IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

STATE OF MONTANA,

Plaintiff,

No. 220137 ORG

Vs.

STATE OF WYOMING and STATE OF

NORTH DAKOTA,

Defendants.

Defendants.

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TELEPHONIC STATUS HEARING

November 13, 2008

Reported by: Dana Saruk, CSR No. 10653

1	APPEARANCES:
2	Special Master
3	BARTON H. THOMPSON, JR. 650-723-2465
4	SUSAN CARTER, ASSISTANT 650-721-1488 STANFORD LAW SCHOOL
5	Crown Quadrangle 559 Nathan Abbott Way
6	Stanford, California 94305-8610 buzzt@stanford.edu
7	susan.carter@stanford.edu
8	Plaintiff State of Montana:
9	MONTANA ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE By: SARAH A. BOND
10	JENNIFER ANDERS 215 North Sanders
11	P.O. Box 201401 Helena, Montana 59620-1401
12	406-444-5894 sbond@mt.gov
13	janders@mt.gov
14	MONTGOMERY & ANDREWS By: JOHN B. DRAPER
15	325 Paseo de Peralta Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501
16	505-986-2525 jdraper@montand.com
17	
18	Defendant Wyoming:
19	WYOMING ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE By: PETER MICHAEL, COUNSEL OF RECORD
20	JAY JERDE DAVID J. WILLMS
21	123 Capitol Building Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002
22	307-777-6196 pmicha@state.wy.us
23	jjerde@state.wy.us dwillm@state.wy.us
24	
25	

1	Defendant North Dakota:
2	NORTH DAKOTA ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE
3	By: TODD A. SATTLER, ESQ., COUNSEL OF RECORD 500 North Ninth Street
4	Bismarck, North Dakota 58501 710-328-3640
5	tsattler@nd.gov
6	For The United States:
7	UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
8	SOLICITOR GENERAL By: WILLIAM M. JAY
9	JAMES DUBOIS 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
10	Washington, D.C. 20530-0001 202-514-8976 william.m.jay@usdoj.gov
11	303-844-1375 james.dubois@usdoj.gov
12	For Anadarko
13	MICHAEL WIGMORE
14	JAMES J. DRAGNA 355 South Grand Avenue, Suite 4400
15	Los Angeles, California 90071 213-680-6436
16	michael.wigmore@bingham.com
17	For N. Cheyenne
18	WHITEING & SMITH By: Jeanne S. Whiteing (Not present)
19	1136 Pearl Street, Suite 203 Boulder, Colorado 80302 303-444-2549
20	jwhiteing@whiteingsmith.com
21	Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings,
22	being taken telephonically at 2224 Third Avenue, San
23	Diego, California, on Thursday, November 13, 2008, at
24	8:30 a.m., before Dana Saruk, Certified Shorthand
25	Reporter, in and for the State of California.

1 THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 2008; 8:30 A.M. 2 3 MR. THOMPSON: I think we can go ahead and 4 begin. Thank you all for being present for this phone conference. 5 6 My name is Barton Thompson. As you know, I've 7 been appointed the Special Master in this case, and I 8 assume you've probably all Googled me and know more 9 about me than I do at this particular point in time. 10 The court reporter has just introduced herself. At the end of this phone call I'll come back and see how 11 12 many copies everyone needs and format for the 13 transcript. 14 My assistant, who I think all of you have 15 talked to at one point or another, Susan Carter, is also 16 in the room here with me. I think you also all know 17 Susan's phone number, but she is the person to talk to in this case about any type of scheduling issue. 18 Susan's phone number is area code 650-721-1488, and her 19 20 e-mail is susan.carter@stanford.edu. 21 So why don't we go around and list appearances. 22 Why don't we start with the plaintiff in the case, State 23 of Montana. 24 Thank you, your Honor. MS. BOND:

that's okay that I go into automatic pilot and call you

25

1 your Honor, if that's all right? 2 MR. THOMPSON: This is the first time I've 3 served as a Special Master for the Supreme Court, so 4 that's fine, but I'll probably also respond to several 5 other things. 6 MS. BOND: I'll try and keep it simple. 7 This is Sarah Bond. I'm counsel of record for 8 the State of Montana. With me here in Montana is 9 Jennifer Anders, who is also with us. And then on the 10 phone from a meeting is our house counsel, so to speak, John Draper. 11 12 MR. THOMPSON: It's probably useful for the 13 court reporter to spell names. 14 MS. BOND: Sarah is S-a-r-a-h. Bond, like 15 Bond, Sarah Bond. And Jennifer, J-e-n-n-i-f-e-r, 16 Anders, A-n-d-e-r-s. And John, J-o-h-n, Draper, 17 D-r-a-p-e-r. The names are correctly spelled on the 18 pleadings of record. And you can call me if you have 19 any questions at 406-444-5894. 20 MR. THOMPSON: Next, State of Wyoming. 21 MR. MICHAEL: This is Peter Michael, P-e-t-e-r 22 M-i-c-h-a-e-l, senior assistant attorney general. With 23 me is Jay Jerde, J-a-y, J-e-r-d-e. He is deputy 24 attorney general. And David Willms. David is the

normal spelling, and Willms is W-i-l-l-m-s. He is an

25

assistant attorney general. Our phone numbers are on the pleadings. I assume everyone has them except for perhaps Mr. Thompson.

