## Uldaho Law **Digital Commons** @ **Uldaho Law**

Hedden-Nicely Collection, All

Hedden-Nicely

3-16-1981

#### Trial Transcript, Vol. 26, Morning Session

Frontier Reporting Service

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.law.uidaho.edu/all

#### Recommended Citation

Frontier Reporting Service, "Trial Transcript, Vol. 26, Morning Session" (1981). *Hedden-Nicely Collection, All.* 165. https://digitalcommons.law.uidaho.edu/all/165

This Transcript is brought to you for free and open access by the Hedden-Nicely at Digital Commons @ UIdaho Law. It has been accepted for inclusion in Hedden-Nicely Collection, All by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ UIdaho Law. For more information, please contact annablaine@uidaho.edu.

case # 4993

File # 133

1	IN THE DISTRICT COURT FOR THE FIFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT		
2	WASHAKIE COUNTY, STATE OF WYOMING		
3			
4	IN RE:		
5 6 7	THE GENERAL ADJUDICATION )  WOFIRIGHTS TO USE WATER )  IN THE BIG HORN RIVER )  SYSTEM AND ALL OTHER )  SOURCES, STATE OF )  WYOMING, )		
9	BEFORE: The Honorable TENO RONCALIO, Special Master		
11	Presiding.		
12	VILED		
- "	3/27 198/		
13	Margaret V. Howater CLERK		
14	DEPUTY		
15	VOLUME 26		
16	Morning Session		
17			
18			
19	BE IT REMEMBERED that on this 16th day of March,		
20	1981, at Room 302, State Capitol Building, Chevenne, Laramie		
21	County, Wyoming, the above-entitled matter resumed for trial		
22	before the Honorable Teno Roncalio, Special Master, Presid-		
23	ing, whereupon the following proceedings were had, to wit:		
24	PROCEEDINGS: ORIGINAL		
25	PROCEEDINGS:		

409 WEST 24TH STREET CHEYENNE, WY 82001 13071 635 8280

to the first the same transfer commences which are also the same and the same the same transfer than the same tran

PRONTIER REPORTING SERVICE

201 MIDWEST BUILDING CASPER, Ver 82601 13071 237 1493

1	APPEARANCES		
2			
3	FOR THE STATE OF	MR. MICHAEL D. WHITE	
	WYOMING:	Special Assistant Attorney General	
4		2900 Energy Center One Building	
		717 17th Street	
5		Denver, CO 80202	
6		ALSO: MR. STUART RIFKIN and MR. SCOTT KROB	
		MR. SCOTT KROB	
7	FOR THE UNITED STATES	MS. REGINA SLEATER	
*	OF AMERICA:	Attorney at Law	
8		Land and Natural Resources	
,		Division	
. <b>9</b>		Department of Justice	
		Federal Building	
10		Cheyenne, WY 82002	
44		and	
11		WII.	
.12		MR. TOM ECHOHAWK	
		Attorney at Law	
13		Land and Natural Resources	
		Division	
· 14		Department of Justice	
		1961 Stout Street	
15		Denver, CO 80294	
16	FOR THE SHOSHONE	SONOSKY, CHAMBERS & SACHSE	
16	TRIBE:	200 M. Street, N.W.	
17		Washington, DC 20006	
*'		BY: MR. WILLIAM PERRY	
18		•	
		MA CHARCE DERACTURAN	
19	FOR THE PRIVATE	MR. GEORGE RADOSEVICH Attorney at Law	
,	WATER HOLDERS:	910 15 Street, Suite 866	
20		Denver, CO 80202	
01			
21		MR. MICHAEL McCARTY	
22		Attorney at Law	
44		P.O. Box 589	
23	,	Cody, WY 82414	
24			
	•		

