

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

- - - - - x

TARRANT REGIONAL WATER DISTRICT, :

Petitioner : No. 11-889

v. :

RUDOLF JOHN HERRMANN, ET AL. :

- - - - - x

Washington, D.C.

Tuesday, April 23, 2013

The above-entitled matter came on for oral argument before the Supreme Court of the United States at 11:10 a.m.

APPEARANCES:

CHARLES A. ROTHFELD, ESQ., Washington, D.C.; on behalf of Petitioner.

ANN O'CONNELL, ESQ., Assistant to the Solicitor General, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.; for United States, as amicus curiae, supporting Petitioner.

LISA S. BLATT, ESQ., Washington, D.C.; on behalf of Respondents.

	C O N T E N T S	
1		
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	29
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
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

P R O C E E D I N G S

(11:10 a.m.)

CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We will hear argument next this morning in Case 11-889, Tarrant Regional Water District v. Herrmann.

Mr. Rothfeld?

ORAL ARGUMENT OF CHARLES A. ROTHFELD

ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER

MR. ROTHFELD: Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice, and may it please the Court:

In the Red River Compact, Oklahoma agreed that Texas would be allowed to use a specified quantity of water that is located in Oklahoma. Oklahoma is now trying to back out of that bargain.

What its argument to this Court in support of its position is essentially that the Court should disregard language that appears in the Red River Compact because that language is superfluous, that the Court should read into the Compact language that does not appear there, and that the Court should not give the text of the Compact what Oklahoma in its brief describes as "talismanic significance."

Our very different view is that the plain text of the Compact must control.

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 all -- three of
13 the four compacting States. The boundaries of that
14 subbasin are drawn not by State lines, but by reference
15 to the -- the last downside dam sites before tributaries
16 to the Red River Basin -- Red River flow into the river
17 itself.

18 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Mr. Rothfeld, we are told
19 that in other compacts when they really mean to give one
20 State the right to take another State's water, the
21 provision in the compact is much clearer, much more
22 definite.

23 This clause, the one that you rely on, is
24 kind of sketchy, isn't it? Doesn't say how they're
25 going to get it, if they're going to pay for it.

1 There's a lot to be filled in.

2 MR. ROTHFELD: Well, the provision that we
3 are relying on, I would say is not sketchy at all. It
4 is quite clear that all four of the compacting States
5 are in the language of the Compact, have equal rights to
6 the use of water, defined water in a defined area of the
7 subbasin, so long as no State uses more than 25 percent
8 of the water. That -- that is quite express as to what
9 is required.

10 In -- it's difficult to read that language
11 to mean anything other than that the States can take --

12 JUSTICE SCALIA: What is the exact language?
13 Do you want to read the exact language just to refresh
14 our recollection?

15 MR. CLEMENT: The exact language -- it appears
16 -- it is reprinted on page 8 of the blue brief in the
17 indented text, and it says, "Within this -- within this
18 subbasin, the signatory States have equal rights to the
19 use of," and then it defines the water that they have the
20 rights to the use of, "at times of normal flow" -- with
21 the flow of the Red River at 3,000 cubic feet per second
22 at the Arkansas/Louisiana border -- "provided that no
23 State is entitled to more than 25 percent of the water in
24 excess of this amount."

25 So the -- the gist of the language is States

1 have -- all -- all four signatory States have equal
2 rights to the use of --

3 JUSTICE BREYER: It doesn't say that. It
4 says, "No State is entitled to more than 25 percent."
5 It doesn't say -- I mean that language doesn't say what
6 happens if in fact there's a State that because of
7 cliffs or something can't get the 25 percent to which it
8 is entitled. It just doesn't say anything about it.

9 MR. ROTHFELD: Well, I have to disagree with
10 that.

11 JUSTICE BREYER: Where does it say something
12 about it?

13 MR. ROTHFELD: It says that -- the section
14 is designed to allocate the water of the subbasin, and
15 it says, "Within the subbasin, States have equal rights
16 to use of the runoff." That's the first part of it.

17 JUSTICE BREYER: Yes.

18 MR. ROTHFELD: The second part of it then
19 says, "provided that no State is entitled to more than
20 25 percent" --

21 JUSTICE BREYER: All right. Does that mean
22 that a State can, when it can't get its pipeline to the
23 river, go into some other State and take the water out
24 of that other State? I mean, I would have thought, if
25 that was their intent, there would be a mechanism for

1 doing it. That you'd have some authority set up by the
2 Compact that would decide where, whether it's really
3 true, and how are we supposed to do it, and there is no
4 such mechanism, rather if there is such a right, which
5 it doesn't say anything about, it's left to the State
6 courts in different States to try to do what is an
7 extremely complex and controversial administrative job.

8 MR. ROTHFELD: A couple points to say about
9 that. First of all, it is not at all a complex job.

10 JUSTICE BREYER: It's not at all complex
11 when Oklahoma is going to say, Texas, go run the pipe to
12 the south of the Red River, and Texas is going to say,
13 I'm sorry, we can't get there, there's too much cactus.
14 And then they're going to say, don't you know that, in
15 fact, when you put your pipeline into Oklahoma, you are
16 going to be taking part of the 25 percent that belongs
17 to us.

18 And Texas will say, no, we aren't. And then
19 we'll have to have a way of measuring how much goes into
20 the river at different places and what are all these
21 different pipelines are going to take out. You
22 understand what I'm saying.

23 MR. ROTHFELD: Right. But --

24 JUSTICE BREYER: I would have thought a
25 mechanism would be set up to do that and there is none.

1 MR. ROTHFELD: Okay. Again, several things
2 about that. First of all, in all these other compacts
3 to which Justice Ginsburg alludes that are cited by our
4 opponents, which expressly allow for cross-border --
5 virtually none of them provide any of the kinds of
6 details that you are describing.

7 JUSTICE BREYER: Fine. But they do say
8 expressly, and I don't know what the terrain is like in
9 the other areas. And here it does not say anything
10 about it. That's why I think we're here in the Court
11 because all it says is you can't take more than
12 25 percent. It doesn't say what happens when Texas is
13 unable to get its 25 percent from the south. I'm now
14 repeating myself, but you point to the language that
15 says what I just say is not consistent with the
16 language.

17 MR. ROTHFELD: What I say -- I guess I will
18 say two things about that. One, I think what you just
19 say is, in fact, with respect, is not consistent with
20 the language. I think that --

21 JUSTICE BREYER: Which language is it not
22 consistent with?

23 MR. ROTHFELD: Equal rights to use of
24 specified water. It -- the -- the subbasin is defined,
25 again, not by State lines, it's defined by -- by

1 downstream dam sites. So it has created a pool of water
2 in the -- in this subbasin, and it says that all four
3 States have equal rights to use of this water, provided
4 that none takes more than 25 percent.

5 It seems to me that on the face of it, that
6 is saying State lines are not relevant and that what we
7 are looking at is a pool of water the States can come
8 and get it. And it is particularly so --

9 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Excuse me.

10 MR. ROTHFELD: If I may just -- I'm sorry.

11 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: No, no. Finish. But I --

12 MR. ROTHFELD: And I think to the extent
13 that there could be any ambiguity in the -- in that
14 language viewed in isolation, in the context of the rest
15 of the Compact, there are places where the drafters of
16 the Compact, in fact, did refer to State lines. They
17 said that States are entitled to use the water within
18 their State boundaries, in the respective States may use
19 the water within their boundaries. They did not -- the
20 framers did not use that language in this provision.

21 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I think under your
22 argument, and you can correct me if I'm wrong, that
23 Louisiana could decide it doesn't want to wait for the
24 flow of water to come to it, and it could just go right
25 into Oklahoma, in which it shares no border, and I don't

1 know how it's going to do that, and take its 25 percent.
2 Does that make sense in terms of the language?

3 MR. ROTHFELD: Well, I will say two things
4 to that --

5 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I mean, you're talking
6 about Texas, but Texas shares a border and so it may be
7 a little easier to cross the borderline. But what's
8 Louisiana going to do?

9 MR. ROTHFELD: Well, let me make two points
10 about that.

11 First of all, I think that not only does it
12 make sense in the language, it's compelled by the
13 language because the language says within this subbasin
14 all four States have equal rights. Separately, there is
15 another separate reach. Reach V of the -- the Compact
16 is Louisiana's, and so the water flows into Louisiana.
17 When the water gets to Louisiana, it's no longer within
18 the subbasin, it's somewhere else.

19 So the plain language of the Compact compels
20 the reading -- compels the -- the point that Louisiana
21 could take its water from within the subbasin.

22 Now, could it do that? The subbasin runs
23 through to Arkansas to Louisiana, so it could go to
24 Louisiana --

25 JUSTICE BREYER: Go back to the first one

1 because what you have done is you've pushed me back to
2 the equal rights. And now if I am going to fight you on
3 it, I have to say the equal rights to water means equal
4 rights to water arising within its boundaries. And all
5 you have to say is equal rights to water arising
6 anywhere in the subbasin.

7 And if I just heard that, then I might say
8 okay, I think yours is a little better. But -- but we
9 have this enormous administrative mess that would seem
10 to be created, and both those interpretations seem
11 possible.

12 So let's go back to that and let me hear
13 quite clearly, now that I've focused it, what's the
14 answer?

15 MR. ROTHFELD: If I may just finish with
16 Justice Sotomayor and I will turn to that?

17 I think the second answer to the question
18 is, the States are going to take the water from the
19 closest point where they can get it. And so Louisiana
20 is not going to go to Oklahoma. If it's going to go
21 into Subbasin 5, it's going to go to Arkansas directly
22 across the State line.

23 JUSTICE GINSBURG: How -- how does it do it?
24 Does it have to apply to Texas?

25 MR. ROTHFELD: It has to apply to

1 whichever --

2 JUSTICE GINSBURG: To Oklahoma.

3 MR. ROTHFELD: If it's going to Oklahoma,
4 and this is partially responsive to Justice Breyer, it
5 would have to apply to the water authorities within
6 Oklahoma. So what is going on here, Tarrant, the Texas
7 water district, is applying to the Oklahoma Water
8 Resources Board. It will seek a permit. This will
9 operate precisely in the same way as if an Oklahoma
10 applicant is seeking a permit.

11 You will go to -- you will go and say, I
12 want to take water out of this point. The Water
13 Resources Board will apply its ordinary standards to
14 determine whether or not that can be granted.

15 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Who -- who erects the
16 facilities to accomplish this diversion?

17 MR. ROTHFELD: Tarrant presumably will do
18 that. If Tarrant needs to obtain rights of way,
19 Oklahoma law provides for exercise of eminent domain, or
20 Tarrant can simply purchase the property to do that.

21 JUSTICE KENNEDY: It's -- it's my
22 understanding that there is a place where Texas can put
23 a line into the river, and then a subset of that
24 question is, the main stem of the river, through --
25 without going through Oklahoma property, other than

1 perhaps just the bank itself.

2 MR. ROTHFELD: That -- that I think is not
3 correct as a factual matter. The -- the Red River lies
4 entirely within Oklahoma, and so Oklahoma, in order to
5 get water out of the main stem, if -- if Texas were to
6 do that, it would have to go into Oklahoma. And -- and
7 in fact, this is in response to -- in part to what --

8 JUSTICE KENNEDY: But you say entirely
9 within Oklahoma, just because of ownership of the bank?

10 MR. ROTHFELD: Because --

11 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Or because of there's also
12 some intervening property between Texas and the bank
13 that Oklahoma owns?

14 MR. ROTHFELD: The -- the border between
15 Oklahoma and Texas is the south vegetation line of the
16 Red River, so therefore it is out of the river past the
17 bank to the vegetation line. So in order to get water
18 out of the main stem, Oklahoma and -- Texas would have
19 to go into Oklahoma. Now, there is --

20 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Do -- do the current laws
21 prohibit that --

22 MR. ROTHFELD: Oklahoma's current laws
23 would, I would think, prevent --

24 JUSTICE KENNEDY: At any point?

25 MR. ROTHFELD: At any point, because the

1 laws that Tarrant is challenging here are laws that are
2 discriminatory Oklahoma laws that prevent any use of
3 water originating in Oklahoma outside.

4 JUSTICE ALITO: When you say Texas has the
5 right to go into Oklahoma, just -- just think about that
6 phrase. That's -- that's very striking. I mean, it
7 sounds like they are going to send in the National Guard
8 or the Texas Rangers.

9 MR. ROTHFELD: Right. And that -- if I may,
10 Justice Alito, that is -- that's a very misleading way
11 of looking at it. And I think Oklahoma's brief suggests
12 that the Texas Rangers are going to descend on Tulsa and
13 seize the water. That is not what -- what is
14 contemplated.

15 JUSTICE ALITO: But you were saying that
16 Oklahoma -- that Texas has the right to force Oklahoma
17 to take private property in Oklahoma by eminent
18 domain if necessary.

19 MR. ROTHFELD: No, I -- there is an -- there
20 is an Oklahoma statute that says in order to -- someone
21 who has a permit to obtain water can exercise eminent
22 domain. An Oklahoma person can do this. A Texas person
23 can do this.

24 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: How does -- how does
25 Oklahoma apply its law in this situation? I assume

1 there is normal priorities and they will get
2 applications from a lot of people. But they have to --
3 what do they have to give Texas? Up to 25 percent?

4 I mean, they can't just say -- deny it
5 because another Oklahoma user has priority, or all this.
6 How does that fit in with the existing administrative
7 structure?

8 MR. ROTHFELD: Well, Oklahoma cannot use
9 more than 25 percent of the water within the subbasin.
10 I think that our friends concede that because the
11 language of the Compact says no State is entitled to
12 more than 25 percent.

13 Within each State's 25 percent allocation, a
14 resident water user of the State will apply to the
15 Oklahoma -- if they are seeking to take their water from
16 Oklahoma, it will apply to the Oklahoma Water Resources
17 Board, which will assess that permit precisely as it
18 assesses permits from Oklahoma residents.

19 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: But it's got to give
20 Texas at least up to its 25 percent, right?

21 MR. ROTHFELD: If -- if there is a request
22 for that much water from a Texas user, and the Texas
23 user has priority as a permit applicant against others
24 who are seeking to take water from this particular --

25 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I guess what I'm

1 asking is, does the Compact give Texas special priority
2 apart from what Oklahoma -- Oklahoma's priorities would
3 be?

4 MR. ROTHFELD: No, it does not. It's --
5 all -- all the Compact says is that Texas is entitled to
6 take water from within the subbasin, its 25 percent.
7 Now when it applies in a particular place, as Tarrant
8 has done here, it's going to apply -- be consistent with
9 the Oklahoma -- Water Resources Board permit application
10 policies, as it has done.

