SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES _ _ _ _ _ _ _ JOHN STURGEON,) Petitioner,)) No. 17-949 v. BERT FROST, IN HIS OFFICIAL) CAPACITY AS ALASKA REGIONAL) DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL PARK) SERVICE, ET AL.,) Respondents.)

Place: Washington, D.C.

Date: November 5, 2018

HERITAGE REPORTING CORPORATION

Official Reporters 1220 L Street, N.W., Suite 206 Washington, D.C. 20005-4018 (202) 628-4888 contracts@hrccourtreporters.com

1 IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES 2 _ 3 JOHN STURGEON,) Petitioner, 4)) No. 17-949 5 v. BERT FROST, IN HIS OFFICIAL 6) 7 CAPACITY AS ALASKA REGIONAL) 8 DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL PARK) 9 SERVICE, ET AL.,) 10 Respondents.) _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ 11 12 Washington, D.C. 13 Monday, November 5, 2018 14 The above-entitled matter came on for 15 16 oral argument before the Supreme Court of the United States at 10:05 a.m. 17 18 19 **APPEARANCES:** 20 MATTHEW T. FINDLEY, ESQ., Anchorage, Alaska; on 21 22 behalf of the Petitioner. 23 RUTH BOTSTEIN, Assistant Attorney General, 24 Anchorage, Alaska; for Alaska, as amicus 25 curiae, supporting the Petitioner.

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

```
1
      APPEARANCES: (Continued)
 2
      EDWIN S. KNEEDLER, Deputy Solicitor General,
 3
          Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.; on
 4
          behalf of the Respondents.
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	CONTENTS	
2	ORAL ARGUMENT OF:	PAGE:
3	MATTHEW T. FINDLEY, ESQ.	
4	On behalf of the Petitioner	4
5	ORAL ARGUMENT OF:	
6	RUTH BOTSTEIN, ESQ.	
7	For Alaska, as amicus curiae,	
8	supporting the Petitioner	22
9	ORAL ARGUMENT OF:	
10	EDWIN S. KNEEDLER, ESQ.	
11	On behalf of the Respondents	32
12	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF:	
13	MATTHEW T. FINDLEY, ESQ.	
14	On behalf of the Petitioner	67
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

4

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	
	(10:05 a.m.)
3	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We'll hear
4	argument first this morning in Case 17-949,
5	Sturgeon versus Frost.
6	Mr. Findley.
7	ORAL ARGUMENT OF MATTHEW T. FINDLEY
8	ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER
9	MR. FINDLEY: Thank you. Mr. Chief
10	Justice, and may it please the Court:
11	Mr. Sturgeon is asking that this Court
12	restore the balance that that Congress
13	struck when enacting ANILCA. ANILCA is unique
14	and represents a series of bargains and
15	compromises.
16	A centerpiece of this balancing was
17	ensuring that the over 18 million acres of
18	non-public lands and waters about to be
19	surrounded by the new ANILCA parks and
20	preserves would not be subject to a new array
21	of federal regulation.
22	Section 103(c) of the statute
23	preserved the status of these non-public lands
24	and waters by excluding them from ANILCA's
25	parks and preserves and specifically exempting

5

1 them from park management regulation.

2	JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I'm sorry, but
3	ANILCA in many places puts statutory duties on
4	the government, on the Park Service. So, for
5	example, the statute expands the Glacier Bay
б	National Monument. It says that the monument
7	shall be managed for the following purposes
8	among others, to protect a segment of the Alsek
9	River fish and wildlife habitats and migration
10	routes and a portion of the Fairweather Range.
11	Or take another example. ANILCA
12	creates the Kobuk Valley National Park, which
13	it says shall be managed for the following
14	purposes: among others, to keep it in an
15	undeveloped state. So the agency has a
16	statutory duty duty to manage these parks
17	for the purpose of maintaining the Kobuk River,
18	the Alsek River, and other rivers.
19	If the Park Service can't do what you
20	say, any regulation on these rivers, how can
21	the Secretary fulfill the statutory duties and
22	under ANILCA, unless it's under its organic
23	powers?
24	MR. FINDLEY: ANILCA, as this Court

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

recognized in the first decision, specifically

invoked the Organic Act and said these parks
 shall be managed in accord with the Organic Act
 and in accord with the provisions of ANILCA.
 And this Court recognized that ANILCA carries
 many provisions specifically modifying the Park
 Service's Organic Act authority, Section 103(c)
 being one of them.

To your question, how can the Park 8 Service fulfill its duties: In understanding 9 10 ANILCA it's understanding the debate about 11 ANILCA, it was very important what land went 12 into conservation system units, but it was 13 equally important what land did not get 14 included within conservation system units. 15 ANILCA was not just a park enabling 16 statute. As this Court recognized in Amoco when it was -- first addressed ANILCA, it was 17 18 resolving multiple land use disputes within 19 Alaska. 20 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: You haven't 21 answered my question.

22 Under your theory, the state manages 23 all navigable waters between federal lands or 24 between state lands. And I mean not waters but 25 lands --

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

1 MR. FINDLEY: Yes. 2 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- in terms of the 3 territorial lands. 4 How does the Park Service engage in 5 its statutory obligations if it can't do what 6 you say? 7 MR. FINDLEY: The Park Service, for 8 all those purposes, it can regulate submerged lands and waters where title did not pass to 9 10 the state at statehood. It can manage public 11 It can manage any non-navigable waters. 12 waters. 13 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: There's no public 14 Under your theory, all the waters waters. 15 belong to the state. 16 MR. FINDLEY: Only navigable waters 17 where title to the submerged lands passed at --18 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: All right. So --19 MR. FINDLEY: -- statehood. 20 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- what you're 21 saying is that a good portion of the Act with all of the preservations of the rivers that the 22 23 Act imposes upon the Park Service, it cannot do any of that work? 24 25 MR. FINDLEY: It cannot do that work

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

1 on any of the specific navigable waters, but it 2 can protect the watershed. The Yukon-Charley 3 is a very good example of that. The 4 Yukon-Charley -- again, think of the balancing 5 of ANILCA that this Court recognized -- some of 6 its conservation purposes is equally important to balance the economic needs of the State of 7 8 Alaska. 9 The Yukon-Charley met goal number one by putting 1.7 million acres of land into the 10 preserve to protect lakes, streams, and the 11 12 watershed. And you protect the river by regulating those 1.7 million acres of public 13 14 lands that's regulated under the watershed --15 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Does it make any 16 _ _ 17 MR. FINDLEY: -- that protects the 18 river. 19 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- difference that a park is designated as a wild and scenic 20 21 river? MR. FINDLEY: No, it does not, Your 22 The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act was even 23 Honor. specifically amended by ANILCA to make sure it 24 25 wasn't covering state land that goes into the

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

site of the river, and the Wild and Scenic
 Rivers Act itself recognizes state ownership of
 submerged lands. In the Wild and Scenic Rivers
 Act, there's nothing about those designations
 that undoes the central compromise that was
 through 103(c).

7 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: That's a quite 8 extreme --

9 JUSTICE KAGAN: And you don't think it 10 makes any difference if there are public lands 11 on both sides of a river? In other words, both 12 banks of a river are public lands, but still 13 the federal government cannot regulate the 14 river running through those lands?

15 MR. FINDLEY: The federal government The Park Service may not. That was a 16 may. power that was not delegated to the Park 17 18 Service. An example that even the Park Service 19 brings up in its brief is the Yukon-Kuskokwim Wildlife Refuge. So there's a very specific 20 21 provision directing that the Park Service may 22 not impede access to these rivers. 23 Particularly in that area of Alaska where there are no roads, the Yukon and the Kuskokwim River 24

25 are the arteries of commerce that's helpful to

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

10

1 get to and from villages. That's how they go 2 to vote. That's how to buy groceries. 3 And the specific mandate in ANILCA is 4 we are about to surround these highways with 5 these federal lands, we're going to put them in 6 a conservation system unit, that's great, but 7 please do not block access to the highway. And 8 that's the point of exempting the rivers. 9 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So an agency 10 like EPA is -- is fully empowered to regulate 11 the waters? MR. FINDLEY: Yes, Your Honor, that's 12 exactly right. The EPA, the Coast Guard, any 13 14 other federal, criminal -- all of these still 15 apply. It's just simply that extra layer of Park Service regulation that was not supposed 16 to apply once these lands and waters were 17 18 surrounded by. JUSTICE KAGAN: What does that do --19 20 MR. FINDLEY: -- the ANILCA parks. 21 JUSTICE KAGAN: -- to your federalism 22 argument? Because, at various times in your 23 brief, you press federalism concerns. But I'm wondering, if those concerns have a lot of 24 25 weight, if what you're really saying is not

11

1 this agency but that agency?

2	MR. FINDLEY: When it comes to
3	interpreting the Organic Act, against Section
4	103(c), those aren't necessarily implicated,
5	although, as this Court recognized in the first
6	decision, the state's power over its navigable
7	waters does raise significant issues of state
8	sovereignty. And any time this Court addresses
9	a case of navigable waters, the refrain rings
10	throughout these cases that the state's
11	ownership of the submerged lands and control
12	and ownership of the resources within it is a
13	hallmark of state state sovereignty and a
14	hallmark of federalism.
15	Where the clear statement rule comes
16	into play is the Park Service's fallback
17	argument here, which is, well, if you look at

18 reserve water rights, this can turn these into 19 public lands and actually make these part of 20 the park.

21 And there's nothing in ANILCA that's a 22 clear statement saying we are going to take the 23 state's submerged lands, make them public 24 lands, and actually include them in the parks. 25 When we were here last time, we talked

12

about when that happens, the enabling statute 1 2 is very clear. And the statute that added Lake 3 Ozette to the Olympic National Park actually 4 specifically said we are adding the submerged 5 lands to the park, so --6 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So you just -it -- it -- you just don't like the Park 7 8 Service. The Coast Guard is fine with you, the Army Corps of Engineers is fine with you, the 9 EPA is fine. But not the Park Service? 10 MR. FINDLEY: It's not that we don't 11 like the Park Service, as it -- it's that layer 12 13 of regulation --14 (Laughter.) 15 MR. FINDLEY: -- that was not supposed 16 to apply on top. Yes, Mr. Chief Justice, 17 that's exactly right. JUSTICE ALITO: Which sentence of 18 19 Section 3103(c) do you think wins this case for 20 you? The second -- second 21 MR. FINDLEY: sentence does the most work, but the second 22 23 sentence needs to be read in conjunction with all three sentences and in conjunction with the 24 25 context of the statute.

13

1 JUSTICE ALITO: All right. I've 2 burned up an awful lot of gray cells trying to 3 put together the pieces of this statute. Could 4 you just take me through the second sentence 5 and explain why that wins the case for you? 6 MR. FINDLEY: Thank you. So you --7 you -- the first sentence of 103(c) has just 8 told you that any non-public land, whether it's state land, submerged -- submerged lands, 9 10 waters, native corporation, or private land, it 11 is not going to be part of the park. JUSTICE ALITO: It's not a portion of 12 13 the park? 14 MR. FINDLEY: It's not a portion of 15 the park. It may be surrounded by the outer 16 boundaries --JUSTICE ALITO: Yeah, and -- and --17 18 MR. FINDLEY: -- but it's not part of 19 the unit. 20 JUSTICE ALITO: Yeah, and -- and, you 21 know, whether something can be within a unit but not be a portion of the unit is kind of a 22 23 nice question. I don't think there's a -- a slam-dunk answer to that one way or the other. 24 25 Would you agree?

1 MR. FINDLEY: I -- I would agree, but 2 the Court doesn't need to reach that issue. То 3 the second sentence, it then says no lands 4 which on or before December 2, 1980, have been 5 conveyed to the state, native corporation, or 6 private person. Again, shorthand, non-public 7 lands. 8 JUSTICE ALITO: Right. 9 MR. FINDLEY: They shall not be 10 subject to regulations applicable solely to 11 public lands within the units. And what that 12 is telling you is not only are they not part of 13 the unit, they may not be regulated as though 14 they were. 15 And that's the function of the word 16 "solely," is to distinguish between park management regulations and the regulations Mr. 17 18 Chief Justice was talking about, Coast Guard, 19 EPA and --20 Well, how does it do JUSTICE KAGAN: 21 _ _ 22 JUSTICE ALITO: All right. When --23 JUSTICE KAGAN: -- that? I'm sorry. JUSTICE ALITO: If I can just ask one 24 25 more question related to this. I understand

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

15

1 that lands is defined by ANILCA to include 2 inter -- water and waters and interests 3 therein, but the second sentence after 4 referring to lands then refers to a conveyance, 5 which I take it means the transfer of title. 6 And nobody really has title to 7 navigable waters. So what do we do with that? The -- there are two --8 MR. FINDLEY: two parts to that. First of all, the submerged 9 10 lands were conveyed to Alaska. The Submerged 11 Lands Act was specifically included within the 12 _ _ 13 JUSTICE ALITO: Right. 14 MR. FINDLEY: -- Statehood Act. 15 In terms of having title to water, 16 this Court has, in U.S. v. California, and PPL 17 Montana, certainly suggested with very strong 18 language that, with -- with the Submerged Lands 19 Act, with title to the submerged lands, and with ownership and control of all the resources 20 21 within there, that is effectively title to the 22 waters. 23 JUSTICE ALITO: No, I mean as to the public lands. 24 Right. 25 MR. FINDLEY:

16

1 JUSTICE ALITO: So public lands are 2 defined -- I mean, lands are defined the same 3 way. They include water. Public means, I take 4 it, title in the United States, but the United 5 States does not have title to navigable waters, 6 is that right? 7 MR. FINDLEY: That is definitely 8 right. And they don't claim so here. 9 JUSTICE KAGAN: Could I ask you to go 10 back --JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: The state doesn't 11 12 -- I'm sorry. 13 JUSTICE KAGAN: -- to the --14 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice Kagan? 15 JUSTICE KAGAN: Okay, could I ask you 16 to go back to the applicable -- regulations applicable solely to public lands? And you 17 18 suggested that that language is what 19 distinguishes Park Service regulations from, 20 let's say, EPA regulations. 21 But, when I read that language, 22 "regulations applicable solely to public 23 lands," it seems to be making a distinction between regulations that apply solely, 24 25 exclusively to public lands and those that

17

1 apply more broadly to both public and private 2 lands. 3 That seems to be the distinction this 4 makes on its face. So I guess I don't quite 5 get how -- how you make it into something 6 different. 7 MR. FINDLEY: Yes. And Mr. Sturgeon's position, as with the state, is that "solely" 8 distinguishes between the generally applicable 9 regulations that we talked to Mr. Chief Justice 10 about, Coast Guard, EPA, and so on, and park 11 12 management regulations. 13 If you were to take the word "solely" 14 out of the statute, you would have 15 inadvertently exempted these lands from a 16 myriad of other federal regulation that applied 17 before ANILCA and that was certainly intended 18 to apply -- apply after ANILCA. 19 If you look, I mean, the Park Service in its argument about Section 103(c) and 20 21 argument --22 JUSTICE KAGAN: But -- but --23 MR. FINDLEY: Go ahead. JUSTICE KAGAN: -- but -- but I guess 24 25 solely to public lands, is like if you take out

1 the -- if you take out the word "solely," this 2 -- this is saying solely to public lands as 3 compared to what, as compared to -- to public 4 lands and something else, meaning non-public 5 lands. And that seems to be the distinction 6 it's drawing: solely to public lands, or to 7 public lands and something else, non-public 8 lands. 9 MR. FINDLEY: The sentence needs to

10 have meaning beyond articulating what is 11 already true. If a regulation is promulgated 12 only to apply to public lands, it already only 13 applies to public lands. That second sentence 14 has to have meaning.

15 And if it doesn't prohibit the Park 16 Service from issuing the exact regulation at 17 issue here, which is a regulation designed to 18 touch both public and non-public land, that 19 sentence actually doesn't prohibit anything. 20 It needs to have prohibitive effect.