1	THE SPECIAL MASTER: Shall we come to order,
2	ladies and gentlemen? This morning I believe our
3	scheduled order of business is to hear arguments on
4	the motion that was filed by the United States of
5	America last week to take judicial notice, and I believe
6	you will want to begin, Regina.
7	MS. SLEATER: Yes, sir. Before we begin,
8	Your Honor, although we had thought we had proof
9	read this a number of times before we filed, we noticed
10	a couple of discrepancies and errors in transcription
11	of numbers. We have an amended motion to correct
12	those discrepancies. Other than that, the motion is
13	identical.
14	MR. WHITE: Could we have about five or six
15	minutes to look at those changes?
16	THE SPECIAL MASTER: Can't we go throught
17	them in open court?
18	MR. WHITE: Okay.
19	THE SPECIAL MASTER: I think we can all do
20	them together.
21	Do you want the motion to take judicial
22	notice, withdrawn, that was filed last week and substitute
23	this in its place?
24	MS. SLEATER: That will be fine, Your Honor,
25	but I don't really know that it is necessary.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: It is done, thank you.

Okay, Reginal

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

0

570

MS. SLEATER: As Your Honor remembers, the summer, starting last fall, I believe the State Of Wyoming introduced into evidence various Certificates of Appropriation relating to adjudicated water rights within the Big Horn River Basin. Included within those certificates offered in evidence were numerous certificates which applied to land held in trust by the United States for the Tribes and individual Indians on the Wind River Indian Reservation. I'm sure if Your Honor thinks back to Houston Williams' arguments on this point, you'll remember that according to the attorneys for the State of Wyoming, it was the position of the State of Wyoming that if a person has an adjudicated water right that they have a vested water right and that it is good unless some proceedings for abandonment are brought at some point in time, which has not been done. Your Honor will further recall that hearings in June when the United States was going to raise challenges to various adjudicated water rights, all parties including the United States stipulated to the validity of these rights, at least conditionally. The condition being if at some point in time rights were decreed which were earlier than

challenge with due notice after, you know, a period of time to the owners of the rights, those rights could be challenged, but for purposes of the action as it stands now, the State of Wyoming, the United States and the Tribes all stipulated that these rights were valid.

الم الم

have a stipulation that the water rights listed in the United States amended motion to take judicial notice has been stipulated as valid for purposes of this action as of now, which they have been, they are part and parcel of the rights which Wyoming had introduced, and they are adjudicated water rights within the Basin. There's no question then that can be brought up at this time as to the status of those rights. Those rights, if they were just State rights, they would be valid water rights that would be part of a conditional confirmation that Your Honor was so doing without objection by any party.

I might also note that as well as the certificates themselves, there was mention made at the earlier hearings of various background information that related to water rights that were on public record with the State, and there was some suggestion

}-	
	about should those records also be in evidence, and
2	the general agreement was, well, they're public
3	records of the State and as such the Court can take
4	judicial notice of what the Court needs to take
5	notice of. These records consist of
6	. THE SPECIAL MASTER: Are these records you're
7	referring to adjudicated water rights?
8	MS. SLEATER: Yes.
9	THE SPECIAL MASTER: Well, they're already
0	in evidence.
1	MS. SLEATER: Yes, sir.
2	THE SPECIAL MASTER: They're in Master's
3	Number 1.
	MS. SLEATER: Well, sir, there are certain
5	backup materials that are part and parcel of the
6	public records relating to these adjudicated rights
17	which were not, which copies of these pieces of paper
18	have never been given to Your Honor, and I don't
19	think it's necessary to do so. These are the original
20	permit applications that related to the water right,
21	the map that goes with the permit application, the
22	proofs of appropriation which are then filed by a
23	party after water has been applied on the land. To
24	some of the rights there are then a statement made by
	the superintendent, the water district or one of the

commissioners who states that he has examined it, there is with them the Order of Certification which is different than the certificate, which is the finding of the State Board of Control. These orders usually contain a statement of the field findings or any relationships of the water rights in the Basin and they are issued by the State Board of Control before the certificate is sent out to the water rights holder. That's the information we would like you to take judicial notice of, and I think, as a 10 matter of fact and earlier in these proceedings the 11 12 Court has already said it would take judicial notice 13 of whatever information was needed.

and the state of t

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

والميه

These are public records in the State Board of Control and in the State Engineer's offices.

They're available to all parties.

