:20 19:4,5,11	59:21	20:4	48:21	enormous 11:7
19:23 20:4,5,20	decisions 16:18	disappear 47:6	dozen 30:3,9	enter 57:10
20:21,23 22:4	defined 5:5,5	disaster 52:17	drafted 36:4	entertaining 48:1
23:9 26:6 28:13	8:23,24 24:17	disavowed 38:22	drafters 9:14	entertainingly
28:25 56:23	27:21 58:14	38:23,23	30:13,14 42:5	41:9
10.25 50.25		30.23,23	30.13,11 12.3	

				6
entirely 13:2,6	40:16 42:9	fact 6:5 7:14 8:18	footnote 32:2,2	given 60:2
19:20	53:10	9:15 13:5 17:14	force 14:14	gives 18:22
entities 26:8 43:7	example 21:15	27:20 32:1	forcing 38:13	19:20 22:21
entitled 5:22 6:3	35:21 37:1	42:12	foreclose 18:7	34:23 40:11
6:7,18 9:16	examples 34:16	factual 13:1 29:1	forgot 38:4	41:20 59:13,22
15:9 16:3 24:7	35:11 54:13	fairly 37:16	fought 52:7	go 6:22 7:10 9:23
24:15 32:13	exceptions 40:12	family 40:5	found 37:19	10:21,23 11:10
47:21	excess 5:22	far 58:8	four 4:13 5:3,25	11:18,18,19
entitlement 4:6	23:21,23 38:6	fascinating 35:21	9:1 10:12 25:24	12:9,9 13:4,17
22:25 23:8	41:14,21,23	faster 44:1 45:16	36:7 55:1 56:10	14:3 17:14 23:7
29:22 54:14	42:8 54:25 55:4	favor 23:11 36:3	framers 9:19	35:19,25 36:3
59:12,16	57:24	favored 38:7	59:24	38:13 41:17
entitles 39:20,22	exclusive 43:2	federalism 18:15	free 45:23	42:3,20 46:16
envision 52:25	exclusively 4:8	feel 40:20,22	freely 21:3	47:21 48:2,9
envisioned 52:22	excuse 9:8 30:8	feet 5:20 23:21	fresh 30:3 53:19	56:4 58:10 59:4
equal 5:4,17,25	30:25	24:5,6 36:8	friend 56:15	59:7
6:14 8:22 9:2	exercise 12:17	49:22	friends 15:8	goes 7:18 25:4
10:12,25 11:1,1	14:19 44:19	fight 10:25 52:8	frustrate 20:6	52:3
11:3 23:12,12	exhaust 54:1	figure 42:7,8	full 23:17 27:24	going 4:24,24
23:13 33:16,17	exhaustion 53:18	filed 43:24 55:19	27:25	7:10,11,13,15
39:22,23,24	existing 15:4	filled 4:25	functioning 47:1	7:20 9:25 10:6
40:2,5,5,11	expense 21:25	finally 59:18	further 22:14	10:25 11:16,18
41:2,7 44:8	expense 21.23 expensive 50:16	Fine 8:6 50:9	25:2.60:3	11:18,19 12:1,4
54:5,7,24,24	50:19	finish 9:10 11:13	23.2.00.3	12:23 14:5,10
58:16 59:10,13	explanation 47:9	first 6:15 7:8 8:1	G	16:6 17:3 22:9
equally 55:2	explicit 34:11,25	10:9,23 17:16	$\overline{\mathbf{G}}$ 3:1	22:19 24:16,25
equally 55.2 equitable 44:2	35:2,5 53:9	18:11 20:16,19	gain 33:20	30:19 36:8
erects 12:13		23:17 26:4	gather 45:20	37:17 45:15
	exploiting 42:25	40:10 41:11	gauges 50:14	
erred 18:11	express 5:7 29:8		general 1:17	48:20 49:25 50:12 57:23
errors 20:21	expressly 4:6 8:3 8:7	43:6,22 44:4	18:21,23 20:10	
28:13 38:1		56:15	54:13	58:4 59:3,4
ESQ 1:15,17,20	extent 9:11	fit 15:4	geographic	good 22:6
2:3,6,10,13	26:20	fixed 40:11	24:17,22	gotten 43:25
essential 35:6	extra 36:20	flat 37:20	getting 39:15	Government
essentially 3:16	49:22	flow4:16 5:19,19	49:24	53:12
ET 1:6	extraordinary	9:23 23:23 24:5	Ginsburg 4:17	Grande 35:23
evaluate 16:13	34:10 53:8	24:8 27:5,12	8:2 11:21,25	granted 12:12
evenly 58:6	extremely 7:6	47:6 57:12	12:13 34:22	green 34:23
everybody 36:12	57:19	flowing 28:1	35:3 45:2,7,10	49:15
43:20	extrinsic 55:8	flows 10:14	gist 5:24	ground 42:22
evidence 37:13	$\overline{\mathbf{F}}$	23:18 58:3	give 3:20 4:18	guarantee 41:13
55:8	face 9:4	focus 33:25	15:1,17,24	54:8
exact 5:11,12	facial 45:13	focused 11:11		guaranteed41:7
46:25 54:5,5		follow23:15 51:5	26:15,25 34:3	Guard 14:5
exactly 16:13	facilities 12:14	foot 41:22	47:4 59:15	guess 8:16 15:23
	I	I	I	I

25:17 28:6 34:5	II 18:8	irrelevant 19:11	40:25 41:3,15	
42:9 48:7 52:8	imaginary 37:3,6	Irving 43:9	41:17,24 42:21	laid 22:18
	immediately	isolation 9:13	43:15 45:2,7,10	lake 29:10,13
H	55:11	issue 4:10 20:20	46:21 49:4,9,12	30:25 31:1,4
half 30:23	implies 23:13	22:4 43:18	49:17,20 50:2,5	33:4,13
happen25:4	importantly	53:11	50:9 51:1,5,10	land 29:12 31:8
42:10,12	47:10 53:10	issues 22:12,18	51:16 52:1,6,12	landowner51:12
happened 42:10	impose 24:20	22:20	52:14,17,24	language 3:17,18