If you want to understand its prohibitive effect, you look at this came into the statute, it was not a last-minute technical addition. It was introduced in the House by Representative Seiberling a year and a half

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

19

1 before ANILCA was passed, and he specifically 2 said the fact that these non-public lands were 3 within the units drawn on the map does not 4 change the status of that state native for 5 private land. And that goes back to, if we're about 6 7 to surround these lands with the parks, they were already subject to a rich matrix of 8 federal regulations before ANILCA. You are not 9 10 going to subject them to any new array of federal regulation merely because of them being 11 12 surrounded by the park. 13 JUSTICE KAGAN: I -- I understand what 14 -- I think it's a good point, the point you 15 make about, look, if it were public lands 16 versus public and non-public lands, this would 17 not be doing very much. But I -- I guess what I want to know 18 19 from you is, like, why pick this language to convey what you want to convey? I mean, how do 20 21 I have to manipulate this language to get it to 22 mean what you want it to mean? 23 MR. FINDLEY: I can't answer why 24 Congress chose those specific words. 25 JUSTICE KAGAN: But, I mean, like

1 what -- what -- what could you do to this 2 language to make it more like what you're 3 suggesting it means? Because I look at this 4 language, it just doesn't say -- it's just not 5 anywhere close to what you're saying it means. 6 MR. FINDLEY: I mean, we believe the 7 8 JUSTICE KAGAN: But maybe I'm wrong about that. I really am trying -- I'm 9 10 struggling with this. 11 MR. FINDLEY: If the language weren't 12 read in context with all three sentences, and 13 read in context with the statute, the meaning 14 becomes clearer. And perhaps in hindsight they 15 could have written something about applicable 16 solely to land, you know, solely land management power, but what your -- the "solely" 17 18 is drawing that distinction of the regulations 19 that only could come into play after the passage of ANILCA. And it's important to keep 20 21 in mind that, without provisions like Section 103(c), there is no ANILCA. There are 22 23 no ANILCA parks. 24 And the -- the large debate, it took 25 two years to pass the statute, there were

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

1 issues relating to the Native Claims Settlement 2 Act, there were issues related to the Statehood 3 Act, and it was a very large debate, that this 4 Court recognized in Amoco, of what lands will 5 go into a conservation system unit and be 6 subject to much more rigorous conservation 7 regulations and which lands will not go into 8 these things.

9 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Did the -- the 10 Park Service had no -- no regulatory authority 11 over these areas prior to ANILCA or --

12 MR. FINDLEY: None. That's correct. 13 Well, I mean, that JUSTICE BREYER: 14 seems the question to me, that -- that the Park 15 Service has a reg, imagine, that says no bonfires in Yellowstone, within the boundaries 16 There are some private 17 of Yellowstone. 18 enclaves within Yellowstone, but they mean no 19 boundaries -- forget it. I want you to reserve your time. I'd rather you reserved your time. 20 21 I'll ask them. MR. FINDLEY: Oh, okay. 22 Thank you. If there are no other questions, I will reserve 23 my time. 24

25 (Laughter.)

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

22

1 MR. FINDLEY: Thank you. CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Good -- good 2 choice. 3 Thank you, counsel. 4 (Laughter.) 5 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Ms. Botstein. 6 ORAL ARGUMENT OF RUTH BOTSTEIN FOR ALASKA, 7 AS AMICUS CURIAE SUPPORTING THE PETITIONER MS. BOTSTEIN: Mr. Chief Justice, and 8 may it please the Court: 9 10 Understanding ANILCA requires 11 understanding remote Alaska. In most of the 12 state, a vast wilderness that is more than 13 twice the size of Texas, our rivers are our 14 only roads. When Congress surrounded many of 15 these crucial state waterways with federal park 16 areas, it consciously chose not to take away state control over these crucial rivers. 17 18 Instead, Congress left them under 19 state control as part of its commitment to providing adequate opportunity for satisfaction 20 of the economic and social needs of the State 21 22 of Alaska and its people. 23 This Court should reject the Park Service's continuing attempts to commandeer 24 25 control of Alaska's navigable waters, because

23

1 that is not what Congress intended. 2 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well. 3 "commandeer" is strong language, but what --4 what do you say for the -- the Park Service's 5 argument that, with respect to their reserved 6 water rights and so on, that you would be creating a checkerboard sort of situation where 7 the Park Service has authority with respect to 8 some areas but not others along -- along the 9 10 river? It is true that both 11 MS. BOTSTEIN: 12 within these park areas there are areas of mixed jurisdiction. Congress absolutely knew 13 14 that because it created islands of private and 15 native corporation land that were beyond the 16 reach of park management regulation and, 17 similarly, with the waters. And that's consistent with the default 18 19 way that water management is done. I mean, PPL Montana mandates a segment-by-segment 20 21 navigability analysis. So, even along large 22 waters, there is a mixed jurisdiction. That --23 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: But what authority would you say that the Park Service 24 25 I mean, you're asserting authority with has?

respect to the river. The Park Service in,
 apart from inholdings, has authority with
 respect to the land.

4 How do you resolve conflicts that are5 inevitably going to arise?

6 MS. BOTSTEIN: What Congress did was 7 mandated cooperative management as a primary 8 management tool in these parks, so -- and -and this gets back to the first question from 9 10 the Court. Justice Sotomayor asked how can the Park Service fulfill its statutory mission if 11 it doesn't have title to all the lands and the 12 13 waters.

14 What Congress said is you work 15 together and create a management plan for each 16 area, identify areas of concern on public and non-public land, and work with landowners and 17 18 the State of Alaska to try to cooperatively 19 resolve those conflicts because Congress knew 20 it wasn't giving sole and exclusive 21 jurisdiction to the federal government. 22 If there's any doubt about that, Your 23 Honor --24 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I don't think 25 you've answered my question. How is the

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

25

1 government, the federal government, supposed to 2 fulfill its statutory duties? There are many 3 rivers here that they're given explicit 4 obligations. 5 Your basically saying 103(c) trumps that doesn't make much sense to me. 6 If a 7 statute tells the government do this and at the 8 same time reserves some rights to the state, doesn't the federal government's obligation to 9 do this, the explicit obligation to deal with 10 11 certain rivers in a particular way, trump any 12 other exemption that you might have? 13 MS. BOTSTEIN: No, Your Honor, because 14 the statutory mission is limited to regulation 15 on the public lands, on the federal lands. 16 Congress reserved state lands, non-public lands to Alaska, private landowners, 17 18 or native corporations. Another --19 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I -- I'm sorry --20 MS. BOTSTEIN: -- way to think --JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- just that's not 21 22 true. Many of these rivers are specifically 23 named in the statute. 24 MS. BOTSTEIN: Yes. 25 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: And your position

1 or your co-counsel's position is that all of 2 these rivers belong to the state? The navigable rivers 3 MS. BOTSTEIN: 4 that were state -- that were not federal owner 5 -- in ownership that passed to the state under 6 the Submerged Lands Act, yes. 7 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Well, we have a 8 problem with whether you can own navigable waters, but that's a different issue. 9 10 MS. BOTSTEIN: What Congress did, Your 11 Honor, was said -- you know, when Congress 12 names the rivers as part of a watershed, in part what it's saying is, on the public lands, 13 14 your statutory mission is to regulate in a way 15 that protects these watersheds, protects access to the watersheds, protects the watersheds, 16 but, at the same time, it is the state that has 17 18 jurisdiction over the water themselves. 19 And if there's any doubt about this, if you look through Title 16, when Congress 20 21 created different national parks, it used 22 vastly different jurisdictional language. 23 When Congress created Yellowstone, which Justice Breyer mentioned, this is what it 24 25 The Yellowstone National Park, as its said:

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

boundaries now are defined or as they may
 hereinafter be defined or extended, shall be
 under the sole and exclusive jurisdiction of
 the United States.

5 That's a very clear statement that 6 says we drew a circle and everything within it 7 is federal; the Park Service can manage it. It 8 does violence to Congress's differing intent to 9 interpret Section 103(c) to mean the same as 10 what -- sole and exclusive federal 11 jurisdiction.

11 jurisdiction.

12 And Congress had very good reasons for giving Alaska more sovereign power, reserving 13 14 more sovereign power to Alaska than it did to 15 Wyoming, because this statute is not a pure 16 conservation statute. This is also a statute that fulfills the promises made to Alaska at 17 statehood and in the Native Claims Settlement 18 19 Act about local control and self-sufficiency designed by Alaskans. 20

JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I'm having a hard time accepting your position in this case with your position that the Katie John decisions should be retained. I don't know how we can give different meaning to public lands in two

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

1 provisions of the same Act.

2 MS. BOTSTEIN: Your Honor, giving 3 effect to Congress's intent in ANILCA does --4 may require preserving the rural subsistence 5 priority in Title 8 of the legislation, even if 6 it does require a different statutory 7 definition.

Now no party has challenged the 8 current federal subsistence management --9 10 subsistence regulations. The briefing 11 certainly reflects this is an issue of great concern to the people of Alaska and its rural 12 13 residents. And the Court should not upset 14 those settled expectations of Alaskans today. 15 A different definition in these titles 16 does reflect Congress's very different intent in Title 8. Title 8 could have been its own 17 18 statute. It has its own statement of purpose. 19 It has its own -- it is the only place in this extensive law where Congress specifically 20 21 exercised its commerce power. And it has a federal takeover 22

23 provision that says Congress was so concerned 24 that there be an -- an -- an enforceable 25 subsistence priority that it gave explicitly

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

1 the federal government the right to regulate 2 that if the state could not, which is how it 3 played out. 4 So we don't think the Court needs to 5 resolve this issue today, but we do ask that 6 the Court leave some space open for those to be 7 differently interpreted in --8 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: One could --9 MS. BOTSTEIN: -- accordance with 10 Congress's intent. JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- if one defines 11 12 them the same, but not in accordance with your 13 views, but in accordance with the government's 14 current view, and the Katie law decisions 15 view --16 MS. BOTSTEIN: The statute --JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- then you don't 17 18 win here. 19 MS. BOTSTEIN: The statute does 20 contain one definition. We've cited to the 21 Court in our brief cases that do suggest, in 22 these long complicated statutes, we do look to 23 Congress's intent in the context of the statute, and that can mean that a term does 24 25 have different meaning in different sections

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

30

1 when that is what Congress --2 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So --3 MS. BOTSTEIN: -- intended. 4 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- why isn't an --5 all of the references to the government's control of rivers in this Act a similar 6 7 statement of purpose? MS. BOTSTEIN: Because those need to 8 be read in the context of 103(c), which doesn't 9 10 say the federal government can come in and regulate these rivers if we don't --11 12 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Or regulate --13 MS. BOTSTEIN: -- compel and ask them 14 to do that. 15 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- subsistence 16 living, but you're arguing that the purpose of 17 the statute is reflected in its structure and words. And the structure and words here are 18 19 giving the government defined statutory duties 20 for any number of rivers within this compound. So it -- I don't see the difference in 21 22 the logic. 23 MS. BOTSTEIN: Your Honor, the statutory duties that the Park Service is 24 25 given, is delegated to regulate for

non-subsistence purposes, is limited by Section 1 2 103(c) and --3 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: You agree --4 MS. BOTSTEIN: -- that is a meaningful 5 restriction. 6 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: You agree with the 7 Katie John decisions, correct? 8 MS. BOTSTEIN: We are not challenging the federal subsistence management regulations 9 10 _ _ 11 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Do you -- do you 12 _ _ 13 MS. BOTSTEIN: -- that were mentioned. 14 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Does the State of 15 Alaska agree with those decisions? 16 MS. BOTSTEIN: Your Honor, the 17 reasoning of those decisions may be appropriate 18 to -- for the limited purpose of effectuating 19 Title 8 but should not be expanded to change 20 the federal reserved water rights doctrine 21 throughout the circuit for all purposes. And, certainly, Congress had good 22 23 reasons for treating Alaska differently than other states in the main body of the statute 24 25 because this comes back to the Congress's

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

32

1 special solicitude for Alaska and its 2 uniqueness, which are concerns this Court spoke 3 about in its 2016 opinion. 4 This is not a situation where we're 5 talking about tourists who might be disturbing a wilderness area. This is a situation where 6 7 people are living and working along these 8 rivers and using them for transportation, for commerce, for fishing. 9 10 And these are exactly the reasons that states were given -- if -- if I may finish my 11 12 sentence, Your Honor? 13 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Sure. 14 MS. BOTSTEIN: These are exactly the 15 reasons that states were given control of their 16 submerged lands under the Submerged Lands Act. And Congress wanted to effectuate those 17 18 purposes in this statute. Thank you. 19 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, 20 counsel. 21 Mr. Kneedler. 22 ORAL ARGUMENT OF EDWIN S. KNEEDLER ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENTS 23 MR. KNEEDLER: Mr. Chief Justice --24 25 excuse me -- and may it please the Court:

1 I'd like to identify at the outset two 2 statutes that have not been discussed which we 3 think are very important to understand the 4 provisions of ANILCA at issue here. 5 The first is a general statute enacted 6 in 1976 and added to the Park Service's general authorities, which is reproduced in our -- in 7 8 our brief at page 8a, and it says the Secretary, under such terms and conditions, et 9 10 cetera, will have the authority to issue 11 regulations concerning boating and other 12 activities on or relating to water located within system units. 13 14 That is a general authority, contrary 15 to Petitioner's argument, that specifically delegates to the Park Service, along with the 16 Coast Guard, power to regulate navigable waters 17 18 in the national park system. So the question here is whether that 19 was somehow abrogated when it comes to Alaska. 20 21 And I think the answer to that question is in 22 another provision that --23 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Mr. Kneedler --MR. KNEEDLER: -- is not mentioned. 24 25 JUSTICE GORSUCH: -- before we get to

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

34

1 the abrogation question --

25

2 MR. KNEEDLER: Yes. 3 JUSTICE GORSUCH: -- I'd just like to 4 understand your argument on the terms of -- of the '76 Act itself a little bit better. 5 Ιt 6 says the Secretary may prescribe regulations concerning boating and other activities on or 7 relating to water within system units. And I'm 8 -- I'm paraphrasing, but I think that's about 9 10 it. And I'd understand your argument 11 better, I think, if the -- if the statute read 12 13 that the Secretary could regulate water in or 14 relating to system units, so not just water 15 within system units but also water outside 16 system units, like the water here that might 17 have some downstream effect, say. 18 But that's not what the statute says. 19 It says that the -- it may prescribe regulations concerning boating or other 20 activities that themselves relate to water in 21 22 system units. 23 So I would think that the government would have to prove some nexus between boating 24

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

or the other activities and the water within

1 the government's system units. And I just 2 didn't see that story told here, how Mr. 3 Sturgeon's hovercraft would in some way impact 4 water within the system units, meaning public 5 -- public lands, public waters. MR. KNEEDLER: Okay. So if -- if I 6 7 could answer that, the -- that, I think, does go to the abrogation question. This is a 8 general statute that applies within --9 JUSTICE GORSUCH: No. I'm -- I'm 10 11 asking whether --MR. KNEEDLER: Yeah. No, no, I'm --12 13 JUSTICE GORSUCH: -- whether you even 14 qualify -- whether you even qualify under this 15 statute before we get to abrogation. 16 MR. KNEEDLER: Yes. Well, I -- I think under -- they are within -- they are 17 located within the outer boundaries of --18 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Within the outer 19 20 boundaries but -- but not necessarily from --21 we know from ANILCA, within the unit itself. MR. KNEEDLER: Well, that goes 22 23 directly to the --24 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Okay. But assume 25 for the -- for the moment that I'm -- I'm --

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

1 I'm persuaded that it's not within the unit, 2 okay, and that you have to rely on relating to 3 the unit. All right? 4 What's your argument then? Do you 5 have one? MR. KNEEDLER: Well, non-navigable 6 waters -- I mean, first of all, we're talk --7 we're talking in -- in this instance about a --8 a river that runs through federal lands on both 9 sides. And it's -- it's been determined to be 10 navigable, but it is -- it is within the 11 federal -- the federal bounds. 12 13 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Okay. 14 MR. KNEEDLER: It may be --15 JUSTICE GORSUCH: If I don't buy that 16 argument, then do you have anything left? MR. KNEEDLER: Well, it would -- it 17 18 would affect the non-navigable waters within 19 the area. There could be stretches of the 20 river that would be non-navigable under this 21 Court's decision in PPL. 22 JUSTICE GORSUCH: That's not -- I 23 guess that doesn't help me either. I'm wondering whether you have any argument that 24 25 the use of the hovercraft outside the system

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

1 units, boating activity outside the system unit 2 -- premise me -- work on that premise -- would 3 have any effect on the water within the system 4 unit? MR. KNEEDLER: Well, it -- it has --5 it has -- a hovercraft could have -- they're 6 7 very loud, they're unsightly, and I don't -- I don't read this to say that the effect has to 8 be on the water. 9 10 The purpose of giving the regulation, 11 regulatory authority to the Park Service is to 12 enable it to fulfill the purposes of the park as a whole, not just the waters. 13 14 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Do we know from the 15 record that the hovercraft could be heard 16 within the system unit itself? 17 MR. KNEEDLER: Well, there --18 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Let alone seen. MR. KNEEDLER: -- were -- there were 19 20 federal lands on -- on both sides of the -- of the -- of the -- of the water. So -- so as --21 22 when operating, I think it could surely be --23 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Okay. MR. KNEEDLER: -- be heard on the 24 25 lands.