Now, for ease and convenience of everyone,

I think the judicial notice is the appropriate way
to go. If we start copying, it would involve every
piece of information that related to these water
rights and tearing through the State Engineer's office,
and it is a public record regularly kept by a state
entity, and as such, is entitled to judicial notice
under the Wyoming Rules of Evidence. Now, that's the
first part of the motion.

1	And the second part is why do we want you			
2	to take judicial notice of all these things. As you			
3	can recall the United States was quite vociferous			
- 4	in its challenges to the water rights before the			
5	stipulation was entered into. However, there was a			
6	stipulation entered by all parties that any adjudicated			
7	water rights would be treated as talld for purposes			
	of this adjudication.			
	THE SPECIAL MASTER: I don't recall the			
10	word was valid, but whatever the stipulation said it			
11	says.			
12	MS. SLEATER: I think that no one would			
13	object to the confirmation and there would be no			
14	challenges mounted until some later point in time.			
15				
16				
17				
18				
19	* * * *			
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				

1	MS. SLEATER: (Continuing) Besides that,		
2	the fact of adjudication is an official action by the		
3	State of Wyoming. Under the laws of Wyoming that deal		
4	with water, as stated by attorneys for the State of		
5	Wyoming earlier and I would not want to contradict		
6	Mr. Houston Williams on this point to get a water		
7	right, it's a vested right.		
8	Therefore, the State of Wyoming is saying that		
9	for these lands described under these adjudicated rights,		
10	they are entitled to a permanent water right.		
11	That is what we would like the Court the		
12	information the Court would glean from these records		
13	in the Engineer's Office.		
14	THE SPECIAL MASTER: No water right is a		
15	permanent water right, is it?		
16	MS. SLEATER: It's vested until such time as		
17	an abandonment proceedings is brought.		
18	THE SPECIAL MASTER: I would suspect that's		
19	a pretty important condition.		
20	MS. SLEATER: My understanding is we are not		
21	dealing with an abandonment proceedings at this point,		
22	THE SPECIAL MASTER: But you wanted a		
23	conclusion that these were permanent water rights,		
24	and my point is they couldn't be any more permanent		
25	than anything else.		

MS. SLEATER: I overspoke, I think. These records in the State Engineer's Office show that the State of Wyoming considers -- has certified that there was placed upon this land a water delivery system, and this water delivery system was such that the State of Wyoming in its official capacity would grant to the applicant a vested water right subject to the normal conditions of Wyoming law.

This is the information we would like the Court to note. We feel this information in and of itself is sufficient to present a prima facie case that the land covered by these certificates are entitled to a water right in this action.

Now, to be very clear, the United States is not saying anything else about this land. We are saying the State of Wyoming gave this land a vested water right. The State of Wyoming issued official documents which said there were water delivery systems on the land that anyone else in the Big Horn or Wind River Basin who had this set of facts, the State of Wyoming would urge the Court to say -- confirm these rights, these are good water rights.

Therefore, this is a judicial admission by a party.

In fact, it's an extra-judicial admission by a party.

The law of admissions by parties is any statement by a

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

573

party, written or oral, inside or outside the court, may be received in evidence.

It's an exception -- well, one of the treatise writers says it's an exception to the hearsay rule.

Another one says the hearsay rule does not apply because as a party they could always put on evidence of their own such that they would not fall within the hearsay problems of no chance of cross-examination and such as that.

Our main point is that with these lands, if we are held to go through something like what's been going on -- we are held to a standard that far surpasses anyone in the Basin that has an adjudicated water right.

Now, the priority date is not the subject of this motion. This is a legal question that lawyers will be briefing for a long time, and the reason I don't want to get into it -- and there are varying priority dates.

For a large number of these we are going to be claiming the State right with the State date. For another number, the 1868 date. For another group, if they are on land that was like in the Arapahoe Ranch, which was purchased at a later time, we are not claiming the State date. We are claiming the date of purchase

409 WEST 24TH STREET

CHEYENNE, WY 82001

13071 635 8287

**T.** 

of the land.