happening 42:22	impossible 42:6		54:12 56:9,14	3:19 4:11 5:4,9
44:22	50:15	<u>J</u>	57:4 58:19	5:11,12,24 6:4
happens 6:5 8:11	inch 48:3	jarring 53:15	59:19 60:4	8:13,15,19,20
33:7 36:9	includes 4:12	job 7:6,8	juxtaposing 38:9	9:13,19 10:1,10
hate 40:19	inconsistent 46:7	JOHN 1:6		10:11,11,17
headache 22:21	55:14	Joint 23:16 24:1	K	15:9 20:15
hear 3:3 11:10	increase 27:12	56:19	Kagan 16:12	23:10 54:14
heard 11:5 43:24	incur 21:25	Justice 1:18 3:3	17:2,8 22:16	56:24 58:14
55:20	indefinitely	3:9 4:17 5:11	23:6 25:7,16,20	59:10,11,23
held 43:2	33:21	6:2,10,16,20	42:22 54:12	large 4:3
heretofore 47:7	indented 5:15	7:9,23 8:2,6,20	58:19	Laughter 30:1
Herrmann 1:6	indifferent 26:18	9:8,10,20 10:3	keep 25:16 27:25	law12:17 14:23
3:5	individual 53:3	10:23 11:14,21	keeps 47:14	20:6,8,11 21:2
hey 36:19	inexplicable	11:25 12:2,13	KENNEDY	21:9,12,17 22:8
highly 55:23	34:17,17 55:5	12:19 13:6,9,18	12:19 13:6,9,18	25:3 26:3 35:7
highway 40:6,8	insist 52:20	13:22 14:2,8,13	13:22 19:3,22	42:25 44:17
history 48:25	instance 28:4,5	14:22 15:17,23	30:18 31:5,10	45:3
51:24 55:16	intended 30:14	16:12 17:2,8,11	31:14,17,20	laws 13:18,20,24
60:1	58:12	17:23,24 18:4	41:15,24	13:24,25 18:13
hog 42:20	intent 6:24	19:3,22 20:14	kept 30:11	21:4 25:11,13
hold 46:16	intentionally	21:8,21 22:16	Kiamichi 44:13	30:16 42:12
honor 23:22	57:2	23:1,6 25:7,16	kind 4:23 17:9	45:21 50:21
hope 45:19 46:4	interesting 38:8	25:20 26:13	22:21 26:25	51:20
51:19	Internet 56:2	27:4,8,10,17	30:12 47:4,5	lawsuit 35:22,24
hoping 29:24	interpretations	28:3,20,24	kinds 8:4	lawyer 29:4
hours 40:7 43:11	11:8	29:15,16,20,21	knew36:19	left 7:4
humorous 38:5	interpretive	29:24 30:5,18	know7:13 8:7	legal 52:1
hundreds 35:19	23:15 24:11	31:5,10,14,17	9:25 17:4 22:22	legislative 45:6
56:1 57:18 59:7	50:17	31:20,25 32:5,8	26:7,7 32:9	legitimate 41:16
hypothetical	interstate 18:16	32:12,21,24	33:2,15 34:5	length 57:20
39:10	34:1,2,7	33:1,6,9,22	36:25 37:20	let's 11:10 21:22
	intervening	34:14,22 35:3	41:19 47:14	25:20,22 39:10
I	13:10	36:2,6,18,22	49:22,23 50:10	39:18 49:21
idea 20:16 23:11	invitation 22:13	36:22,25 37:3,6	50:16 55:5	53:25
57:1	involves 24:16	37:11,16,19,22	known 35:17	33:25 licensed 29:15
identical 46:11	ironically 46:10	39:2,5,14,17	knows 29:23	lies 13:1
46:15	56:5	39:19 40:1,22	30:2,13 36:12	
	30.3	,	,	limitation 38:16

	i	ı	1	
59:9	38:11 42:6,13	measured 52:7	Municipal 43:8	39:25 54:4
limiting 54:8	44:5 47:25 48:2	measurement	45:1	
line 4:6 11:20	49:23 50:19	49:25 50:12		0
12:21 13:13,15	51:11,18,19	52:23	N	O 2:1 3:1
23:19 43:25	55:24	measurements	N 2:1,1 3:1	obligations 19:2
58:15 59:5	Louisiana's	50:7	narrow57:19	20:12
lines 4:14 8:24	10:14	measuring 7:18	National 14:5	obstacle 20:7
9:5,15 17:11	lower 20:23 22:5	52:9,19	near 37:22	21:13,20
56:25	26:23	mechanism 6:24	Nebraska 35:14	obtain 12:16
LISA 1:20 2:10		7:3,24	35:16,19	14:19
28:22	M	meet 28:5	necessarily	obtaining 16:21
listen 41:1	magical 47:5	mention 55:21	21:19 22:10	20:7 21:18
literally 57:24	main 12:22 13:3	56:2	51:14	offered 55:13
little 10:5 11:6	13:16 29:11,14	mentioned 55:17	necessary 14:16	offering 55:18
31:7 34:3,4	29:18 30:20	56:6	52:9	office 43:11 44:9
37:20 55:14	31:6 32:9,14	mentioning	need 20:11 22:13	44:24,25
located 3:13	39:8 52:15	55:12 56:5 57:5	25:2 45:17	officials 44:24
47:20 59:4	major 27:21	merits 16:22	53:14	oh 37:2,5 40:25
long 5:6 17:19	39:11	mess 11:7 48:12	needs 12:16	48:10
22:6 58:16	map 31:1 32:17	56:17	28:12 38:17	okay 7:25 11:6
longer 10:15	32:25 34:21	method 38:1	negotiated 56:18	27:8 32:24 33:9
long-term 55:11	49:14,14 57:16	methodological	negotiating	37:8 39:6,13,16
look 22:5,24 31:1	march 46:10	38:1	55:16,20 60:1	39:21 40:10
32:16,17 33:3	math 38:6,7	Mexico 35:24,25	negotiations	49:13,17,23
34:21 38:17	matter 1:11 13:1	36:1	56:22	51:4,6,10,16