MR. THOMPSON: Yeah. I actually have the service list. One of the things I will do in a minute is probably also ask the State of Montana if they could update the service list and include not only phone numbers but also e-mails. We can come back to that in a moment.

So the State of North Dakota?

MR. SATTLER: This Todd Sattler, T-o-d-d, S-a-t-t-l-e-r, counsel of record and assist attorney general. My phone number is 701-328-3640.

MR. THOMPSON: Thank you. Turning to amici and other non parties, is there somebody on the phone call for the United States?

MR. JAY: You have two of us. I am William Jay. William is spelled normally. The last name is J-a-y. I am assistant to the solicitor general at main Justice. With me on the phone is my colleague from the environment and natural resources division, Jim Dubois. I'll let him introduce himself.

MR. DUBOIS: The name is James Dubois,
D-u-b-o-i-s. Kind of like if you were in Wyoming, it
would be "due boyce."

```
1
             MR. JAY: Willy Jay again. My phone number is
 2
     202-514-8976, and it is not in the pleadings.
 3
             MR. THOMPSON: Thank you.
 4
             And then is there anyone on the phone today for
5
    the Northern Cheyenne tribes?
6
             MS. BOND: This is Sarah Bond. I have talked
7
    with Jeanne Whiteing, who is the counsel of record for
8
    the tribes. She has indicated that she is involved in
9
    another meeting today and could not attend. The
10
    Northern Cheyenne has just had a tribal council election
    and they have a new president, presently Leroy Spang.
11
12
    She will be meeting with the new leadership of the
     tribe, and at this point is only tracking the case for
13
14
     informational purposes until she gets further
15
     instructions from her client.
             MR. THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you.
16
17
              And then finally, is there anyone on the phone
18
    for Anadarko Petroleum Corporation?
             MR. WIGMORE: This is Michael Wigmore,
19
20
    M-i-c-h-a-e-l, W-i-g-m-o-r-e. I'm with Bingham
21
    McCutchen. It's on the pleadings also. It's
    B-i-n-g-h-a-m. My phone number is 202-373-6792.
22
23
             MR. THOMPSON: Thank you. Did I pronounce that
24
    Anadarko correctly?
25
             MR. WIGMORE: You did.
```

MR. THOMPSON: Is there anyone else? We have gone through everybody who is on the service list, but I want to make sure I catch anyone else. My main goal today is to develop an initial case management plan and I will embody that in a first case management order.

There are eight items that I hope we can cover in the next 45 minutes and I will just go down the eight items and then come back to -- I want to talk about filings and other formal communications; procedural rules; the motion to dismiss that's been referred to me, amicia, and in particular Anadarko's motion for leave to file an amicus brief in support of respondent State of Wyoming; other current management issues; fees and costs; potential settlement discussions; and then any other matters that any of you have.

So turning to the first of those eight items, the filings and other formal communications. As probably most of you know, I am responsible for maintaining the Court's docket. And when I ultimately file a final report with the Supreme Court, I will need to send hard copies of all the items in that docket to the U.S. Supreme Court clerk's office. But I would also like to maintain a Web-based document for the use of all of the parties. Most Special Masters are now doing that, and the parties seem to find that to be quite

useful.

So with that in mind, what I will request all parties to do is to serve all filings and other formal communications by both regular mail and e-mail. For regular mail, what I would ask is that you send me an original, plus three copies. And then I would also ask that you send everybody by e-mail a PDF of that document. And one of the things that I'll provide in the first case management order is what address you should be using for me for both the regular mail and also the e-mail. I'll probably set up a special e-mail account here, so that everything involved in this particular case goes to that e-mail account.

So I guess the first question I should ask is, is it going to be a problem for anyone to not only provide the hard copies but also a PDF?

MS. BOND: Not for Montana. That was going to be our suggestion if there was a question about it, but I think that's a good idea.

MR. THOMPSON: Okay. Great.

The other thing to know here as, again, probably most of you know, now that it's before me, now that the matter is before me, Supreme Court Rule 33 no longer applies. That means for any type of briefs or motions you no longer have to worry about Supreme Court

Rule 33 getting things printed up in the small booklets, worrying about exactly what color you are going to have to use. I will set out the format that I would ask that our documents be in, in the first case management order, but it's generally what you would expect to file in Federal District Court.

The next question is do all of the counsel have electronic copies of the documents that you've filed to date with the U.S. Supreme Court? Let me rephrase that. Is there anyone who doesn't have an electronic version in one form or another of the documents that you filed before the court?

MS. BOND: Montana has all of ours out with the only caveat that our maps, the maps that we appended to the original, the first motion for leave to file, because of their size are separate PDF. But we have all of that electronically. We don't have Wyoming's appendices electronically. I don't know if Wyoming does or not.

MR. MICHAEL: This is Steve Michael. We have all of our pleadings in PDF form available to be shared, if necessary.

MR. THOMPSON: And I would say that in the case of maps, since those are frequently difficult to reduce to a PDF format, I wouldn't worry about -- to the degree

1 | either in the past or in the future you will use maps.

I wouldn't worry about those on the PDF. But everything else, it would be great having the PDF format.