11 The resources board will assess that permit
12 application just as it would assess an application
13 from --

14 JUSTICE KAGAN: And what does that mean
15 exactly? What would Oklahoma do to evaluate that
16 application and to compare it to other applications from
17 Oklahomans, and also maybe to compare it -- maybe there
18 is more than one Texas application.

19 How does the Oklahoma board make those
20 decisions?

21 MR. ROTHFELD: It -- a permit applicant
22 submits an application, which has to demonstrate that it
23 satisfies the standards for obtaining the water. That
24 will be assessed on its merits by the Water Resources
25 Board.

1 If there are competing applications for the
2 same water, then it's -- it's done in the terms of
3 priority -- of --

4 JUSTICE KAGAN: I'm really asking you to
5 tell me what the Oklahoma board is going to do. I mean,
6 why doesn't the Oklahoma board just say, you know,
7 sorry, we like Oklahomans? Would that be all right?

8 MR. ROTHFELD: Well, that is their current
9 policy. That would not be all right.

10 JUSTICE KAGAN: What -- what -- what
11 different kind of priorities do they have to use, and
12 why do they have to use them, as I think -- somewhere
13 along the lines of what the Chief Justice was asking?

14 MR. ROTHFELD: I suppose there -- there are
15 two points there. One is, if there is enough water to
16 go around for everyone, as in fact there is, then they
17 simply assess it in terms of priority in time. Whoever
18 makes the first application will get it.

19 However, Oklahoma can only get 25 -- use
20 25 percent of the water. And therefore, Texas has the
21 right, so long as there is water available and Texas has
22 not used its 25 percent of the subbasin water. Texas
23 has the right to seek that anywhere it can get it in the
24 subbasin.

25 If I may, Mr. Chief Justice.

1 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
2 Ms. O'Connell.

3 ORAL ARGUMENT OF ANN O'CONNELL,
4 FOR UNITED STATES, AS AMICUS CURIAE,
5 SUPPORTING THE PETITIONER

6 MS. O'CONNELL: Mr. Chief Justice, and may
7 it please the Court:

8 The court of appeals concluded that Oklahoma
9 may categorically foreclose Texas water users from
10 accessing Reach II Subbasin 5 water in Oklahoma, and the
11 court reached that conclusion for reasons that in the
12 view of the United States are wrong.

13 First, the Court of Appeals erred in
14 applying a presumption against preemption to determine
15 whether the challenged Oklahoma laws conflict with the
16 Compact. The rationale for that presumption where it
17 has been applied is one of federalism, but the States
18 themselves created the terms of the interstate Compact,
19 and respect for the States as sovereigns in that context
20 requires enforcement of the Compact according to its
21 terms.

22 Second, the court of appeals relied on
23 general Compact provisions to conclude that the Compact
24 gives States unrestricted authority to regulate the
25 water within their boundaries. But the general

1 provisions of the Compact make clear that a State's
2 regulation of water has to be consistent with the
3 allocations made under the Compact, and each State's
4 obligations under the Compact.

5 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Well, I -- I am not quite
6 sure I agree with your reading of the Court of Appeals'
7 opinion. It seems to me the Court of Appeals' opinion
8 is consistent with the Respondents' argument that they
9 looked at the terms of the Compact.

10 And it seems to me that you may be right
11 that the Compact either says you get the water or you
12 don't, and the dormant Commerce Clause is just
13 irrelevant. But I read the opinion of the court of
14 appeals as being quite consistent with that proposition.
15 You win or you lose, up or down, under the Compact. The
16 dormant Commerce Clause doesn't -- just doesn't have
17 much to do with it.

18 MS. O'CONNELL: Well, we agree with that.
19 We don't think that the dormant Commerce Clause comes
20 into play here. We think that whether Texas can access
21 the water in Oklahoma through the Oklahoma permitting
22 process depends entirely on whether the Compact gives
23 them that right or not.

24 JUSTICE KENNEDY: But that's the way I
25 read the analytic approach of the court of appeals at

1 39A, when it starts talking about the point of --
2 Section 5.05.

3 MS. O'CONNELL: Right. And we don't
4 disagree with that, that the -- that the commerce clause
5 shouldn't come into play here.

6 Where we disagree with the Court of Appeals
7 is with the Court of Appeals' conclusion that,
8 regardless of whether a State law would frustrate the
9 purpose or pose an obstacle to a State obtaining its
10 share of water under the Compact, that that State law
11 should prevail under the Compact. So the Compact makes
12 clear that those general provisions preserving State
13 water law need to be consistent with each State's
14 obligations under the Compact.

15 And if I could --

16 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, where, if
17 you're relying on the Compact and its language, where do
18 you come up with this idea that States first have to try
19 to get their 25 percent from water within their borders?
20 I don't see that anywhere.

21 MS. O'CONNELL: Well, first of all, we think
22 that that's an issue that, if the Court decided that --
23 that there are errors in the Court of Appeals' opinion
24 that should be corrected, we think that's something the
25 court of -- that the lower courts could consider on

1 remand.

2 But I'll tell you where it comes from, which
3 is Sections 2.01 and 2.10(a) of the Compact, which
4 preserve the application of State water law. Section
5 2.01 says that, "Each State may freely administer water
6 rights and uses in accordance with the laws of that
7 State, but that such -- such uses shall be subject to
8 the availability of water in accordance with the
9 Compact."

10 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, it seems to me
11 that you like some provisions of State law, but not
12 others.

13 MS. O'CONNELL: No. What we're saying is
14 that if there's a State law that conflicts with the
15 allocation or poses an obstacle to the allocation of
16 water under the Compact, then it's preempted.

17 But, for example, if Texas could access
18 25 percent of the water from within its State, then
19 the -- the application of a State law that would bar
20 Texas water users from obtaining a portion of its water
21 in Oklahoma wouldn't necessarily be preempted because it
22 wouldn't pose an obstacle to the allocation.

23 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: What do you do --
24 what do you do with a situation -- let's say there's
25 Oklahoma water available to Tarrant that is closer than

1 the water they would get from somewhere else in Texas.
2 Do they have to incur the additional expense to get
3 Texas water, or can they take the cheaper route and get
4 Oklahoma water?

5 MS. O'CONNELL: Well, we think -- again, we
6 think this is a -- an issue for the court of -- for the
7 lower courts to look at on remand, but we think there's
8 a -- there's a good argument to be made that, so long as
9 Texas could access 25 percent of the water within its
10 boundaries, then application of an Oklahoma law that
11 would prohibit Texas from going through the Oklahoma
12 permitting process wouldn't necessarily be preempted.

13 And again, we -- these -- these -- there are
14 lots of issues, as we point out in our brief and we did
15 at the invitation stage, that would need to be
16 addressed, perhaps, in further proceedings or perhaps
17 before the --

18 JUSTICE KAGAN: Ms. O'Connell, isn't that a
19 reason why we shouldn't accept your basic view? I mean,
20 if -- if you think of all the issues that you laid out
21 that are going to have to be decided and the difficulty
22 of those issues -- I mean, you read this brief that you
23 submitted, it gives you kind of a headache. That --
24 that -- you know, and it -- it suggests how difficult
25 the process is.

1 And then you look at this provision, and
2 maybe this provision can be read as an entitlement, but
3 it can just as easily, as -- as Justice Breyer
4 suggested, be read as a cap, "no more than 25 percent."

5 So as between those two possible readings,
6 the complexity of your way of reading this, which would
7 have -- why?

8 MS. O'CONNELL: Justice Kagan, I'd like to,
9 if I could, go to the second point, which is on the --
10 the -- whether you read this as a 25 percent entitlement
11 or a cap, and I would like to point the Court, not just
12 to the language of the Compact, which we think weighs in
13 favor of the idea that each right -- each State has an
14 equal right and that the -- the equal right to use the
15 water in the subbasin implies an equal right, not just
16 an opportunity.

17 But the interpretive comments that follow
18 Section 5.05(b) -- this is at page 30 of the is Joint
19 Appendix -- refer to a "right." The first full
20 paragraph there says, "When the flows" -- I'm sorry,
21 it's the -- the second line. "If the States have
22 competing uses and the amount of water available in
23 excess of 3,000 cubic feet per second cannot satisfy all
24 such uses, each State will honor the other State's right
25 to 25 percent of the excess flow."

1 The Red River Compact Commission also
2 approved rules and regulations, and those say -- they're
3 on page, I think, 19 of the Joint Appendix. I might
4 have that page -- yeah, I have that page wrong.

5 But the -- the Red River Compact
6 Commission's rules and regulations say that when the
7 flow is above 12,000 cubic feet per second, so that
8 Louisiana could get its 3,000 cubic feet per second,
9 "each of the signatory States shall be entitled to
10 25 percent of the total runoff in undesignated flow."

11 So I think it -- it's pretty clear that
12 based on the -- both the text of the Compact and the
13 interpretive comments in the rules that the Red River
14 Compact Commission came up with, that there is not just
15 that you can take whatever is in your borders even if
16 that doesn't amount to 25 percent, but -- but that each
17 State is entitled to 25 percent of the water, and that
18 if that involves going into another State within this
19 geographic area that's not defined with respect to State
20 boundaries, then that is permissible under the Compact.

21 And as the Petitioner pointed out, when the
22 States wanted to impose a State boundary restriction in
23 the Compact, they did so. There are several subbasins
24 that span more than one geographic -- or more than one
25 State, and the Compact in those provisions says that you

1 can take whatever you want within your boundaries.

2 And I also don't think that this is going to
3 be particularly troublesome to administer. I mean,
4 there may need to be some further proceedings on that,
5 but Oklahoma law provides the backdrop for what would
6 happen when a Texas water user goes in to -- to ask for
7 a permit to appropriate and divert water from within
8 Oklahoma.

9 JUSTICE KAGAN: And what does that mean?
10 What would Oklahoma do?

11 MS. O'CONNELL: Well, the Oklahoma Water
12 Resources Board would just apply its normal procedures
13 and laws to determine whether this particular use of
14 water could be put to beneficial use. If -- they would
15 just apply whatever laws they would apply to any
16 applicant, regardless of whether they are from Texas or
17 Oklahoma.

18 JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, people keep on saying
19 that, and I -- I guess I just still don't understand
20 quite what it means.

21 MS. O'CONNELL: Well --

22 JUSTICE KAGAN: I mean, let's say Oklahoma,
23 the board is sitting there and it gets lots of
24 applications from Oklahoma users. And let's say it also
25 gets multiple applications from Texas users. That it's

1 not just one county, it's four counties. What does
2 Oklahoma do to -- to decide who gets the water?

3 MS. O'CONNELL: Well, I think just as -- as
4 Petitioner's counsel pointed out, there's a -- a
5 priority in water law, where whoever submits the
6 application first would -- would get the water if it's
7 available and they can put it to beneficial use.

8 And I -- and I -- the Court shouldn't be
9 concerned. I know all -- I know there are amicus briefs
10 submitted by other Texas entities that would like to
11 have water from this particular subbasin as well.

12 They're all part of the same Region C, and they -- I
13 think they have some way to work it out. It's not --

14 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, I don't understand
15 your answer. If -- if you're correct, wouldn't the
16 Oklahoma board have to give priority to the Texas
17 applicants in order to make sure that Texas got its
18 share of the water?

19 It couldn't just treat -- it couldn't just
20 be indifferent as to whether it was an Oklahoma or Texas
21 applicant.

22 MS. O'CONNELL: That -- true, to the extent
23 that Texas was not receiving its water. I mean,
24 under -- under our theory, which we think could be
25 developed more in the lower courts, if Texas was already

1 receiving 25 percent of the water, then Oklahoma would
2 not have to give it any kind of special priority. But
3 if it -- if it was not, then the Oklahoma Water
4 Resources Board would treat it just like an Oklahoma
5 applicant.

6 JUSTICE ALITO: Is it correct that -- that
7 there are reservoirs in Texas that flow into -- from
8 which water is released into the Red River?

9 MS. O'CONNELL: Yes.

10 JUSTICE ALITO: Okay. And --

11 MS. O'CONNELL: And in Oklahoma as well.

12 JUSTICE ALITO: And what if Texas didn't --
13 what if Texas could get -- could -- could release that
14 water and increase the flow of the river, but it chose
15 not to do so, so it could take other water out of the
16 river?

17 MS. O'CONNELL: This -- this is the last
18 point made in the Respondent's brief --

19 JUSTICE ALITO: Yeah.

20 MS. O'CONNELL: -- and -- and the response
21 to that would just be that all of the States would have
22 the opportunity to do that. In fact, the whole subbasin
23 is defined by the last major dam site on the tributaries
24 that are running in. So Oklahoma could do the same
25 thing.

1 And also, when the reservoirs are full,
2 they're full. It's not like Texas could keep all of the
3 water that's -- that's there from flowing into the
4 bottom portion of that tributary.

5 JUSTICE BREYER: Well, we're only
6 considering the instance where there isn't enough water
7 to meet the 25 percent in Texas. And in that instance,
8 I guess there are 50,000 places, not just in Oklahoma,
9 but also in Arkansas, where they might get some.

10 And all my question, and I think that was
11 being asked, is there anything else you want to say as
12 to why that's an easy matter to decide?

13 MS. O'CONNELL: Well, I -- it's -- we don't
14 think it needs to be decided in this particular
15 proceeding.

16 I think there are two errors that the Court
17 of Appeals made in applying a presumption against
18 preemption and in concluding that a Texas water user
19 could never divert water from outside of its State.
20 Those could be developed -- those additional problems
21 could be dealt with by the Oklahoma Water Resources
22 Board or as you said, perhaps in the original action.

23 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.

24 Ms. Blatt?

25 ORAL ARGUMENT OF LISA S. BLATT

1 ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENTS

2 MS. BLATT: Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice,
3 and may it please the Court:

4 If I could just address two sort of factual
5 questions.

6 Under the -- the actual Red River Boundary
7 Compact, the lawyer for Tarrant was wrong. There's
8 actually a strip called Shawnee Creek, from the Denison
9 Dam to the Shawnee Creek, that actually belongs to
10 Texas. So there's a piece of the Red River in this very
11 subbasin that is -- it's in the express Boundary
12 Compact.

13 Moreover, all of the Red River and Lake
14 Texoma that is in Texas is part of the main stem, and
15 that is not only in the land of Texas, Texas users draw
16 water, quite a lot of water, from Lake Texoma. So
17 that's two places on the main stem.

18 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Are they licensed?

19 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So I'm sure -- you're --
20 you're saying that the State of Texas can take water
21 directly from the main stem?

22 MS. BLATT: It can and does.

23 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: That's my point, yeah.

24 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Anywhere close to of
25 the 25 percent they claim entitlement to?

1 MS. BLATT: Well, who knows?

2 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I was hoping you
3 did.