45:17 50:20	28:10 60:7	middle 30:24	never 28:16	52:6 53:5
52:2 56:4,19	mean 4:18 5:10	43:10	33:22,23,24	Oklahoma 3:11
57:16 60:1	6:4,20,23 10:3	mile 30:23	34:9,14,19 35:1	3:13,13,21 4:1
looked 19:7 49:6	14:4 15:2 16:12	miles 35:19	35:15 36:13,14	7:10,14 9:24
looking 9:6 14:9	17:3 22:17,20	57:18,19 58:9	37:14 39:1	11:18,25 12:1,4
32:22	25:1,7,20 26:21	58:10 59:7	42:10,23 48:17	12:5,7,17,23
looks 33:4	33:23 34:8	million 55:18	50:3 52:6,7	13:2,2,4,7,11
lose 19:13	48:11 49:24	mincemeat 46:9	55:16,20	13:13,16,17,25
lost 42:14	50:15 53:5	56:16	New 35:24,25	14:1,3,10,14
lot 4:25 14:25	54:16 57:8,10	minute 46:1	36:1	14:14,15,18,20
29:13 31:2	meaning 39:3	47:11	Niobrara 34:18	14:23 15:3,6,13
40:20,22 46:10	47:5 60:2	minutes 50:20	normal 5:19	15:14,14,16,25
49:5	meaningless	51:19 56:10	14:24 25:10	16:7,13,17 17:3
lots 22:12 25:21	41:25	misleading 14:8	44:23	17:4,17 18:6,8
31:3 54:13	means 11:1	missing 46:6	north 43:8,13	18:13 19:19,19
Louisiana 4:1	25:18 33:19	47:1	44:25 57:19	21:19,23 22:2,8
9:22 10:6,14,15	54:25	months 55:16	notion 35:25	22:9 25:3,6,8,9
10:18,21,22	meant 36:19	morning 3:4	55:15	25:15,20,22,25
11:17 24:6	53:10	move 48:3	numbers 37:25	26:15,19,24
30:16 36:9,15	measure 51:9	multiple 25:23	numerical 39:24	27:1,2,9,22
30.10 30.7,13		muiupit 43.43		,-,-,- <u>-</u>

				6
				10000
28:6,18 30:19	28:16 57:25	6:3,6,19 7:15	picked44:13	pool 8:25 9:6
36:11 38:11,13	out-of-State 45:4	8:11,12 9:3,25	pickle 42:17	58:14
38:13 41:4	45:10,14,15	15:1,7,10,11	piece 29:7	poor 43:9 48:18
42:20,23 43:1,2	owned 55:17	15:18 16:4	pink 32:18,20	48:19
43:3,9,13,20	ownership 13:7	17:18,20 20:17	33:11	portion 21:18
43:23,25 44:7	owns 13:11	21:16 22:7 23:2	pipe 7:10	28:2 39:12 56:6
44:12,17,23,23	O'Connell 17:25	23:8,23 24:8,14	pipeline 6:21	58:8
45:2,4,8,18,23	18:1,4 19:16	24:15 26:24	7:14	pose 20:7 21:20
47:14,17,19,20	20:1,19 21:11	28:5 29:22	pipelines 7:20	poses 21:13
48:3,8 49:5,7	22:3,16 23:6	32:13 36:10,10	53:17	posit 39:5
51:7 52:4,20	25:9,19 26:1,20	36:13,14,16,21	place 12:20 16:5	position 3:16
53:21,21,23	27:7,9,15,18	37:8,24 38:2	44:12 56:25,25	34:9 35:18
55:24 56:6	28:11	39:8,17,23	59:6	possible 11:9
57:10 58:2,10	O'CONNELL	40:12,15,16,17	places 7:19 9:14	23:3
58:23,25	1:17 2:6	41:2,8,14,21	28:6 29:14	post 55:10
Oklahomans		42:18 45:22,24	plain 3:23 10:17	power44:19
16:15 17:5	P	46:1,13,16	58:13 59:23	practical 58:20
44:18	P 3:1	48:23 52:3,4,21	planning 32:3	practicalities
Oklahoma's	page 2:2 5:15	53:21,22 54:5,6	33:10 55:12,23	57:15
13:20 14:9	23:16 24:1,2,2	58:9,17 59:9,14	55:25	practicality 59:2
15:25 42:25	32:21 41:9 46:4	59:17		
	46:23 47:23		play 19:18 20:3	precisely 12:7
old 31:1	54:23 55:19	perfectly 41:16	30:15	15:15
one's 38:5	pages 56:2	period 56:19	please 3:10 18:5	preempted21:14
one-fourth 54:25	painfully 56:20	permanently	28:25	21:19 22:10
open43:12	panhandle 49:15	44:4	plenty 53:19	preemption
operate 12:7	-	permissible	point 8:13 10:18	18:12 28:15
46:11	paragraph 23:18	24:18	11:17 12:10	prejudice 33:18
operates 57:16	part 6:15,17 7:15	permit 12:6,8	13:22,23 19:24	preserve 21:2
opinion 19:5,5,11	13:5 26:10	14:19 15:15,21	22:12 23:7,9	preserving 20:10
20:21	29:11 31:8,10	16:7,9,19 25:5	27:16 29:20	press 38:25
opponents 8:3	31:15	43:11,14 44:8	34:2 36:2 39:6	presumably
	partially 12:2	44:18 45:3,10	39:6 40:19	12:15
opportunity		, ,	5710 10117	
23:14 27:20	particular 15:22	51:8,9	42:21 44:1,5,13	presumption
	16:5 25:11 26:9	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		· -
23:14 27:20	16:5 25:11 26:9 28:12	51:8,9	42:21 44:1,5,13	presumption
23:14 27:20 opposed 48:4	16:5 25:11 26:9 28:12 particularly 9:7	51:8,9 permits 15:16	42:21 44:1,5,13 52:15 53:3,10	presumption 18:12,14 28:14
23:14 27:20 opposed 48:4 oral 1:11 2:2,5,9	16:5 25:11 26:9 28:12 particularly 9:7 25:1	51:8,9 permits 15:16 43:7	42:21 44:1,5,13 52:15 53:3,10 pointed 24:19	presumption 18:12,14 28:14 pretty 24:9