So if everybody could send to Susan Carter the documents that you have already filed in the court in PDF form, then we can go ahead and start the Web-based docket and we will put all those documents on it also so that everyone has easy access to them.

MS. BOND: This is Montana. I think I might need to correct myself. I think I do have all of the appendices that were included within the bound document filed with the court. What we didn't have are the documents from which those were excerpted.

MR. THOMPSON: That's fantastic. But I recognize that there might be some type of documents in the nature of maps or other large appendices that might be difficult sometimes to put in PDF format and I think that's totally appropriate and fine.

So, again, if I could ask all the parties then to send by PDF -- in PDF format or some other electronic format, Susan can always convert it then to PDF. If you could send prior documents to Susan.

As I mentioned a moment ago, if counsel for Montana would be willing to update the service list for this case, and since I am now asking that all parties

documents around by e-mail in addition to regular mail, if you could also include e-mail on that.

MS. BOND: I can do that with the possible exception of Mr. Wigmore. Then I have another question. I see from Anadarko's motion that on this one it says Mr. Dragna is counsel of record. So if I could get a clarification and the e-mail for that party or that requested amicus, I could send in the rest of them. I have the rest of the e-mails.

MR. WIGMORE: Sarah, this is Mike. I can send you my contact information. I think for the Special Master process, I'll be on the service list as counsel of record at the court.

MR. THOMPSON: Okay. So should both James Dragna and you then be listed?

MR. WIGMORE: Yeah, if that's okay. If you need one person, it will probably be me, assuming that that's acceptable to you, even though he is counsel of record at the -- he gets the asterisk at the Supreme Court, but I think I'll probably be doing most of the communication. However you would like it. If you can do two, that would be fine. If you want just a single name, it would be mine.

MR. THOMPSON: I guess my preference on this

1 would be generally if we can have one party per address 2 and then just get multiple copies sent to that, it would 3 probably be easier. 4 MR. WIGMORE: That's Fine. Sarah, then it 5 would be me as the contact for the Special Master 6 process. And Sarah, I will send you an updated virtual 7 card so you have all of my information. 8 MS. BOND: Thanks very much, Mike. 9 MR. JAY: Sarah, this is Willy Jay. I think 10 Jim is going to be our primary contact for the federal government, if you're just going to use one name. 11 12 MS. BOND: Should I send -- I have to ask the Special Master, should I send both, for example, 13 Mr. Jay's and Mr. Dubois' e-mails to Susan? 14 15 MR. THOMPSON: Yes. I think we can go ahead 16 and include everybody's e-mail. I'm just trying to hold 17 down the total number of packages that need to be mailed. 18 19 MS. BOND: Okay. And I have all those. And I 20 have Northern Cheyenne's counsel's e-mail also. 21 MR. THOMPSON: So just going around for hard 22 copies, for Montana, how many for any types of 23 pleadings, motions, filings? How many copies would you 24 want?

If we can, four would be good, but

MS. BOND:

25

1 three would be all right. Two would need to come to my 2 office here in Montana and one to John Draper's office 3 in Santa Fe, if that's possible. If not, just send us 4 what you've got, send us one, and we will take care of 5 the rest. 6 MR. THOMPSON: I think that should be fine. 7 what I'm going to do is go around and see how many 8 copies each of the various folks on the service list 9 would like. 10 So then, for Wyoming? MR. MICHAEL: I guess I have a question. We 11 12 haven't talked about discovery yet and I don't even know if we will today, but if we get voluminous discovery, 13 14 that would be something different, I assume. 15 MR. THOMPSON: Yes. And we will talk about 16 that after the motion to dismiss is resolved. 17 MR. MICHAEL: Okay. But for regular pleadings, four would be nice, if people don't mind that many. 18 19 MR. THOMPSON: Okay. And they can all go to 20 you in Cheyenne? 21 MR. MICHAEL: Yeah. Four in Cheyenne, to me. 22 MR. THOMPSON: Okay. North Dakota? 23 MR. SATTLER: We will take two. 24 MR. THOMPSON: The United States? 25 MR. DUBOIS: Two should be sufficient, your

1 | Honor. This is Jim Dubois.

MR. THOMPSON: Then for Anadarko?

MR. WIGMORE: Two should be fine for us as

well. Thank you.

MR. THOMPSON: Thanks. So I think that takes care of the filings and other formal communications.

The next item is procedural rules. And, again, as you probably know, the only applicable Supreme Court rule, is Rule 17, which doesn't provide a great deal of guidance. We must follow the form of pleadings and motions set out in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. And in all other respects, the Rules of Civil Procedure and the Federal Rules of Evidence can be used as guidelines.

What I will be doing is incorporating slightly modified versions of the various civil procedure rules that seem to be relevant in the case management orders, as appropriate. But to the degree that the case management orders don't explicitly address an issue, you should look to the Rules of Civil Procedure for general guidance. I don't think there will be much difficulty. Most of the Rules of Civil Procedure are not directly relevant and some of them need slight modification for purposes of this type of an original matter. And so that's why, as I said, as they become appropriately

relevant, I would incorporate various of the Rules of Civil Procedure as they need to be modified into the case management orders. But if you ever have any questions, just look to the civil procedure rules.

MS. BOND: Okay. Thank you.