4 (Laughter.)

5 MS. BLATT: Who knows? Texas has more than
6 a dozen fresh tributaries running from Subbasin 2 and
7 Subbasin 4.

8 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I'm talking about
9 Subbasin 5.

10 MS. BLATT: Subbasin 5, these are all --
11 excuse me -- these are tributaries that run into
12 Subbasin 5. There is more than a dozen tributaries in
13 Subbasin 5.

14 For 30 years no one has ever kept track of
15 any kind of accounting whatsoever, so when we say, "who
16 knows," that is the way the drafters -- it's not only
17 the way the drafters intended, but that has been the
18 state of play for 30 years.

19 So nobody -- and in the laws of Louisiana
20 and Arkansas don't even track diversions. So --

21 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Just to be clear, in your
22 view, Texas can, without going on Oklahoma property,
23 take water from the main stem in Basin 5?

24 MS. BLATT: In Subbasin 5, there is only up
25 from Denison Dam east to Shawnee Creek. So that's just

1 anywhere from a half a mile to three-quarters. It runs
2 from the -- from the middle of the channel.

3 East -- excuse me, west is Lake Texoma, and
4 if you want to look at the map, it's a big old lake.
5 That is a lot of water. And they definitely do take --
6 and that's in the brief -- they take lots of water from
7 that lake from the Texas side.

8 JUSTICE KENNEDY: But my question was, can
9 they take it from the main stem --

10 MS. BLATT: Only in that -- that little slip
11 of land to Shawnee Creek. It's -- it's a part of
12 Texas --

13 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Is that the part that,
14 under their allegation at least, is saline?

15 MS. BLATT: Well, again, they drink the
16 water in Subbasin 5.

17 JUSTICE KENNEDY: All right. Is that the
18 part that --

19 MS. BLATT: Yes. They think --

20 JUSTICE KENNEDY: -- they are referring
21 to --

22 MS. BLATT: Yes.

23 JUSTICE KENNEDY: -- when they say it's too
24 saline?

25 MS. BLATT: Yes. They think all the water

1 that their residents drink is salty, but they still are
2 drinking it.

3 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Texans.

4 MS. BLATT: They're drinking it. In fact,
5 they're -- footnote 3 and footnote 4, their water
6 planning documents, say this is a -- quite a -- a
7 drinkable source of water.

8 JUSTICE SCALIA: When they --

9 MS. BLATT: I understand they think it's
10 salty, but they drink it.

11 JUSTICE SCALIA: When they take water from
12 the main stream of the Red River, how do they know how
13 much of that water is from Reach V?

14 MS. BLATT: Well, the --

15 JUSTICE SCALIA: They are -- they are
16 entitled to -- to no more than 25 percent from Reach V.
17 Is everything that -- that comes into Texas in the main
18 channel of the Red River water from Reach V?

19 MS. BLATT: So if you look at the -- if you
20 look at the map in the red brief that's got all the --
21 the colors, and the pink is Subbasin 5. So where they
22 divert water from is all up and down those blue
23 tributaries that are in pink south of the Red River.

24 JUSTICE SCALIA: Now what page are you
25 looking at?

1 MS. BLATT: This is 33A --

2 JUSTICE SCALIA: Yeah, okay.

3 MS. BLATT: -- this map.

4 JUSTICE SCALIA: Yeah, yeah, yeah. I didn't
5 know --

6 MS. BLATT: So they -- and then if you look
7 at that -- that blue lake that looks like a dragon, that
8 is also where they are -- they are taking water.

9 JUSTICE SCALIA: What --

10 MS. BLATT: That just happens to be in Reach
11 I.

12 JUSTICE SCALIA: Reach I. Okay.

13 MS. BLATT: But their water planning
14 documents show that all the water in the pink on the
15 Texas side is a very valuable source of drinking water.
16 And if you see, all the way down to Lake Texarkana, they
17 can -- they are taking that water, too.

18 And when we say about what we know, no one
19 has ever done any accounting because the Equal Rights
20 Clause has always been read as equal rights to the use
21 of the water without prejudice to or from each other's
22 State, and, in that sense, it means that if one State
23 took an earlier use of the water, it wouldn't gain a
24 priority indefinitely over the other States.

25 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, it never -- it

1 never says that. I mean, that's why we have a case. It
2 never says it has to be from your State.

3 And I appreciate your -- the focus in your
4 argument on State sovereignty, but this is an interstate
5 Compact. And the whole point of interstate compacts is
6 that we have to -- each State has to give up a little
7 here or a little there to solve a problem.

8 So I -- I guess it's -- I don't know why
9 these basic principles of State sovereignty apply in the
10 context of an interstate compact.

11 MS. BLATT: Right. I mean, it is our
12 position that the States would have never agreed to this
13 extraordinary right without an -- an unequivocal
14 explicit statement.

15 But I do think it is absolutely critical to
16 understand that what they are asking for is
17 unprecedented, Mr. Chief Justice. There has never been
18 a cross-border diversion, ever, under any State water
19 compact. And the two examples they cite in their reply
20 brief are inexplicable -- absolutely inexplicable. They
21 cite the Niobrara Compact with no cite. They -- they
22 cite the Compact, but they never say there has been a
23 cross-border diversion.

24 And if you look on the map --

25 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Say that again, because

1 we have a green brief that gives us samples of
2 provisions for cross border.

3 MS. BLATT: Yeah, under explicit right.
4 There has never been a cross-border diversion without an
5 explicit statement. Not only --

6 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Because there have been
7 many, many --

8 MS. BLATT: Many with explicit statements
9 and then the essential bells and whistles as to eminent
10 domain, points of diversion, and which choice of law.

11 And what they tried to say because we have
12 been saying all along how unprecedented this would be to
13 sort of read in silence on borders, they tried to come
14 up with two examples in their reply brief.

15 And that's what I'm talking about. The
16 reply brief is not only -- is devoid of a citation, but
17 Nebraska and Wyoming told both us, and Wyoming told
18 Tarrant's counsel, that there have never been
19 diversions. And Nebraska was quite -- like, wow, we
20 hadn't known that. And it shows the danger of their
21 position. They think if it's silent as to borders, the
22 State of Wyoming can go hundreds of miles into Nebraska
23 and take the water across the border.

24 The other example they cite is fascinating
25 because it's a lawsuit before you. They cite the Rio

1 Grande Compact as a basis of saying El Paso can walk
2 into New Mexico, but their lawsuit to you is based on
3 the notion that Texas can't go into New Mexico. It's
4 New Mexico has a downstream delivery. So --

5 JUSTICE BREYER: But there was a point, it
6 seems to me, to favor them, which is go back to 1970 --
7 the '70s, when they drafted this.

8 MS. BLATT: I'm there.

9 JUSTICE BREYER: So they are in the room,
10 and there are representatives of all four States, and as
11 they say, okay, there is going to be more than 3,000 feet,
12 what happens? And Louisiana would say, we want at least
13 25 percent, done. Arkansas, 25 percent, done.
14 Oklahoma, same, done. Texas, same, done.

15 But everybody in the room knows that Texas
16 could never get more than 12 percent within its borders.
17 And since it could never get 12 -- more than 12 percent,
18 Louisiana would be sitting there with not really
19 25 percent but with 38. And so -- so -- - - - - --

20 MS. BLATT: But with all due -- sorry.

21 JUSTICE BREYER: -- that would suggest that,
22 hey, no, they all knew this and so they meant there must
23 be some way for Texas to get the extra. Otherwise, why
24 were they saying 25 percent for Texas? If --

25 MS. BLATT: Justice Breyer. Justice Breyer.

1 It's just not true. What they cite to is a 1970
2 engineering report --

3 JUSTICE BREYER: You know, this is an
4 example I made up because I think --

5 MS. BLATT: Oh. Well, the --

6 JUSTICE BREYER: -- an imaginary
7 conversation.

8 MS. BLATT: Oh.

9 JUSTICE BREYER: But if in an imaginary
10 conversation --

11 MS. BLATT: Well, okay. 34 percent of the
12 watershed is in Texas, so there is no reason to think
13 anyone thought Texas couldn't get its share.

14 JUSTICE BREYER: Why?

15 MS. BLATT: There's no -- because there's no
16 evidence there was any discussion about any State and
17 whether -- Texas never complained. No one ever said
18 Texas couldn't get its water.

19 JUSTICE BREYER: Wouldn't that be a fairly
20 easy thing to check going back to 1970 --

21 MS. BLATT: If you --

22 JUSTICE BREYER: -- to find out whether,
23 you know, Texas was just on some little salt flat --

24 MS. BLATT: Sure.

25 JUSTICE BREYER: -- near the river and --

1 MS. BLATT: We did. They did in their
2 brief, and they came up with an 11 to 16 percent. Our
3 engineers ran the numbers after correcting their
4 three-series method -- methodological errors, and we
5 came up with 29 percent.

6 They -- they double-counted streams. They
7 forgot that Subbasin 5 is not only runoff but also rain.
8 And then -- this one's humorous -- they didn't count the
9 excess. So all the -- all the math that they did
10 favored Texas, so the math didn't come out that way.

11 But what's interesting about the Tarrant's
12 view in juxtaposing with the United States' view,
13 Tarrant's view is it could have all the water, but they
14 could get all of it still from Oklahoma. So Louisiana,
15 Arkansas, and -- and Texas could come take all their
16 share from Oklahoma, forcing Oklahoma to have to go
17 south.

18 Now the United States' view, and this is
19 I -- they read a border limitation in there. They say,
20 look, borders are here, but if Texas really needs it,
21 you got to let them come in. That -- that's the United
22 States.

23 They definitely -- which I don't understand
24 their reliance on the Russello principle because they
25 read borders into this. Texas has actually disavowed

1 this view. Tarrant's disavowed it. They disavowed it
2 to the Tenth Circuit when the Tenth Circuit asked for
3 what their standing would be to press it. They said,
4 we've never claimed this.

5 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So what do you think is
6 the remedy? Meaning --

7 MS. BLATT: The remedy?

8 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I -- let me just posit
9 the point, okay? I understand your point to the Chief
10 that there's been no proof that Texas doesn't get its
11 25 percent or that it couldn't get it from the main stem
12 or somewhere. I accept that.

13 But let's, for the hypothetical, say that
14 there's a major drought and Texas can't get it from its
15 portion. What's its remedy?

16 MS. BLATT: Okay. Here -- Yeah.

17 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So that -- that it's not
18 getting --

19 MS. BLATT: Okay.

20 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- 25 percent --

21 MS. BLATT: Yeah. So let's --

22 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- as the Compact
23 entitles it to.

24 MS. BLATT: Okay. It's the last statement.
25 The Compact no way, no how entitles the parties to equal

1 25 percent. It just doesn't say equal rights to a
2 numerical share. It doesn't say equal rights to a
3 numerical quantity.

4 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: It says, "shall have
5 equal rights to the use of runoff originating in
6 Subbasin 5."

7 MS. BLATT: Right. And you and I could have
8 equal rights to the use of the family car or equal
9 rights to the use of the highway. That doesn't tell me
10 anything about how many hours I can spend on the
11 highway.

12 But here's the problem. The real problem is
13 with the cap. Okay? Their view is that the first
14 clause gives you an absolute equal right to a fixed
15 25 percent, no exceptions. But then you have this
16 provided clause which does no work for them. The
17 provided clause, which says you don't get any more than
18 25 percent, they are saying, well, by definition, if you
19 get exactly 25 percent, the State can take no more than
20 25 percent. So they actually just sort of combine the
21 two.

22 The other -- I hate to point this out
23 because I -- I feel a lot of affinity for the United
24 States, but their proof --

25 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You feel a lot of

1 what?

2 MS. BLATT: Affinity for them.

3 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Oh.

4 MS. BLATT: But listen to their proof for
5 why there's an equal 25 percent.

6 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You are representing
7 Oklahoma.

8 MS. BLATT: I am, but I used to work for
9 them.

10 They say well, we're guaranteed an equal
11 25 percent share, and they cite the compliance rules on
12 page 19. And entertainingly so, the rules that they
13 cite just disprove what they said.

14 The first rule they cite only gave 3 States.
15 They divided it by 3 instead of 4. Their view, the
16 United States' view, is there's a guarantee of
17 25 percent of any amount that's in excess of 3,000.

18 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Well, this is a -- a
19 perfectly legitimate argument for you to make, but I
20 want to go back to Justice Sotomayor's question.

21 At least as I understood it, it's this, I
22 want you to assume -- I know you don't agree with
23 that -- I want you to assume that the Compact gives
24 Texas a right to 25 percent of the -- of the excess --
25 of the water above the cubic foot.

1 MS. BLATT: The excess, yeah.

2 JUSTICE KENNEDY: I want you to assume that.
3 Now, wouldn't the Compact be meaningless if Texas
4 couldn't actually reach that water?

5 MS. BLATT: That is -- that is the United
6 States' view, and they'd have to go above it. What they
7 would have to do, which no one else -- no one has
8 done -- and I think the drafters thought it was
9 ultimately impossible because of Arkansas and Louisiana,
10 is call for an accounting and actually figure out what
11 the total was, figure out what the excess was, divvy up
12 the 4 shares, do exactly what Tarrant wants I guess to
13 happen, which has never happened, and it's not clear to
14 the drafters of the compliance rules that it could in
15 fact ever happen because of the riparian laws of
16 Arkansas and Louisiana.

17 But -- so in other words, if we lost this
18 case, which is probably why Tarrant is disavowing the
19 United States' view, is Texas would be in quite of a
20 pickle trying to prove they couldn't get their
21 25 percent. And so I read Tarrant as saying, don't you
22 dare send us back to try to prove that. We want to be
23 able to go whole hog into Oklahoma.

24 And if I could get to the point that Justice
25 Kagan was talking about, what's on the ground happening,

1 and why Oklahoma would have never agreed to this type of
2 cross-border right because what Tarrant is doing is
3 exploiting Oklahoma's law, which proceeds on the
4 assumption that water in Oklahoma is a public trust
5 that's held for the exclusive benefits of Oklahoma.

6 And there are three ways where Oklahoma
7 would not have agreed to this, and it would have been
8 carefully articulated in a Compact.

9 The first is prior appropriation. There are
10 4 Texas entities that have signed up for permits: The
11 Upper Trinity, the North Texas Municipal Water District,
12 Irving and Tarrant. And poor Oklahoma City got
13 sandwiched in the middle. It beat -- it beat Trinity to
14 the permit office by 24 hours.

15 And so not surprisingly, it's open season
16 for Oklahoma water, all of north Texas has come in and
17 sought a permit and there's priority.