23:14 27:20 opposed 48:4 oral 1:11 2:2,5,9 3:7 18:1 28:22 order 13:2,15	16:5 25:11 26:9 28:12 particularly 9:7	51:8,9 permits 15:16 43:7 permitting 19:19	42:21 44:1,5,13 52:15 53:3,10 pointed 24:19 26:2 48:16 57:16	presumption 18:12,14 28:14 pretty 24:9 prevail 20:9 prevent 13:21,25
23:14 27:20 opposed 48:4 oral 1:11 2:2,5,9 3:7 18:1 28:22 order 13:2,15 14:18 26:16	16:5 25:11 26:9 28:12 particularly 9:7 25:1	51:8,9 permits 15:16 43:7 permitting 19:19 22:10 51:7,17	42:21 44:1,5,13 52:15 53:3,10 pointed 24:19 26:2 48:16	presumption 18:12,14 28:14 pretty 24:9 prevail 20:9
23:14 27:20 opposed 48:4 oral 1:11 2:2,5,9 3:7 18:1 28:22 order 13:2,15	16:5 25:11 26:9 28:12 particularly 9:7 25:1 parties 39:22	51:8,9 permits 15:16 43:7 permitting 19:19 22:10 51:7,17 58:21	42:21 44:1,5,13 52:15 53:3,10 pointed 24:19 26:2 48:16 57:16 points 7:7 10:7	presumption 18:12,14 28:14 pretty 24:9 prevail 20:9 prevent 13:21,25 prevented 44:8
23:14 27:20 opposed 48:4 oral 1:11 2:2,5,9 3:7 18:1 28:22 order 13:2,15 14:18 26:16 ordinary 12:11 58:23	16:5 25:11 26:9 28:12 particularly 9:7 25:1 parties 39:22 Paso 35:23	51:8,9 permits 15:16 43:7 permitting 19:19 22:10 51:7,17 58:21 person 14:20,20 Petitioner 1:4,16	42:21 44:1,5,13 52:15 53:3,10 pointed 24:19 26:2 48:16 57:16 points 7:7 10:7 17:13 35:7 43:22 44:12	presumption 18:12,14 28:14 pretty 24:9 prevail 20:9 prevent 13:21,25 prevented 44:8 principle 38:21 46:3 48:10
23:14 27:20 opposed 48:4 oral 1:11 2:2,5,9 3:7 18:1 28:22 order 13:2,15 14:18 26:16 ordinary 12:11 58:23 original 28:19	16:5 25:11 26:9 28:12 particularly 9:7 25:1 parties 39:22 Paso 35:23 pattern 47:22	51:8,9 permits 15:16 43:7 permitting 19:19 22:10 51:7,17 58:21 person 14:20,20 Petitioner 1:4,16 1:19 2:4,8,14	42:21 44:1,5,13 52:15 53:3,10 pointed 24:19 26:2 48:16 57:16 points 7:7 10:7 17:13 35:7 43:22 44:12 48:15 56:15	presumption 18:12,14 28:14 pretty 24:9 prevail 20:9 prevent 13:21,25 prevented 44:8 principle 38:21 46:3 48:10 principles 34:6
23:14 27:20 opposed 48:4 oral 1:11 2:2,5,9 3:7 18:1 28:22 order 13:2,15 14:18 26:16 ordinary 12:11 58:23 original 28:19 originating 14:1	16:5 25:11 26:9 28:12 particularly 9:7 25:1 parties 39:22 Paso 35:23 pattern 47:22 pay 4:24 55:18	51:8,9 permits 15:16 43:7 permitting 19:19 22:10 51:7,17 58:21 person 14:20,20 Petitioner 1:4,16 1:19 2:4,8,14 3:8 18:3 24:19	42:21 44:1,5,13 52:15 53:3,10 pointed 24:19 26:2 48:16 57:16 points 7:7 10:7 17:13 35:7 43:22 44:12 48:15 56:15 policies 16:8	presumption 18:12,14 28:14 pretty 24:9 prevail 20:9 prevent 13:21,25 prevented 44:8 principle 38:21 46:3 48:10 principles 34:6 prior 43:6 44:4
23:14 27:20 opposed 48:4 oral 1:11 2:2,5,9 3:7 18:1 28:22 order 13:2,15 14:18 26:16 ordinary 12:11 58:23 original 28:19 originating 14:1 40:2	16:5 25:11 26:9 28:12 particularly 9:7 25:1 parties 39:22 Paso 35:23 pattern 47:22 pay 4:24 55:18 people 14:25	51:8,9 permits 15:16 43:7 permitting 19:19 22:10 51:7,17 58:21 person 14:20,20 Petitioner 1:4,16 1:19 2:4,8,14 3:8 18:3 24:19 56:13	42:21 44:1,5,13 52:15 53:3,10 pointed 24:19 26:2 48:16 57:16 points 7:7 10:7 17:13 35:7 43:22 44:12 48:15 56:15 policies 16:8 policy 17:7	presumption 18:12,14 28:14 pretty 24:9 prevail 20:9 prevent 13:21,25 prevented 44:8 principle 38:21 46:3 48:10 principles 34:6 prior 43:6 44:4 55:25
23:14 27:20 opposed 48:4 oral 1:11 2:2,5,9 3:7 18:1 28:22 order 13:2,15 14:18 26:16 ordinary 12:11 58:23 original 28:19 originating 14:1 40:2 other's 33:18	16:5 25:11 26:9 28:12 particularly 9:7 25:1 parties 39:22 Paso 35:23 pattern 47:22 pay 4:24 55:18 people 14:25 25:16 43:17	51:8,9 permits 15:16 43:7 permitting 19:19 22:10 51:7,17 58:21 person 14:20,20 Petitioner 1:4,16 1:19 2:4,8,14 3:8 18:3 24:19 56:13 Petitioner's 26:2	42:21 44:1,5,13 52:15 53:3,10 pointed 24:19 26:2 48:16 57:16 points 7:7 10:7 17:13 35:7 43:22 44:12 48:15 56:15 policies 16:8 policy 17:7 political 44:23	presumption 18:12,14 28:14 pretty 24:9 prevail 20:9 prevent 13:21,25 prevented 44:8 principle 38:21 46:3 48:10 principles 34:6 prior 43:6 44:4 55:25 priorities 14:24