MR. THOMPSON: So the next item is the motion to dismiss by Wyoming. As you know, that's been referred to me now, and it would seem that that's the very first thing that I need to take up.

So what I would propose is that we set both a time and a date for a hearing on Wyoming's motion so that I can proceed forward and try to, well, resolve that motion.

On the location, I think the location needs to be in a neutral site. I have two possible sites. One is that we can use the courtroom here at Stanford Law School. It's the courtroom that both the Ninth Circuit and the California Supreme Court use occasion. The other possibility would be I can check to see whether or not I could get a courtroom in the Tenth Circuit building in Denver. There is also a possibility I could try Salt Lake City, but what a lot of the other special Masters have found is that it's fairly difficult to get district court courtrooms. So I would appreciate the parties' thoughts on that. Obviously, Stanford is

convenient for me, but there are more of you than there are of me.

MS. BOND: Your Honor, I appreciate the consideration. We are good with either Denver or Stanford. I suppose Denver is a little closer for me, but Stanford is just fine and --

MR. DUBOIS: Warmer.

MR. THOMPSON: We are going to be starting to talk about January or February in a moment.

MS. BOND: I'm guessing that Stanford might be a little bit more acceptable in the blizzard season, but either way is fine with use.

MR. THOMPSON: So other thoughts? And I really am interested in making sure that this is convenient for all parties. So other people's reaction?

MR. MICHAEL: This is Pete Michael speaking from Cheyenne. Obviously, Denver is quite convenient for us. We can drive to Denver. So I guess that's somewhat of a preference, although Sarah is right, weatherwise, you know, you never know whether the DIA will be open or closed. So we would be amenable to Stanford if the balance of considerations went to that.

MS. BOND: It makes sense to me, Pete.

MR. SATTLER: Your Honor, this is Todd Sattler in North Dakota. We would be fine with either location.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I wonder whether you have thought about allowing appearances telephonically or if you are set up for that? MR. THOMPSON: I think we can probably do that here at Stanford. I would need to check on the Byron White building in Denver as to whether or not they can do that easily also. MR. SATTLER: I'm not certain what we will do, but if that option is available, that would be helpful to know. MR. THOMPSON: I understand that North Dakota is in a slightly different position than either Wyoming or Montana in this case. And I assume for both the United States and for Anadarko that both is probably equally convenient? MR. DUBOIS: This is Jim Dubois for the United States. Actually, Denver is about as convenient as you can get because I'm staring at the Tenth Circuit building out of my window, but I can also get an airplane and make it to Stanford. It's not a problem. MR. THOMPSON: So you are in Denver? MR. DUBOIS: I am in Denver, yes. MR. THOMPSON: This is --MR. WIGMORE: Whatever the parties work out, would be fine with us. We don't really have a say in

1 | it.

MR. THOMPSON: Then in terms of dates. I don't know whether or not you have your calendars in front of you. My guess is that given that we only have about a month before the holiday season, and I'm actually leaving the United States for three weeks as of December 12, that it would be very difficult to schedule something before then. So I have looked at my calendar and found three dates. They, unfortunately, are all Tuesdays. So I don't know whether or not that will work for everybody.

Let me throw out three possible dates and see whether or not we can get agreement over the telephone. And if not, I'll give the responsibility to Susan to try to find a date that works. But they are January 6th, February 3rd, and February 17th. The easiest way is to have people tell me if they have conflicts on any of those dates at the moment.

MS. BOND: Sarah, from Montana. The 3rd and 17th of February would be the best for us, preferably the 17th.

MR. MICHAEL: This is Pete Michael. I have got a conflict on January 6th, but the other two dates are okay.

MR. SATTLER: This is Todd Sattler. All three

dates will work. 1 2 MR. DUBOIS: This is Jim Dubois. All three 3 dates would work for me. 4 MS. BOND: John, do you have a conflict on any 5 of those dates? 6 MR. DRAPER: January 6th is difficult. 7 February 3rd or 17th would be fine. 8 MR. THOMPSON: Why don't I then -- what I will 9 do is I will ask Susan to check on availability, both at 10 the courtroom here at Stanford Law School and also in Denver on those two dates. We will decide on a location 11 12 and a date and get that out to people as quickly as possible. 13 14 I guess also on the motion to dismiss -- so I 15 know that obviously both Montana and Wyoming will want to make arguments at that hearing. Would the United 16 17 States like to have some oral time at that? I will tell 18 you as the Special Master I would find it valuable. MR. DUBOIS: If you would find it valuable, 19 20 your Honor, I suspect the answer then is yes. 21 MR. THOMPSON: Okay. Also as part of the first 22 management order, I'll also set out the times for the 23 various argument. I assume probably morning is better 24 for people? 25 MS. BOND: We are good either way, your

1 Honor.

MR. THOMPSON: Okay. The next thing is on the motion of Anadarko for leave to file the amicus brief. What I will do is I will address that motion in the first case management order. I haven't looked at it yet, so I will do that, and as I say, rule on that in the first case management order.

And so I as understand, the Northern Cheyenne tribe has filed a motion but, Ms. Bond, what you have told me is basically, at the moment, they will just sit back and watch?

MS. BOND: I believe that's correct. I think the difference between the two amici is we objected to the participation of Anadarko, and I think their motion is just to participate in the motion to dismiss, which is the only motion.