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

38

1	But if I could go to the second
2	statutory provision I wanted wanted to cite,
3	this is in 410hh-2 that we cite in our brief,
4	again, against the backdrop of the 1976
5	statute, it says "the Secretary shall
6	administer the lands, waters, and interests
7	therein added to existing areas or established
8	by the foregoing sections of ANILCA" the one
9	that lists the parks "in accordance with the
10	Organic Act as amended and supplemented." In
11	other words, in accordance with the general
12	authorities, which includes the 1976 Act.
13	This provision, far from abrogating
14	the Secretary's authority, confirms that with
15	respect to the waters that were added to the
16	to the parks, to the park system
17	JUSTICE BREYER: Okay. I've got
18	MR. KNEEDLER: the Secretary can
19	invoke the 1976 Act.
20	JUSTICE BREYER: So your point here,
21	which we'll hear something about probably on
22	rebuttal, is that there's some other statutes
23	here that, whatever it says in in 103(c),
24	give direct authority to the Secretary to do
25	this. I see where you're driving at.

39

1 But I'd like to go back to 103(c) 2 because the question that Justice Kagan asked 3 was a question that was in my mind too, and it 4 is to do with the word "solely." 5 And either they -- he can answer this 6 on rebuttal too if he wants. Imagine something 7 like Yellowstone, not perfectly, but it's a square and it is mostly -- it's federal, but 8 there are a few houses belonging to Smith and 9 10 Jones that are private, and the -- pass a 11 statute, a reg, and the reg says: Oh, no 12 bonfires within the boundaries of the park, 13 which means Smith can't do it either. 14 Now is that a reg that is a reg solely 15 relating to lands to which the U.S. has title? 16 Well, I can -- the argument that it couldn't possibly be for the purposes of this statute is 17 18 you wouldn't need -- you wouldn't need sentence 19 2 at all if that were the case. You just wouldn't need it, period, because it wouldn't 20 21 apply to the river regardless because it says 22 it wouldn't. Okay? 23 So sentence 2 must have some purpose. And, therefore, when the national park system 24 25 has a reg which says "applies within the

1 boundaries of a national park," that is a rule 2 that relates only to public lands. And if it 3 doesn't -- see, without that, this is 4 meaningless, and so it must mean that, and so 5 it must be that that kind of thing is what you 6 can't do to enclaves within public lands in this area. And the river is such an enclave 7 because it is not a piece of property to which 8 the United States has title. 9 10 Now that, I think, is their argument. 11 I've had a hard time grasping the arguments in 12 this case, but I think that that is their 13 argument. 14 If I am right, what's the answer to 15 it, if there is one? 16 MR. KNEEDLER: There are a number of answers to that, and there -- there are several 17 18 respects in which 103(c), the second sentence, 19 is inapplicable. 20 Perhaps the most basic is the fact 21 that 103(c), that second sentence, refers to -excuse me -- refers to land -- no lands which 22 23 have been conveyed to a state. The -- the Submerged Lands Act 24 25 conveyed to the state only submerged lands and

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

1 interests in waters. It did not convey the 2 waters themselves. 3 And so that -- so the second sentence 4 of 103(c) does not affect the Park Service's 5 regulation of navigable waters --6 JUSTICE BREYER: I got that one. MR. KNEEDLER: -- which --7 JUSTICE BREYER: Is there another one? 8 Because that one, I don't know if water is 9 10 stuff you could convey and I don't know art. But -- but is there another one? 11 MR. KNEEDLER: No, Justice, if I could 12 13 just finish --14 JUSTICE BREYER: I'm not --15 MR. KNEEDLER: -- my point. 16 No, that -- that's -- that's critical to the point I was making before, that the 1976 17 18 Act is one of general applicability, specifically giving the Secretary the authority 19 to regulate waters, including navigable waters. 20 21 And the other statute I mentioned 22 specifically says that the Secretary may 23 regulate the waters added to these park units according to the general authorities, which 24 25 includes the '76 Act, and that ties directly to

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

1 the fact that the waters, the navigable waters, 2 were not conveyed to the state, and, therefore, 3 the Secretary's regulatory authority over such 4 waters is not -- is not --5 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Can --6 JUSTICE ALITO: Who has title to --7 MR. KNEEDLER: -- affected at all by 8 the --9 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Can I ask the 10 question in reverse? What can't you do? Under 11 your reading of this statute, what sorts of 12 regulations can't you pass? 13 Because, if you can identify a 14 permissible and impermissible, you're giving 15 meaning to this. If you don't, you're 16 basically saying there's no meaning. MR. KNEEDLER: And I -- I think it may 17 18 be useful to distinguish two different types of 19 -- of non -- of -- of land not owned by the 20 United States. The one were the inholdings, so the issue here was -- that was different about 21 22 Alaska was that, within the outer boundaries, 23 there were lands selected by the state or selected by native corporations, and Congress 24 25 did not want them to be administered just like

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

the Park Service lands themselves, the -- the 1 2 -- the usual Park Service lands. It wanted 3 them to be set apart. 4 The other category -- and that is --5 that is what the legislative history that the б other side refers to was all about, was 7 preserving the ability of the native 8 corporations to use the large tracts of land that they had selected. It was not about 9 10 navigable waters. That's the other category of 11 -- at issue here. 12 And, again, the state only owns the It's -- it's -- it's an established 13 bed. 14 principle --15 JUSTICE GORSUCH: But, Mr. Kneedler --16 MR. KNEEDLER: -- of navigable waters 17 _ _ 18 JUSTICE GORSUCH: -- I haven't yet 19 heard an answer to Justice Sotomayor's question 20 when it comes to water. Does the government 21 claim plenary authority over all waterways in 22 Alaska? 23 MR. KNEEDLER: No. We're only --24 we're only talking here about waterways, 25 navigable waterways within national parks.

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

1 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Right. But 2 everything relates. All waterways are 3 connected. And you say it's not just the 4 waterway but anything related to the waterway 5 that you own or that you claim to have land on besides -б 7 MR. KNEEDLER: Well, it --8 JUSTICE GORSUCH: -- so where is the limit? 9 MR. KNEEDLER: It's -- it's well --10 it's well established under -- under the 11 12 navigational servitude and -- and, in fact, the 13 Submerged Lands Act preserves to Congress the 14 ability to regulate in the interest of 15 commerce. 16 JUSTICE GORSUCH: So it's plenary --17 it's plenary then, right? MR. KNEEDLER: I -- I -- I -- it's --18 19 it's pretty close to plenary, but this Court 20 has recognized that there is -- but the 21 Secretary hasn't exercised it to that degree, 22 but -- but the -- this Court has recognized in 23 cases involving navigable water that the fact that the state owns the submerged lands does 24 25 not interfere with Congress's ability to

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

45

1 regulate the waters --2 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, but --3 MR. KNEEDLER: -- themselves. 4 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- that's --5 the --6 MR. KNEEDLER: The Clean Water Act, 7 for example. CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: 8 The navigational servitude, I mean, that's really 9 10 about if Alaska decided to, you know, build a 11 bridge across the river and things like that. 12 I don't know that it reaches as far to justify 13 any type of regulation on -- on the water. 14 MR. KNEEDLER: Well, Congress 15 regulates, again, outside of parks, regulates 16 extensively navigable waters for dredging and filling, for --17 18 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: It regulates 19 navigable waters. The question --20 MR. KNEEDLER: -- the Clean Water Act, 21 for pollution. 22 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: No, no, all 23 sorts of things. And that's, as the state reads it and the private party, that's what the 24 25 "solely" is for. They agree that the Clean

46

1	Water Act applies. They agree that the
2	navigational servitude applies. I think they
3	agree that the reserved water rights apply.
4	They what they don't agree is that
5	that is a lever that gives you authority to do
б	this sort of day-to-day regulation, such as,
7	you know, the hovercraft traffic.
8	MR. KNEEDLER: Well, the
9	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: And while
10	while you may think a hovercraft is unsightly,
11	I mean, if you're trying to get from point A to
12	point B, it's pretty beautiful.
13	(Laughter.)
14	MR. KNEEDLER: Well, there are
15	there are there are a number of instances
16	within the Act in which Congress has
17	specifically required the Secretary to
18	accommodate, to take into account what's
19	different about Alaska, by requiring them to
20	accommodate methods of transportation like air.
21	We mentioned boating.
22	The fact that the Secretary is is
23	permitted to regulate boating only subject
24	only reasonably means that he can regulate
25	boating, means the National Park Service can

1 regulate boating --2 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So am I to --3 MR. KNEEDLER: -- on -- on waters 4 within the park. 5 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Can I summarize 6 what I think you said? Are you saying that 7 103(c) basically, because of the navigational servitude, the other regulations you've pointed 8 to, doesn't permit the government to regulate 9 activities on the territorial lands or -- or on 10 the submerged lands, but it does give it 11 12 basically plenary authority over navigable 13 waters? 14 MR. KNEEDLER: I -- I hesitate to say 15 plenary. I think it gives it -- it preserves 16 for the -- through the Park Service whatever the scope of authority that -- that Congress 17 18 would have or the federal government has over 19 navigable waters. 20 The uplands are very --21 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So you're --22 MR. KNEEDLER: -- different. 23 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- basically saying, whatever the regulations were under the 24 25 Organic Act or even under this Act, and

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

charging you with taking care of certain parks,
 that the navigable waters are part of that
 charge?

4 MR. KNEEDLER: Yes. And the uplands 5 are different, and that's really what drove 6 103(c), was to make sure that these land 7 selections were not going to be subject to the 8 general regulations of the Park Service.

9 And, in fact, that's been exactly 10 true. There -- there are -- there are really 11 only three sets of regulations that the Park 12 Service has applied in -- in -- outside of federally owned lands. One is the regulation 13 14 of navigable waters pursuant to an express 15 statutory authorization in the '76 Act. The 16 other two have to do with the regulation of solid waste pursuant to a specific statutory 17 18 directive to regulate within the boundaries of national park units, just like this statute 19 talks about within system units, and the other 20 21 is mining in areas of the national park system, which the Park Service has applied regulations 22 23 there. All three pursuant to specific statutory directives. 24

25 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So your --

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

49

1 MR. KNEEDLER: The Park Service --2 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You think --3 MR. KNEEDLER: -- has not done more 4 than that. 5 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So -- so you 6 think the state's argument works with respect 7 to solid land, land land? MR. KNEEDLER: Well --8 9 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: It's --10 MR. KNEEDLER: -- there is --11 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: It's only 12 because you don't think that water is included 13 in public lands that their argument doesn't 14 work? 15 MR. KNEEDLER: No, their -- well, 16 it's because --17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: It's only because it is water? 18 19 MR. KNEEDLER: Water -- water was not 20 conveyed to the state. That's the first 21 argument. 22 The second argument is, if you have a 23 regulation that, in the case -- examples I mentioned, regulations issued pursuant to 24 25 statutory directive to apply to both public and

50

1 non-public lands within the national park, that 2 comes within the reference they are not 3 regulations applicable solely to --4 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: But that's --5 MR. KNEEDLER: -- public lands and --6 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- that's the -- that's one of your arguments that causes me 7 8 concern, because you're saying that if the regulation applies to the -- the private or 9 10 state land, then it is not a regulation solely 11 applicable to public land and, therefore, it's 12 not covered. 13 But the -- the sentence is obviously 14 designed to protect the state, the natives, and 15 the private landholders against the federal 16 government or the Park Service to whatever extent we can debate. But to say that all the 17 18 Park Service has to do to get around it is say, 19 oh, and this applies to the inholdings, that can't be right. 20 MR. KNEEDLER: Well, I'm -- I'm not 21 saying -- I'm not -- in fact, I would disclaim 22 23 the proposition that the Park Service could treat them as -- as -- as -- the same way it 24 25 treats regular Park Service lands. It cannot

1 do that. And the only examples where it has 2 issued regulations that go beyond that are 3 pursuant to specific statutory directive, of 4 which the 1976 Act regulating waters is one. 5 Now that's --JUSTICE KAGAN: But, if --6 7 MR. KNEEDLER: Now that's --8 JUST KAGAN: -- I understand your view, Mr. Kneedler, what you're saying this 9 10 means is that non-public lands shall not be 11 subject to regulations that are applicable only 12 to public lands. 13 And you don't need a statute to tell 14 you that. Of course, non-public lands aren't 15 subject to regulations applicable solely to public lands. If that's what the statute was 16 17 saying, who would need a statute? MR. KNEEDLER: Well, I -- I think the 18 purpose of the statute -- and, again, I think 19 20 this comes through in the legislative history that -- that is cited on the other side -- the 21 native groups were concerned, and as was the 22 23 state, that because large tracts of land that they had selected were going to be included 24 25 within the -- in the -- within the outer

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

boundaries, that they were not going to be -that they would be treated just like -- they wanted assurance that they wouldn't be treated just like Park Service.

5 And that's what this did. It's 6 important to recognize that this is subsection 7 (c) of a section that deals with maps. It isn't -- it -- it doesn't -- you would think if 8 there was some major substantive change -- work 9 10 that this was supposed to do aside from the substantive regulations, it would appear 11 12 elsewhere.

13 And there may be -- I think it --14 JUSTICE KAGAN: But just on the face 15 of things, Mr. Kneedler, if -- if the Park 16 Service issues a regulation and the regulation says this applies only to public lands within a 17 18 park, right, and you're not a public land 19 within a park, you're a private land within a park, what kind of assurance do you need? 20 21 It's like you know that you're not a 22 public land, so it doesn't matter that you're 23 in the park. You don't need a special statute to tell you that, do you? You only need a 24

25 special statute if the special statute exempts

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

you from something that would otherwise apply
 to you.
 MR. KNEEDLER: With all respect, I

4 don't think that's correct. I think that the 5 -- I think that there was a lot of debate about -- about different versions of the statute. 6 And I -- and I think if you -- if you recall, 7 8 as I said, this was in a section dealing with maps, and the statute required that the -- that 9 10 the -- that the lot -- the boundaries -- that 11 maps be published identifying what the parks 12 were.