Anyway, it gets -- each permit has to be treated individually when it comes time to establish priority dates, as Your Honor well knows, as does all the land on the Reservation because the United States' position is if it's something we want sold and then brought back in trust, the latest date we have the land is the date we bought it back, and for the other land that was never sold, the date is 1868. So that all of this is going to have to be broken down later on in the briefing.

What we are dealing with today is what has to be applied to show that the land is entitled to a water right.

The United States' position -- and we think that this is a very valid position based on the law and based on prior statements of the State of Wyoming and prior positions of the State of Wyoming -- is that if the land has an adjudicated water right, the State of Wyoming has already admitted that that land then is entitled to a water right, and we think it establishes a prima facie case as to all parties that such land is entitled to a water right and that that is sufficient proof for these lands and no other proof is necessary at this time until someone would overcome the presumption raised.

"大大大"的特殊,但是有政治,但是不是一个的政治,但是不是

THE SPECIAL MASTER: What other proof, such as arability, irrigability, economic validity, and so on?

MS. SLEATER: That's right, sir. What I'm saying is if these rights weren't held by the United States in trust for the Indians, they would be absolutely good in the State of Wyoming and that it's a violation of due process and the civil rights of the tribes and anything else to say that we have to go through five or six more steps when anyone else in the Basin would have a perfectly good water right at this point in time.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: I didn't think I was requiring you to do that.

MS. SLEATER: Well, Your Honor, we have been trying in this case to put on a fairly cohesive and direct case, and as you've noticed from what's happening on cross -- and I'm not saying that the State is not entitled to do this -- we are being held to a much more stringent proof than was being suggested for the holders of adjudicated rights, and all I'm saying is, "Okay, for the land we have adjudicated rights for, let's go back to the standard that everybody else used."

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Well, I think I have been fair in trying to use the same standard and grant the legal rights that each side has to examine with precision

23

24

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

	•		
1	and thoroughness the position of the other side,		
2	and that's how we began on these water rights, and		
3	you were very excellent in pursuing it that way with		
4	every minute little detail, and the experts were out		
5	around the ground. Had it not been for the stipulation,		
6	we might have still been on those water rights, so		
7	Mr. White has begun the same way on the Reservation,		
8	He may not continue through every remaining acre		
9	that way, but I can't call down the State or call it		
10	to work a little less thorough on them, but we are making		
11	progress toward a culmination of the lawsuit, and		
12	that!s what counts.		
13	MS. SLEATER: I was not suggesting that what		
14	had gone on was not perfectly proper.		
15	All I was saying is that since these lands have		
16	an adjudicated water right, that they are entitled to		
17	recognition of that fact and recognition of the fact		
18	that the State of Wyoming has said that if the land		
19	has an adjudicated water right, that's the best right,		
20	and that, in and of itself, establishes a prima facie		
21	case.		
22	You will notice, Your Honor, that		
23	THE SPECIAL MASTER: I understand you.		
24	MS. SLEATER: we listed these by permit		

number rather than by adjudication number because all the

evidence has gone in by permit numbers, and it's my understanding from talking to private counsel that' the common way is to deal with it by permit number, but we could provide adjudication numbers also.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Do you assert now that every acre of these 15,557-1/2 acres are trust lands held by the United States in trust for the Indians?

MS. SLEATER: Yes, sir. With the adjudicated water right covered by trust and fee lands, we omitted, from the acreage figure the fee lands, so the permit number may, in fact — where we list a permit number for 102.4, the permit may cover 150 acres, of which the 47.6 or whatever are fee land and the 102 is trust.

Thank you.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Very well. Thank you.

MR. WHITE: I would like to make two inquiries. The first inquiry may substantially shorten the argument this morning, and that is if the United States relies on these certificates as evidence of the water right associated with these lands and relies on State law for those rights, including the priority date, we have no objection.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: I don't believe Regina said anything about State law in her argument.