23:14 27:20 opposed 48:4 oral 1:11 2:2,5,9 3:7 18:1 28:22 order 13:2,15 14:18 26:16 ordinary 12:11 58:23 original 28:19 originating 14:1 40:2	16:5 25:11 26:9 28:12 particularly 9:7 25:1 parties 39:22 Paso 35:23 pattern 47:22 pay 4:24 55:18 people 14:25 25:16 43:17 50:10	51:8,9 permits 15:16 43:7 permitting 19:19 22:10 51:7,17 58:21 person 14:20,20 Petitioner 1:4,16 1:19 2:4,8,14 3:8 18:3 24:19 56:13	42:21 44:1,5,13 52:15 53:3,10 pointed 24:19 26:2 48:16 57:16 points 7:7 10:7 17:13 35:7 43:22 44:12 48:15 56:15 policies 16:8 policy 17:7	presumption 18:12,14 28:14 pretty 24:9 prevail 20:9 prevent 13:21,25 prevented 44:8 principle 38:21 46:3 48:10 principles 34:6 prior 43:6 44:4 55:25

	I	I	1	I
priority 15:3,21	18:24 20:10	read 3:19 5:9,12	Regional 1:3 3:5	12:11 15:14
15:24 17:1,15	21:9 24:23	19:11,23 22:20	regulate 18:22	16:7,9,22 25:10
26:3,15,25	34:24 46:9	22:25 23:2,8	regulation 18:25	27:2 28:18
33:21 43:14,19	50:12 57:5,7	33:17 35:10	regulations	58:24
43:21 44:4	pro-Texas 48:23	38:16,22 42:18	23:25 24:4	respect 8:18
private 14:15	public 43:1	54:21,22,23	release 27:11	18:17 24:17
probably 42:15	purchase 12:18	57:3 59:11,23	46:13,20	45:14,21 50:8
problem 34:4	purpose 20:7	reading 10:18	released 27:6	57:5 59:22
40:9,9 43:16	pushed 10:24	19:4 23:4 59:8	relevant 9:5 52:1	respective 9:17
44:11 48:16,20	put 7:14 12:20	59:10	reliance 38:21	46:18,25
51:21 52:19	25:12 26:5	readings 23:3	relied 18:20	Respondents
problems 28:17	p.m 60:6	reads 53:12	rely 4:22	1:21 2:11 19:6
procedures		59:10	relying 5:2 20:15	28:23
25:10	Q	real 40:9	remaining 56:11	Respondent's
proceed 54:3	quantity 3:12	really 4:18 7:1	remand 20:24	27:16
proceeding	39:25	17:2 36:15	22:5 48:13	response 13:5
28:13	question 11:15	38:17 52:15	remarkable	27:18 58:18
proceedings	12:22 28:8 31:5	reams 56:21,21	53:15	responsive 12:2
22:14 25:2	41:17 43:19	reason 22:17	remedy 39:3,4	rest 9:13 48:21
proceeds 42:25	58:18	37:9 57:6,21	39:12	restriction 24:20
44:17	questions 29:2	reasons 18:9	remember 48:18	review45:16
process 19:20	59:18 60:3	REBUTTAL	repeating 8:13	rhyme 57:6
22:10,23	quite 5:3,7 11:11	2:12 56:12	repeats 47:22	right 4:19 6:20
prohibit 13:19	19:3,12 25:18	receiving 26:21	48:5	7:3,22 9:23
22:9	29:13 32:3	26:24	reply 34:17	14:3,7,14 15:18
proof 39:7 40:21	35:16 42:16	recollection 5:13	35:11,13 56:3	17:5,7,19,21
41:1		red3:11,17,25	report 36:24	19:8,21 20:1
property 12:18	$\frac{\mathbf{R}}{\mathbf{R}}$	4:2,16,16 5:20	reporting 51:13	23:11,12,12,13
12:23 13:10	R 3:1	7:11 13:1,14	representatives	23:17,22 31:14
14:15 30:19	race 44:8	23:24 24:3,11	36:7	34:8,10,25 40:4
proposition	rain 38:4	27:6 29:3,7,10	representing	40:11 41:21
19:12	raised 58:18	32:9,15,17,20	41:3	42:24 51:6 52:5
prove 42:17,19	59:18	46:24	reprinted 5:14	53:8 54:24
provide 8:4	ran 37:25	redundant 46:19	request 15:19	55:12,15,21
provided 5:21	Rangers 14:6,10	refer9:15 23:17	require 59:7	56:3,5 59:5
6:18 9:2 40:13	ratification 55:10	reference 4:14	required 5:8 58:7	rights 5:4,17,18
40:14	rationale 18:14	46:17 47:2	requirement	6:1,14 8:22 9:2
provides 12:17	reach 4:10 10:13	references 46:5	53:18	10:12,25 11:1,2
25:3	10:13 18:8	referred 56:24	requires 18:18	11:3 12:16 21:4
provision 4:20	32:10,13,15	referring 31:17	reservoirs 27:5	33:16,17 39:23
5:1 9:19 22:24	33:7,9 42:1	58:1	27:24	39:24 40:2,5,6
22:25 47:1,12	47:19 49:8,13	refresh 5:12	resident 15:12	44:8 53:8 54:5
48:23 49:3 54:2	52:3 54:9,10	regardless 20:6	residents 15:16	54:7,14 58:16
55:2,3 60:2	reached 18:9	25:14	31:23	59:10,13
provisions 18:21	reaches 4:4,4	Region 26:10	resources 12:6	Rio 35:22

				0.