13 Those maps might have -- and -- and, 14 in fact, I think did -- just outline the outer 15 boundaries. And so subsection (c) says, well, 16 yeah, that -- that may be the boundaries of what was designated, but we want to be clear 17 18 that it's only -- it's only the public lands 19 that will be deemed to be portions --20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: But you're not 21 taking --

22JUSTICE BREYER: Though I think there23are --24JUSTICE ALITO: Can I ask a question

25 about --

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

1 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- adequate 2 account of -- of the third sentence. I mean, 3 you're trying to minimize it by saying it's 4 maps. The third sentence has to illuminate the 5 first two. And what it says is, if a state, a 6 native corporation, or an owner wants to convey 7 lands to the Secretary, it can. In other words, if you -- the -- the 8 -- the Secretary, feels that you need to have 9 10 authority over areas that you don't, it tells you in -- in the third sentence how to do it: 11 12 get the state or the native corporation to 13 convey it to you. 14 That would be an odd sentence to 15 include if this were not -- if this were a -- a -- a protection you could write around just by 16 17 saying, oh, and, by the way, this applies to 18 the -- the inholders. 19 MR. KNEEDLER: No, I -- I don't think so at all. I mean, I think -- I think this 20 21 provision was in there because if the -- if you had native or state selected lands or native 22 23 lands, the corporation -- the native corporation, they were -- if they decided to 24 25 sell their land, this just says that the Park

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

1 Service could purchase it.

25

2 JUSTICE ALITO: If you claim that --3 JUSTICE BREYER: Can I go back to this 4 question because this is obviously the question 5 that's bothering some of us, okay? 6 And it seems to me you sort of 7 answered it both ways. You're not -- I -- I 8 started out thinking that if a reg applies to Mr. Smith's inholding in Yosemite because it 9 10 applies to all of Yosemite, that that is solely 11 public lands. Because if the only things that 12 Why? count as a reg for public lands -- we've said 13 14 this three times -- are -- are those regs that 15 say they don't apply to Smith's inholding, you 16 don't need this statute, okay? That's the 17 basic thing. Now some of what you said seems to 18 agree with that and some of it does not. But 19 20 what I took your basic arguments to be, one, 21 that water, unlike Mr. Smith's cabin, is close 22 enough to public lands that it's out of this 23 thing. Two, even if it isn't, there are other 24

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

statutes that give specific authority to the

1 government to regulate the water. And one of 2 them might be general. One of them might be 3 the ones you just started off your argument 4 with. One of them might be -- I don't know. 5 There are two or three on that. Now I think I've got this very helpful 6 7 argument right at least to what you're arguing. 8 And is there something else, or do I have it so wrong it's hardly worth answering? 9 10 MR. KNEEDLER: No, I -- I think 11 it's --12 (Laughter.) 13 MR. KNEEDLER: -- I think it's 14 basically correct, but there is the category of 15 regulations that are not applicable solely to 16 public lands because -- because they have been made applicable to inholdings within the Park 17 Service. 18 19 Whether or not that's valid in any particular case is a different matter, but 20 21 there are three, as I mentioned, that were done 22 pursuant to statutory authorization, and those, 23 I think, must be valid because Congress has authorized them. 24 25 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Counsel, I

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

57

1 think --2 MR. KNEEDLER: But that is not really 3 involved here. Here, we're only talking about 4 _ _ 5 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Counsel --6 MR. KNEEDLER: Waters which were not 7 _ _ CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- Justice 8 Alito has been trying to ask a question. 9 10 MR. KNEEDLER: I'm sorry. 11 (Laughter.) 12 JUSTICE ALITO: Thank you, Chief 13 Justice. 14 I just wanted to ask you a question 15 about implied reserved water rights. In the 16 cases where we have dealt with that, the government has been asked to show in detail the 17 18 purpose of the reservation and the volume of 19 water that's necessary to achieve that purpose. 20 Do you have to make any kind of 21 showing like that here? MR. KNEEDLER: Well, in the 1999 22 23 regulations that Congress allowed to go into effect, the -- the Park Service by rule 24 25 identified the Park Service units or the areas

1 added or expanded by ANILCA in which there were 2 reserved water rights. And when you look at 3 the purposes for which these units were 4 established, it's clear that water was a 5 central purpose of them. 6 In fact, the one we have here is the Yukon-Charley Rivers National Preserve, and it 7 -- and it specifically defines as one of the 8 purposes to preserve the entire Charley river 9 10 basin, including streams and lakes. So that -- that clearly identifies the 11 12 protection of the integrity of those waters and 13 the -- and the -- the scenic values associated 14 That's why we have national parks. with them. 15 That's why we have this national preserve. So I -- I think it's clear that water 16 is reserved for the purposes of these 17 18 reservations, every one of which either refers 19 to specific bodies of water or to aquatic activities, such as fishing --20 21 JUSTICE ALITO: So what has been --22 MR. KNEEDLER: -- or boating or 23 access. JUSTICE ALITO: -- reserved -- what 24 25 has been reserved here is plenary authority for

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

1 the federal government --2 MR. KNEEDLER: No. 3 JUSTICE ALITO: -- to regulate the 4 navigable waters? 5 MR. KNEEDLER: The -- the -- the -the -- the -- the extent of the -- of the --6 7 and -- and the -- the Ninth Circuit's opinion 8 in Katie John III makes this clear, the extent or even, frankly, the existence at a particular 9 10 location of a reserved water right has not been decided. 11 12 If -- if there's an adjudication down the road that the reserved water right does not 13 14 extend to some stretch or another area, that 15 could be resolved. But what the -- what the 16 Interior Department had to do in light of the Katie John decisions was to identify the areas 17 18 that for the time being in its view were 19 subject to --20 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, no I wasn't --21 MR. KNEEDLER: -- reserved water

JUSTICE ALITO: -- asking about the
geographical limits of it. I'm asking about
the regulatory limits.

22

rights.

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

1 As to water for which there is a 2 reserved right, the federal government, the 3 Park Service can do -- can regulate completely, 4 as it -- is that right? 5 MR. KNEEDLER: I -- I wouldn't -- I --6 I -- I think within the national park system it 7 overlaps with the 1976 statute that I -- that I 8 mentioned, which I -- I think directly -- you don't have to go through the reserved water 9 10 rights approach to get there -- within national parks, the -- the -- Katie John's subsistence 11 12 use could have been satisfied by relying on the 13 1976 Act and not relying on reserved water 14 rights. 15 And all we have here are navigable 16 waters within national parks. But, no, I -the extent of what regulatory power might be 17 18 triggered would be different. If I could go back to the --19 20 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, could I just --MR. KNEEDLER: -- Chief Justice's 21 22 question. 23 JUSTICE ALITO: -- slip in one more question since you referred to Katie -- to 24 25 Katie John, and I'll ask you the same question

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

61

that was asked of counsel for Alaska. 1 If we were to rule against you here, 2 3 would that necessarily mean that the Katie John 4 decision was incorrect? 5 MR. KNEEDLER: I -- I -- I would 6 certainly hope not, but -- but, I mean, I think Petitioners have a different -- Petitioner and 7 the State have a difficult argument because 8 Katie John and the regulations implementing it, 9 10 once the Congress specifically allowed to go into effect with full knowledge that Katie John 11 was out there, it turns on the definition of 12 public lands, which is a term that runs 13 14 throughout the Act, which is, we think, a good 15 reason why -- why it should be upheld. 16 At the very least, Katie John demonstrates the importance of federal 17 18 regulation of waters within these areas, in 19 that instance for -- for subsistence uses. 20 If I could just finish the answer about sentence 3 of -- of 103 -- 103(c). One 21 22 of the -- one of the things the Park Service 23 could never do is grant access to private The Park Service not only regulates 24 lands. 25 things that you can't do in national parks but

things that they have to allow, like access,
 camping, picnicking.

Well, obviously, the Park Service cannot allow people to have private -- have access to the private inholdings. So one of the reasons why the Park Service might want to acquire the adjacent lands or the inholdings would be for the purpose of allowing public access to those areas.

But I also want to underscore that there are so many provisions of ANILCA that specifically refer to water and, in fact, the regulation of water. One of the ones I mentioned, 3170(a), specifically allows the Park Service to regulate boating in -- in these areas.

That picks up on the 1976 Act, the 17 general application that is made specific here 18 19 by allowing regulation of boating. There's 3121(b) which requires access for subsistence 20 unit -- units -- uses. There's the Wild and 21 Scenic Rivers Act, which the whole purpose of 22 23 designating a river within these national parks 24 is to preserve --

25 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: But there's

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

63

1 nothing --2 MR. KNEEDLER: -- the river. 3 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: -- that says that 4 the Park Service has plenary authority over all 5 the navigable rivers within the conservation 6 system unit, nor is there any indication by any 7 member of Congress of such a authority? MR. KNEEDLER: Well, I mean, putting 8 to one side whatever we might mean by plenary, 9 10 the 1976 Act specifically gives the parks --11 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: But this would 12 have been a --13 MR. KNEEDLER: -- authority over 14 water. 15 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Sorry to 16 interrupt. This would have been a huge deal for the people of Alaska and the 17 18 representatives from Alaska to accept full or 19 close to full Park Service authority over all 20 the navigable rivers, yet --MR. KNEEDLER: I -- I -- to the 21 22 contrary. I -- I -- I see no indication in 23 that, and this 1410hh-2 that I mentioned specifically says that the waters added to 24 25 these areas are subject to regulation under the

Park Service's general authority, which
 includes the 1976 Act.

3 I think the extraordinary thing would 4 be to say that -- that the federal government 5 through the Park Service did not have the 6 authority to regulate navigable waters, not 7 just any navigable waters but navigable waters in park areas set aside for the very purpose, 8 often express purpose of preserving the values 9 of the rivers and lakes and streams that were 10 11 in their midst.

12 The -- this -- this -- this is a very 13 water-centric statute. And I think it would 14 turn it upside down to say that Congress, of 15 all things, was incapable of regulating the 16 navigable waters within -- within the park 17 system.

Well, but, I 18 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: 19 mean, the waters are very important to Alaskan way of life in the way they aren't elsewhere. 20 21 And I -- I guess the argument on the other side, it would be pretty extraordinary if you 22 23 go to the trouble to say you only can regulate lands with respect to which you have title, and 24 25 you say from that you get the authority over

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

1 the rivers, even though title in the submerged 2 lands is in the state? 3 MR. KNEEDLER: Well, our argument 4 doesn't depend on the title question or -- or 5 control over navigable waters. But the title question is involved in -- if -- if -- on the 6 -- on the -- on the Katie John rationale. 7 8 But, on the points you mentioned, ANILCA itself embodies the compromise or the --9 10 or the balance of the competing values. 11 In most parks, you can't hunt. 12 Hunting is permitted in national preserves, 13 including this one. In -- in most places, you 14 can't have airplane use. Well, here, you are allowed to have airplane use. 15 16 There's specific provisions for access to inholdings, something that you don't 17 18 normally have in other national parks, but, 19 because there were inholdings, there are provisions for that. There's provisions for --20 21 for boating and other access to subsistence 22 uses. 23 The very things that make Alaska different are accommodated in this statute. 24 25 But one of the things that -- that is not

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

1 different about Alaska is the importance of the 2 federal government having control over the 3 navigable waters that are the centerpiece of 4 the parks. 5 What is different about Alaska is the 6 large tracts of inholdings, which is really what the focus of 103(c) was. And in that 7 situation and only in very limited 8 circumstances has the Park Service ever applied 9 regulations that go beyond simply the public 10 lands to -- to embrace the broader -- the 11 12 broader system of -- of -- of lands. 13 And, again, this is the Yukon-Charley 14 River's national monument. It would be -- or 15 national preserve. It would be extraordinary 16 to conclude that the Park Service, without some express statement to that effect in the -- in 17 the statute, could not regulate it. 18 19 And, as I say, this statute giving it the authority to regulate waters is -- is 20 21 explicit on that point. 22 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, 23 counsel. 24 Five minutes, Mr. Findley. 25

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

1 REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF MATTHEW T. FINDLEY ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER 2 3 MR. FINDLEY: Yes, thank you. 4 Counsel several times cited the 5 provision of ANILCA, saying these parks and 6 preserves shall be governed in accord to the 7 Organic Act. Counsel forgot to finish the 8 provision of the statute that says "and as amended or modified by ANILCA." 9 10 So every time they refer to the 11 Organic Act they have to read it together with 12 ANILCA. And you have to read it with Section 103(c), at the very front of the statute, it's 13 14 a linchpin, and it's foundational. And what 15 it's designed to do is say, if the federal 16 government doesn't have title, it's not public 17 land, it is not part of the park, and it's 18 there to prevent the Park Service from using 19 its Organic Act authority to regulate extraterritorially to land that --20 21 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: The -- the problem 22 is --23 MR. FINDLEY: -- is not part of the 24 unit. 25 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- you don't have

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

1 title to the water. I mean, you suggest that 2 there are some cases who say effectively it is, 3 but effectively is different than is. 4 Navigable waters are navigable waters. 5 We rarely think of them as someone having title 6 to them, but we do think of them as having interest in them. And if there's two 7 8 interests, the federal government's and the state's, don't they win? 9 10 Because, if they have an interest, 11 they have a public interest that, by statute, is being directed. I mean, there are 26 rivers 12 designated as wild and scenic rivers here. 13 14 There are all sorts of -- I've 15 mentioned this repeatedly -- all sorts of statutory obligations that the government's 16 being given under this particular Act to 17 18 preserve these waterways in a particular way. 19 So I -- I -- I don't understand. Τf you don't have title, does this -- at least 20 21 with respect to navigable waters, do you have 22 any claim whatsoever? 23 MR. FINDLEY: What matters here is that the United States does not have title to 24 25 those waters and does not have title to the

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

69

1 submerged lands. Once that's the case, they 2 aren't public lands. They aren't part of these 3 And the Park Service may not use its units. 4 Organic Act authority to reach out and regulate 5 them. 6 You asked the Park Service early on a 7 very foundational question: What does 103(c) prohibit in your view? And 20 minutes later 8 there was no answer from the Park Service. 9 10 The reality is, in their view, any time they feel it is necessary or appropriate 11 12 to regulate outside the boundaries of public 13 lands, they feel they can do that. 14 Now they feel, well, we haven't done 15 it that often, but this is exactly what Section 16 103(c) was designed to prevent. They are looking at 751(b) -- go ahead. 17 Sorry, I 18 thought I heard a question come in. 19 They are looking at 751(b) and they are relying on that phrase, "activities on or 20 21 related to water," to justify regulating water that is not part of the unit, and there's no 22 23 limiting principle to that. Activities on or relating to water 24 25 could very easily be read as activities taking

70

1 place on native corporation land within the 2 unit. All of that is exterritorial regulation. That is what Section 103(c) was specifically 3 4 designed to prevent, so every time the Park 5 Service wanted to promulgate a regulation to 6 reach out to non-public land that is not part 7 of the unit, the State of Alaska, a native corporation, or a private party did not have to 8 qo petition the court and say: Please don't do 9 That was the central deal of ANILCA. 10 this. And the waters were as crucial to that 11 12 as a native corporation land and the other inholdings. As my friend from the state made 13 14 very clear, and for the State of Alaska, the 15 rivers are the roads. And while the Act 16 constantly references rivers and waters, you need to give effect to both dual balancing that 17 18 Congress was doing. 19 By adding over 100 million acres of land, public land to these units, you are 20 achieving significant protection of the waters, 21 and you're also protecting all waters where the 22 23 -- where the state does not own the submerged

24 lands. So regulation of those public lands,

25 indeed, protects the waters.

What we are talking about here is the state's authority to retain primary control over the use of its rivers that run by the parks and are surrounded by the parks. The federal government, of course, retains control of the rivers. As we've talked about, the Clean Air Act applies, Coast Guard regulations apply, federal criminal law applies. These rivers are already significantly protected.