MR. WHITE: That's what the certificates are

25

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1	issued under, and I want to find out from the United		
2	States		
3	THE SPECIAL MASTER: We can't keep this from		
4	getting any more complicated than Regina asserts		
5	State water rights, qualifies it to be considered for		
6	a grant of a decree of water rights for this land. She		
7	doesn't say that this should be that way because the		
8	State gave it a permit. She said the fact that it has		
9	a permit, it should be entitled		
10	MR. WHITE: What changes have been made from		
11	the original		
12	THE SPECIAL MASTER: Now, that's a good		
13	question.		
14	MR. WHITE: from the original to the amended		
15	motion? I would like to know.		
16	THE SPECIAL MASTER: My answer is it doesn't		
17	make much difference. She has withdrawn the original		
18	motion and now we have an amended motion, and that may		
19	be unfair because you waived the ten-day notice on		
20	your original, not on the amendment.		
21	MR. WHITE: I have a stack of certificates,		
22	Your Honor, with respect to the original, and I think		
23	I'm entitled to know what the new one is.		
24	THE SPECIAL MASTER: Would you like ten to		
25	fifteen minutes to do that?		

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Mr. White.

MR. WHITE: Your Honor, we've reviewed the amended motion which was submitted today, and there are a large number of additions and changes which we've not had an opportunity to take the time to examine that we ought to. On the other hand, we have some ogeneral evidence and argument that we're ready to proceed with and we might as well get that out of the way as long as we have the time set aside. I think Ms. Sleater agreed we can go back and deal with the details sometime in the future, and we could go ahead and set a date to do that if you like, Your Honor, or we can wait until we get back in session to deal with those. Idd like to go ahead and deal with the general aspects of the motion.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: All right, proceed.

MR. WHITE: Your Honor, in general, while the United States -- Well, the State of Wyoming feels that the motion should not be granted for several reasons. The most important of those reasons is that certification of a water right under Wyoming law has nothing to do with the irrigable nature of the lands covered by that water right. The purpose of the motion, according to the motion, is to show the lands described in those certificates is irrigable, which is,

1	of course, a test for a reserved right, but the State
2	of Wyoming would suggest to the Court that it is not
3	a test for a state awarded water right, and as a
4	result, we would object to judicial notice or these
5	documents being used as evidence because as the
6	Court pointed out, most if not all of them have been
	   =3m1++o3

The use of the facts contained in those certificates, whether by judicial notice or by fact that they've already been admitted to show irrigability is simply inappropriated. And to support our case on that we would at this time call Mr. George Christopulos.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Mr. Christopulos, do you want to be sworn in again? Might just as well.

### GEORGE. CHRISTOPULOS

16

17

18

19

21

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows, to wit:

### DIRECT EXAMINATION

20 BY MR. WHITE:

- MR. WHITE: Sit at the red table, please.
- 22 Q Would you please state your full name.
- 23 A George Christopulos, C-H-R-I-S-T-O-P-U-L-O-S.
- THE SPECIAL MASTER: Mr. Christopulos, when
- 25 christopulos-direct-white

8)

The state of the s

1			
1	the day ever comes we don't have to spell our		
2	names in this hearing, we're doomed.		
3	MR. WHITE: George has learned by long		
4	experience.		
5		THE SPECIAL MASTER: So have I.	
6	Q	(By Mr. White) What is your occupation, Mr.	
7		Christopulos?	
8		I'm the State Engineer of the State of Wyoming.	
9	Q	How long have you been State Engineer?	
10	. <b>A</b>	.I've been State Engineer for slightly more than	
11		six years.	
12	Q	Were you employed by the State Engineer's office	
13		prior to the time you became State Engineer?	
14	A	Yes. I have been in the State Engineer's Office	
15		more than 27 years. I was Deputy State Engineer	
16		for nearly 17 years prior to the time I was	
17		appointed State Engineer.	
18	Q	In addition to your position as State Engineer,	
19		do you hold any position on the Wyoming State	
20		Board of Control?	
21	A	I'm the president of the Board of Control.	
22	Q	And how long have you been president of the	
23		Board of Control?	
24	A For slightly more than six years, since I've been		
25	christopulos-direct-white		