18 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: But that's the same
19 problem. Even if you take within State, all of these
20 people, if they were applying for water in Texas as
21 well, there'd be the same issue there. One of them
22 would beat the other one. It's a question of priority.
23 You're just claiming that everybody from Oklahoma should
24 have -- well, not absolute priority, but --

25 MS. BLATT: Well, I have two points. First,

1 had -- had Oklahoma seen this coming, since they hadn't
2 heard about this until Tarrant filed its application,
3 Oklahoma City certainly would have gotten in line
4 faster. And second of all, the whole point of this
5 Compact -- and if you think about your equitable
6 apportionment doctrines, which whoever gets to the water
7 first gets a prior -- gets a priority permanently --
8 this was the point of the Compact. Louisiana and
9 Arkansas wouldn't have to develop their water, Texas and
10 Oklahoma were much more economically developed States,
11 and the equal rights prevented a race to the permit
12 office.

13 Let me get to the second aspect what's a
14 problem, and that is, compacts usually spell out the
15 points of diversion. The last place Oklahoma would have
16 picked as the point of diversion is the Kiamichi River,
17 and Tarrant is saying, not surprisingly, it's the most
18 desirable.

19 And the third is the eminent domain.
20 Eminent domain law in Oklahoma proceeds on the
21 assumption that those are Oklahomans who got the permit,
22 and thus can exercise a core sovereign power, and
23 Tarrant, not surprisingly, would like to come in and do
24 that.

25 And none of this is happening with the

1 normal political checks in Oklahoma. Oklahoma can't
2 vote out of office the Tarrant officials. It cannot
3 vote out of office the Upper Trinity or the North Texas
4 Municipal Water District.

5 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Ms. Blatt, does Oklahoma
6 law in any circumstance permit an appropriation of
7 water -- water in Oklahoma for out-of-State use?

8 MS. BLATT: Well, it's -- if it's compacted
9 water, you have to get legislative approval and --

10 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Just here and now, does
11 Oklahoma ever --

12 MS. BLATT: Yes, it can.

13 JUSTICE GINSBURG: -- permit out-of-State
14 use of its water?

15 MS. BLATT: It has not. It could, but
16 the -- but Tarrant is correct that there are facial
17 differences with respect to out-of-State. So
18 out-of-State users would have to get the water going
19 faster, it's subject to a review. And there's a
20 statement in there that you need to look and see if
21 there's a better use for Oklahoma.

22 Now, I hope you ask them this because I
23 gather their view is under the dormant Commerce Clause
24 is all of those laws are constitutional with respect to
25 99 percent of the Compact, which is it's allocated to --

1 to Oklahoma for its free and unrestricted use. So
2 they're basically saying there's 1 percent of this
3 Compact that's unconstitutional.

4 And not only is it 1 percent, the minute it
5 drops below 3,000, all of a sudden, it became. And on
6 this, we'd like to talk to the Russello principle. I
7 also hope you ask them, this is on page 15A of -- 14A of
8 the 15A brief. There are border references arbitrarily
9 and they're missing, they're there. It's completely
10 inconsistent.

11 And this -- their view would make complete
12 mincemeat out of 4 other provisions of the Compact. And
13 ironically, it would march a lot of States into Texas.
14 But back to (b) -- (b)(2) and 5.05(c) operate identical
15 in that they're basically downstream delivery, where all
16 States have to release 40 percent of the water
17 downstream. So they -- they're the same. They're
18 absolutely identical.

19 You hold on to 60, you let 40 percent go.
20 But only (c) contains that border reference. Only (c)
21 says, "within their respective States." And yet even in
22 (c), it's completely redundant and unnecessary because
23 you can't release water from without your State.

24 JUSTICE SCALIA: Where is this? Where is
25 this? Where is this?

1 MS. BLATT: This is on page 14A and 15A --
2 sorry -- of the red brief. So only (c) says within
3 their respective States, but (b)(2) is the exact same
4 functioning provision, and it's missing the border
5 reference. And I -- you don't have time now to ask the
6 United States' view, but I think the United States would
7 agree with us that if you give this border thing kind of
8 the magical meaning, borders kind of appear and
9 disappear with the water flow, which is very strange.

10 Tarrant thinks that there's some heretofore
11 unheard of crediting system, but they don't have an
12 explanation on how (b)(2) and (c) -- but more
13 importantly, if you could just turn to 9A for just a
14 minute, which is 402, I want to walk you through this --
15 I'm sorry, 401(b). This is a provision that -- this is
16 water wholly within Texas. And you don't have to
17 understand much to know that Texas keeps 60, Oklahoma
18 gets 40.

19 So you have a big chunk of Texas, and Texas
20 is allocated 60 and Oklahoma is allocated 40. Now,
21 under Tarrant's view, because this is silent as to
22 borders and because Oklahoma is not in this Reach, it's
23 not actually located within the subbasin, Oklahoma
24 either is entitled to or has to go get all of its water
25 from Texas. And this pattern repeats itself -- this is

1 on page 41 of our brief -- throughout the Compact, where
2 the Compact is silent as to borders, and under their
3 view -- and their Louisiana view is somewhat
4 entertaining.

5 I can't tell if they think Louisiana can go
6 into Oklahoma or has to move one inch up to the border
7 to take it out as opposed to just waiting, but under
8 this view -- and again, it repeats itself throughout the
9 contract -- the State that's not in the basin because
10 there are no borders and because, I guess under their
11 view, the only way that Oklahoma to get its water would
12 be to go into Texas, and that's why they're sort of
13 taking this bit about, oh, this Russello principle, if
14 it's here, it must mean -- it must have had
15 significance, would make a complete mess of the Compact.

16 If I could also just turn to the remand of
17 the United States. I just wanted to make -- to make
18 three points. And that is, I do think it is significant
19 that it's pointed -- it is addressed to a problem that
20 Texas itself has never asserted. They're saying well,
21 poor Texas can't get its water. And remember, Texas is
22 upstream, so this sort of poor Texas is only to Texas.
23 No other State is going to have this problem because the
24 rest are downstream.

25 So this you have to be able to get to your

1 25 percent is a uniquely pro-Texas provision that
2 apparently at the same time for 20 years of drafting
3 history when Texas was trying to buy this water, and the
4 three States were saying, no way, no how, they either
5 subconsciously or unconsciously or unintentionally
6 enacted this provision for Texas's benefit.

7 JUSTICE BREYER: In Subbasin 1, that's
8 mostly in Oklahoma, but Texas gets a lot of the water or
9 the other way around? It looked to me like Subbasin 1's
10 in Oklahoma.

11 MS. BLATT: Which reach?

12 JUSTICE BREYER: Subbasin 1. It says
13 Subbasin 1.

14 MS. BLATT: Are you talking about 401?

15 JUSTICE BREYER: Oh yeah, 401.

16 MS. BLATT: Okay. So that's in Reach 1. So
17 that's on this map -- the next map. So none of it --
18 it's all within the green, the same with the panhandle
19 of Texas.

20 JUSTICE BREYER: Okay. I get it. I get it.
21 Anyway --

22 MS. BLATT: Yeah.

23 JUSTICE BREYER: -- because of that and
24 because during the time when, let's say, there's
25 5,000 feet of the -- of the 2,000 extra, you know,

1 Louisiana has to get 500. Okay. How do they know
2 whether they're getting it? I mean, how -- there must
3 be some system of measurement going on or how does this
4 all work?

5 MS. BLATT: Justice Breyer, you have to
6 trust me. There has never been an accounting ever,
7 ever, ever, ever under this Compact.

8 JUSTICE BREYER: So, so -- - in other
9 words --

10 MS. BLATT: No measurements have ever been
11 taken with respect to this.

12 JUSTICE BREYER: Fine. So that -- I don't
13 know how that cuts because certainly the people who drew
14 this must have thought at least in those other
15 provisions they are going to develop a measurement
16 system in case of controversy.

17 MS. BLATT: Well, there are gauges. So
18 they -- I mean, it would not be impossible, although
19 very expensive. And just so you know, Section 211, and
20 in the interpretive comments of 211, the State said the
21 last thing we want is this accounting because it's
22 expensive and burdensome. And Louisiana and Arkansas,
23 if you look at the minutes, they are complaining because
24 their laws are not set up for accounting. They are
25 riparian States, so they don't track diversions. They

1 just -- they don't do it.

2 So this was -- this is -- when you talk
3 about how this cuts, you have 20 years of silence --

4 JUSTICE SCALIA: I -- I don't understand
5 what you just said, "They're riparian States, so they
6 don't track diversions."

7 MS. BLATT: Okay. So when you comment --

8 JUSTICE SCALIA: Why does that follow?

9 MS. BLATT: Right. Okay. So in the -- the
10 Oklahoma and Texas, in their permitting system, what
11 they permit, they track how much you take under the
12 permit. They measure.

13 JUSTICE SCALIA: Okay.

14 MS. BLATT: Louisiana, if you are a
15 landowner, you just draw from the water and it's a --
16 it's a voluntary reporting system, so you don't
17 necessarily have to tell the State how much you took
18 out.

19 JUSTICE SCALIA: Okay.

20 MS. BLATT: So one is a permitting system,
21 and in Louisiana and Arkansas -- and, I think, again,
22 the minutes just talk about we hope Louisiana and
23 Arkansas will develop their laws to do better tracking
24 of diversions. But again, this would be the problem of
25 an accounting.

1 But I -- so in terms of the 20 years of
2 history, you have complete silence on this, even though,
3 under our view, it always --

4 JUSTICE BREYER: The relevant legal
5 argument, I think, is look at what you just cited to us
6 about this Reach in the subbasin. 60 percent goes to
7 Texas, 40 percent to Oklahoma.

8 MS. BLATT: Right.

9 JUSTICE BREYER: Okay. Now, they've never
10 measured it. That's because they never fought about it,
11 I guess. And now we have a fight. So why is it any
12 easier to develop the necessary measuring system
13 there --

14 MS. BLATT: Well --

15 JUSTICE BREYER: -- than it would be here?

16 MS. BLATT: -- the disaster --

17 JUSTICE BREYER: And that argues against you
18 because your main point, really, is that this is all too
19 complicated --

20 MS. BLATT: Justice Breyer, the disaster
21 would be and the affront to sovereignty is throughout
22 the Compact, not so much the measuring that's a problem.
23 Oklahoma would be able to insist on crossing Texas's
24 borders to draw that 40 percent. And no one has ever,
25 ever envisioned any of the Compact as not applying

1 borders. It's not so much the measurement.

2 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, I thought that
3 was what your -- the other side does envision, that it
4 doesn't -- it's not bound by the borders, but it's bound
5 by the agreement, the Compact. Compacts compromise the
6 individual State sovereignty. That's the whole point of
7 them.

8 MS. BLATT: Okay. But if their view -- I
9 mean, it is that they have to -- again, our view is that
10 if they had wanted, like all the other cross-border
11 rights, to allow for an extraordinary right, they would
12 have made an explicit statement and then spelled out
13 exactly what that meant, most importantly the point of
14 diversion. Here, at most you have silence on the issue.

15 Now, the government reads into borders
16 sometimes because they say you do have borders unless
17 there is a need. Under Tarrant's view, which I think is
18 the most jarring and remarkable view, this is all a
19 borderless common, and every State could have
20 criss-crossing pipelines into every State because you
21 don't have an exhaustion requirement. So Texas, even
22 though it's got plenty of water in its fresh water
23 streams and currently uses them, could take their whole
24 25 percent from Oklahoma. Oklahoma could take its whole
25 25 percent from Texas. Arkansas could come into

1 Oklahoma -- and that's their view of the world.

2 And I think the United States thought, no,
3 that doesn't make too much sense. Let's at least make
4 Texas exhaust.

5 But the provision -- the Compact doesn't say
6 this. Again, the United States and Tarrant proceed on
7 the assumption that there is a numerical share, that
8 it's equal rights to an exact 25 percent, exact
9 25 percent. Well, that's not what it says. It just
10 says equal rights to the use subject to a cap, and we
11 think a cap by limiting the use is not a guarantee that
12 you can reach the cap, much less that you can cross
13 borders to reach the cap.

14 And if I could just make one more sense --

15 JUSTICE KAGAN: Ms. Blatt, the solicitor
16 general here today spoke of lots of different examples
17 where the language of entitlement and rights was used.
18 Do you have a view as -- as to that?

19 MS. BLATT: So they -- you mean the two
20 compliance rules they cited? They cited -- so they
21 say -- that's what I was saying that was sort of sad is
22 because what they cited disproved what they were trying
23 to assert it for.

24 So if you -- you don't even have to read
25 the -- you don't even have to read the compliance rules.

1 Just read page 19 of their brief. They say in the same
2 sentence that we have an equal -- there's an equal right
3 to one-fourth of an excess above 3,000. So that means
4 you take whatever is above 3,000 and divide by four
5 equally. And then they cite a provision that only
6 divides by 3. And then the next provision they cite
7 didn't divide the excess, it divided the total water.

8 I don't know why they -- it's inexplicable.
9 I can't tell you why they did that.

10 And the only other thing I want to say on
11 the extrinsic evidence, and I do think -- if you think
12 there's any ambiguity in here, which I think there
13 clearly is, you have 30 years of post ratification,
14 which the States immediately did long-term water
15 planning without so mentioning of this right. And
16 Tarrant actually offered to buy the same water for
17 \$1.7 billion in 2002, which is a little bit inconsistent
18 with the notion that they had this right all along.
19 They just, in 18 months of negotiating history, never
20 mentioned that they thought they owned the water, they
21 were actually offering to pay 1.7 million. And the
22 amicus brief filed by the Tribes, on page 4, says we
23 were at the negotiating table and we never heard Tarrant
24 mention this right.

25 And the other thing, I do think the water

1 planning documents are highly significant because not so
2 much Louisiana and Arkansas, but Oklahoma and Texas take
3 water planning very seriously because of their prior
4 appropriation systems. There are hundreds of thousands
5 of pages on the Internet and none of them mention this
6 right. Again, they cited something in their reply
7 brief, but if you go look at it, it doesn't come close
8 to mentioning a right of Subbasin 5. Again, ironically
9 it mentioned a portion of Oklahoma where Texas would
10 have to actually buy the water.

11 We'd ask you to affirm. Thank you.

12 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.

13 Mr. Rothfeld, you have four minutes
14 remaining.

15 REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF CHARLES A. ROTHFELD

16 ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER

17 MR. ROTHFELD: Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice.

18 Just a couple of points. First, my friend, Ms.
19 Blatt, said that it would make mincemeat and a complete
20 mess out of the Compact to apply its terms as they were
21 written. We think that this Compact was negotiated over
22 a period of 25 years. If you look at the Joint
23 Appendix, you will very painfully see that there are
24 reams and reams of commentary on the -- on the
25 negotiations.