MR. WIGMORE: That's right.

MR. THOMPSON: The amicus brief, as I understand it, is not a motion to intervene or to otherwise participate in the moment.

MR. WIGMORE: That's right. It's just a motion for leave because we didn't get consent of all the parties. So the amicus brief had to be submitted on motion for leave.

MR. THOMPSON: I understand.

Other current management issues. If the motion to dismiss is denied, we will obviously need to discuss broader issues of case management at that time, including how to proceed forward with discovery and resolution of the various legal issues. But it would not appear that there is any reason why we need to address those issues at this time until we have resolved the motion to dismiss. I wanted to get people's thoughts on that.

MS. BOND: That sounds right to us.

MR. MICHAEL: I agree with that as well. This is Pete Michael.

MR. THOMPSON: Great. The only thing then that I'll emphasize at this point is that my goal is to obviously resolve this carefully and appropriately, but also to resolve it as expeditiously as possible. There is some original jurisdiction cases that have lasted very lengthy periods of time and that's not what I want to see happen in this particular case. So one of the things I will be doing is trying to move this case forward.

MS. BOND: Thank you. We appreciate that.

MR. THOMPSON: Okay. The next thing is on fees and costs. So that you know in advance, my current hourly rate on private legal matters is \$550 an hour,

but I recognize that the parties in this case are states and that there is a public interest aspect to this job, so I am going to lower my rate for purposes of this to \$450 per hour. I may well employ a third year law year student as a clerk on some research issues, but at this point in time I don't expect to employ anything in the nature of a more senior clerk. I might need to do that at some point in the future, but I don't need to do that right now, and so hopefully that will keep the overall fees and costs down.

There will be a charge for normal expenses like this conference call line, travel, overnight delivery, but I would expect that the only substantial and in any sense unusual expense is likely to be the printing of any reports. Otherwise, I think the expenses will be fairly routine, and I will work to keep those expenses down to a minimum.

Some Special Masters in the past have required the establishment of escrow accounts for their fees and disbursements, but I don't see any reason to do that in this particular case. Instead, what I will plan to do is to submit periodic bills, probably once or at most twice a year. And what I will do with those, for those of you who have not been involved in original jurisdiction matters in the past, is I will send those

bills directly to the Court with copies to you. And then you will have 10 days to make any comments on those bills. And in the letter that accompanies the bill to you, I'll remind you of that 10-day period for comment. If you have any comments on the bills, you should send any of those comments directly to the Court. You shouldn't send your comments to me. That's purely a matter between you and the Court. If anyone is unhappy with the bill, I don't want to know about it. So that's sort of the first item.

The costs are generally assessed equally between the principal parties in these cases. This case is a little bit unusual in that it would appear that from everything I've read so far, the main parties are Montana and Wyoming, and that at the moment North Dakota is not seeking any relief nor is anyone seeking anything against North Dakota. So I assume that the costs would probably be split between Montana and Wyoming, but that's something I would appreciate the parties could discuss.

The Special Masters do have discretion if they want to, to suggest modification of the allocation if it's warranted by egregious behavior, but I don't expect to see anything of that nature here.

So, again, my expectation would be probably the

costs would be assessed equally between Montana or Wyoming.

MS. BOND: For Montana, equally is fine.

I guess I did have, if it's all right, one comment with respect to the procedure by which we pay costs. As much as I would like to, I don't have the checkbook for the State of Montana and I don't even know that the attorney general does. In terms of timing, if the Master is not wanting to set up an escrow account, that's fine. I don't know that I can get a check out of anybody from the state in 10 days, so I just wanted to alert somebody on the record that we have a bureaucracy to go through.

So in terms of the timing, the escrow account for some sort of prepayment works better for us because then you are not left without ability to disburse fees to -- fees that you've incurred and pay for costs that you've incurred, and I don't have that problem with the bureaucratic timing. And I don't know if you can send out a -- in a construction project you will often see an amount of money down, sort of, and I don't know if you want to do that or just be aware, please alert the Court, that I don't -- depending upon the timing, if we are relying on electronics, then we will get a bill pretty quickly. But given the security in Washington,

if the bill has to go from the Master to the Supreme Court, get logged in, get recorded and so forth, and then come back out to us, it's going to be a lot longer than 10 days before we can even see it and review it necessarily. Also, if that's 10 calendar days. And so just as something to think about, the logistics of that are such that I can't make a comment and/or pay within 10 days. I don't think we are physically capable of doing that.

MR. THOMPSON: Let me clarify. The process is that I would submit a bill for fees and costs incurred. I will send a copy of that, which is actually in the form of an interim motion for costs to the Court. I will send that to all of the parties and then the clerk's office will wait for 10 days to receive any responses that you have to it.

MS. BOND: Okay.

MR. THOMPSON: For example, if you believe that there are cost items on it that you should not be assessed, then you would have 10 days in that to file a response. At that point the motion goes on the conference list for the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court would then issue an order, either granting, denying, or modifying the bill. And the Court's order then specifies the amount to be paid and how that amount

is to be apportioned between the parties.

So at that point, you would then be responsible for paying me. And what I will do is I will just incur all of the various costs myself and get reimbursed through that particular process.