State Engineer. Does the Wyoming Board of Control adjudicate Q state permitted water fights? Yes, it does. Does it issue certificates such as those --A Yes. -- involved in the motion that's before the Court? Yes, they do. Does the certificate constitute evidence of an adjudicated water right? 10 That's correct. A 11 As president of the Board of Control, are you Q 12 familiar with the procedures used by the Board 13 of. Control? 14 15 Yes, I am. A Are you familiar with the issues that are considered 16 by the Board of Control when adjudicating a state 17 water right? 18 A Yes. 19 And that would involve the certification of Q 20 water rights such as is involved in the certificates before the Court this morning? 22 Yes. . A 23 In adjudicating a water right, an irrigation 24 christopulos-direct-white 25

mand and the transfer of the

	<del></del>	`~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
1		water right, does the Board of Control consider
2		the nature of the land involved?
3	A	No.
4	} ·   	THE SPECIAL MASTER: Would you define for
5		me what you mean by nature of land, I don't
6		know what that means.
7		. MR. WHITE: I got that today, Your Honor.
8	Q	(By Mr. White) Does it consider the chemical
9		nature of the parcel of land involved?
10	A	No.
11	Q	Does it consider the physical nature of the
12		parcel of land involved?
13	A	. No.
14	Q	Does it make any determination as to whether
15		or not the land involved can sustain long-term
16		.irrigation?
17	A	.No.
18	Q	Does it make any decision as to whether or not
19		the land involved can be irrigated over a sustained
20		period at reasonable cost?
21	A	No.
22	Q	Does it make any economic determinations?
23	A	. No.
24		MR. WHITE: I have no further questions, Your
25	christopulos-direct-white	

		Honor.
•	<b>.</b>	

5

6

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

17

49

IJ

Ø

W.

MS. SLEATER: Your Honor, I have just a very few.

# CROSS-EXAMINATION

## BY MS. SLEATER:

- Q Isn't it true, Mr. Christopulos, that after a water right is adjudicated, it's treated by the Board of Control and the State Engineer as a vested water right?
- 10 A Yes.

A

- Q Without any of the showings Mr. White has previously mentioned?
  - I think the Board of Control, when they adjudicate a water right, determine that whether or not the lands have been itrigated in terms of permit by field inspection. If it's found that they are in fact being irrigated by that field irrigation, the Board adjudicates. The Board does not look down the line to see whether it will be going out of production five years down the line or ten or twenty because of a physical situation on the ground or any -- whether they go out of production because those economics, because the lands could not produce for that rancher or farmer.

25 christopulos-cross-sleater

201 M.D.M.S.\* B.\* (D.M.S. CACHER - S. 1. 926-31 - 3.27 2.37 1.133

	The risk is all the appropriators, he is the one
2	that determines whether they wish to proceed.
3	The Board decides whether or not in fact the terms
4	of permit have been met in determining whether
5	to adjudicate.
6	Q . And if the Board finds. that the terms of permit
7	have been met, a system is built, then the person,
8	the applicator is
9	A Appropriator.
10	Q The appropriator is given a water right that is
11	good for purposes of Wyoming water management?
12	A Yes. They're issued a Certifidate of Appropriation,
13	which is good until such time as it's challenged,
14	until such time as somebody determines the lands
15	are not being irrigated, and, of course, an
16	abandonment.proceedings could be brought against
17	that appropriation.
18	MS. SLEATER: Thank you.
19	MR. RADOSEVICH: Your Honor, may I just ask
20	Mr. Christopulos a few questions?
21	THE SPECIAL MASTER: Surely.
22	CROSS-EXAMINATION
23	BY MR. RADOSEVICH:
24	Q Mr. Christopulos, are these water rights that are
25	christopulos-cross-sleater
	christopulos-cross-radosevich
	409 WEST 7416 STREET TRONTIER REPORTING SERVICE 201 MONEST BOLDS CHEVES AL WY 82007 CASHA STREET CASHA STREET

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Ø

- l Q How is that priority determined?
- A The priority is established by date.

MS. SLEATER: I object, this is outside both direct and cross.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Objection's overruled.

It may go in. It touches the argument you raised on your argument that some of these may be the date of the application, some may be something else.

. Go. ahead and answer.