riparian 42:12	runs 10:20 30:23	6:12 19:25 21:2	simple 58:20	26:25
50:22 51:2	Russello 38:21	23:16 50:16	simply 12:18	specified 3:12
river 3:11,17,25	46:3 48:10	Sections 21:1	17:15 57:3	8:23
4:2,16,16,16		see 20:18 33:13	58:21	spell 44:11
5:20 6:22 7:11	S	45:17 56:20	site 27:21 58:15	spelled 53:9
7:19 12:21,22	S 1:20 2:1,10 3:1	seek 12:6 17:21	sites 4:15 8:25	spend 40:7
13:1,14,14	28:22	seeking 12:8	sitting 25:21	spent 59:24
23:24 24:3,11	sad 54:18	15:13,22	36:15	spoke 54:13
27:6,12,14 29:3	saline 31:11,21	seen 43:23	situation 14:23	stage 22:13
29:7,10 32:9,15	salt 37:20	seize 14:11	21:22	standards 12:11
32:20 37:22	salty 31:23 32:7	send 14:5 42:19	sketchy 4:23 5:2	16:21 58:23
44:13	samples 34:23	sense 10:1,10	slip 31:7	standing 38:25
ROBERTS 3:3	sandwiched	33:19 53:25	solicitor 1:17	starts 19:24
14:22 15:17,23	43:10	54:11 57:11	54:12	state 4:6,14,19
17:24 20:14	satisfies 16:21	58:5 59:6	solve 34:4	5:6,21 6:3,5,18
21:8,21 28:20	satisfy 23:21	sentence 54:24	somewhat 47:25	6:21,22,23 7:4
29:15,21,24	saying 7:21 9:5	separate 10:13	sorry 7:12 9:9	8:24 9:5,15,17
30:5 31:25	14:13 21:11	Separately 10:12	17:5 23:18	11:20 15:9,12
33:22 40:22,25	25:16 29:17	seriously 55:25	36:17 46:24	20:6,7,8,10
41:3 43:15	35:9,23 36:21	set 6:25 7:24	47:12	
52:24 56:9 60:4	40:15 42:18	50:21	sort 29:1 35:10	21:2,3,5,9,12
	44:14 45:24			21:16,17 23:11
room 36:6,12	48:17 49:1	share 20:8 26:17	40:17 48:9,19	23:22 24:15,16
Rothfeld 1:15	54:18	37:10 38:13	54:18	24:17,20,23
2:3,13 3:6,7,9	says 4:7 5:16 6:3	39:24 41:8 54:4	Sotomayor 9:8	28:16 29:17
4:17 5:1 6:8,12	6:12,14,18 8:10	58:9	9:10,20 10:3	30:15 33:19,19
6:17 7:7,22,25	8:14 9:1 10:11	shares 9:24 10:4	11:14 29:16,20	33:24 34:1,3,6
8:16,22 9:9,11	14:18 15:9 16:3	42:9	39:2,5,14,17	34:15 35:19
10:2,7 11:13,23	19:9 21:3 23:18	Shawnee 29:5,6	39:19 40:1 57:4	37:13 40:16
12:1,15,25 13:8	24:23 33:23,24	30:22 31:8	Sotomayor's	43:16 46:20
13:12,20,23	40:1,14 46:18	show33:11	41:17	48:6,20 50:17
14:7,17 15:6,19	46:24 49:9 54:6	shows 35:17	sought 43:14	51:14 53:3,16
16:2,19 17:6,12		side 31:4 33:12	sounds 14:5	53:17 56:25
56:10,12,14	54:7 55:19	52:25	source 32:4	57:7 58:15,15
57:9	59:13	signatory 5:17	33:12	59:5,14
route 22:1	SCALIA 5:11	5:25 24:7	south 7:11 8:12	statement 34:11
RUDOLF 1:6	32:5,8,12,21	signed 43:7	13:13 32:20	35:2 39:21
rule 41:11	32:24 33:1,6,9	significance 3:22	38:14 57:20	45:17 53:9
rules 23:25 24:4	46:21 51:1,5,10	48:12	sovereign 44:19	statements 35:5
24:11 41:8,9	51:16	significant 48:15	sovereigns 18:17	States 1:1,12,19
42:11 54:17,22	season 43:12	55:23	59:21	2:7 4:7,13 5:3
run 7:10 30:8	second 5:20 6:17	silence 35:10	sovereignty 34:1	5:10,17,24,25
running 27:22	11:15 18:20	50:25 51:24	34:6 52:18 53:3	6:14 7:5 9:2,6
30:3	23:7,19,21 24:5	53:11	59:19,22	9:16,17 10:12
runoff 6:15 24:8	24:6 44:1,10	silent 35:18	span 24:22	11:16 18:2,10
38:4 40:2	section 4:9,11	47:18,24	special 15:24	18:15,17,22
				<u> </u>

				7
20.16 22.10	anhhasina 4.5	16.4 22.1 24.12	Torrog 2.12.25	56.14.60.4