10 I mean, the hovercraft rule, to come 11 back to what brought us here today, why is that 12 rule there? It's not there to protect the quality of the river. It's there because of 13 14 sound and it's there because the Park Service 15 wants to restrict access to remote areas of the 16 parks, while the State of Alaska has a very different view about access to the remote areas 17 18 of the state. And that's a judgment call that 19 ANILCA should leave to the State of Alaska. 20 Thank you. CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: 21 Thank you, counsel. The case is submitted. 22 23 (Whereupon, at 11:06 a.m., the case was submitted.) 24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

	-	icial	
	access [11] 9:22 10:7 26:	ahead [2] 17:23 69:17	applicable [12] 14:10 16:
1 7 (2) 0 40 40	15 58: 23 61: 23 62: 1,5,9,20	air [1] 46:20	16,17,22 17: 9 20: 15 50: 3,
1.7 ^[2] 8:10,13 100 ^[1] 70:19	65: 16,21	airplane [2] 65:14,15	11 51: 11,15 56: 15,17
	accommodate [2] 46:18,	alaska ^[29] 6: 19 8: 8 9: 23	application [1] 62:18
103 [1] 61: 21	20	15: 10 22: 6,11,22 24: 18 25:	applied [4] 17:16 48:12,22
103(c [23] 6 :6 9 :6 11 :4 13 :	accommodated [1] 65:	17 27: 13,14,17 28: 12 31: 15,	66: 9
7 17 :20 20 :22 25 :5 27 :9 30 :	24	23 32: 1 33: 20 42: 22 43: 22	applies [11] 18:13 35:9 39:
9 31 :2 38 :23 39 :1 40 :18,21	accord ^[3] 6:2,3 67:6	45: 10 46: 19 61: 1 63: 17,18	25 46: 1,2 50: 9,19 52: 17 54:
41 :4 47 :7 48 :6 61 :21 66 :7	accordance [5] 29: 9,12,	65: 23 66: 1,5 70: 7,14	17 55: 8,10
67:13 69:7,16 70:3	13 38: 9,11	alaskan [1] 64: 19	apply ^[13] 10:15,17 12:16
1410hh-2 [1] 63:23	according [1] 41:24	alaskans [2] 27:20 28:14	16: 24 17: 1,18,18 18: 12 39:
16 [1] 26 :20	account ^[2] 46:18 54:2	alaska's [1] 22: 25	21 46: 3 49: 25 53: 1 55: 15
1976 [11] 33: 6 38: 4,12,19	achieve [1] 57:19	alito [23] 12:18 13:1,12,17,	approach [1] 60:10
41: 17 51: 4 60: 7,13 62: 17	achieving [1] 70 :21	20 14: 8,22,24 15: 13,23 16:	appropriate [2] 31:17 69:
63: 10 64: 2	acquire [1] 62:7	1 42: 6 53: 24 55: 2 57: 9,12	11
1980 [1] 14: 4	acres [3] 8:10,13 70:19	58: 21,24 59: 3,20,23 60: 20,	aquatic [1] 58:19
1999 [1] 57: 22	across [1] 45:11	23	area [6] 9:23 24:16 32:6 36:
2	act [47] 6:1,2,6 7:21,23 8:	allow ^[2] 62:1,4	19 40: 7 59: 14
2 [3] 14: 4 39: 19,23	23 9: 2,4 11: 3 15: 11,14,19	allowed [3] 57:23 61:10	areas [16] 21:11 22:16 23:
20 [1] 69: 8	21: 2,3 26: 6 27: 19 28: 1 30:	65: 15	9,12,12 24: 16 38: 7 48: 21
2016 [1] 32: 3	6 32: 16 34: 5 38: 10,12,19	allowing [2] 62:8,19	54: 10 57: 25 59: 17 61: 18
26 [1] 68 :12	40: 24 41: 18,25 44: 13 45: 6,	allows [1] 62:14	62: 9,16 63: 25 64: 8
	20 46: 1,16 47: 25,25 48: 15	alone [1] 37:18	aren't [5] 11:4 51:14 64:20
3	51: 4 60: 13 61: 14 62: 17,22	already [3] 18:11,12 19:8	69: 2,2
3 [1] 61: 21	63: 10 64: 2 67: 7,11,19 68:	although [1] 11:5	arguing ^[2] 30:16 56:7
3103(c [1] 12: 19	17 69:4 70: 15	amended [3] 8:24 38:10	argument [26] 10:22 11:
3121(b [1] 62:20	activities [9] 33:12 34:7,	67 :9	17 17: 20,21 22: 6 23: 5 32:
3170(a [1] 62:14	21,25 47: 10 58: 20 69: 20,24,	amicus [1] 22:7	22 33: 15 34: 4,11 36: 4,16,
4	25	amoco ^[2] 6:16 21:4	24 39: 16 40: 10,13 49: 6,13,
	activity [1] 37:1	analysis [1] 23:21	21,22 56: 3,7 61: 8 64: 21 65:
410hh-2 [1] 38:3	actually [4] 11:19,24 12:3	anilca [32] 6:3,4,10,11,15,	3 67: 1
7	18 :19		arguments [3] 40:11 50:7
751/b [2] 60 :47.40	added [7] 12:2 33:6 38:7,	1 17: 17,18 19: 1,9 20: 20,22,	55: 20
751(b ^[2] 69 :17,19 76 ^[3] 34:5 41: 25 48: 15	15 41 :23 58 :1 63 :24	23 21 :11 22 :10 28 :3 33 :4	arise [1] 24:5
	adding [2] 12:4 70:19	35: 21 38: 8 58: 1 62: 11 65: 9	army [1] 12:9
8	addition [1] 18:24	67: 5,9,12 70: 10	around [2] 50:18 54:16
8 [4] 28: 5,17,17 31: 19	addressed [1] 6:17	another [5] 25:18 33:22	array ^[1] 19:10
8a [1] 33: 8	addresses [1] 11:8	41: 8,11 59: 14	art [1] 41:10
	adequate [2] 22:20 54:1	answer ^[9] 13:24 19:23 33:	arteries [1] 9:25
A	adjacent [1] 62:7	21 35 :7 39 :5 40 :14 43 :19	articulating [1] 18:10
ability [3] 43:7 44:14,25	adjudication [1] 59:12	61 :20 69 :9	aside [2] 52:10 64:8
abrogated [1] 33:20	administer [1] 38:6	answered [3] 6:21 24:25	asserting [1] 23:25
abrogating [1] 38:13	administered [1] 42:25	55: 7	associated [1] 58:13
abrogation [3] 34:1 35:8,	affect [2] 36:18 41:4	answering [1] 56:9	assume [1] 35:24
15	affected [1] 42:7	answers [1] 40:17	assurance [2] 52:3,20
absolutely [1] 23:13	agency [3] 10:9 11:1,1	apart [2] 24:2 43:3	attempts [1] 22:24
accept [1] 63:18	agree ^[10] 13:25 14:1 31:3,	appear [1] 52:11	authorities [3] 33:7 38:12
accepting [1] 27:22	6,15 45: 25 46: 1,3,4 55: 19	applicability [1] 41:18	41: 24
_			

			,
authority [30] 6:6 21:10	11 24: 6 25: 13,20,24 26: 3,	charging [1] 48:1	50 :8
23: 8,24,25 24: 2 33: 10,14	10 28: 2 29: 9,16,19 30: 3,8,	charley [1] 58:9	concerned [2] 28:23 51:
37: 11 38: 14,24 41: 19 42: 3	13,23 31: 4,8,13,16 32: 14	checkerboard [1] 23:7	22
43: 21 46: 5 47: 12,17 54: 10	boundaries [15] 13:16 21:	chief ^[38] 10:9 12:6,16 14:	concerning [3] 33:11 34:
55: 25 58: 25 63: 4,7,13,19	16,19 27: 1 35: 18,20 39: 12	18 16: 14 17: 10 21: 9 22: 2,5,	7,20
64: 1,6,25 66: 20 67: 19 69: 4	40: 1 42: 22 48: 18 52: 1 53:	8 23: 2,23 32: 13,19,24 45: 2,	concerns [3] 10:23,24 32:
authorization ^[2] 48:15	10,15,16 69: 12	4,8,18,22 46: 9 48: 25 49: 2,5,	2
56: 22	bounds [1] 36:12	9,11,17 50: 4,6 53: 20 54: 1	conclude [1] 66:16
authorized [1] 56:24	breyer ^[9] 21:13 26:24 38:	56: 25 57: 5,8,12 60: 21 64:	conditions [1] 33:9
away ^[1] 22:16	17,20 41: 6,8,14 53: 22 55: 3	18 66: 22	confirms [1] 38:14
awful [1] 13:2	bridge [1] 45:11	choice [1] 22:3	conflicts [2] 24:4,19
B	brief [5] 9:19 10:23 29:21	chose [2] 19:24 22:16	congress [30] 19:24 22:14,
	33: 8 38 :3	circle [1] 27:6	18 23: 1,13 24: 6,14,19 25:
back [8] 16:10,16 19:6 24:	briefing [1] 28:10	circuit [1] 31:21	16 26: 10,11,20,23 27: 12 28:
9 31 :25 39 :1 55 :3 60 :19	brings [1] 9 :19	circuit's [1] 59:7	20,23 30: 1 31: 22 32: 17 42:
backdrop [1] 38:4	broader [2] 66:11,12	circumstances [1] 66:9	24 44: 13 45: 14 46: 16 47:
balance [2] 8:7 65:10	broadly [1] 17:1	cite [2] 38: 2,3	17 56: 23 57: 23 61: 10 63: 7
balancing [2] 8:4 70:17	build ^[1] 45:10	cited [3] 29:20 51:21 67:4	64: 14 70: 18
banks [1] 9:12	burned [1] 13:2	claim [5] 16:8 43:21 44:5	congress's [7] 27:8 28:3,
basic [3] 40:20 55:17,20	buy [2] 10: 2 36: 15	55: 2 68: 22	16 29: 10,23 31: 25 44: 25
basically [6] 25:5 42:16	C	claims [2] 21:1 27:18	conjunction [2] 12:23,24
47: 7,12,23 56: 14		clean ^[3] 45:6,20,25	connected [1] 44:3
basin [1] 58 :10	cabin [1] 55:21	clear ^[9] 11:15,22 12:2 27:	consciously [1] 22 :16
beautiful [1] 46:12	california [1] 15:16	5 53: 17 58: 4,16 59: 8 70: 14	conservation [8] 6:12,14
becomes [1] 20:14	came ^[1] 18:22	clearer ^[1] 20 :14	8:6 10:6 21: 5,6 27: 16 63: 5
bed [1] 43:13	camping [1] 62:2	clearly [1] 58:11	consistent [1] 23:18
behalf [2] 32: 23 67:2	cannot [5] 7:23,25 9:13 50:	close [4] 20:5 44:19 55:21	constantly [1] 70:16
believe [1] 20 :6	25 62: 4	63: 19	contain [1] 29:20
belong [2] 7:15 26:2	care [1] 48:1	coast [5] 10:13 12:8 14:18	context [5] 12:25 20:12,13
belonging [1] 39:9	carries ^[1] 6:4	17: 11 33: 17	29: 23 30: 9
besides [1] 44:6	case ^[9] 11:9 12:19 13:5	co-counsel's [1] 26:1	continuing [1] 22:24
better [2] 34:5,12	27: 22 39: 19 40: 12 49: 23	come [3] 20:19 30:10 69:	contrary [2] 33:14 63:22
between [6] 6:23,24 14:16	56: 20 69: 1	18	control ^[10] 11:11 15:20
16: 24 17: 9 34 :24	cases [5] 11:10 29:21 44:	comes [7] 11:2,15 31:25	22: 17,19,25 27: 19 30: 6 32:
beyond [4] 18:10 23:15 51:	23 57: 16 68: 2	33 :20 43 :20 50 :2 51 :20	15 65: 5 66: 2
2 66:10	category ^[3] 43:4,10 56:14	commandeer [2] 22:24	convey [6] 19: 20,20 41: 1,
bit [1] 34: 5	causes ^[1] 50:7	23 :3	10 54: 6,13
block [1] 10:7	cells [1] 13:2	commerce [4] 9:25 28:21	conveyance [1] 15:4
boating [13] 33:11 34:7,20,	centerpiece [1] 66:3	32:9 44: 15	conveyed [6] 14:5 15:10
24 37:1 46:21,23,25 47:1	central ^[3] 9:5 58:5 70:10	commitment [1] 22:19	40 :23,25 42 :2 49 :20
58:22 62:15,19 65:21	certain [2] 25:11 48:1	compared [2] 18:3,3	cooperative [1] 24: 7
bodies [1] 58:19	certainly [5] 15:17 17:17	compel [1] 30:13	cooperatively [1] 24:18
body [1] 31 :24	28: 11 31: 22 61 :6	competing [1] 65:10	corporation [10] 13:10 14:
bonfires [2] 21:16 39:12	cetera [1] 33 :10	completely [1] 60:3	5 23 :15 54 :6,12,23,24 70 :1,
both [10] 9:11,11 17:1 18:	challenged [1] 28:8	complicated [1] 29:22	8,12
18 23 :11 36 :9 37 :20 49 :25	challenging [1] 31:8	compound [1] 30 :20	
55 :7 70 :17	change ^[3] 19:4 31:19 52:	-	corporations [3] 25 :18
bothering [1] 55:5	9	compromise [2] 9:5 65:9	42: 24 43: 8
botstein [23] 22:5,6,8 23:	charge [1] 48:3	concern ^[3] 24:16 28:12	corps [1] 12 :9
		L	

56:14 department [1] 59:16 drew [1] 27:6 10,14 48:9 69 couldn't [1] 39:16 depend [1] 65:4 driving [1] 38:25 example [3] counsel [8] 22:3 32:20 56: designated [3] 8:20 53:17 drove [1] 48:5 examples [3] 25 57:5 61:1 66:23 67:4,7 68:13 designating [1] 62:23 dual [1] 70:17 exclusive [5] court [1] 55:13 designations [1] 9:4 designations [1] 9:4 designations [1] 9:4 duties [4] 6:9 25:2 30:19, 10 court [20] 6:4,16 8:5 11:5,8 designed [6] 18:17 27:20 E exclusively exclusively 10 28:13 29:4,6,21 32:2,25 50:14 67:15 69:16 70:4 detail [1] 57:17 b [1] 24:15 exempting	8:3 9:18 45:7 ^{2]} 49:23 51:1 ^{3]} 24:20 27:3, (1] 16:25 52:25 40:22 ^[1] 17:15
couldn't [1] 39:16 depend [1] 65:4 driving [1] 38:25 example [3] counsel [8] 22:3 32:20 56: designated [3] 8:20 53:17 drove [1] 48:5 examples [4] 25 57:5 61:1 66:23 67:4,7 68:13 designating [1] 62:23 dual [1] 70:17 exclusive [4] course [1] 51:14 designations [1] 9:4 designed [6] 18:17 27:20 exclusive [2] 3 10 court [20] 6:4,16 8:5 11:5,8 designed [6] 18:17 27:20 E exclusive [2] 3 exclusive [2] 3 10 28:13 29:4,6,21 32:2,25 50:14 67:15 69:16 70:4 detail [1] 57:17 exempted [2] exempted [2]	8:3 9:18 45:7 ^{2]} 49:23 51:1 ^{3]} 24:20 27:3, (1] 16:25 52:25 40:22 ^[1] 17:15
counsel [8] 22:3 32:20 56: designated [3] 8:20 53:17 drove [1] 48:5 examples [1] 52:13 course [1] 55:13 designating [1] 62:23 dual [1] 70:17 10 course [1] 51:14 designations [1] 9:4 designations [1] 9:4 exclusive [2] 3 court [20] 6:4,16 8:5 11:5,8 designed [6] 18:17 27:20 E exclusive [2] 3 14:2 15:16 21:4 22:9,23 24: 50:14 67:15 69:16 70:4 each [1] 24:15 exempted [2] 3 10 28:13 29:4,6,21 32:2,25 detail [1] 57:17 exempting	^{2]} 49:23 51:1 ^{3]} 24:20 27:3, y ^[1] 16:25 2:25 40:22 ^[1] 17:15