THE WITNESS: The priority date is established by the date the application is received in the State Engineer's office, and if a permit is issued, of course, the adjudication dates from the time the application is received and therefore priority date is established under state law for that right.

have to sustain -- I have to overrule that
because there is already in evidence a massive
chart showing virtually every one of these as to
whether it applies as to a ceded portion and an
unceded portion of the Reservation. One of the
hundreds of exhibits in this case clearly points
out a good many of these water rights, and where
christopulos-redirect-white

-

50

they re located, and most of them came in about

1 1905 as I recall, 1906, 1907.

MS. SLEATER: Your Honor, I'd like to point

MS. SLEATER: Your Honor, I'd like to point out that on the aerial photographs and overlays that were introduced by Mr. Billstein, in fact all of these permits are located, that's one of the color codings that's on those exhibits.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Thank you. Go ahead, Mr. White.

- 11 also asked you whether or not an inspection
  12 was made to see whether or not an irrigation
  13 system was built and irrigation actually took
  14 place. Do you recall that question?
- 15 A Yes.

- 16 Q Isn't it true that the inspection determines

  17 only whether or not there's been irrigation once ---
- 18 A Yes.
- 19 Q -- for that parcel of land?
- 20 A Yes. It would determine whether or not actually that land was being irrigated at the time of inspection.
- 23 Of irrigable acreage is that acreage; capable of christopulos-redirect-white

24.68 3-11 sustaining long-term irrigation at reasonable cost, does any decision by the Board of Control and the certification process or does any inspection by your office or the offices of the Board of Control reach the issue of whether or not those lands are irrigable? 6 Not under that definition, it does not. MR. WHITE: Thank you, Your Honor. 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 **20** 21 22 23

24

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

THE SPECIAL MASTER: No further arguments from either side? I'm ready to rule on the motion now.

I'm going to grant this motion to take judicial notice, and I believe it's altogether appropriate that it be granted.

MR. WHITE: Could we have a chance to take a crack at the specifics, Your Honor? I would tell the Court that there are certificates in this list that are outside Water Division 3 that have the wrong listing for the source, have all sorts of problems with them, which we were granted an opportunity to take a look at.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: If the certificate numbered in here is outside Water Division No. 3, obviously we will have no jurisdiction over it and it can be stricken subject to a motion to strike.

If it has other objections, that fall in the category called the clutter in the State Engineer's Office, we are not paying much attention to that. I can't help that if there's an incompleteness.

MR. WHITE: As agreed by counsel and I thought agreed by the Court, I thought we would have an opportunity to speak to the specifics.

MS. SLEATER: I hate to agree with Mr. White here,
Your Honor --

THE SPECIAL MASTER: I know that you do.

24

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

3

**3** 

"一种现在这一个人的人,我们就是一个人的人,我们就是一个人的人,我们就是一个人的人,我们就是一个人的人,这个人的人,这个人的人,这个人的人,这个人的人,这个人

amendment is that we noticed in the typing that there
had been transpositions and some of the additions had
been left out. I think what Mr. White will find when
he reviews the amended motion, the objections he just
mentioned will no longer be appropriate. That's the
reason we filed an amendment.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: You certainly have leave to make further inquiry. I don't propose to enter an order today granting this as to the specifics, but I will grant the motion to take judicial notice of the appropriate and proper State water rights that are on the Reservation. I think I have a duty to do that.

MS. SLEATER: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Mr. Christopolis, we are going to see an awful lot of you in the months ahead.

That's all I had unless the parties had more.

MR. WHITE: All through, Your Honor.

MR. RADOSEVICH: Excuse me, Your Honor, a moment. I would like to make a motion that to the extent that judicial notice has been granted in connection with this motion that judicial notice be taken of all other adjudicated water rights on the Reservation and in the Third Water Division for the

409 WEST 24TH STREET

CHEYENNE, WY #2001

(307) 635-8280

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

purposes of the Court ---

THE SPECIAL MASTER: The adjudicated water rights, Mr. Radosevich, are already in evidence. For one thing, they have already been introduced into evidence in Master's Exhibit No. 1, so there should be no question about that.

This would include all the adjudicated water rights in Riverton -- all of the Reclamation Projects of the Riverton area that sit in that wide area within the Reservation.