20:16 23:19 24:7,20 27:19	subbasins 4:5 24:21	16:4 22:1 24:13 24:24 27:13	Texas 3:12,25 7:10,11,17 8:11	56:14 60:4 theory 26:22
33:21 34:9 36:7	subconsciously	29:17 30:20	10:4,4 11:22	they'd 42:3
38:9,15,19	49:2	31:2,3,6 32:8	12:4,20 13:3,10	thing 27:23 37:17
40:21 41:11,13	subdivides 4:4	35:20 38:12	13:13,16 14:2,6	47:4 50:18 55:7
, and the second			, , ,	
42:3,16 44:7 46:10,13,18,25	subject 21:5 45:16 54:7	40:16 43:16	14:10,14,20	55:22 57:14
47:3,3 48:14		48:4 51:8 53:20 53:21 55:1,24	15:1,18,20,20	59:22 things 7:25 8:17
49:1 50:22 51:2	submits 16:20	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	15:24 16:3,16	O
	26:3	57:11,22,24	17:18,19,20	59:12,15
53:24 54:3	submitted 22:21	59:14	18:7 19:18	think 8:9,17,19
55:11 57:22,24	26:8 60:5,7	taken 50:8	21:15,18,24	9:11,20 10:9
58:4,6 59:1	submitting 58:22	takes 9:3	22:1,7,9 25:4	11:6,15 12:25
State's 4:19	subset 12:21	talismanic 3:22	25:14,23 26:8	13:21 14:3,9
15:11 18:24	sudden46:2	talk 46:3 50:24	26:15,16,19,21	15:8 17:10
19:1 20:11	suggest 36:18	51:19	26:23 27:5,10	19:17,18 20:19
23:22	suggested 23:2	talking 10:3	27:11,25 28:5	20:22 22:3,4,5
statute 14:18	59:8,20	19:24 30:5	28:15 29:7,11	22:18 23:10
stem 12:22 13:3	suggests 14:9	35:12 42:22	29:12,12,17	24:1,9,25 26:1
13:16 29:11,14	22:22	49:11 57:17	30:2,19 31:4,9	26:11,22 28:8
29:18 30:20	superfluous 3:18	Tarrant 1:3 3:4	32:14 33:12	28:12,13 31:16
31:6 39:8	support 3:15	12:4,15,16,18	35:25 36:11,12	31:22 32:6
strange 47:6	supporting 1:19	13:24 16:5	36:20,21 37:9	34:12 35:18
stream 32:9	2:8 18:3	21:23 29:4 42:9	37:10,14,15,20	37:1,9 39:2
streams 38:3	suppose 17:12	42:15,18,24	38:7,12,17,22	42:5 44:2 47:3
53:20	supposed7:2	43:9,24 44:14	39:7,11 41:21	48:2,15 51:18
striking 14:4	Supreme 1:1,12	44:20,24 45:13	41:25 42:16	52:2 53:14,24
strip 29:5	sure 19:4 26:16	47:7 54:3 55:13	43:7,8,13,17	54:8 55:8,8,9
structure 15:5	29:16 37:21	55:20	44:6,25 46:10	55:22 56:18,23
subbasin 4:10,12	surplus 57:23	Tarrant's 35:15	47:13,14,16,16	57:2,9,14 58:6
4:13 5:6,16	58:4	38:8,10,23	47:22 48:9,17	58:19 59:9
6:13,14 8:23	surprisingly	47:18 53:14	48:18,18,19,19	thinks 47:7
9:1 10:11,16,19	43:12 44:14,20	tell 17:3 20:25	48:25 49:5,16	third 44:16
10:20 11:4,19	system 47:8	40:6 48:2 51:14	51:7 52:4 53:18	thought 6:23
15:7 16:4 17:20	49:25 50:13	55:6 59:25	53:22 54:1	7:23 37:10 42:5
17:22 18:8	51:7,13,17 52:9	Tenth 38:24,24	55:24 56:6	50:11 52:24
23:13 26:9	systems 56:1	terms 10:1 16:25	57:10 58:7,11	53:24 55:17
27:20 29:8 30:3		17:15 18:16,19	59:1	thousands 56:1
30:4,6,7,9,10	<u>T</u>	19:7 51:23	Texas's 49:3	three 4:12 43:3
30:21 31:13	T 2:1,1	56:17 57:3	52:20	48:15 49:1
32:18 38:4 40:3	table 55:20	58:13	Texoma 29:11	three-quarters
47:20 49:4,6,9	take 4:19 5:10	terrain 8:7	29:13 30:25	30:23
49:10 52:3 56:5	6:22 7:20 8:10	territory 4:12	text 3:21,24 5:15	three-series 38:1
57:15,17,23,25	9:25 10:19	Texans 31:25	24:10	time 17:15 47:2
58:2,3,3 59:5	11:16 12:10	Texarkana	Thank 3:9 17:24	48:24 49:21
59:11	14:15 15:13,22	33:13	28:20,24 56:8,9	times 5:19
	l		l	l

				1.