So I think the real question at this stage is not the 10 days, but instead whether or not, just as a matter of being able to process the payment and not have any problems at that stage of processing, whether or not that's a fine procedure or whether or not you would actually prefer some type of an escrow account.

MS. BOND: The process you just outlined is fine. Actually, we would kind of prefer an escrow account because it gets it out of our hair first, but then that puts some accounting on you.

So the account that you just described is fine. I was hoping that nobody was expecting us to cut a check in 10 days. The one you outlined is fine. It will come to us, we'll have time to look at it and then we can pay it.

MR. THOMPSON: Okay. Willy, your thoughts on this?

MR. JAY: Our thoughts are that 50/50 seems fair considering North Dakota's lack of involvement here. And also that sounds fine as far as procedural.

1 MR. THOMPSON: Okay. And would you prefer to 2 use the procedure of my simply submitting an interim 3 motion for fees and costs once or twice a year rather than having an escrow account? 4 5 MR. JAY: Yeah. I think we would prefer 6 that. 7 MR. THOMPSON: So, Montana, if you don't mind, 8 I think that's probably the easiest. MS. BOND: Sure. That's fine. 9 10 MR. THOMPSON: And so on the allocation of costs, as I said, at the moment we can move forward with 11 12 the assumption it will be equally split between Montana 13 and Wyoming, and obviously that can be changed in the 14 future if it becomes appropriate. 15 So any other questions, concerns on the fees 16 and costs? 17 MS. BOND: I don't think so. 18 MR. THOMPSON: Okay. Then the only other thing that I want to mention is simply the possibility of 19 20 settlement. And I view it as one of my roles as Special 21 Master is to encourage both sides to always consider 22 settlement discussions at any stage of the proceedings 23 that seem appropriate. And that doesn't mean I don't 24 want to hear and resolve this matter, but I think

settlement is always a useful option for parties.

25

I can't be involved in any settlement discussions. If you do at any point decide to go that route, and there is no reason why you need to inform me, but I also want to let you know that if at any point you want my assistance in helping to identify a mediator or the like, I would be happy to do so.

So, again, this isn't pushing you to settlement but it's just encouraging you, as I think any good judge or Special Master, too, to always consider that option.

MS. BOND: Thank you. I think from Montana's perspective our governors are actually pretty good friends and they have -- I think our feeling is that we are looking forward to settlement discussions after the legal issues that have separated the parties that are legitimate simple differences of the way we read the Compact. After those are decided, we expect there might be some possibility of settlement discussions.

MR. THOMPSON: Okay. So are there any other matters that people would like to discuss today? That exhausts my agenda.

MR. MICHAEL: This is Peter Michael speaking.

I had one subject that I wanted to bring up and it kind of comes out of some comments you made earlier regarding the pleading format. When we filed our motion to

dismiss, of course we had to really trim down the various documents that we attached so they would fit in an appendix under Supreme Court procedure. And we were informed by the clerk that at some point in the process if the Court was going to consider the motion without appointing a Special Master, that if the Court wanted complete copies of any of documents, that the Court would ask for those or for additional copies.

Early in the process, right after we filed our motion, I know Sarah Bond called me up and said there is some documents we would like to see and we immediately sent them on up to Montana.

So I don't know if, given the fact that now it's before you and you have more leeway in terms of the way that things are presented, whether it would be beneficial to actually for you to have the documents, the complete documents. Because of course, again, we submit the trimmed-down version to comply with the Court's appendix requirements. And I just put that issue on the table. I don't know if that's beneficial to you or something you would want to do or maybe wait until the arguments and see if there is something you would like to have a more complete -- a copy of the original document versus the shortened appendix version.

MR. THOMPSON: No. I actually think it would be useful to have complete documents. Would Montana and Wyoming be able to get together and agree on a set of documents that could serve as an appendix for this motion?

MR. MICHAEL: Well, we have our appendices. I don't think it would be difficult for us to -- again, we sent documents already up to Montana once, but we could send -- gather a complete set of documents that were in our appendix and then send them up for review, and then Montana could decide if they have any concerns about authenticity or anything of that nature.

MR. THOMPSON: That would be great. That would be my preference. I would like, for purposes of this motion, to have in front of me all primary documents that Montana and Wyoming believe could be relevant to the resolution of the legal issues concerning the Yellow Stone River Compact. And if the two parties could agree on that set of documents, then that would be very valuable.

MR. JAY: This is Willy Jay. I just wanted to flag for you that the United States' amicus brief is at motion to dismiss stage also. It has a couple of documents bound at the end and those are from the same set that we understand the parties to be referring to.

But to the extent that the parties are putting together a set, an agreed upon set for you, we would like them to include those to the engineering committee report. And I think, and Michael can correct me if I'm wrong, I think are excerpted in Wyoming's set, but set forth at greater length than our brief.

MR. THOMPSON: That would be fine. So counsel for Montana, would you be willing to take responsibility then for working with counsel for Wyoming and also consulting with the United States in putting together those documents?