MR. RADOSEVICH: Yes, Your Honor, but to the extent that there will be any difference in the judicial notice taken on these rights contained in this motion by the Federal Government, I would like to make a motion that the same judicial notice be taken of other adjudicated water rights as far as their --

THE SPECIAL MASTER: I believe there is no doubt that its appropriate and can be granted because I know of no other person in these proceedings that intends to use the water right for the purpose that the United States is here.

Well, can we proceed to Mr. Billstein, or are you not going to call him until this afternoon?

MR. ECHOHAWK: Your Honor, I anticipated this would take much longer. Mr. Billstein is back at the hotel

CHEYENNE, WY B2001

13071 635-8280

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

 	 <del></del>	-

resting because he didn't feel very well.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: I was hoping we could keep one witness from getting sick.

MR. ECHOHAWK: He did all right until about 10:00 last night.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Should we call him at 1:00?

MR. WHITE: I would like to go ahead, but I recognize the problem they have with Mr. Billstein, and I would not urge the Court to go ahead when you have a witness sick.

and I would ask that when we reconvene -- I might have an opportunity this afternoon to take my father to the doctor sometime during the afternoon.

He's got a badly infected foot, and I have yet to be able to get an exact appointment, and perhaps we could start at 1:30 and start with Ron and I could advise the Court what time I might be able to get an appointment.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: If you want time off this afternoon, arrangements will be given to you without any doubt.

We have nothing we can put on now between now and then?

MR. ECHOHAWK: No, Your Honor.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: All right. I

23

409 WEST 24TH STREET

CHEYENNE, WY 82001 (307) 635 8280

The state of the s

İ	want to take this opportunity to say to all of you that
	I hope that there has been apparent in this lawsuit
	so far a genuine and sincere desire on my part to
	cooperate in every way possible in the presentation of
	your evidence and bringing on everything to be brought
I	forth so we can adjudicate it properly and fairly,
ı	but we are now coming to the area where after this week
<b>,</b>	we are going to try to assess the actual hours of a
)	direct witness' testimony and make a judgment as to
)	what is the proper time for cross-examination of that
ļ	direct testimony because we have to keep moving ahead,
2	and we're going to try and measure it in that term so
3	we can put an end to these proceedings because we
4	simply have to come to a conclusion as early or earlier
5	than that date which we have for that.
5	We are in the toughest and meanest part of it now.
7	We are in the heart of the lawsuit, and I hope that we
В	can finish up with Mr. Billstein, what, Regina, in today
9	and tomorrow?
0	MS. SLEATER: Your Honor, I'm not cross-
1	examining. You had better ask Mr. White.
2	
3	today and tomorrow?
4	<b>}</b>
	right. Your Honor, if we can quickly get the results of

the stipulation between the United States and the State and the tribes with respect to the identification of the tracts. Private counsel didn't get involved in that 4 stipulation, and I don't think they particularly cared 5 about that stipulation, but once we get the results of 6 tract numbers, the numbering effort done, and the 7 identification of the types and acreage in each tract, 8 then it ought to go very quickly, and my present guess is that if everything goes according to schedule, we 10 are looking at around somewhere between Wednesday noon 11 and Thursday noon to be through. 12 THE SPECIAL MASTER: Do you have anybody 13 else you can put on at that time to use up Thursday and 14 Friday? 15 I think we could probably get MR. ECHOHAWK: 16 Mr. Kersich down. 17 THE SPECIAL MASTER: Is he available? 18 MR. ECHOHAWK: He's through in California. 19 THE SPECIAL MASTER: Is he in town now? 20 MR. ECHOHAWK: No, I think he's on the 21 Reservation. 22 All right. We will stand THE SPECIAL MASTER: 23 in recess until 1:30 unless you hear that you can be with 24 your dadeat 1:30. If you will call our office and let 25

4-7	2475
1	me know, we will stay in recess until you can come back,
2	two or three or four o'clock.
3	(Recessed at 10:55 to (reconvene at 1:30.
<b>4</b> 5	
<b>6</b>	
8	
9 10	
11	
12	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20.	
21	
22	
23	-
24	