today 54:13	understand 7:21	15:21 25:4	wants 42:9 57:10	55:22,25 56:7
told 4:17 35:14	25:17 26:13	28:15 58:7	Washington 1:8	57:12,23,23,24
35:14	32:6 34:13	users 18:7 21:18	1:15,18,20	57:24 58:3,4,5
total 24:8 42:8	38:20 39:6	25:22,23 29:12	water 1:3 3:5,13	58:7,14,16,23
55:4	47:14 51:1	45:15 59:3	4:6,7,19 5:5,5,7	59:3,3,6,13
track 30:11,17	understanding	uses 4:10 5:6	5:18,22 6:13,22	waters 4:2
50:22 51:3,8	12:20	21:4,5 23:20,22	8:23,25 9:2,6	watershed 37:9
tracking 51:20	understood	53:20	9:16,18,23	way 7:18 12:7,16
treat 26:17 27:2	41:18	usually 44:11	10:14,15,19	14:8 19:22 23:4
Tribes 55:19	undesignated		11:1,2,3,16	26:11 30:13,14
tributaries 4:15	24:8	V	12:3,5,5,10,10	33:13 36:20
27:21 30:3,8,9	unequivocal	v 1:5 3:5 10:13	13:3,15 14:1,11	38:7 39:22 48:8
32:20	34:10	32:10,13,15	14:19 15:7,12	49:1,6
tributary 28:2	unheard 47:8	valuable 33:12	15:13,14,20,22	ways 43:3
tried 35:8,10	unintentionally	values 9:17	16:4,7,21,22	weighs 23:10
Trinity 43:8,10	49:2	vegetation 13:13	16:25 17:13,18	west 30:25 58:8
44:25	unique 4:11	13:15	17:19,20 18:7,8	we'll 7:18
troublesome	uniquely 48:23	view3:23 18:10	18:23,25 19:9	we're 8:9 21:11
25:1	United 1:1,12,18	22:17 30:19	19:19 20:8,11	28:3 41:7 57:17
true 7:2 26:20	2:7 18:2,10	38:9,9,10,15	20:17 21:2,3,6	We've 39:1
36:23	38:9,15,18	38:23 40:10	21:14,16,18,18	whatsoever
trust 43:1 50:3	40:20 41:13	41:12,13 42:3	21:23,24 22:1,2	30:12
try 7:5 20:16	42:2,16 47:3,3	42:16 45:20	22:7.23:13,20	whichever 11:24
42:19	48:14 53:24	46:8 47:3,18,25	24:15 25:4,5,9	whistles 35:6
trying 3:14 42:17	54:3	47:25 48:5,8	25:12,25 26:3,4	wholly 47:13
48:25 54:19	unnecessary	51:25 53:5,6,14	26:9,17,21,24	wide 57:18,18,19
Tuesday 1:9	46:19	53:15,23 54:15	27:1,6,12,13	win 19:13
turn 11:14 47:10	unprecedented	viewed 9:13	28:1,4,15,16	words 42:14 50:6
48:13	34:14 35:9	virtually 8:4	28:18 29:13,13	60:1,2
two 8:17 10:7	unrestricted	voluntary 51:13	29:17 30:20	work 26:11 40:13
17:13 23:3	18:22 45:23	vote 44:24,25	31:2,3,13,22	41:5 50:1
28:13 29:1,14	Upper43:8 44:25		32:2,4,8,10,15	world 53:23
34:16 35:11	upstream 48:19	W	32:19 33:5,10	wouldn't 21:19
40:18 43:22	use 3:12 4:7 5:5	wait 9:22 57:12	33:11,12,14,18	21:20 22:10
54:16 58:9	5:17,19 6:1,15	waiting 48:4	33:20 34:16	26:14 33:20
59:12,15	8:22 9:2,16,17	walk 35:23 47:11	35:20 37:15	37:16 41:25
type 42:23	9:19 13:25 15:6	want 5:12 9:22	38:10 41:22	44:6
	17:9,10,17	12:10 24:24	42:1 43:1,8,13	Wow 35:16
U	23:12 25:11,12	28:9 31:1 36:9	43:17 44:3,6	writing 59:24
ultimately 42:6	26:5 33:17,20	41:17,19,20,24	45:1,4,4,6,11	written 56:18
unable 8:12	40:2,5,6 45:4	42:19 47:11	45:15 46:13,20	wrong 9:21 18:10
unconsciously	45:11,18,23	50:18 55:7	47:6,13,21 48:8	24:2 29:4
49:2	54:7,8 57:7,25	57:25 59:3,21	48:18,25 49:5	wrote 59:24
unconstitutional	58:17 59:3,16	wanted 24:20	51:12 53:19,19	Wyoming 35:14
45:25	user 15:3,12,20	48:14 53:7	55:4,11,13,17	35:14,19
			, , - , -	ĺ

x 1:2,7 20 21 23	002 55:14 013 1:9 11 50:16,17 3 1:9 4 43:11 5 5:6,22 6:3,6	47:15,17 52:4 52:21 401 49:11,12 401(b) 47:12	
x 1:2,7 20 21 23	013 1:9 11 50:16,17 3 1:9 4 43:11	52:21 401 49:11,12	
Y 21 23	11 50:16,17 3 1:9 4 43:11	401 49:11,12	
<u>Y</u> 23	3 1:9 4 43:11	· ·	
	4 43:11	TUI(U) T/.12	
yean 27.2 32.27 27.		402 47:11	
33:1,1,1 34:25 25		41 47:23	
* *	6:19 7:15 8:11	41 47.23	
0,110,10	8:12 9:3,25	5	
,	15:1,7,10,11	5 4:10 11:19 18:8	
	15:18 16:4	30:6,7,9,10,20	
	17:18,20 20:17	30:21 31:13	
	21:16 22:7 23:2	32:18 38:4 40:3	
Φ	23:8,23 24:8,14	56:5 57:15,17	
A = = = 1 1	24:15 26:24	57:25 58:3,3	
	28:5 29:22	59:5,11	
<u> </u>	32:13 36:10,10	5,000 49:22	
1 45:24 46:1 49:4	36:16,21 39:8	5.05 19:25	
49:9,10,13 58:2	39:17,23 40:12	5.05(b) 23:16	
1's 49:6	40:15,16,17	5.05 (c) 46:11	
1.7 55:18	41:2,8,14,21	50,000 28:6	
10 57:19	42:18 48:23	500 49:23	
11 37:24	53:21,22 54:5,6	56 2:14	
11-889 1:4 3:4	56:19 58:9,17		
11:10 1:13 3:2	59:9,14,17,24	6	
12 36:13,14,14 ₂₈	8 2:11	60 46:16 47:14	
12,000 24:5	9 38:2	47:17 52:3	
12:08 60:6		60/40 57:6	
14A 46:4,23	3	7	
	2:4 32:2 41:11	70s 36:4	
	41:12 55:3	708 30:4	
	,000 5:20 23:21	8	
	24:6 36:8 41:14	8 5:15	
	46:2 54:25 55:1		
0-1-	0 23:16 30:11	9	
	30:15 55:10	9A 47:10	
7.	3A 32:23	99 45:22	
2 1.10 20.2 16.11	4 37:8		
16.25 47.0	8 36:16		
2,000 49:22 39	9A 19:24		
2.01 21:1,3	4		
20 40 24 50 25	30:4 32:2 41:12		
51 22 55 10	42:9 43:7 46:9		
200 50 10	55:19 0.46:13.16		
40	0 46:13,16		