1 I think the Court has to assume that when
2 the drafters of the Compact used language and referred
3 to State lines in one place and not in another place,
4 they had some idea of what they were doing and they made
5 these different choices intentionally. So I think the
6 Court simply should read the terms of the Compact --

7 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So how do you deal with
8 all the provisions she was mentioning with respect to
9 the 60/40 division? I can't make rhyme or reason of
10 those provisions that don't use within State boundaries,
11 but it has to mean that.

12 MR. ROTHFELD: Well, I don't think that it
13 has to mean that. If Oklahoma wants to enter Texas to
14 take -- if it makes more sense for them to do it, they
15 can. If not, they can just wait for the water to flow
16 down.

17 I think one thing which -- which Ms. Blatt
18 did not address is the practicalities of how Subbasin 5
19 operates. If you look at the map that was pointed out
20 to you, Subbasin 5, which is what we're talking about
21 here, is a very wide -- hundreds of miles wide, but
22 extremely narrow. It's 10 to 20 miles wide -- north to
23 south for most of its length.

24 The reason the drafters drew this is because
25 the States all take -- the assumption was all of the

1 water in this Subbasin was going to be surplus water,
2 literally excess water. The States all take the water
3 that they want to use outside of Subbasin 5, and so
4 the -- the allocations that Ms. Blatt was referring to
5 by Oklahoma are all in Subbasin 1, they are not in
6 Subbasin 5. The water that flows into Subbasin 5 is
7 water that the States assumed was going to be surplus.
8 And so it would make no sense, having divided this water
9 evenly between the compacting States, to think that the
10 drafters would have required a water user in Texas at
11 the far west end, which would get its portion of the
12 25 percent share two miles across the border in
13 Oklahoma, instead to have to go 200 miles to the east to
14 get it out of Texas.

15 That is not what the drafters intended to
16 accomplish by this. They created, by the plain terms of
17 the -- of the language, a common pool of water defined
18 by dam site, not by State line, and gave each State
19 equal rights to access that water so long as they did
20 not use more than 25 percent.

21 Your response to a question which was raised
22 by Justice Kagan both to me and Ms. Blatt, I think the
23 practical application of this is very simple. One
24 simply has to apply to the permitting authorities,
25 wherever you're submitting your application from, they

1 will apply their ordinary standards. The Oklahoma Water
2 Resources Board does that now for applications from
3 within Oklahoma, it can do it just as well for
4 applications from Texas or other from other States.

5 And, again, the practicality of this is,
6 water users are going to want to use water as close to
7 where they are located as they can. They're going to go
8 right across the State line within Subbasin 5 if that's
9 the place to get the water. It makes no sense to
10 require them to go hundreds of miles distant to get it.

11 Ms. Blatt suggested that we are reading the
12 25 percent limitation out of the Compact. I think her
13 reading reads the equal rights language out of the
14 Compact. They read the Subbasin 5 language as being all
15 capped and no entitlement. It does two things. It
16 gives equal rights to the water, and then says that you
17 can't take more than 25 percent within your State. So
18 it's designed to do two things. It's designed to give
19 you an entitlement and to say you can only use
20 25 percent of it.

21 And finally, Ms. Blatt raised questions of
22 -- of sovereignty and political concern. As the Chief
23 Justice suggested, this is a Compact that's an agreement
24 between coordinate sovereigns. They have decided what
25 they want to do. And the thing that gives respect to

1 sovereignty is to write -- is to read the plain language
2 of the Compact as the framers wrote it. Again, they spent
3 25 years writing it. They took considerable care, as
4 you can tell if you look at the negotiating history, in
5 using the words for each provision. Those words should
6 be given meaning.

7 If there are no further questions.

8 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.

9 The case is submitted.

10 (Whereupon, at 12:08 p.m., the case in the
11 above-entitled matter was submitted.)

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A				
able 42:23 48:25 52:23	allegation 31:14	16:22 17:18	38:15 42:9,16	basic 22:19 34:9
aboveentitled 1:11 60:11	allocate 4:2 6:14	21:4,19 22:10	44:9 50:22	basically 46:2 46:15
absolute 40:14 43:24	allocated 45:25 47:20,20	26:6 44:2	51:21,23 53:25	basin 4:3,3,16 30:23 48:9
absolutely 34:15 34:20 46:18	allocates 4:6	58:23,25	56:2	basis 36:1
accept 22:19 39:12	allocation 15:13 21:15,15,22	applications 15:2 16:16	articulated 43:8	beat 43:13,13,22
access 19:20 21:17 22:9 58:19	allocations 19:3 58:4	17:1 25:24,25	asked 28:11 39:2	behalf 1:15,20 2:4,11,14 3:8
accessing 18:10	allow 8:4 53:11	59:2,4	asking 16:1 17:4 17:13 34:16	29:1 56:16
accomplish 12:16 58:16	allowed 3:12	applied 18:17	aspect 44:13	bells 35:9
accounting 30:15 33:19 42:10 50:6,21 50:24 51:25	alludes 8:3	applies 16:7	assert 54:23	belongs 7:16 29:9
action 28:22	ambiguity 9:13 55:12	apply 11:24,25 12:5,13 14:25	asserted 48:20	beneficial 25:14 26:7
actual 29:6	amicus 1:19 2:7 18:4 26:9	15:14,16 16:8	assess 15:17 16:11,12 17:17	benefit 49:6
additional 22:2 28:20	55:22	25:12,15,15	assessed 16:24	benefits 43:5
address 29:4 57:18	amount 5:24 23:22 24:16	34:9 56:20	assesses 15:18	better 11:8 45:21 51:23
addressed 22:16 48:19	41:17	58:24 59:1	assistant 1:17	big 31:4 47:19
administer 21:5 25:3	analytic 19:25	applying 12:7 18:14 28:17	assume 14:25 41:22,23 42:2	billion 55:17
administrative 7:7 11:9 15:6	ann 1:17 2:6 18:3	43:20 52:25	57:1	bit 48:13 55:17
affinity 40:23 41:2	answer 11:14,17 26:15	apportionment 44:6	assumed 58:7	blatt 1:20 2:10 28:24,25 29:2
affirm 56:11	anyway 49:21	appropriate 25:7	assumption 43:4 44:21 54:7	29:22 30:1,5 30:10,24 31:10
affront 52:21	apart 16:2	appropriation 43:9 45:6 56:4	57:25	31:15,19,22,25 32:4,9,14,19
agree 19:6,18 41:22 47:7	apparently 49:2	approval 45:9	authorities 12:5 58:24	33:1,3,6,10,13 34:11 35:3,8
agreed 3:11 4:1 34:12 43:1,7	appeals 18:8,13 18:22 19:6,7	approved 24:2	authority 7:1 18:24	36:8,20,25 37:5,8,11,15
agreement 53:5 59:23	19:14,25 20:6	april 1:9	availability 21:8	37:21,24 38:1
al 1:6	20:7,23 28:17	arbitrarily 46:8	available 17:21 21:25 23:22	39:7,16,19,21 39:24 40:7
alito 14:4,10,15 26:14 27:6,10 27:12,19	appear 3:20 47:8	area 5:6 24:19	26:7	41:2,4,8 42:1,5 43:25 45:5,8
	appearances 1:14	areas 4:3,5 8:9		45:12,15 47:1 49:11,14,16,22
	appears 3:17 5:15	arent 7:18	B	50:5,10,17 51:7,9,14,20
	appendix 23:19 24:3 56:23	argues 52:17	b 23:18 46:14,14 47:3,12,15	52:8,14,16,20 53:8 54:15,19
	applicant 12:10 15:23 16:21	argument 1:12 2:2,5,9,12 3:4	back 3:14 10:25 11:1,12 36:6	56:19 57:17 58:4,22 59:11
	25:16 26:21	3:7,15 9:22	37:20 41:20	59:21
	27:5	18:3 19:8 22:8	42:22 46:14	blue 5:16 32:22
	applicants 26:17	28:25 34:4	backdrop 25:5	
	application 16:9 16:12,12,16,18	41:19 52:5	bank 13:1,9,12 13:17	
		56:15	bar 21:19	
		arising 11:4,5	bargain 3:14	
		arkansas 4:1 5:22 10:23	based 24:12 36:2	
		11:21 28:9		
		30:20 36:13		

<p>33:7 board 12:8,13 15:17 16:9,11 16:19,25 17:5 17:6 25:12,23 26:16 27:4 28:22 59:2 border 5:22 9:25 10:6 13:14 35:2,23 38:19 46:8,20 47:4,7 48:6 58:12 borderless 53:19 borderline 10:7 borders 20:19 24:15 35:13,21 36:16 38:20,25 47:8,22 48:2 48:10 52:24 53:1,4,15,16 54:13 bottom 28:4 bound 53:4,4 boundaries 4:8 4:13 9:18,19 11:4 18:25 22:10 24:20 25:1 57:10 boundary 24:22 29:6,11 breyer 6:3,11,17 6:21 7:10,24 8:7,21 10:25 12:4 23:3 28:5 36:5,9,21,25 36:25 37:3,6,9 37:14,19,22,25 49:7,12,15,20 49:23 50:5,8 50:12 52:4,9 52:15,17,20 brief 3:21 5:16 14:11 22:14,22 27:18 31:6 32:20 34:20</p>	<p>35:1,14,16 38:2 46:8 47:2 48:1 55:1,22 56:7 briefs 26:9 burdensome 50:22 buy 49:3 55:16 56:10</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">C</p> <hr/> <p>c 1:8,15,18,20 2:1 3:1 26:12 46:14,20,20,22 47:2,12 cactus 7:13 call 42:10 called 4:4 29:8 cant 6:7,22 7:13 8:11 15:4 36:3 39:14 45:1 46:23 48:5,21 55:9 57:9 59:17 cap 23:4,11 40:13 54:10,11 54:12,13 capped 59:15 car 40:8 care 60:3 carefully 43:8 case 3:4 34:1 42:18 50:16 60:9,10 categorically 18:9 certainly 44:3 50:13 challenged 18:15 challenging 14:1 channel 31:2 32:18 charles 1:15 2:3 2:13 3:7 56:15 cheaper 22:3 check 37:20</p>	<p>checks 45:1 chief 3:3,9 14:24 15:19,25 17:13 17:25 18:1,6 20:16 21:10,23 28:23 29:2,18 29:24 30:2,8 32:3 33:25 34:17 39:9 40:25 41:3,6 43:18 53:2 56:12,17 59:22 60:8 choice 35:10 choices 57:5 chose 27:14 chunk 47:19 circuit 39:2,2 circumstance 45:6 citation 35:16 cite 34:19,21,21 34:22 35:24,25 37:1 41:11,13 41:14 55:5,6 cited 8:3 52:5 54:20,20,22 56:6 city 43:12 44:3 claim 29:25 claimed 39:4 claiming 43:23 clause 4:23 19:12,16,19 20:4 33:20 40:14,16,17 45:23 clear 5:4 19:1 20:12 24:11 30:21 42:13 clearer 4:21 clearly 11:13 55:13 clement 5:15 cliffs 6:7 close 29:24 56:7 59:6</p>	<p>closer 21:25 closest 11:19 colors 32:21 combine 40:20 come 9:7,24 20:5,18 35:13 38:10,15,21 43:16 44:23 53:25 56:7 comes 19:19 21:2 32:17 coming 44:1 comment 51:7 commentary 56:24 comments 23:17 24:13 50:20 commerce 19:12 19:16,19 20:4 45:23 commission 24:1,14 commissions 24:6 common 53:19 58:17 compact 3:11,17 3:19,21,24,25 4:3,5,9,10,21 5:5 7:2 9:15,16 10:15,19 15:11 16:1,5 18:16 18:18,20,23,23 19:1,3,4,9,11 19:15,22 20:10 20:11,11,14,17 21:3,9,16 23:12 24:1,5 24:12,14,20,23 24:25 29:7,12 34:5,10,19,21 34:22 36:1 39:22,25 41:23 42:3 43:8 44:5 44:8 45:25 46:3,12 48:1,2 48:15 50:7</p>	<p>52:22,25 53:5 54:5 56:20,21 57:2,6 59:12 59:14,23 60:2 compacted 45:8 compacting 4:13 5:4 58:9 compacts 4:19 8:2 34:5 44:14 53:5 compare 16:16 16:17 compelled 10:12 compels 10:19 10:20 competing 17:1 23:22 complained 37:17 complaining 50:23 complete 46:11 48:15 52:2 56:19 completely 46:9 46:22 complex 7:7,9 7:10 complexity 23:6 compliance 41:11 42:14 54:20,25 complicated 52:19 compromise 53:5 concede 15:10 concern 59:22 concerned 26:9 conclude 18:23 concluded 18:8 concluding 28:18 conclusion 18:11 20:7 conflict 18:15 conflicts 21:14</p>
--	---	--	---	--