MS. BOND: Yes, your Honor. I would, with the one caveat that Wyoming's attachments are quite a bit more voluminous and we do not agree that some of those are relevant and appropriate to be under consideration. But I think we could, if Pete will send us again the full set of what he wants to send to you, I think we can hopefully work through any authenticity or foundational kind of issues and then reserve any objection to whether or not it's something that the Court should consider in this kind of motion and preserve that particular argument for legal argument before you. In other words, we can agree that these are the documents and then argue about what they mean or whether you should even consider them later.

MR. THOMPSON: That's all I would ask for at this stage. And I understand entirely that by agreeing on the authenticity of the documents that you are not in the process also agreeing that those documents are relevant in interpreting the Compact.

MS. BOND: Thank you. We are fine with doing that.

MR. DUBOIS: Your Honor, this is Jim Dubois.

Just so that I'm clear, are you wanting only the

documents that were cited in the various briefs or are

you inviting the parties to submit documents that were

not referenced as well?

MR. THOMPSON: Thank you for that clarifying question.

First of all, my understanding from listening to counsel for Wyoming is that in some cases some of the documents might have been truncated. And I think it would be appropriate if any of the parties believe that additional portions of those documents should be before the Special Master in ruling on this motion, that the complete document be provided. But in addition to that, if there are additional documents that were not included at that point in time that one or more parties believe are relevant to the resolution of the legal issues in the motion, then I would invite those also to be

1 | included in this larger appendix.

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

Just to further clarify the question, it's not just the truncated documents you would like in this compendium but the copies of the originals which were transcribed

and reprinted in our briefs?

MR. THOMPSON: That's correct. I think it's useful to have one appendix that can serve as a complete appendix for this motion. And, again, the parties in agreeing on this appendix are simply agreeing to the authenticity of the documents.

MR. DRAPER: Thank you.

MS. BOND: Your Honor, just as another clarifying point. The parties are the only entities?

MR. THOMPSON: That's correct. The parties and the United States.

MS. BOND: The other thing is, just so we are really clear, I heard a discussion of documents that were cited and then I've heard a discussion of documents that were appended, and those may be different subsets. Can you just repeat what exactly you want us to put together? You are inviting us to add documents and see if we can agree that they are properly before the Court and then also put together a single set of what we would agree were the full documents from which both parties'

1 appendices were -- and the United States -- were 2 redacted? And if there were any materials, for example, 3 secondary sources that were cited in a brief but were 4 not appended, are you also asking for copies of those? 5 MR. THOMPSON: No. So let me separate out. 6 What I assume that the parties were thinking about were 7 primary documents that would not otherwise be accessible 8 to the Special Master. So those would be various 9 documents concerning, for example, the original 10 negotiation of the Compact or congressional approval of the Compact. I would think those would also include the 11 12 type of congressional materials that were included. But 13 to the degree that I have easy access to secondary 14 materials, you don't need to include those. 15 So you are thinking correspondence MS. BOND: 16 between the parties that would only be in the archives 17 of the individual states, for example? 18 MR. THOMPSON: That's correct. 19 MS. BOND: We would have -- this appendix would 20 have the full original documents from which the 21 appendices were redacted as well as other primary 22 materials that we want the Special Master to rely on; is 23 that accurate? 24 That's correct. And obviously, MR. THOMPSON:

I don't want you to put in materials simply to make it

25

longer. So, obviously, only include those materials that you consider to be relevant. But I do think it will be useful in resolving the motion to dismiss and also in resolving any other matters in the future that involve legal interpretation of the Compact to have that type of a comprehensive appendix. Then obviously in the future, if additional documents were to come to mind that in any future motion would be relevant, then those could be introduced at that point in time. But anything that you believe at this point that you would like to rely upon in arguing on the motion to dismiss, include that. And, again, we are only talking about primary materials that the Special Master would not otherwise have easy access to.

MS. BOND: All right. Thank you.

MR. THOMPSON: Any other questions on this?

MR. WIGMORE: This is Michael Wigmore again.

For what it's worth, as you may understand we just have one very narrow but important issue in the case. I'm sure we will attend the hearing on the motion to dismiss and I understand it's purely legal issues at that point. We are not a party to the Compact, but we will be there. And to the extent you have any questions, we will be

And to the extent you have any questions, we will be

happy to participate. And if you wouldn't find that

helpful, we will sit quietly and take copious notes.

MR. THOMPSON: Let me resolve the motion first and then I'll consider that question.

MR. WIGMORE: Right. I'm sorry. Right, obviously. You said you were going to resolve the motion in the mention on our break.

MR. THOMPSON: Okay.

MS. BOND: I guess, your Honor, the only other question I have with respect to your resolution of the motion of Anadarko to participate, just for the record, our objection to their participation is because they are not a sovereign named in the Compact, and that we believe that Wyoming would speak to their interest as being negotiated in paren patria on behalf of their citizens, and that we didn't think their participation in amicus fit within Rule 37 for being helpful to the Court. But that hasn't been briefed, but we will defer.

MR. WIGMORE: I'm sorry. Is there going to be a hearing on that motion because I don't believe -- while you did not consent, I do not believe that Montana filed an opposition.