25 57:5 61:1 66:23 67:4,7 68:13 dual [1] 70:17 exclusive [1] 50:17 court [1] 55:13 designating [1] 62:23 duties [4] 6:9 25:2 30:19, 10 course [1] 51:14 designations [1] 9:4 designed [6] 18:17 27:20 24 exclusive [2] 3 14:2 15:16 21:4 22:9,23 24: 50:14 67:15 69:16 70:4 each [1] 24:15 exempted [2] 3 10 28:13 29:4,6,21 32:2,25 detail [1] 57:17 exempting	^{3]} 24: 20 27: 3, / ^[1] 16: 25 2: 25 40: 22 ^[1] 17: 15
count [1] 55:13 designating [1] 62:23 duties [4] 6:9 25:2 30:19, 10 course [1] 51:14 designations [1] 9:4 designed [6] 18:17 27:20 24 exclusively court [20] 6:4,16 8:5 11:5,8 designed [6] 18:17 27:20 E excuse [2] 3 exempted [10 28:13 29:4,6,21 32:2,25 50:14 67:15 69:16 70:4 detail [1] 57:17 each [1] 24:15 exempting	y ^[1] 16: 25 2: 25 40: 22 ^[1] 17: 15
course [1] 51:14 designations [1] 9:4 24 exclusively court [20] 6:4,16 8:5 11:5,8 designed [6] 18:17 27:20 E exclusively 14:2 15:16 21:4 22:9,23 24: 50:14 67:15 69:16 70:4 each [1] 24:15 exempted [10 28:13 29:4,6,21 32:2,25 detail [1] 57:17 each [1] 24:15 exempting	2: 25 40: 22 [1] 17: 15
court [20] 6:4,16 8:5 11:5,8 designed [6] 18:17 27:20 E excuse [2] 3 14:2 15:16 21:4 22:9,23 24: 50:14 67:15 69:16 70:4 each [1] 24:15 exempted [10 28:13 29:4,6,21 32:2,25 detail [1] 57:17 each [1] 24:15 exempting	2: 25 40: 22 [1] 17: 15
14:2 15:16 21:4 22:9,23 24: 50:14 67:15 69:16 70:4 each [1] 24:15 exempted [10 28:13 29:4,6,21 32:2,25 detail [1] 57:17 each [1] 24:15 exempting	^[1] 17: 15
14:2 15:16 21:4 22:9,23 24: 50:14 67:15 69:16 70:4 each [1] 24:15 exempted [10 28:13 29:4,6,21 32:2,25 detail [1] 57:17 each [1] 24:15 exempting	
	[1] 10: 8
	[1] 25: 12
court's [1] 36:21 difference [3] 8:19 9:10 easily [1] 69:25 exempts [1]	52: 25
covered [1] 50:12 30:21 economic [2] 8:7 22:21 exercised [1]	[2] 28: 21 44: 21
covering [1] 8:25 different [23] 17:6 26:9,21, edwin [1] 32:22 existence [1] 59: 9
create [1] 24:15 22 27:25 28:6,15,16 29:25, effect [10] 18:20,22 28:3 existing [1]	38: 7
created [3] 23:14 26:21,23 25 42:18,21 46:19 47:22 34:17 37:3,8 57:24 61:11 expanded	
creating [1] 23:7 48:5 53:6 56:20 60:18 61:7 66:17 70:17 expectation	
criminal [1] 10:14 65:24 66:1,5 68:3 effectively [3] 15:21 68:2, explain [1] 1	3: 5
critical [1] 41:16 differently [2] 29:7 31:23 3 explicit [3] 2	5: 3,10 66: 21
crucial [3] 22:15,17 70:11 differing [1] 27:8 effectuate [1] 32:17 explicitly [1]	
curiae [1] 22:7difficult [1] 61:8effectuating [1] 31:18express [3].	48: 14 64: 9 66:
current [2] 28:9 29:14 direct [1] 38:24 either [4] 36:23 39:5,13 58: 17	
D directed [1] 68:12 18 extend [1] 59	9: 14
directing [1] 9:21 eisewhere [2] 52.12 64. extended [1]	1] 27: 2
day-to-day [1] 46:6 directive [3] 48:18 49:25 20 extensive [1] 28: 20
deal [3] 25:10 63:16 70:10 51:3 embodies [1] 65:9 extensively	y [1] 45: 16
dealing [1] 53:8 directives [1] 48:24 embrace [1] 66:11 extent [4] 50	:17 59: 6,8 60 :
deals [1] 52:7 directly [3] 35:23 41:25 60: empowered [1] 10:10 17	
dealt [1] 57:16 8 enable [1] 37:12 exterritoria	al [1] 70: 2
debate [5] 6:10 20:24 21:3 disclaim [1] 50:22 enabling [2] 6:15 12:1 extra [1] 10:1	15
50:17 53:5 discussed [1] 33:2 enacted [1] 33:5 extraordina	ary [3] 64:3,22
december [1] 14:4 disputes [1] 6:18 enclave [1] 40:7 66:15	
decided [3] 45:10 54:24 distinction [4] 16:23 17:3 enclaves [2] 21:18 40:6 extraterrite	orially [1] 67:
59: 11 18: 5 20: 18 enforceable [1] 28: 24 20	-
decision [3] 11:6 36:21 61: distinguish [2] 14:16 42: engage [1] 7:4 extreme [1]	9: 8
4 18 engineers [1] 12:9	F
decisions [0] 27:23 29:14 distinguishes [2] 16:19 enough [1] 55:22	
31:7,15,17 59:17 17:9 entire [1] 58:9 face [2] 17:4	
	40: 20 42: 1 44 :
	48 :9 50 :22 53 :
defined [6] 15:1 16:2,2 27: doing [2] 19:17 70:18 equally [2] 6:13 8:6 14 58:6 62:12	
1,2 30:19 done [4] 23:19 49:3 56:21 established [4] 38:7 43: fallback [1] 49:3 56:21	
defines [2] 29:11 58:8 69:14 13 44:11 58:4 far [2] 38:13 4	
definitely [1] 16:7 doubt [2] 24:22 26:19 et [1] 33:9 federal [36] 6	
	6 19: 9,11 22:
	1,9,15 26: 4 27:
	29:1 30: 10 31 :
	,12 37: 20 39: 8
delegates [1] 33:16 exact [1] 18:16 47:18 50:15 \$	59: 1 60: 2 61:

17 64: 4 66: 2 67: 15 68: 8	15 68: 17	16 32: 12	17,19 66: 6 70: 13
federalism [3] 10:21,23	gives [3] 46:5 47:15 63:10	hope [1] 61:6	instance [2] 36:8 61:19
11 :14	giving ^[8] 24:20 27:13 28:2	house [1] 18:24	instances [1] 46:15
federally [1] 48:13	30 :19 37 :10 41 :19 42 :14	houses [1] 39: 9	instead [1] 22:18
feel ^[3] 69:11,13,14	66: 19	hovercraft [6] 35:3 36:25	integrity [1] 58:12
feels [1] 54:9	goal [1] 8:9	37: 6,15 46: 7,10	intended [3] 17:17 23:1
few [1] 39:9	gorsuch ^[18] 33:23,25 34:	huge [1] 63:16	30: 3
filling [1] 45:17	3 35: 10,13,19,24 36: 13,15,	hunt [1] 65:11	intent [5] 27:8 28:3,16 29:
findley ^[37] 7:1,7,16,19,25	22 37: 14,18,23 43: 15,18 44:	hunting [1] 65:12	10,23
8 :17,22 9 :15 10 :12,20 11 :2	1,8,16		inter [1] 15:2
12: 11,15,21 13: 6,14,18 14:	got [3] 38:17 41:6 56:6		interest [4] 44:14 68:7,10,
1,9 15: 8,14,25 16: 7 17: 7,23	governed [1] 67:6	identified [1] 57:25	11
18: 9 19: 23 20: 6,11 21: 12,	government [21] 9:13,15	identifies [1] 58:11	interests [4] 15:2 38:6 41:
22 22: 1 66: 24 67: 1,3,23 68:	24: 21 25: 1,1,7 29: 1 30: 10,	identify [4] 24:16 33:1 42:	1 68: 8
23	19 34: 23 43: 20 47: 9,18 50:	13 59: 17	interfere [1] 44:25
fine [3] 12:8,9,10	16 56 :1 57 :17 59 :1 60 :2 64 :	identifying [1] 53:11	interior [1] 59:16
finish [4] 32:11 41:13 61:	4 66: 2 67 :16	iii [1] 59 :8	interpret [1] 27:9
20 67: 7	government's [6] 25:9	illuminate [1] 54:4	interpreted [1] 29:7
first [9] 6:17 11:5 13:7 15:9	29: 13 30: 5 35: 1 68: 8,16	imagine [2] 21:15 39:6	interpreting [1] 11:3
24 :9 33 :5 36 :7 49 :20 54 :5	grant [1] 61:23	impact [1] 35: 3	interrupt [1] 63:16
fishing [2] 32:9 58:20	grasping [1] 40:11	impede [1] 9:22	introduced [1] 18:24
five [1] 66:24	gray ^[1] 13:2	impermissible [1] 42:14	invoke [1] 38:19
focus [1] 66:7	great [2] 10:6 28:11	implementing [1] 61:9	invoked [1] 6:1
foregoing [1] 38:8	groceries [1] 10:2	implicated [1] 11:4	involved [2] 57:3 65:6
forget [1] 21:19	groups [1] 51:22	implied [1] 57: 15	involving [1] 44:23
forgot [1] 67:7	guard [5] 10:13 12:8 14:18	importance [2] 61:17 66:	islands [1] 23:14
foundational ^[2] 67:14	17 :11 33 :17	1	isn't [3] 30:4 52:8 55:24
69:7	guess ^[5] 17:4,24 19:18 36:	important [7] 6:11,13 8:6	issue [9] 14:2 18:17 26:9
frankly [1] 59:9	23 64: 21	20: 20 33: 3 52: 6 64: 19	28: 11 29: 5 33: 4,10 42: 21
friend [1] 70:13		imposes [1] 7:23	43: 11
front [1] 67:13	<u> </u>	inadvertently [1] 17:15	issued [2] 49:24 51:2
fulfill [4] 6:9 24:11 25:2 37:	half [1] 18:25	inapplicable [1] 40:19	issues [4] 11:7 21:1,2 52:
12	hallmark [2] 11:13,14	incapable [1] 64:15	16
fulfills [1] 27:17	happens [1] 12:1	include [4] 11:24 15:1 16:	issuing [1] 18:16
full ^[3] 61:11 63:18,19	hard [2] 27:21 40:11	3 54: 15	itself [5] 9:2 34:5 35:21 37:
fully [1] 10:10	hardly [1] 56:9	included [4] 6:14 15:11	16 65 :9
function [1] 14:15	hear ^[1] 38:21	49: 12 51: 24	
	heard [4] 37:15,24 43:19	includes [3] 38:12 41:25	J
G	69: 18	64: 2	john [10] 27:23 31:7 59:8,
gave [1] 28:25	help [1] 36:23	including [3] 41:20 58:10	17 60: 25 61: 3,9,11,16 65: 7
general [11] 33:5,6,14 35:	helpful [2] 9:25 56:6	65: 13	john's [1] 60:11
9 38 :11 41 :18,24 48 :8 56 :2	hereinafter [1] 27:2	incorrect [1] 61:4	jones [1] 39:10
62: 18 64: 1	hesitate [1] 47:14	indeed [1] 70:25	jurisdiction [6] 23:13,22
generally [1] 17:9	highway [1] 10:7	indication [2] 63:6,22	24: 21 26: 18 27: 3,11
geographical [1] 59:24	highways [1] 10:4	inevitably [1] 24:5	jurisdictional [1] 26:22
gets [1] 24:9	hindsight [1] 20:14	inholders [1] 54:18	justice's [1] 60:21
give [5] 27:25 38:24 47:11	history [2] 43:5 51:20	inholding [2] 55:9,15	justify ^[2] 45:12 69:21
55: 25 70: 17	honor [9] 8:23 10:12 24:23	inholdings [10] 24:2 42:	·
given [5] 25:3 30:25 32:11,	25 :13 26 :11 28 :2 30 :23 31 :	20 50 :19 56 :17 62 :5,7 65 :	K
J			

	01	icial	
kagan ^[18] 9:9 10:19,21 14:	22: 4 46: 13 56: 12 57: 11	map [1] 19:3	ms [22] 22:5,8 23:11 24:6
20,23 16: 9,13,14,15 17: 22,	law [2] 28:20 29:14	maps [5] 52:7 53:9,11,13	25: 13,20,24 26: 3,10 28: 2
24 19: 13,25 20: 8 39: 2 51: 6,	layer ^[2] 10:15 12:12	54: 4	29: 9,16,19 30: 3,8,13,23 31:
8 52: 14	least [3] 56:7 61:16 68:20	matrix [1] 19:8	4,8,13,16 32: 14
katie [13] 27:23 29:14 31:7	leave [1] 29:6	matter [2] 52:22 56:20	much [3] 19:17 21:6 25:6
59: 8,17 60: 11,24,25 61: 3,9,	left [2] 22:18 36:16	matters [1] 68:23	multiple [1] 6:18
11,16 65: 7	legislation [1] 28:5	matthew [1] 67:1	must [4] 39:23 40:4,5 56:
kavanaugh [8] 31:3,6,11,	legislative [2] 43:5 51:20	mean ^[28] 6:24 15:23 16:2	23
14 62: 25 63: 3,11,15	lever [1] 46:5	17: 19 19: 20,22,22,25 20: 6	myriad [1] 17:16
keep [1] 20:20	life [1] 64:20	21 :13,18 23 :19,25 27 :9 29 :	<u> </u>
kind [4] 13:22 40:5 52:20	light [1] 59: 16	24 36 :7 40 :4 45 :9 46 :11 54 :	
57: 20	limit [1] 44:9	2,20 61: 3,6 63: 8,9 64: 19	named [1] 25:23
kneedler [72] 32:21,22,24	limited [4] 25:14 31:1,18	68: 1,12	names [1] 26:12
33: 23,24 34: 2 35: 6,12,16,	66: 8	meaning [9] 18:4,10,14 20:	national [23] 12:3 26:21,
22 36: 6,14,17 37: 5,17,19,	limiting [1] 69:23	13 27: 25 29: 25 35: 4 42: 15,	25 33 :18 39 :24 40 :1 43 :25
24 38: 18 40: 16 41: 7,12,15	limits [2] 59:24,25	16	46: 25 48: 19,21 50: 1 58: 7,
42: 7,17 43: 15,16,23 44: 7,	linchpin [1] 67:14	meaningful [1] 31:4	14,15 60: 6,10,16 61: 25 62:
10,18 45: 3,6,14,20 46: 8,14	lists [1] 38:9	meaningless [1] 40:4	23 65: 12,18 66: 14,15
47: 3,14,22 48: 4 49: 1,3,8,10,		means ^[8] 15:5 16:3 20:3,5	native [18] 13:10 14:5 19:4
15,19 50: 5,21 51: 7,9,18 52:	living [2] 30:16 32:7	39: 13 46: 24,25 51: 10	21 :1 23 :15 25 :18 27 :18 42 :
15 53: 3 54: 19 56: 10,13 57:	local [1] 27:19	member [1] 63:7	24 43: 7 51: 22 54: 6,12,22,
2,6,10,22 58: 22 59: 2,5,21	located [2] 33:12 35:18	mentioned [12] 26:24 31:	22,23 70: 1,7,12
60: 5,21 61: 5 63: 2,8,13,21	location [1] 59:10	13 33: 24 41: 21 46: 21 49:	natives [1] 50:14
65: 3	logic [1] 30:22	24 56: 21 60: 8 62: 14 63: 23	navigability [1] 23:21
knowledge [1] 61:11	long [1] 29: 22	65: 8 68: 15	navigable [38] 6:23 7:16 8:
kuskokwim [1] 9:24	look [8] 11:17 17:19 18:22	merely [1] 19:11	1 11: 6,9 15: 7 16: 5 22: 25
	19: 15 20: 3 26: 20 29: 22 58:	met [1] 8: 9	26: 3,8 33: 17 36: 11 41: 5,20
	2	methods [1] 46:20	42 :1 43 :10,16,25 44 :23 45 :
lake [1] 12:2	looking [2] 69:17,19	midst [1] 64:11	16,19 47: 12,19 48: 2,14 59:
lakes [3] 8:11 58:10 64:10	lot [4] 10:24 13:2 53:5,10	might [10] 25:12 32:5 34:	4 60: 15 63: 5,20 64: 6,7,7,16
land [37] 6:11,13,18 8:10,	loud [1] 37:7	16 53: 13 56: 2,2,4 60: 17 62:	65: 5 66: 3 68: 4,4,21
25 13 :8,9,10 18 :18 19 :5 20 :	Μ	6 63: 9	navigational [4] 44:12 45:
16,16 23: 15 24: 3,17 40: 22		million ^[3] 8:10,13 70:19	9 46: 2 47: 7
42: 19 43: 8 44: 5 48: 6 49: 7,	made [4] 27:17 56:17 62:	mind [2] 20:21 39:3	necessarily [3] 11:4 35:
7,7 50: 10,11 51: 23 52: 18,	18 70: 13	minimize [1] 54: 3	20 61:3
19,22 54: 25 67: 17,20 70: 1,	main [1] 31:24	mining [1] 48: 21	necessary [2] 57:19 69:
6,12,20,20	major [1] 52:9	minutes [2] 66:24 69:8	
landholders [1] 50:15	manage [3] 7:10,11 27:7	mission [3] 24:11 25:14	need [13] 14: 2 30: 8 39: 18,
landowners [2] 24:17 25:	managed [1] 6:2	26: 14	18,20 51: 13,17 52: 20,23,24
	management [10] 14:17	mixed [2] 23:13,22	54:9 55: 16 70: 17
language [10] 15:18 16:18,		modified [1] 67:9	needs [6] 8:7 12:23 18:9,
21 19 :19,21 20 :2,4,11 23 :3	8,15 28: 9 31: 9	modifying [1] 6:5	20 22 :21 29 :4
26: 22	manages [1] 6:22	moment [1] 35:25	never [1] 61:23
large [6] 20:24 21:3 23:21	mandate [1] 10:3	montana [2] 15:17 23:20	new [1] 19: 10
43 :8 51 :23 66 :6	mandated [1] 24:7	monument [1] 66:14	nexus [1] 34 :24
last [1] 11:25	mandates [1] 23:20	most [5] 12:22 22:11 40:20	nice [1] 13:23
last-minute [1] 18:23	manipulate [1] 19:21	65: 11,13	ninth [1] 59:7
later [1] 69:8	many ^[5] 6:5 22:14 25:2,22	mostly [1] 39 :8	nobody [1] 15:6
laughter [6] 12:14 21:25	62: 11		non [1] 42: 19

	Uff	icial	
none [1] 21: 12	17 :16 21 :23 25 :12 31 :24	19: 7 20: 23 24: 8 26: 21 38: 9,	20 41: 15,17 46: 11,12 66: 21
non-navigable [4] 7:11	33: 11 34: 7,20,25 38: 11,22	16 43: 25 45: 15 48: 1 53: 11	pointed [1] 47:8
36: 6,18,20	41: 21 43: 4,6,10 47: 8 48: 16,	58:14 60:11,16 61:25 62:	points [1] 65:8
non-public [13] 13:8 14:6	20 51: 21 54: 8 55: 24 64: 21	23 63: 10 65: 11,18 66: 4 67:	pollution [1] 45:21
18: 4,7,18 19: 2,16 24: 17 25:	65: 18,21 70: 12	5	portion [4] 7:21 13:12,14,
17 50: 1 51: 10,14 70: 6	others [1] 23:9	part [13] 11:19 13:11,18 14:	22
non-subsistence [1] 31:	otherwise [1] 53:1	12 22: 19 26: 12,13 48: 2 67:	portions [1] 53:19
1	out ^[9] 17:14,25 18:1 29:3	17,23 69: 2,22 70: 6	position [5] 17:8 25:25 26:
nor [1] 63:6	55: 8,22 61: 12 69: 4 70: 6	particular [5] 25:11 56:20	1 27: 22,23
normally [1] 65:18	outer [6] 13:15 35:18,19	59: 9 68: 17,18	possibly [1] 39:17
nothing [3] 9:4 11:21 63:1	42 :22 51 :25 53 :14	particularly [1] 9:23	power [8] 9:17 11:6 20:17
number ^[4] 8:9 30:20 40:	outline [1] 53:14	parts [1] 15 :9	27: 13,14 28: 21 33: 17 60:
16 46: 15	outset [1] 33:1	party ^[3] 28:8 45:24 70:8	17
0	outside [6] 34:15 36:25 37:	pass [4] 7 :9 20 :25 39 :10	ppl ^[3] 15:16 23:19 36:21
	1 45: 15 48: 12 69: 12	42: 12	premise [2] 37:2,2
obligation [2] 25:9,10	over [16] 11:6 21:11 22:17	passage [1] 20:20	prescribe [2] 34:6,19
obligations [3] 7:5 25:4	26: 18 42: 3 43: 21 47: 12,18	passed [3] 7:17 19:1 26:5	preservations [1] 7:22
68: 16	54: 10 63: 4,13,19 64: 25 65:	people ^[5] 22:22 28:12 32:	preserve [7] 8:11 58:7,9,
obviously [3] 50:13 55:4	5 66: 2 70: 19	7 62: 4 63: 17	15 62: 24 66: 15 68: 18
62: 3	overlaps [1] 60:7	perfectly [1] 39:7	preserves [4] 44:13 47:15
odd [1] 54:14	own [6] 26: 8 28: 17,18,19	perhaps [2] 20:14 40:20	65: 12 67: 6
often [2] 64:9 69:15	44: 5 70: 23	period [1] 39 :20	preserving [3] 28:4 43:7
okay [11] 16:15 21:22 35:6,	owned [2] 42:19 48:13	permissible [1] 42:14	64 :9
24 36: 2,13 37: 23 38: 17 39:	owner ^[2] 26:4 54:6	permit [1] 47 :9	press [1] 10:23
22 55: 5,16	ownership [5] 9:2 11:11,	permitted [2] 46:23 65:12	pretty [3] 44:19 46:12 64:
olympic [1] 12:3	12 15: 20 26: 5	person [1] 14:6	22
once [3] 10:17 61:10 69:1	owns ^[2] 43:12 44:24	persuaded [1] 36:1	prevent [3] 67:18 69:16 70
one ^[34] 6 :7 8 :9 13 :24 14 :	ozette [1] 12:3	petition [1] 70:9	4
24 29: 8,11,20 36: 5 38: 8 40:	P	petitioner [3] 22:7 61:7 67:	
15 41: 6,8,9,11,18 42: 20 48:		2	principle [2] 43:14 69:23
13 50: 7 51: 4 55: 20 56: 1,2,	page [1] 33:8	petitioners [1] 61:7	prior [1] 21:11
4 58: 6,8,18 60: 23 61: 21,22	paraphrasing [1] 34:9	petitioner's [1] 33:15	priority [2] 28:5,25
62: 5,13 63: 9 65: 13,25	park [100] 6:5,8,15 7:4,7,23	phrase [1] 69:20	private [16] 13:10 14:6 17:
ones [2] 56:3 62:13	8:20 9:16,17,18,21 10:16	pick [1] 19: 19	1 19: 5 21: 17 23: 14 25: 17
only [28] 7:16 14:12 18:12,	11: 16,20 12: 3,5,7,10,12 13:	picks [1] 62:17	39: 10 45: 24 50: 9,15 52: 19
12 20: 19 22: 14 28: 19 40: 2,	11,13,15 14: 16 16: 19 17: 11,	picnicking [1] 62:2	61: 23 62: 4,5 70: 8
25 43 :12,23,24 46 :23,24 48 :	19 18: 15 19: 12 21: 10,14	piece [1] 40:8	probably [1] 38:21
11 49: 11,17 51: 1,11 52: 17,	22: 15,23 23: 4,8,12,16,24	pieces [1] 13:3	problem [2] 26:8 67:21
24 53: 18,18 55: 12 57: 3 61:	24: 1,11 26: 25 27: 7 30: 24	place [2] 28:19 70:1	prohibit ^[3] 18:15,19 69:8
24 64: 23 66: 8	33: 6,16,18 37: 11,12 38: 16	places [1] 65:13	prohibitive [2] 18: 20,22
open [1] 29:6	39: 12,24 40: 1 41: 4,23 43: 1,	plan [1] 24:15	promises [1] 27:17
operating [1] 37:22	2 46: 25 47: 4,16 48: 8,11,19,	play ^[2] 11:16 20:19	promulgate [1] 70:5
opinion [2] 32:3 59:7	21,22 49: 1 50: 1,16,18,23,	played [1] 29:3	promulgated [1] 18:11
opportunity [1] 22:20	25 52: 4,15,18,19,20,23 54:	please [4] 10:7 22:9 32:25	property [1] 40:8
oral [2] 22:6 32:22	25 56: 17 57: 24,25 60: 3,6	70 :9	proposition [1] 50:23
organic [10] 6:1,2,6 11:3	61: 22,24 62: 3,6,15 63: 4,19	plenary [9] 43:21 44:16,17,	
38 :10 47 :25 67 :7,11,19 69 :	64: 1,5,8,16 66: 9,16 67: 17,	19 47: 12,15 58: 25 63: 4,9	protecting [1] 70:22
4	18 69: 3,6,9 70: 4	point [9] 10:8 19:14,14 38:	protection [3] 54:16 58:
other [27] 9:11 10:14 13:24	parks [23] 6:1 10:20 11:24		

	Off	icial	
12 70: 21	rather [1] 21:20	6,23 66: 18,20 67: 19 69: 4,	reserves [1] 25:8
protects [5] 8:17 26:15,15,	rationale [1] 65:7	12	reserving [1] 27:13
16 70: 25	reach [4] 14:2 23:16 69:4	regulated [2] 8:14 14:13	residents [1] 28:13
prove ^[1] 34:24	70: 6	regulates [4] 45:15,15,18	resolve [3] 24:4,19 29:5
providing [1] 22:20	reaches [1] 45:12	61: 24	resolved [1] 59:15
provision [8] 9:21 28:23	read [10] 12:23 16:21 20:12,	regulating [4] 8:13 51:4	resolving [1] 6:18
33: 22 38: 2,13 54: 21 67: 5,8	13 30: 9 34: 12 37: 8 67: 11,	64: 15 69: 21	resources [2] 11:12 15:20
provisions ^[9] 6:3,5 20:21	12 69: 25	regulation [27] 10:16 12:	respect ^[9] 23:5,8 24:1,3
28:1 33:4 62: 11 65: 16,20,	reading [1] 42:11	13 17: 16 18: 11,16,17 19: 11	38: 15 49: 6 53: 3 64: 24 68:
20	reads [1] 45:24	23 :16 25 :14 37 :10 41 :5 45 :	21
public [57] 7:10,13 8:13 9:	reality [1] 69:10	13 46: 6 48: 13,16 49: 23 50:	respects [1] 40:18
10,12 11: 19,23 14: 11 15: 24	really ^[8] 10:25 15:6 20:9	9,10 52: 16,16 61: 18 62: 13,	respondents [1] 32:23
16: 1,3,17,22,25 17: 1,25 18:	45: 9 48: 5,10 57: 2 66: 6	19 63: 25 70: 2,5,24	restriction [1] 31:5
2,3,6,7,12,13,18 19: 15,16	reason [1] 61:15	regulations [34] 14:10,17,	retained [1] 27:24
24: 16 25: 15 26: 13 27: 25	reasonably [1] 46:24	17 16: 16,19,20,22,24 17: 10,	reverse [1] 42:10
35: 4,5,5 40: 2,6 49: 13,25	reasoning [1] 31:17	12 19: 9 20: 18 21: 7 28: 10	rich [1] 19:8
50: 5,11 51: 12,16 52: 17,18,	reasons [5] 27:12 31:23	31: 9 33: 11 34: 6,20 42: 12	rights [10] 11:18 23:6 25:8
22 53: 18 55: 11,13,22 56: 16	32: 10,15 62: 6	47: 8,24 48: 8,11,22 49: 24	31 :20 46 :3 57 :15 58 :2 59 :
61 :13 62 :8 66 :10 67 :16 68 :	rebuttal [3] 38:22 39:6 67:	50: 3 51: 2,11,15 52: 11 56:	22 60: 10,14
11 69: 2,12 70: 20,24	1	15 57: 23 61: 9 66: 10	rigorous [1] 21:6
published [1] 53:11	recall [1] 53:7	regulatory [5] 21:10 37:	rings [1] 11:9
purchase [1] 55:1	recognize [1] 52 :6	11 42: 3 59: 25 60: 17	river [18] 8:12,18,21 9:1,11,
pure [1] 27: 15	recognized [7] 6:4,16 8:5	reject [1] 22:23	12,14,24 23: 10 24: 1 36: 9,
purpose [14] 28:18 30:7,	11: 5 21: 4 44: 20,22	relate [1] 34:21	20 39: 21 40 :7 45 :11 58 :9
16 31 :18 37 :10 39 :23 51 :	recognizes [1] 9:2	related [4] 14:25 21:2 44:4	62: 23 63: 2
19 57: 18,19 58: 5 62: 8,22	record [1] 37:15	69: 21	rivers [28] 7:22 8:23 9:2,3,
64: 8,9	refer [2] 62:12 67:10	relates [2] 40:2 44:2	22 10: 8 22: 13,17 25: 3,11,
purposes [10] 7:8 8:6 31:	reference [1] 50: 2	relating [7] 21:1 33:12 34:	22 26: 2,3,12 30: 6,11,20 32:
1,21 32: 18 37: 12 39: 17 58:	references [2] 30:5 70:16	8,14 36: 2 39: 15 69: 24	8 58: 7 62: 22 63: 5,20 64: 10
3,9,17	referred [1] 60:24	rely [1] 36:2	65: 1 68: 12,13 70: 15,16
pursuant [6] 48:14,17,23	referring [1] 15:4	relying [3] 60:12,13 69:20	river's [1] 66:14
49: 24 51: 3 56: 22	refers [5] 15:4 40:21,22 43:		road [1] 59:13
put ^[2] 10:5 13:3	6 58: 18	repeatedly [1] 68:15	roads [3] 9:24 22:14 70:15
putting [2] 8:10 63:8	reflect [1] 28:16	representative [1] 18:25	roberts [31] 10:9 12:6 16:
Q	reflected [1] 30:17	representatives [1] 63:	14 21: 9 22: 2,5 23: 2,23 32:
qualify [2] 35:14,14	reflects [1] 28:11	18	13,19 45: 2,4,8,18,22 46: 9
question [28] 6:8,21 13:23	refrain [1] 11:9	reproduced [1] 33:7	48: 25 49: 2,5,9,11,17 50: 4,6
14: 25 21: 14 24: 9,25 33: 19,	refuge [1] 9:20	require [2] 28:4,6	53: 20 54: 1 56: 25 57: 5,8 64:
21 34 :1 35 :8 39 :2,3 42 :10	reg ^[8] 21:15 39:11,11,14,	required [2] 46:17 53:9	18 66: 22
43 :19 45 :19 53 :24 55 :4,4	14,25 55: 8,13	requires [2] 22:10 62:20	rule [4] 11:15 40:1 57:24
57: 9,14 60: 22,24,25 65: 4,6	regardless [1] 39:21	requiring [1] 46:19	61 :2
69: 7,18	regs [1] 55:14	reservation [1] 57:18	running [1] 9:14
questions [1] 21:23	regular [1] 50:25	reservations [1] 58:18	runs [2] 36:9 61:13
quite [2] 9:7 17:4	regulate [30] 7:8 9:13 10:	reserve [3] 11:18 21:19,23	rural [2] 28:4,12
·	10 26: 14 29: 1 30: 11,12,25	reserved [16] 21:20 23:5	ruth [1] 22:6
R	33 :17 34 :13 41 :20,23 44 :	25 :16 31 :20 46 :3 57 :15 58 :	S
raise [1] 11:7	14 45 :1 46 :23,24 47 :1,9 48 :	2,17,24,25 59: 10,13,21 60:	same [8] 16:2 25:8 26:17
rarely [1] 68:5	18 56: 1 59: 3 60: 3 62: 15 64:	2,9,13	27 :9 28 :1 29 :12 50 :24 60 :
-			21.0 20.1 20.12 30.24 00.