<p>connell 1:17 2:6 consider 20:25 considerable 60:3 considering 28:6 consistent 8:15 8:19,22 16:8 19:2,8,14 20:13 constitutional 45:24 contains 46:20 contemplated 14:14 context 9:14 18:19 34:10 contract 48:9 control 3:24 controversial 7:7 controversy 50:16 conversation 37:7,10 coordinate 59:24 core 44:22 correct 9:22 13:3 26:15 27:6 45:16 corrected 20:24 correcting 38:3 couldnt 26:19 26:19 37:13,18 39:11 42:4,20 counsel 18:1 26:4 28:23 35:18 56:12 60:8 count 38:8 counties 26:1 county 26:1 couple 7:8 56:18 court 1:1,12 3:10,15,16,18 3:20 8:10 18:7</p>	<p>18:8,11,13,22 19:6,7,13,25 20:6,7,22,23 20:25 22:6 23:11 26:8 28:16 29:3 57:1,6 courts 7:6 20:25 22:7 26:25 created 9:1 11:10 18:18 58:16 crediting 47:11 creek 29:8,9 30:25 31:11 crisscrossing 53:20 critical 34:15 cross 10:7 35:2 54:12 crossborder 8:4 34:18,23 35:4 43:2 53:10 crossing 52:23 cubic 5:21 23:23 24:7,8 41:25 curiae 1:19 2:7 18:4 current 13:20 13:22 17:8 currently 53:23 cuts 50:13 51:3</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">D</p> <hr/> <p>d 1:8,15,18,20 3:1 dam 4:15 9:1 27:23 29:9 30:25 58:18 danger 35:20 dare 42:22 deal 57:7 dealt 28:21 decide 7:2 9:23 26:2 28:12 decided 20:22 22:21 28:14</p>	<p>59:24 decisions 16:20 defined 5:6,6 8:24,25 24:19 27:23 58:17 defines 5:19 definite 4:22 definitely 31:5 38:23 definition 40:18 delivery 36:4 46:15 demonstrate 16:22 denison 29:8 30:25 deny 15:4 department 1:18 depends 19:22 descend 14:12 describes 3:21 describing 8:6 designed 6:14 59:18,18 desirable 44:18 details 8:6 determine 12:14 18:14 25:13 develop 44:9 50:15 51:23 52:12 developed 26:25 28:20 44:10 devoid 35:16 didnt 27:12 33:4 38:8,10 55:7 differences 45:17 different 3:23 4:11 7:6,20,21 17:11 54:16 57:5 difficult 5:10 22:24 difficulty 22:21 directly 11:21</p>	<p>29:21 disagree 6:9 20:4,6 disappear 47:9 disaster 52:16 52:20 disavowed 38:25 39:1,1 disavowing 42:18 discriminatory 14:2 discussion 37:16 disprove 41:13 disproved 54:22 disregard 3:17 distant 59:10 district 1:3 3:5 12:7 43:11 45:4 diversion 12:16 34:18,23 35:4 35:10 44:15,16 53:14 diversions 30:20 35:19 50:25 51:6,24 divert 25:7 28:19 32:22 divide 55:4,7 divided 41:15 55:7 58:8 divides 4:3 55:6 division 57:9 divvy 42:11 doctrines 44:6 documents 32:6 33:14 56:1 doesnt 4:24 6:3 6:5,5,8 7:5 8:12 9:23 17:6 19:16,16 24:16 39:10 40:1,2,9 53:4 54:3,5 56:7 doing 7:1 43:2 57:4</p>	<p>domain 12:19 14:18,22 35:10 44:19,20 dont 7:14 8:8 9:25 19:12,19 20:3,20 25:2 25:19 26:14 28:13 30:20 34:8 38:23 40:17 41:22 42:21 47:5,11 47:16 50:12,25 51:1,4,6,16 53:21 54:24,25 55:8 57:10,12 dormant 19:12 19:16,19 45:23 doublecounted 38:6 downside 4:15 downstream 9:1 36:4 46:15,17 48:24 dozen 30:6,12 drafted 36:7 drafters 9:15 30:16,17 42:8 42:14 57:2,24 58:10,15 drafting 49:2 dragon 33:7 draw 29:15 51:15 52:24 drawn 4:14 drew 50:13 57:24 drink 31:15 32:1 32:10 drinkable 32:7 drinking 32:2,4 33:15 drops 46:5 drought 39:14 due 36:20</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">E</p> <hr/> <p>e 2:1 3:1,1</p>
---	--	--	--	---

earlier 33:23	23:15 33:19,20	53:21	24:7,8 36:11	fresh 30:6 53:22
easier 10:7	39:25 40:1,2,5	existing 15:6	49:25	friend 56:18
52:12	40:8,8,14 41:5	expense 22:2	fight 11:2 52:11	friends 15:10
easily 23:3	41:10 44:11	expensive 50:19	figure 42:10,11	frustrate 20:8
east 30:25 31:3	54:8,10 55:2,2	50:22	filed 44:2 55:22	full 23:19 28:1,2
58:13	58:19 59:13,16	explanation	filled 5:1	functioning 47:4
easy 28:12 37:20	equally 55:5	47:12	finally 59:21	further 22:16
economically	equitable 44:5	explicit 34:14	find 37:22	25:4 60:7
44:10	erects 12:15	35:3,5,8 53:12	fine 8:7 50:12	
either 19:11	erred 18:13	exploiting 43:3	finish 9:11 11:15	G
47:24 49:4	errors 20:23	express 5:8	first 6:16 7:9 8:2	g 3:1
el 36:1	28:16 38:4	29:11	10:11,25 17:18	gain 33:23
eminent 12:19	esq 1:15,17,20	expressly 4:6	18:13 20:18,21	gather 45:23
14:17,21 35:9	2:3,6,10,13	8:4,8	23:19 26:6	gauges 50:17
44:19,20	essential 35:9	extent 9:12	40:13 41:14	general 1:17
enacted 49:6	essentially 3:16	26:22	43:9,25 44:7	18:23,25 20:12
enforcement	et 1:6	extra 36:23	56:18	54:16
18:20	evaluate 16:15	49:25	fit 15:6	geographic
engineering	evenly 58:9	extraordinary	fixed 40:14	24:19,24
37:2	everybody	34:13 53:11	flat 37:23	getting 39:18
engineers 38:3	36:15 43:23	extremely 7:7	flow 4:16 5:20	50:2
enormous 11:9	evidence 37:16	57:22	5:21 9:24	ginsburg 4:18
enter 57:13	55:11	extrinsic 55:11	23:25 24:7,10	8:3 11:23 12:2
entertaining	exact 5:12,13,15		27:7,14 47:9	12:15 34:25
48:4	47:3 54:8,8	F	57:15	35:6 45:5,10
entertainingly	exactly 16:15	face 9:5	flowing 28:3	45:13
41:12	40:19 42:12	facial 45:16	flows 10:16	gist 5:25
entirely 13:4,8	53:13	facilities 12:16	23:20 58:6	give 3:20 4:19
19:22	example 21:17	fact 6:6 7:15	focus 34:3	15:3,19 16:1
entities 26:10	35:24 37:4	8:19 9:16 13:7	focused 11:13	26:16 27:2
43:10	examples 34:19	17:16 27:22	follow 23:17	34:6 47:7
entitled 5:23 6:4	35:14 54:16	32:4 42:15	51:8	59:18
6:8,19 9:17	exceptions	factual 13:3	foot 41:25	given 60:6
15:11 16:5	40:15	29:4	footnote 32:5,5	gives 18:24
24:9,17 32:16	excess 5:24	fairly 37:19	force 14:16	19:22 22:23
47:24	23:23,25 38:9	family 40:8	forcing 38:16	35:1 40:14
entitlement 4:6	41:17,24 42:1	far 58:11	foreclose 18:9	41:23 59:16,25
23:2,10 29:25	42:11 55:3,7	fascinating	forgot 38:7	go 6:23 7:11
54:17 59:15,19	58:2	35:24	fought 52:10	9:24 10:23,25
entitles 39:23,25	exclusive 43:5	faster 44:4	four 4:13 5:4 6:1	11:12,20,20,21
envision 53:3	exclusively 4:8	45:19	9:2 10:14 26:1	12:11,11 13:6
envisioned	excuse 9:9 30:11	favor 23:13 36:6	36:10 55:4	13:19 14:5
52:25	31:3	favored 38:10	56:13	17:16 23:9
equal 5:5,18 6:1	exercise 12:19	federalism	framers 9:20	35:22 36:3,6
6:15 8:23 9:3	14:21 44:22	18:17	60:2	38:16 41:20
10:14 11:2,3,3	exhaust 54:4	feel 40:23,25	free 46:1	42:6,23 46:19
11:5 23:14,14	exhaustion	feet 5:21 23:23	freely 21:5	47:24 48:5,12

<p>56:7 58:13 59:7,10 goes 7:19 25:6 52:6 going 4:25,25 7:11,12,14,16 7:21 10:1,8 11:2,18,20,20 11:21 12:3,6 12:25 14:7,12 16:8 17:5 22:11,21 24:18 25:2 30:22 36:11 37:20 45:18 48:23 50:3,15 58:1,7 59:6,7 good 22:8 gotten 44:3 government 53:15 grande 36:1 granted 12:14 green 35:1 49:18 ground 42:25 guarantee 41:16 54:11 guaranteed 41:10 guard 14:7 guess 8:17 15:25 25:19 28:8 34:8 42:12 48:10 52:11</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">H</p> <p>hadnt 35:20 44:1 half 31:1 happen 25:6 42:13,15 happened 42:13 happening 42:25 44:25 happens 6:6 8:12 33:10 36:12</p>	<p>hate 40:22 headache 22:23 hear 3:3 11:12 heard 11:7 44:2 55:23 held 43:5 heres 40:12 heretofore 47:10 herrmann 1:6 3:5 hey 36:22 highly 56:1 highway 40:9,11 history 49:3 52:2 55:19 60:4 hog 42:23 hold 46:19 honor 23:24 hope 45:22 46:7 51:22 hoping 30:2 hours 40:10 43:14 humorous 38:8 hundreds 35:22 56:4 57:21 59:10 hypothetical 39:13</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">I</p> <p>id 23:8 idea 20:18 23:13 57:4 identical 46:14 46:18 ii 18:10 ill 21:2 im 7:13,22 8:13 9:10,22 15:25 17:4 23:20 29:19 30:8 35:15 36:8 47:15 imaginary 37:6</p>	<p>37:9 immediately 55:14 implies 23:15 importantly 47:13 53:13 impose 24:22 impossible 42:9 50:18 inch 48:6 includes 4:12 inconsistent 46:10 55:17 increase 27:14 incur 22:2 indefinitely 33:24 indented 5:17 indifferent 26:20 individual 53:6 inexplicable 34:20,20 55:8 insist 52:23 instance 28:6,7 intended 30:17 58:15 intent 6:25 intentionally 57:5 interesting 38:11 internet 56:5 interpretations 11:10 interpretive 23:17 24:13 50:20 interstate 18:18 34:4,5,10 intervening 13:12 invitation 22:15 involves 24:18 ironically 46:13 56:8 irrelevant 19:13</p>	<p>irving 43:12 isnt 4:24 22:18 28:6 isolation 9:14 issue 4:10 20:22 22:6 43:21 53:14 issues 22:14,20 22:22 ive 11:13</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">J</p> <p>jarring 53:18 job 7:7,9 john 1:6 joint 23:18 24:3 56:22 justice 1:18 3:3 3:9 4:18 5:12 6:3,11,17,21 7:10,24 8:3,7 8:21 9:9,11,21 10:5,25 11:16 11:23 12:2,4 12:15,21 13:8 13:11,20,24 14:4,10,15,24 15:19,25 16:14 17:4,10,13,25 18:1,6 19:5,24 20:16 21:10,23 22:18 23:3,8 25:9,18,22 26:14 27:6,10 27:12,19 28:5 28:23 29:2,18 29:19,23,24 30:2,8,21 31:8 31:13,17,20,23 32:3,8,11,15 32:24 33:2,4,9 33:12,25 34:17 34:25 35:6 36:5,9,21,25 36:25 37:3,6,9 37:14,19,22,25 39:5,8,17,20</p>	<p>39:22 40:4,25 41:3,6,18,20 42:2,24 43:18 45:5,10,13 46:24 49:7,12 49:15,20,23 50:5,8,12 51:4 51:8,13,19 52:4,9,15,17 52:20 53:2 54:15 56:12,17 57:7 58:22 59:23 60:8 juxtaposing 38:12</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">K</p> <p>kagan 16:14 17:4,10 22:18 23:8 25:9,18 25:22 42:25 54:15 58:22 keep 25:18 28:2 keeps 47:17 kennedy 12:21 13:8,11,20,24 19:5,24 30:21 31:8,13,17,20 31:23 41:18 42:2 kept 30:14 kiamichi 44:16 kind 4:24 17:11 22:23 27:2 30:15 47:7,8 kinds 8:5 knew 36:22 know 7:14 8:8 10:1 17:6 22:24 26:9,9 32:12 33:5,18 34:8 37:3,23 41:22 47:17 49:25 50:1,13 50:19 55:8 known 35:20 knows 30:1,5,16</p>
--	---	---	--	---

36:15	59:12	42:9,16 44:8	measurements	narrow 57:22
<hr/> L <hr/>	limiting 54:11	48:3,5 50:1,22	50:10	national 14:7
laid 22:20	line 4:6 11:22	51:14,21,22	measuring 7:19	near 37:25
lake 29:13,16	12:23 13:15,17	56:2	52:12,22	nebraska 35:17
31:3,4,7 33:7	23:21 44:3	louisianas 10:16	mechanism 6:25	35:19,22
33:16	58:18 59:8	lower 20:25 22:7	7:4,25	necessarily
land 29:15 31:11	lines 4:14 8:25	26:25	meet 28:7	21:21 22:12
landowner	9:6,16 17:13	<hr/> M <hr/>	mention 55:24	51:17
51:15	57:3	m 1:13 3:2 60:10	56:5	necessary 14:18
language 3:17	lisa 1:20 2:10	magical 47:8	mentioned	52:12
3:18,19 4:11	28:25	main 12:24 13:5	55:20 56:9	need 20:13
5:5,10,12,13	listen 41:4	13:18 29:14,17	mentioning	22:15 25:4
5:15,25 6:5	literally 58:2	29:21 30:23	55:15 56:8	45:20 53:17
8:14,16,20,21	little 10:7 11:8	31:9 32:12,17	57:8	needs 12:18
9:14,20 10:2	31:10 34:6,7	39:11 52:18	merits 16:24	28:14 38:20
10:12,13,13,19	37:23 55:17	major 27:23	mess 11:9 48:15	negotiated
15:11 20:17	located 3:13	39:14	56:20	56:21
23:12 54:17	47:23 59:7	map 31:4 32:20	method 38:4	negotiating
57:2 58:17	long 5:7 17:21	33:3 34:24	methodological	55:19,23 60:4
59:13,14 60:1	22:8 58:19	49:17,17 57:19	38:4	negotiations
large 4:3	longer 10:17	march 46:13	mexico 36:2,3,4	56:25
laughter 30:4	longterm 55:14	math 38:9,10	middle 31:2	never 28:19
law 12:19 14:25	look 22:7 23:1	matter 1:11 13:3	43:13	33:25 34:1,2
20:8,10,13	31:4 32:19,20	28:12 60:11	mile 31:1	34:12,17,22
21:4,11,14,19	33:6 34:24	mean 4:19 5:11	miles 35:22	35:4,18 36:16
22:10 25:5	38:20 45:20	6:5,21,24 10:5	57:21,22 58:12	36:17 37:17
26:5 35:10	50:23 52:5	14:6 15:4	58:13 59:10	39:4 42:13
43:3 44:20	56:7,22 57:19	16:14 17:5	million 55:21	43:1 48:20
45:6	60:4	22:19,22 25:3	mincemeat	50:6 52:9,10
laws 13:20,22	looked 19:9 49:9	25:9,22 26:23	46:12 56:19	55:19,23
14:1,1,2 18:15	looking 9:7	34:1,11 48:14	minute 46:4	new 36:2,3,4
21:6 25:13,15	14:11 32:25	50:2,18 53:9	47:14	niobrara 34:21
30:19 42:15	looks 33:7	54:19 57:11,13	minutes 50:23	normal 5:20
45:24 50:24	lose 19:15	meaning 39:6	51:22 56:13	15:1 25:12
51:23	lost 42:17	47:8 60:6	misleading	45:1
lawsuit 35:25	lot 5:1 15:2	meaningless	14:10	north 43:11,16
36:2	29:16 31:5	42:3	missing 46:9	45:3 57:22
lawyer 29:7	40:23,25 46:13	means 11:3	47:4	notion 36:3
left 7:5	49:8	25:20 33:22	months 55:19	55:18
legal 52:4	lots 22:14 25:23	55:3	morning 3:4	numbers 38:3
legislative 45:9	31:6 54:16	meant 36:22	move 48:6	numerical 40:2
legitimate 41:19	louisiana 4:1	53:13	multiple 25:25	40:3 54:7
length 57:23	5:22 9:23 10:8	measure 51:12	municipal 43:11	<hr/> O <hr/>
licensed 29:18	10:16,17,20,23	measured 52:10	45:4	o 1:17 2:1,6 3:1
lies 13:3	10:24 11:19	measurement	<hr/> N <hr/>	obligations 19:4
limitation 38:19	24:8 30:19	50:3,15 53:1	n 2:1,1 3:1	20:14