MR. THOMPSON: I don't think we need to have a hearing, even over the telephone, on this particular motion. And so I think I have all of -- I have the motion itself of Anadarko to file the amicus brief and I

1 think that's sufficient for me to rule on it. 2 MS. BOND: All right. Thank you. 3 MR. WIGMORE: Thank you. 4 MR. THOMPSON: Okay. Anything else? 5 MS. BOND: Not from Montana. 6 MR. THOMPSON: Okay. So I guess the only other 7 question then for the court reporter is she probably 8 wants to know how many copies each of you would like. 9 MS. BOND: Of the transcript? 10 MR. THOMPSON: Yes. I'm sorry. What did I 11 just say? 12 MS. BOND: I'm sorry. I just blanked. 13 MR. THOMPSON: I might have said something 14 different, but the transcript, yes. 15 MS. BOND: One for Montana. 16 MR. MICHAEL: This is Pete Michael. We will 17 take one, but can it be condensed? 18 MR. SATTLER: North Dakota does not need a 19 transcript. MR. THOMPSON: Does the United States want a 20 21 transcript? 22 MR. WIGMORE: Of this, no, your Honor. I think 23 that the case management order will cover anything. 24 MR. THOMPSON: Okay. Anadarko? 25 MR. WIGMORE: We don't need a copy of the

1 | transcript, your Honor.

MR. THOMPSON: Okay. Well, thank you very much. And as I said, we'd sort of go down quickly the various action items. I will be determining the date and the location of the motion, the hearing on the motion and getting information out to you on that as soon as possible. And then I'll also be issuing a first case management order.

As part of that first case management order

I'll also be ruling on the motion of Anadarko for leave
to file an amicus brief.

The state of Montana, counsel for Montana, will produce an updated service list that also includes everybody's e-mail, addresses and we'll send that around to all parties and also to the Special Master.

In addition to that, counsel for Montana will take responsibility for working with Wyoming and also consulting with the United States in putting together an appendix for the motion to dismiss.

I guess the one thing we didn't talk about was how soon that appendix could be put together.

MS. BOND: I think the bulk of the documents are within Wyoming's possession. I don't know -- Pete, I don't know if you have electronic copies of the hard copy stuff you sent us.

```
1
             MR. MICHAEL: I think we already do.
 2
             MS. BOND: Then we could do that pretty
 3
    quickly. And I could get the e-mails today.
 4
             As a quick clarification, when you say notify
5
    the Special Master, I assume you mean through Susan
6
    Carter?
7
             MR. THOMPSON: Yes.
8
             MS. BOND: I can talk to Pete later today. Are
9
    you in this afternoon, Pete?
10
             MR. MICHAEL: Yes.
             MS. BOND: We can get right after that.
11
12
             MR. THOMPSON: Okay. Should we set a date, say
    the end of this month to do some additional talking?
13
14
             MS. BOND: Yeah. That would be great. It will
15
    give us time to coordinate with the United States and
16
    make sure all our ducks are in a row.
17
              I will be sending to Susan the e-mails of
18
    everyone that I have today. Thereafter, would my
19
    communication with the Special Master be to a Web site
20
    or to a Web site and also Susan?
21
             MR. THOMPSON: It will probably be through
22
    Susan.
23
             Okay. Action items. Anything else on that
24
    list?
25
             MR. MICHAEL: This is Pete Michael.
```

```
1
    many -- would you like three copies, hard copies of the
 2
    appendix?
 3
             MR. THOMPSON: How many pages are we talking
 4
    about, do you think?
5
              MR. MICHAEL: I suspect it would be 220, 200
6
    pages, maybe.
7
              MR. THOMPSON: Yeah. I would say on that
8
    probably, if you could, send three copies. That would
9
    be quite useful.
10
              MR. MICHAEL: We will also send the PDF version
    so you can access it that way.
11
12
              MR. THOMPSON: That's excellent.
13
              MS. BOND: One more question from me. When we
14
    are sending -- I guess Montana won't be this round, but
15
    do you want those in a notebook or physically -- the
16
    physical copies, do you want those bound in three-ring
17
    binders?
             MR. THOMPSON: Of which document?
18
19
             MS. BOND: The appendices that we agree on.
20
              MR. THOMPSON:
                            In order to save money on the
21
    postage, why don't you just send the documents to me and
22
    then I can store them.
23
             MS. BOND: Okay.
24
             MR. THOMPSON: Don't worry about putting them
25
    in three-ring binders or doing anything fancy with
```

```
1
     them.
 2
              MS. BOND: Okay. Thank you.
 3
              MR. THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you, very much.
 4
     Again, have a good day.
               (Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings concluded
 5
 6
     at 9:30 a.m.)
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

OS1t10	on of Telephonic Hearing STATE OF MONTANA vs. STATE OF W YOMING,
1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATION
2	
3	I, Dana Saruk, CSR NO. 10653, hereby certify
4	that I reported in shorthand the above proceedings on
5	Thursday, November 13, 2008, at 2224 Third Avenue, in
6	the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, State of
7	California; and I do further certify that the above and
8	foregoing pages contain a true and correct transcript of
9	all of said proceedings.
L0	And I further certify that I am a disinterested
11	person and am in no way interested in the outcome of
L2	said action, or connected with or related to any of the
L3	parties in said action, or to their respective counsel.
L4	Dated: November 29, 2008.
L5	
L6	
L7	
L8	
L9	Dana Saruk, CSR No. 10653
20	
21	
22 l	

KRAMM & ASSOCIATES, INC.

23

24

25