	Official			
25	16,18,18,21 10: 16 12: 8,10,	somehow [1] 33:20	status [1] 19:4	
satisfaction [1] 22:20	12 16: 19 17: 19 18: 16 21:	someone [1] 68:5	statute [50] 6:16 12:1,2,25	
satisfied [1] 60:12	10,15 23: 8,24 24: 1,11 27: 7	sorry [6] 14:23 16:12 25:19	13: 3 17: 14 18: 23 20: 13,25	
saying [17] 7:21 10:25 11:	30: 24 33: 16 37: 11 43: 1,2	57: 10 63: 15 69: 17	25: 7,23 27: 15,16,16 28: 18	
22 18 :2 20 :5 25 :5 26 :13 42 :	46: 25 47: 16 48: 8,12,22 49:	sort [3] 23:7 46:6 55:6	29: 16,19,24 30: 17 31: 24	
16 47: 6,24 50: 8,22 51: 9,17	1 50: 16,18,23,25 52: 4,16	sorts [4] 42:11 45:23 68:14,	32: 18 33: 5 34: 12,18 35: 9,	
54: 3,17 67: 5	55: 1 56: 18 57: 24,25 60: 3	15	15 38: 5 39: 11,17 41: 21 42:	
says [21] 14:3 21:15 27:6	61: 22,24 62: 3,6,15 63: 4,19	sotomayor [31] 6:20 7:2,	11 48: 19 51: 13,16,17,19 52:	
28: 23 33: 8 34: 6,18,19 38: 5,	64: 5 66: 9,16 67: 18 69: 3,6,	13,18,20 8: 15,19 9: 7 16: 11	23,25,25 53: 6,9 55: 16 60: 7	
23 39: 11,21,25 41: 22 52: 17	9 70: 5	24: 10,24 25: 19,21,25 26: 7	64: 13 65: 24 66: 18,19 67: 8,	
53: 15 54: 5,25 63: 3,24 67: 8	service's [7] 6:6 11:16 22:	27: 21 29: 8,11,17 30: 2,4,12,	13 68: 11	
scenic [7] 8:20,23 9:1,3 58:		15 42: 5,9 47: 2,5,21,23 67:	statutes [4] 29:22 33:2 38:	
13 62: 22 68: 13	servitude [4] 44:12 45:9	21,25	22 55: 25	
scope [1] 47:17	46: 2 47: 8	sotomayor's [1] 43:19	statutory [16] 7:5 24:11	
second [12] 12:21,21,22	set [2] 43:3 64:8	sovereign [2] 27:13,14	25: 2,14 26: 14 28: 6 30: 19,	
13: 4 14: 3 15: 3 18: 13 38: 1	sets [1] 48:11	sovereignty [2] 11:8,13	24 38: 2 48: 15,17,24 49: 25	
40: 18,21 41: 3 49: 22	settled [1] 28:14	space [1] 29: 6	51: 3 56: 22 68: 16	
secretary [13] 33: 9 34: 6,	settlement [2] 21:1 27:18	special [4] 32: 1 52: 23,25,	still ^[2] 9:12 10:14	
13 38: 5,18,24 41: 19,22 44:	several [2] 40:17 67:4	25	story [1] 35:2	
21 46: 17,22 54: 7,9	shall [6] 6:2 14:9 27:2 38:5	specific [11] 8:1 9:20 10:3	streams [3] 8:11 58:10 64:	
secretary's [2] 38:14 42:3	51 :10 67 :6	19: 24 48: 17,23 51: 3 55: 25	10	
section [12] 6:6 11:3 12:	shorthand [1] 14:6	58 :19 62 :18 65 :16	stretch [1] 59:14	
19 17 :20 20 :22 27 :9 31 :1	show [1] 57:17	specifically [18] 6 :5 8 :24	stretches [1] 36:19	
52 :7 53 :8 67 :12 69 :15 70 :3	showing [1] 57:21	12 :4 15 :11 19 :1 25 :22 28 :	strong [2] 15:17 23:3	
sections [2] 29:25 38:8	side [4] 43:6 51:21 63:9 64:	20 33: 15 41: 19,22 46: 17	structure [2] 30:17,18	
See [5] 30 :21 35 :2 38 :25 40 :		58: 8 61: 10 62: 12,14 63: 10,	struggling [1] 20:10	
3 63 :22	sides [3] 9:11 36:10 37:20	24 70 :3	stuff [1] 41 :10	
seems [6] 16:23 17:3 18:5	significant [2] 11:7 70:21	spoke [1] 32: 2	sturgeon's [2] 17:7 35:3	
21: 14 55: 6,18	similar [1] 30 :6	square [1] 39:8	subject [10] 14:10 19:8,10	
seen ^[1] 37:18	similarly [1] 23:17	started [2] 55:8 56:3	21: 6 46: 23 48: 7 51: 11,15	
segment-by-segment ^[1] 23:20	simply [2] 10:15 66:10 since [1] 60:24	state [49] 6: 22,24 7: 10,15 8: 7,25 9: 2 11: 7,13,13 13: 9	59:19 63:25 submerged [23] 7:8,17 9:	
seiberling [1] 18:25	site [1] 9:1	14:5 16: 11 17: 8 19: 4 22: 12,	3 11 :11,23 12 :4 13 :9,9 15 :	
selected [5] 42:23,24 43:9	situation [4] 23:7 32:4,6	15,17,19,21 24: 18 25: 8,16	9,10,18,19 26: 6 32: 16,16	
51: 24 54: 22	66:8	26: 2,4,5,17 29: 2 31: 14 40:	40: 24,25 44: 13,24 47: 11	
selections [1] 48:7	size [1] 22:13	23,25 42: 2,23 43: 12 44: 24	65 :1 69 :1 70 :23	
self-sufficiency [1] 27:	slam-dunk [1] 13:24	45: 23 49: 20 50: 10,14 51:	subsection [2] 52:6 53:15	
19	slip [1] 60:23	23 54: 5,12,22 61: 8 65: 2 70:	subsistence [10] 28:4,9,	
sell [1] 54:25	smith [2] 39:9,13	7,13,14,23	10,25 30 :15 31 :9 60 :11 61 :	
sense [1] 25:6	smith's [3] 55:9,15,21	statehood [5] 7:10,19 15:	19 62: 20 65: 21	
sentence [22] 12:18,22,23	social [1] 22:21	14 21 :2 27 :18	substantive [2] 52:9,11	
13: 4,7 14: 3 15: 3 18: 9,13,	sole [3] 24:20 27:3,10	statement [6] 11:15,22 27:		
19 32 :12 39 :18,23 40 :18,21	solely ^[22] 14: 10,16 16: 17,	5 28 :18 30 :7 66 :17	suggested [2] 15:17 16:	
41: 3 50: 13 54: 2,4,11,14 61:	22,24 17: 8,13,25 18: 1,2,6	states [9] 16:4,5 27:4 31:	18	
21	20: 16,16,17 39: 4,14 45: 25	24 32 :11,15 40 :9 42 :20 68 :	suggesting [1] 20:3	
sentences [2] 12:24 20:	50: 3,10 51: 15 55: 10 56: 15	24	summarize [1] 47:5	
12	solicitude [1] 32:1	state's [5] 11:6,10,23 49:6	supplemented [1] 38:10	
service [59] 6:9 7:4,7,23 9:	solid [2] 48:17 49:7	68 :9	supporting [1] 22:7	

	01	icial	
supposed [4] 10:16 12:15	together [3] 13:3 24:15 67:	14: 13 21: 5 35: 21 36: 1,3 37:	49: 12,18,19,19 55: 21 56: 1
25: 1 52: 10	11	1,4,16 62: 21 63: 6 67: 24 69:	57: 15,19 58: 2,4,16,19 59:
surely [1] 37:22	took ^[2] 20:24 55:20	22 70: 2,7	10,13,21 60: 1,9,13 62: 12,
surround ^[2] 10:4 19:7	tool [1] 24:8	united [6] 16:4,4 27:4 40:9	13 63: 14 68: 1 69: 21,21,24
surrounded [4] 10:18 13:	top [1] 12:16	42: 20 68: 24	water-centric [1] 64:13
15 19: 12 22: 14	touch [1] 18:18	units [21] 6:12,14 14:11 19:	waters [73] 6:23,24 7:9,11,
system [25] 6:12,14 10:6	tourists [1] 32:5	3 33: 13 34: 8,14,15,16,22	12,14,14,16 8: 1 10: 11,17
21: 5 33: 13,18 34: 8,14,15,	tracts [3] 43:8 51:23 66:6	35: 1,4 37: 1 41: 23 48: 19,20	11: 7,9 13: 10 15: 2,7,22 16:
16,22 35: 1,4 36: 25 37: 1,3,	traffic [1] 46:7	57: 25 58: 3 62: 21 69: 3 70:	5 22: 25 23: 17,22 24: 13 26:
16 38: 16 39: 24 48: 20,21	transfer [1] 15:5	20	9 33: 17 35: 5 36: 7,18 37: 13
60: 6 63: 6 64: 17 66: 12	transportation [2] 32:8	unlike [1] 55:21	38: 6,15 41: 1,2,5,20,20,23
Т	46: 20	unsightly [2] 37:7 46:10	42: 1,1,4 43: 10,16 45: 1,16,
takeover [1] 28:22	treat [1] 50:24	up ^[3] 9:19 13:2 62:17	19 47: 3,13,19 48: 2,14 51: 4
talked [2] 11:25 17:10	treated [2] 52:2,3	upheld [1] 61:15	57: 6 58: 12 59: 4 60: 16 61 :
talks [1] 48:20	treating [1] 31:23	uplands [2] 47:20 48:4	18 63: 24 64: 6,7,7,16,19 65:
technical [1] 18:23	treats [1] 50:25	upset [1] 28:13	5 66: 3,20 68: 4,4,21,25 70:
tells [2] 25:7 54:10	triggered [1] 60:18	upside [1] 64:14	11,16,21,22,25
term [2] 29:24 61:13	trouble [1] 64:23	useful [1] 42:18	watershed [4] 8:2,12,14
terms [4] 7:2 15:15 33:9	true [4] 18:11 23:11 25:22	uses [3] 61:19 62:21 65:22	26: 12
34: 4	48: 10	using ^[2] 32:8 67:18	watersheds [3] 26:15,16,
territorial [2] 7:3 47:10	trump [1] 25:11	usual [1] 43:2	16
texas [1] 22:13	trumps [1] 25:5	V	waterway [2] 44:4,4
themselves [5] 26:18 34:	try [1] 24:18	valid [2] 56:19,23	waterways [6] 22:15 43:
21 41 :2 43 :1 45 :3	trying ^[5] 13:2 20:9 46:11	values [3] 58:13 64:9 65:	21,24,25 44: 2 68: 18
theory [2] 6:22 7:14	54 :3 57 :9	10	way [12] 13:24 16:3 23:19
therefore [3] 39:24 42:2	turn [2] 11:18 64:14	various [1] 10:22	25: 11,20 26: 14 35: 3 50: 24
50:11	turns [1] 61:12	vast [1] 22:12	54: 17 64: 20,20 68: 18
therein [2] 15:3 38:7	twice [1] 22:13	vastly [1] 26:22	ways [1] 55:7
there's [17] 7:13 9:4,20 11:	two [11] 15: 8,9 20: 25 27: 25	versions [1] 53:6	weight [1] 10:25
21 13 :23 24 :22 26 :19 38 :	33 :1 42 :18 48 :16 54 :5 55 :	versus [1] 19:16	whatever [5] 38:23 47:16, 24 50:16 63:9
22 42 :16 59 :12 62 :19,21,25	24 56: 5 68: 7	view [6] 29:14,15 51:9 59:	whatsoever [1] 68:22
65 :16,20 68 :7 69 :22	type [1] 45:13 types [1] 42:18	18 69: 8,10	whether [9] 13: 8,21 26: 8
thinking [1] 55:8		views [1] 29:13	33: 19 35: 11,13,14 36: 24
third [3] 54:2,4,11	U	villages [1] 10:1	56: 19
though [3] 14:13 53:22 65:	u.s ^[2] 15 :16 39 :15	violence [1] 27:8	whole [2] 37:13 62:22
	under ^[18] 6:22 7:14 8:14	volume [1] 57:18	wild [6] 8:20,23 9:1,3 62:21
three [7] 12:24 20:12 48:11,	22 :18 26 :5 27 :3 32 :16 33 :9	vote [1] 10: 2	68: 13
23 55:14 56:5,21	35: 14,17 36: 20 42: 10 44:	W	wilderness [2] 22:12 32:6
throughout [3] 11:10 31:	11,11 47: 24,25 63: 25 68: 17		wildlife [1] 9:20
21 61 :14	underscore [1] 62:10	wanted [7] 32:17 38:2,2	will [5] 21:4,7,23 33:10 53:
ties [1] 41:25	understand [8] 14:25 18:	43 :2 52 :3 57 :14 70 :5	19
title [28] 7:9,17 15:5,6,15,	21 19: 13 33: 3 34: 4,11 51: 8	wants [2] 39:6 54:6	win [2] 29:18 68:9
19,21 16: 4,5 24: 12 26: 20	68: 19	waste [1] 48:17	wins [2] 12:19 13:5
28: 5,17,17 31: 19 39: 15 40:	understanding [4] 6:9,10	water [53] 11:18 15:2,15	within [54] 6:14,18 11:12
9 42: 6 64: 24 65: 1,4,5 67:	22: 10,11	16: 3 23: 6,19 26: 18 31: 20	13: 21 14: 11 15: 11,21 19: 3
16 68: 1,5,20,24,25	undoes [1] 9:5	33: 12 34: 8,13,14,15,16,21,	21: 16,18 23: 12 27: 6 30: 20
titles [1] 28:15	uniqueness [1] 32:2	25 35: 4 37: 3,9,21 41: 9 43:	33: 13 34: 8,15,25 35: 4,9,17,
today [2] 28:14 29:5	unit [18] 10:6 13:19,21,22	20 44: 23 45: 6,13,20 46: 1,3	

18,19,21 **36:**1,11,18 **37:**3, 16 **39**:12,25 **40**:6 **42**:22 **43**: 25 **46**:16 **47**:4 **48**:18,20 **50**: 1,2 **51:**25,25 **52:**17,19,19 **56:**17 **60:**6,10,16 **61:**18 **62:** 23 63:5 64:16,16 70:1 without [3] 20:21 40:3 66: 16 wondering [2] 10:24 36: 24 word [4] 14:15 17:13 18:1 39:4 words [6] 9:11 19:24 30: 18,18 38:11 54:8 work [8] 7:24,25 12:22 24: 14,17 **37:**2 **49:**14 **52:**9 working [1] 32:7 works [1] 49:6 worth [1] 56:9 write [1] 54:16 written [1] 20:15 wyoming [1] 27:15 Υ year [1] 18:25 years [1] 20:25 yellowstone [6] 21:16,17, 18 **26:**23,25 **39:**7 **yosemite** [2] **55:**9,10 yukon [1] 9:24 yukon-charley [5] 8:2,4, 9 58:7 66:13 yukon-kuskokwim [1] 9: 19