<p>obstacle 20:9 21:15,22 obtain 12:18 14:21 obtaining 16:23 20:9 21:20 oconnell 18:2,3 18:6 19:18 20:3,21 21:13 22:5,18 23:8 25:11,21 26:3 26:22 27:9,11 27:17,20 28:13 offered 55:16 offering 55:21 office 43:14 44:12 45:2,3 officials 45:2 oh 37:5,8 41:3 48:13 49:15 okay 8:1 11:8 27:10 33:2,12 36:11 37:11 39:9,16,19,24 40:13 49:16,20 50:1 51:7,9,13 51:19 52:9 53:8 oklahoma 3:11 3:13,13,21 4:1 7:11,15 9:25 11:20 12:2,3,6 12:7,9,19,25 13:4,4,6,9,13 13:15,18,19 14:2,3,5,16,16 14:17,20,22,25 15:5,8,15,16 15:16,18 16:2 16:9,15,19 17:5,6,19 18:8 18:10,15 19:21 19:21 21:21,25 22:4,10,11 25:5,8,10,11 25:17,22,24 26:2,16,20</p>	<p>27:1,3,4,11,24 28:8,21 30:22 36:14 38:14,16 38:16 41:7 42:23 43:1,4,5 43:6,12,16,23 44:1,3,10,15 44:20 45:1,1,5 45:7,11,21 46:1 47:17,20 47:22,23 48:6 48:11 49:8,10 51:10 52:7,23 53:24,24 54:1 56:2,9 57:13 58:5,13 59:1,3 oklahomans 16:17 17:7 44:21 oklahomas 13:22 14:11 16:2 43:3 old 31:4 onefourth 55:3 ones 38:8 open 43:15 operate 12:9 46:14 operates 57:19 opinion 19:7,7 19:13 20:23 opponents 8:4 opportunity 23:16 27:22 opposed 48:7 oral 1:11 2:2,5,9 3:7 18:3 28:25 order 13:4,17 14:20 26:17 ordinary 12:13 59:1 original 28:22 originating 14:3 40:5 outofstate 45:7 45:13,17,18 outside 14:3</p>	<p>28:19 58:3 owned 55:20 ownership 13:9 owns 13:13 <hr/>P<hr/>p 3:1 60:10 page 2:2 5:16 23:18 24:3,4,4 32:24 41:12 46:7 47:1 48:1 55:1,22 pages 56:5 painfully 56:23 panhandle 49:18 paragraph 23:20 part 6:16,18 7:16 13:7 26:12 29:14 31:11,13,18 partially 12:4 particular 15:24 16:7 25:13 26:11 28:14 particularly 9:8 25:3 parties 39:25 paso 36:1 pattern 47:25 pay 4:25 55:21 people 15:2 25:18 43:20 50:13 percent 5:7,23 6:4,7,20 7:16 8:12,13 9:4 10:1 15:3,9,12 15:13,20 16:6 17:20,22 20:19 21:18 22:9 23:4,10,25 24:10,16,17 27:1 28:7 29:25 32:16 36:13,13,16,17</p>	<p>36:19,24 37:11 38:2,5 39:11 39:20 40:1,15 40:18,19,20 41:5,11,17,24 42:21 45:25 46:2,4,16,19 49:1 52:6,7,24 53:24,25 54:8 54:9 58:12,20 59:12,17,20 perfectly 41:19 period 56:22 permanently 44:7 permissible 24:20 permit 12:8,10 14:21 15:17,23 16:9,11,21 25:7 43:14,17 44:11,21 45:6 45:13 51:11,12 permits 15:18 43:10 permitting 19:21 22:12 51:10,20 58:24 person 14:22,22 petitioner 1:4,16 1:19 2:4,8,14 3:8 18:5 24:21 56:16 petitioners 26:4 phrase 14:6 picked 44:16 pickle 42:20 piece 29:10 pink 32:21,23 33:14 pipe 7:11 pipeline 6:22 7:15 pipelines 7:21 53:20 place 12:22 16:7 44:15 57:3,3</p>	<p>59:9 places 7:20 9:15 28:8 29:17 plain 3:23 10:19 58:16 60:1 planning 32:6 33:13 55:15 56:1,3 play 19:20 20:5 30:18 please 3:10 18:7 29:3 plenty 53:22 point 8:14 10:20 11:19 12:12 13:24,25 20:1 22:14 23:9,11 27:18 29:23 34:5 36:5 39:9 39:9 40:22 42:24 44:4,8 44:16 52:18 53:6,13 pointed 24:21 26:4 48:19 57:19 points 7:8 10:9 17:15 35:10 43:25 44:15 48:18 56:18 policies 16:10 policy 17:9 political 45:1 59:22 pool 9:1,7 58:17 poor 43:12 48:21,22 portion 21:20 28:4 39:15 56:9 58:11 pose 20:9 21:22 poses 21:15 posit 39:8 position 3:16 34:12 35:21 possible 11:11 23:5</p>
--	--	--	---	--

post 55:13	proceed 54:6	12:24 28:10	38:20 52:18	remand 21:1
power 44:22	proceeding	31:8 41:20	reams 56:24,24	22:7 48:16
practical 58:23	28:15	43:22 58:21	reason 22:19	remarkable
practicalities	proceedings	questions 29:5	37:12 57:9,24	53:18
57:18	22:16 25:4	59:21 60:7	reasons 18:11	remedy 39:6,7
practicality 59:5	proceeds 43:3	quite 5:4,8	rebuttal 2:12	39:15
precisely 12:9	44:20	11:13 19:5,14	56:15	remember
15:17	process 19:22	25:20 29:16	receiving 26:23	48:21
preempted	22:12,25	32:6 35:19	27:1	repeating 8:14
21:16,21 22:12	prohibit 13:21	42:19	recollection	repeats 47:25
preemption	22:11		5:14	48:8
18:14 28:18	proof 39:10	R	red 3:11,17,25	reply 34:19
prejudice 33:21	40:24 41:4	r 3:1	4:2,16,16 5:21	35:14,16 56:6
preserve 21:4	property 12:20	race 44:11	7:12 13:3,16	report 37:2
preserving	12:25 13:12	rain 38:7	24:1,5,13 27:8	reporting 51:16
20:12	14:17 30:22	raised 58:21	29:6,10,13	representatives
press 39:3	proposition	59:21	32:12,18,20,23	36:10
presumably	19:14	ran 38:3	47:2	representing
12:17	protexas 49:1	rangers 14:8,12	redundant	41:6
presumption	prove 42:20,22	ratification	46:22	reprinted 5:16
18:14,16 28:17	provide 8:5	55:13	refer 9:16 23:19	request 15:21
pretty 24:11	provided 5:22	rationale 18:16	reference 4:14	require 59:10
prevail 20:11	6:19 9:3 40:16	reach 4:10 10:15	46:20 47:5	required 5:9
prevent 13:23	40:17	10:15 18:10	references 46:8	58:10
14:2	provides 12:19	32:13,16,18	referred 57:2	requirement
prevented 44:11	25:5	33:10,12 42:4	referring 31:20	53:21
principle 38:24	provision 4:21	47:22 49:11,16	58:4	requires 18:20
46:6 48:13	5:2 9:20 23:1,2	52:6 54:12,13	refresh 5:13	reservoirs 27:7
principles 34:9	47:4,15 49:1,6	reached 18:11	regardless 20:8	28:1
prior 43:9 44:7	54:5 55:5,6	reaches 4:4,4	25:16	resident 15:14
56:3	60:5	read 3:19 5:10	region 26:12	residents 15:18
priorities 15:1	provisions 18:23	5:13 19:13,25	regional 1:3 3:5	32:1
16:2 17:11	19:1 20:12	22:22 23:2,4	regulate 18:24	resources 12:8
priority 15:5,23	21:11 24:25	23:10 33:20	regulation 19:2	12:13 15:16
16:1 17:3,17	35:2 46:12	35:13 38:19,25	regulations 24:2	16:9,11,24
26:5,16 27:2	50:15 57:8,10	42:21 54:24,25	24:6	25:12 27:4
33:24 43:17,22	public 43:4	55:1 57:6	release 27:13	28:21 59:2
43:24 44:7	purchase 12:20	59:14 60:1	46:16,23	respect 8:19
private 14:17	purpose 20:9	reading 10:20	released 27:8	18:19 24:19
probably 42:18	pushed 11:1	19:6 23:6	relevant 9:6	45:17,24 50:11
problem 34:7	put 7:15 12:22	59:11,13	52:4	57:8 59:25
40:12,12 43:19	25:14 26:7	readings 23:5	reliance 38:24	respective 9:18
44:14 48:19,23		reads 53:15	relied 18:22	46:21 47:3
51:24 52:22	Q	59:13	rely 4:23	respondents
problems 28:20	quantity 3:12	real 40:12	relying 5:3	1:21 2:11 19:8
procedures	40:3	really 4:19 7:2	20:17	27:18 29:1
25:12	question 11:17	17:4 36:18	remaining 56:14	response 13:7

<p>27:20 58:21 responsive 12:4 rest 9:14 48:24 restriction 24:22 review 45:19 rhyme 57:9 right 4:20 6:21 7:4,23 9:24 14:5,9,16 15:20 17:7,9 17:21,23 19:10 19:23 20:3 23:13,14,14,15 23:19,24 31:17 34:11,13 35:3 40:7,14 41:24 43:2 51:9 52:8 53:11 55:2,15 55:18,24 56:6 56:8 59:8 rights 5:5,18,20 6:2,15 8:23 9:3 10:14 11:2,3,4 11:5 12:18 21:6 33:19,20 40:1,2,5,8,9 44:11 53:11 54:8,10,17 58:19 59:13,16 rio 35:25 riparian 42:15 50:25 51:5 river 3:11,17,25 4:2,16,16,16 5:21 6:23 7:12 7:20 12:23,24 13:3,16,16 24:1,5,13 27:8 27:14,16 29:6 29:10,13 32:12 32:18,23 37:25 44:16 roberts 3:3 14:24 15:19,25 18:1 20:16 21:10,23 28:23</p>	<p>29:18,24 30:2 30:8 32:3 33:25 40:25 41:3,6 43:18 53:2 56:12 60:8 room 36:9,15 rothfeld 1:15 2:3,13 3:6,7,9 4:18 5:2 6:9,13 6:18 7:8,23 8:1 8:17,23 9:10 9:12 10:3,9 11:15,25 12:3 12:17 13:2,10 13:14,22,25 14:9,19 15:8 15:21 16:4,21 17:8,14 56:13 56:15,17 57:12 route 22:3 rudolf 1:6 rule 41:14 rules 24:2,6,13 41:11,12 42:14 54:20,25 run 7:11 30:11 running 27:24 30:6 runoff 6:16 24:10 38:7 40:5 runs 10:22 31:1 russello 38:24 46:6 48:13</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">S</p> <hr/> <p>s 1:20 2:1,10 3:1 28:25 sad 54:21 saline 31:14,24 salt 37:23 salty 32:1,10 samples 35:1 sandwiched 43:13 satisfies 16:23</p>	<p>satisfy 23:23 saying 7:22 9:6 14:15 21:13 25:18 29:20 35:12 36:1,24 40:18 42:21 44:17 46:2 48:20 49:4 54:21 says 4:7 5:17 6:4 6:13,15,19 8:11,15 9:2 10:13 14:20 15:11 16:5 19:11 21:5 23:20 24:25 34:1,2 40:4,17 46:21 47:2 49:12 54:9,10 55:22 59:16 scalia 5:12 32:8 32:11,15,24 33:2,4,9,12 46:24 51:4,8 51:13,19 season 43:15 second 5:21 6:18 11:17 18:22 23:9,21,23 24:7,8 44:4,13 section 4:9,11 6:13 20:2 21:4 23:18 50:19 sections 21:3 see 20:20 33:16 45:20 56:23 seek 12:8 17:23 seeking 12:10 15:15,24 seen 44:1 seize 14:13 send 14:7 42:22 sense 10:2,12 33:22 54:3,14 57:14 58:8 59:9 sentence 55:2</p>	<p>separate 10:15 separately 10:14 seriously 56:3 set 7:1,25 50:24 share 20:10 26:18 37:13 38:16 40:2 41:11 54:7 58:12 shares 9:25 10:6 42:12 shawnee 29:8,9 30:25 31:11 shouldnt 20:5 22:19 26:8 show 33:14 shows 35:20 side 31:7 33:15 53:3 signatory 5:18 6:1 24:9 signed 43:10 significance 3:22 48:15 significant 48:18 56:1 silence 35:13 51:3 52:2 53:14 silent 35:21 47:21 48:2 simple 58:23 simply 12:20 17:17 57:6 58:24 site 27:23 58:18 sites 4:15 9:1 sitting 25:23 36:18 situation 14:25 21:24 sketchy 4:24 5:3 slip 31:10 solicitor 1:17 54:15 solve 34:7 somewhat 48:3</p>	<p>sorry 7:13 9:10 17:7 23:20 36:20 47:2,15 sort 29:4 35:13 40:20 48:12,22 54:21 sotomayor 9:9 9:11,21 10:5 11:16 29:19,23 39:5,8,17,20 39:22 40:4 57:7 sotomayors 41:20 sought 43:17 sounds 14:7 source 32:7 33:15 south 7:12 8:13 13:15 32:23 38:17 57:23 sovereign 44:22 sovereigns 18:19 59:24 sovereignty 34:4 34:9 52:21 53:6 59:22 60:1 span 24:24 special 16:1 27:2 specified 3:12 8:24 spell 44:14 spelled 53:12 spend 40:10 spent 60:2 spoke 54:16 stage 22:15 standards 12:13 16:23 59:1 standing 39:3 starts 20:1 state 4:6,14,20 5:7,23 6:4,6,19 6:22,23,24 7:5 8:25 9:6,16,18 11:22 15:11,14</p>
---	---	---	--	--

20:8,9,10,12 21:4,5,7,11,14 21:18,19 23:13 23:24 24:17,18 24:19,22,25 28:19 29:20 30:18 33:22,22 34:2,4,6,9,18 35:22 37:16 40:19 43:19 46:23 48:9,23 50:20 51:17 53:6,19,20 57:3,10 58:18 58:18 59:8,17	stream 32:12 streams 38:6 53:23 striking 14:6 strip 29:8 structure 15:7 subbasin 4:10 4:12,14 5:7,18 6:14,15 8:24 9:2 10:13,18 10:21,22 11:6 11:21 15:9 16:6 17:22,24 18:10 23:15 26:11 27:22 29:11 30:6,7,9 30:10,12,13,24 31:16 32:21 38:7 40:6 47:23 49:7,9 49:12,13 52:6 56:8 57:18,20 58:1,3,5,6,6 59:8,14	supporting 1:19 2:8 18:5 suppose 17:14 supposed 7:3 supreme 1:1,12 sure 19:6 26:17 29:19 37:24 surplus 58:1,7 surprisingly 43:15 44:17,23 system 47:11 50:3,16 51:10 51:16,20 52:12 systems 56:4	43:2,12 44:2 44:17,23 45:2 45:16 47:10 54:6 55:16,23 tarrants 35:18 38:11,13 39:1 47:21 53:17 tell 17:5 21:2 40:9 48:5 51:17 55:9 60:4 tenth 39:2,2 terms 10:2 17:2 17:17 18:18,21 19:9 52:1 56:20 57:6 58:16	42:3,19 43:10 43:11,16,20 44:9 45:3 46:13 47:16,17 47:19,19,25 48:12,20,21,21 48:22,22 49:3 49:8,19 51:10 52:7 53:21,25 54:4 56:2,9 57:13 58:10,14 59:4 texass 49:6 52:23 texoma 29:14,16 31:3 text 3:21,24 5:17 24:12 thank 3:9 18:1 28:23 29:2 56:11,12,17 60:8 thats 6:16 8:10 14:6,6,10 19:24 20:22,24 24:19 28:3,3 28:12 29:17,23 30:25 31:6 32:20 34:1 35:15 38:21 41:17 43:5,18 46:3 48:9,12 49:7,16,17 52:10,22 53:6 54:1,9,21 59:8 59:23
statement 34:14 35:5 39:24 45:20 53:12 statements 35:8 states 1:1,12,19 2:7 4:7,13,20 5:4,11,18,25 6:1,15 7:6 9:3 9:7,17,18 10:14 11:18 15:13 18:4,12 18:17,19,24 19:1,3 20:13 20:18 23:21,24 24:9,22 27:21 33:24 34:12 36:10 38:12,18 38:22 40:24 41:14,16 42:6 42:19 44:10 46:13,16,21 47:3,6,6 48:17 49:4 50:25 51:5 54:2,6 55:14 57:25 58:2,7,9 59:4	subbasins 4:5 24:23 subconsciously 49:5 subdivides 4:4 subject 21:7 45:19 54:10 submits 16:22 26:5 submitted 22:23 26:10 60:9,11 submitting 58:25 subset 12:23 sudden 46:5 suggest 36:21 suggested 23:4 59:11,23 suggests 14:11 22:24 superfluous 3:18 support 3:15	t 2:1,1 table 55:23 take 4:20 5:11 6:23 7:21 8:11 10:1,21 11:18 12:12 14:17 15:15,24 16:6 22:3 24:15 25:1 27:15 29:20 30:23 31:5,6,9 32:11 35:23 38:15 40:19 43:19 48:7 51:11 53:23,24 55:4 56:2 57:14,25 58:2 59:17 taken 50:11 takes 9:4 talismanic 3:22 talk 46:6 51:2 51:22 talking 10:5 20:1 30:8 35:15 42:25 49:14 57:20 tarrant 1:3 3:4 12:6,17,18,20 14:1 16:7 21:25 29:7 42:12,18,21	60:4 tenth 39:2,2 terms 10:2 17:2 17:17 18:18,21 19:9 52:1 56:20 57:6 58:16 terrain 8:8 territory 4:12 texans 32:3 texarkana 33:16 texas 3:12,25 7:11,12,18 8:12 10:6,6 11:24 12:6,22 13:5,12,15,18 14:4,8,12,16 14:22 15:3,20 15:22,22 16:1 16:5,18 17:20 17:21,22 18:9 19:20 21:17,20 22:1,3,9,11 25:6,16,25 26:10,16,17,20 26:23,25 27:7 27:12,13 28:2 28:7,18 29:10 29:14,15,15,20 30:5,22 31:7 31:12 32:17 33:15 36:3,14 36:15,23,24 37:12,13,17,18 37:23 38:10,15 38:20,25 39:10 39:14 41:24	59:4 texass 49:6 52:23 texoma 29:14,16 31:3 text 3:21,24 5:17 24:12 thank 3:9 18:1 28:23 29:2 56:11,12,17 60:8 thats 6:16 8:10 14:6,6,10 19:24 20:22,24 24:19 28:3,3 28:12 29:17,23 30:25 31:6 32:20 34:1 35:15 38:21 41:17 43:5,18 46:3 48:9,12 49:7,16,17 52:10,22 53:6 54:1,9,21 59:8 59:23 theory 26:24 thered 43:21 theres 5:1 6:6 7:13 13:11 21:14,24 22:7 22:8 26:4 29:7 29:10 37:15,15 39:10,14 41:5 41:16 43:17 45:19,21 46:2 47:10 49:24
statute 14:20 stem 12:24 13:5 13:18 29:14,17 29:21 30:23 31:9 39:11 strange 47:9				

<p>55:2,12 theyre 4:24,25 7:14 24:2 26:12 28:2 32:4,5 46:2,9,9 46:15,17,17 48:12,20 50:2 51:5 59:7 theyve 52:9 thing 27:25 37:20 47:7 50:21 55:10,25 57:17 59:25 things 8:1,18 10:3 59:15,18 think 8:10,18,20 9:12,21 10:11 11:8,17 13:2 13:23 14:5,11 15:10 17:12 19:19,20 20:21 20:24 22:5,6,7 22:20 23:12 24:3,11 25:2 26:3,13,24 28:10,14,16 31:19,25 32:9 34:15 35:21 37:4,12 39:5 42:8 44:5 47:6 48:5,18 51:21 52:5 53:17 54:2,11 55:11 55:11,12,25 56:21 57:1,5 57:12,17 58:9 58:22 59:12 thinks 47:10 third 44:19 thought 6:24 7:24 37:13 42:8 50:14 53:2 54:2 55:20 thousands 56:4 three 4:12 43:6 48:18 49:4</p>	<p>threequarters 31:1 threeseries 38:4 time 17:17 47:5 49:2,24 times 5:20 today 54:16 told 4:18 35:17 35:17 total 24:10 42:11 55:7 track 30:14,20 50:25 51:6,11 tracking 51:23 treat 26:19 27:4 tribes 55:22 tributaries 4:15 27:23 30:6,11 30:12 32:23 tributary 28:4 tried 35:11,13 trinity 43:11,13 45:3 troublesome 25:3 true 7:3 26:22 37:1 trust 43:4 50:6 try 7:6 20:18 42:22 trying 3:14 42:20 49:3 54:22 tuesday 1:9 tulsa 14:12 turn 11:16 47:13 48:16 two 8:18 10:3,9 17:15 23:5 28:16 29:4,17 34:19 35:14 40:21 43:25 54:19 58:12 59:15,18 type 43:1</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">U</p>	<p>ultimately 42:9 unable 8:13 unconsciously 49:5 unconstitutio... 46:3 understand 7:22 25:19 26:14 32:9 34:16 38:23 39:9 47:17 51:4 understanding 12:22 understood 41:21 undesignated 24:10 unequivocal 34:13 unheard 47:11 unintentionally 49:5 unique 4:11 uniquely 49:1 united 1:1,12,18 2:7 18:4,12 38:12,18,21 40:23 41:16 42:5,19 47:6,6 48:17 54:2,6 unnecessary 46:22 unprecedented 34:17 35:12 unrestricted 18:24 46:1 upper 43:11 45:3 upstream 48:22 use 3:12 4:7 5:6 5:19,20 6:2,16 8:23 9:3,17,18 9:20 14:2 15:8 17:11,12,19 23:14 25:13,14 26:7 33:20,23 40:5,8,9 45:7</p>	<p>45:14,21 46:1 54:10,11 57:10 58:3,20 59:6 59:19 user 15:5,14,22 15:23 25:6 28:18 58:10 users 18:9 21:20 25:24,25 29:15 45:18 59:6 uses 4:10 5:7 21:6,7 23:22 23:24 53:23 usually 44:14</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">V</p> <p>v 1:5 3:5 10:15 32:13,16,18 valuable 33:15 vegetation 13:15 13:17 view 3:23 18:12 22:19 30:22 38:12,12,13,18 39:1 40:13 41:15,16 42:6 42:19 45:23 46:11 47:6,21 48:3,3,8,11 52:3 53:8,9,17 53:18 54:1,18 viewed 9:14 virtually 8:5 voluntary 51:16 vote 45:2,3</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">W</p> <p>wait 9:23 57:15 waiting 48:7 walk 36:1 47:14 want 5:13 9:23 12:12 25:1 28:11 31:4 36:12 41:20,22 41:23 42:2,22 47:14 50:21 55:10 58:3</p>	<p>59:6,25 wanted 24:22 48:17 53:10 wants 42:12 57:13 washington 1:8 1:15,18,20 water 1:3 3:5,13 4:6,7,20 5:6,6 5:8,19,23 6:14 6:23 8:24 9:1,3 9:7,17,19,24 10:16,17,21 11:3,4,5,18 12:5,7,7,12,12 13:5,17 14:3 14:13,21 15:9 15:14,15,16,22 15:24 16:6,9 16:23,24 17:2 17:15,20,21,22 18:9,10,25 19:2,11,21 20:10,13,19 21:4,5,8,16,18 21:20,20,25 22:1,3,4,9 23:15,22 24:17 25:6,7,11,14 26:2,5,6,11,18 26:23 27:1,3,8 27:14,15 28:3 28:6,18,19,21 29:16,16,20 30:23 31:5,6 31:16,25 32:5 32:7,11,13,18 32:22 33:8,13 33:14,15,17,21 33:23 34:18 35:23 37:18 38:13 41:25 42:4 43:4,11 43:16,20 44:6 44:9 45:4,7,7,9 45:14,18 46:16 46:23 47:9,16</p>
--	---	---	--	--

47:24 48:11,21 49:3,8 51:15 53:22,22 55:7 55:14,16,20,25 56:3,10 57:15 58:1,1,2,2,6,7 58:8,10,17,19 59:1,6,6,9,16 waters 4:2 watershed 37:12 way 7:19 12:9 12:18 14:10 19:24 23:6 26:13 30:16,17 33:16 36:23 38:10 39:25 48:11 49:4,9 ways 43:6 wed 46:6 56:11 weighs 23:12 west 31:3 58:11 weve 39:4 whats 10:7 11:13 38:11 39:15 42:25 44:13 whatsoever 30:15 whichever 12:1 whistles 35:9 wholly 47:16 wide 57:21,21 57:22 win 19:15 words 42:17 50:9 60:5,5 work 26:13 40:16 41:8 50:4 world 54:1 wouldnt 21:21 21:22 22:12 26:15 33:23 37:19 42:3 44:9 wow 35:19 write 60:1	writing 60:3 written 56:21 wrong 9:22 18:12 24:4 29:7 wrote 60:2 wyoming 35:17 35:17,22 <hr/> X <hr/> x 1:2,7 <hr/> Y <hr/> yeah 24:4 27:19 29:23 33:2,4,4 33:4 35:3 39:16,21 42:1 49:15,22 years 30:14,18 49:2 51:3 52:1 55:13 56:22 60:3 youd 7:1 youre 10:5 20:17 26:15 29:19,20 43:23 58:25 youve 11:1 <hr/> Z <hr/> <hr/> 0 <hr/> 000 5:21 23:23 24:7,8 28:8 36:11 41:17 46:5 49:25,25 55:3,4 01 21:3,5 05 20:2 23:18 46:14 08 60:10 <hr/> 1 <hr/> 1 46:2,4 49:7,12 49:13,16 55:17 55:21 58:5 10 1:13 3:2 21:3 57:22	11 1:13 3:2 38:2 11889 1:4 3:4 12 24:7 36:16,17 36:17 60:10 14a 46:7 47:1 15a 46:7,8 47:1 16 38:2 18 2:8 55:19 19 24:3 41:12 55:1 1970 36:6 37:1 37:20 1s 49:9 <hr/> 2 <hr/> 2 4:10 21:3,3,5 30:6 46:14 47:3,12 49:25 20 49:2 51:3 52:1 57:22 200 58:13 2002 55:17 2013 1:9 211 50:19,20 23 1:9 24 43:14 25 5:7,23 6:4,7 6:20 7:16 8:12 8:13 9:4 10:1 15:3,9,12,13 15:20 16:6 17:19,20,22 20:19 21:18 22:9 23:4,10 23:25 24:10,16 24:17 27:1 28:7 29:25 32:16 36:13,13 36:19,24 39:11 39:20 40:1,15 40:18,19,20 41:5,11,17,24 42:21 49:1 53:24,25 54:8 54:9 56:22 58:12,20 59:12 59:17,20 60:3	29 2:11 38:5 <hr/> 3 <hr/> 3 2:4 5:21 23:23 24:8 32:5 36:11 41:14,15 41:17 46:5 55:3,4,6 30 23:18 30:14 30:18 55:13 33a 33:1 34 37:11 38 36:19 39a 20:1 <hr/> 4 <hr/> 4 30:7 32:5 41:15 42:12 43:10 46:12 55:22 40 46:16,19 47:18,20 52:7 52:24 57:9 401 47:15 49:14 49:15 402 47:14 41 48:1 <hr/> 5 <hr/> 5 4:10 11:21 18:10 20:2 23:18 30:9,10 30:12,13,23,24 31:16 32:21 38:7 40:6 46:14 49:25 56:8 57:18,20 58:3,6,6 59:8 59:14 50 28:8 500 50:1 56 2:14 <hr/> 6 <hr/> 60 46:19 47:17 47:20 52:6 57:9	<hr/> 7 <hr/> 7 55:17,21 70s 36:7 <hr/> 8 <hr/> 8 5:16 <hr/> 9 <hr/> 99 45:25 9a 47:13
---	--	--	--	--