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

Hedden-Nicely Collection, All

Hedden-Nicely

5-7-1981

Trial Transcript, Vol. 53, 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. 53, Morning Session" (1981). *Hedden-Nicely Collection, All.* 192. https://digitalcommons.law.uidaho.edu/all/192

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.

BOX !!

case # 4993

The same was the same of the s

File # 160

1	IN THE DISTRICT COURT FOR THE FIFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
2	WASHAKIE COUNTY, STATE OF WYOMING
3	
4	IN RE:
5	THE GENERAL ADJUDICATION) SOME OF RIGHTS TO USE WATER)
6	IN THE BIG HORN RIVER) Civil No. 4993 SYSTEM AND ALL OTHER)
7	SOURCES, STATE OF) WYOMING.)
8 ,	
9	FILED
10	5/20 ·198/
11	Margaut V. HamptoniciERK
12	DEFUTY
13	
14 15	VOLUME 53
16	Morning Session
17	Thursday, May 7, 1981
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	ORIGINAL

1	APPEARANCES.	
2		
3	FOR THE STATE	HALL & EVANS
4	OF WYOMING:	2900 Energy Center One Building 717 17th Street
5		Denver, CO 80202 BY: MR. MICHAEL D. WHITE and
6		MR. JAMES MERRILL, Special Assistant Attorneys General
7		and MR. SCOTT KROB
8,	FOR THE UNITED STATES	MR. JAMES CLEAR and MR. JOSEPH MEMBRINO
9	OF AMERICA:	Attorneys at Law Land and Natural Resources Division
10		Department of Justice P.O. Box 7415
11		Benjamin Franklin Station Washington, DC 20044
12		and
13		MR. THOMAS ECHOHAWK
14		Attorney at Law Land and Natural Resources Division
15		Department of Justice 1961 Stout Street
16		Denver, CO 80294
17	FOR THE SHOSHONE TRIBE:	SONOSKY, CHAMBERS & SACHSE 200 M. Street
18		Washington, DC 20006 BY: MR. WILLIAM PERRY
19		•
20	CLERK TO THE SPECIAL MASTER:	MR. LEO SALAZAR Attorney at Law
21		701 Rocky Mountain Plaza Cheyenne, WY 82001
22		, ,, ,,
23		
24		

As Your Honor will recall, during the cross-examination of Mr. Kersich, Wyoming moved to compel production of the land classification standards and reports that HKM

23

24

had developed admittedly by Mr. Kersich, as part of their work for the United States in preparation for reserved rights litigation concerning the Crow Reservation in Montana.

At the time that we made that motion, Your Honor denied the motion, but also stated that you would reconsider the State's Motion to Compel Production of those standards and reports upon "Some closer showing" -- "Showing some closer relationship to the topography, land or other physical features of the two Reservations."

Your Honor's statement appears in the transcript on Page 1725, of the transcript of this case.

The record now contains showings that
the land, the topography and the soils
characteristics between the Wind River and the
Crow Reservations are in fact remarkably
similar. The showing in the record comes
through the testimony of the United States'
own expert witnesses, particularly Mr. Waples,
who, Your Honor, will recall, testified that
he classified roughly forty to 50,000 acres of
land on the Crow Reservation and he has

classified a like amount on the Wind River

Reservation in preparation for this case.

Having done that much work on the two
Reservations, the State cannot but admit
that Mr. Waples is well qualified to discuss
the soils characteristics, the topography
and the land types involved in the two
Reservations.

Now, in their responsive brief, the

United States suggests that the record

contains very little showing of the similarities

between the two Reservations, and I think

that an examination of the record will prove

that in fact the record contains a showing

that there are many similarities.

During my cross-examination -- oh, excuse me, voir dire of Mr. Waples when he was offered as an expert witness, I asked him on Page 3299 of the transcript, "Isn't it true that there are major differences between the land types and soils series on the Crow Reservation and Wind River Indian Reservation?"

After several objections and discussions on the record, Mr. Waples volunteered that There are not only differences between the

499 WEST 24TH STREET

(+4) (44) (44) (44)

13) 75 675 8280

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

22

23

24

25

Reservations, but also similarities. ... which weren't even addressed in the question.

He said, "On the Wind, in the Wind River Basin, there are large terraces, large gravel terraces. On the Crow there are some large gravel terraces. On the Wind there are many sandstone uplands, residual soil types — excuse me, residual type soils. On the Crow there are sandstone derived soils, but many of them are more shale derived than sandstone derived. So admittedly there are some distinctions.

"There are upland soils, which isn't to say that there aren't some sandstone uplands on the Crow because there are."

Later in the same voir dire I asked Mr. Waples to "Characterize some of the major differences between the two Reservations with respect to topography."

Again Mr. Echohawk objected. After we disposed of objections the witness answered, "Both Reservations have a certain amount' -- "Certain mountainous area on them. They have everywhere from, from raw alluvial plains in the lower elevations to sandstone and shale uplands,

and sloping foothills and mountainous regions. Topographically they are not at all that dissimilar." Then the Special Master asked, "Did each have broad alluvial valley floors?" The Witness replied, "Yes, they do." So, with respect to topography of the Reservation, the Witness has testified, Mr. Waples testified that there is everything 10 from alluvial floors to terraces above those floors to sloping upland to mountains, 11 probably on both Reservations. 12 I then asked Mr. Waples to characterize 13 the differences and similarities between the 14 Reservations with respect to drainage, which 15 is as, Your Honor, is well aware, is a major 16 point of concern in this litigation. The 17 question was, "Let's start with the surface 18 drainage characteristics on the Crow and 19 Wind River. Are they similar or dissimilar?" 20 The answer, "Where the topography is 21 similar, they are similar." 22 23 24

25

4-5

4

すぐり ひにっき マすまれ らりだしきき

CHENENIE WY 82001

3 6076 635 9280

4

400

4

ونعدي

4

4

4-3

4-2

-4-3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

MR. MERRILL: And since the witness already testified that there are at least four different major topographical features that occur on both reservations, it's fair to say surface drainage characteristics across the majority of the reservations would be similar.

I asked the witness about the subsurface drainage characteristics such as hydroelectric -the transcript is incorrect, it should be hydraulic conductivity and depth to barrier. The witness replied, "Well, there again, it depends on where you are talking. If you are talking in a gravel terrace of similar type material, they're going to be the same. If you are talking a heavy clay low land along the river and we have the same type of thing in both places on both reservations, they're going to be similar."

So through Mr. Waples's testimony it's fairly clear we are talking about similar land types, very similar topography, a very similar drainage characteristics on the Crow Reservation and Wind River Indian Reservation. There are admittedly distinctions. The reservations are approximately 200 miles apart and there are some distinctions with respect to the soils. The

25

24

409 WEST 24TH STREET

CHEYENNE, WY 82001

(307) 635 8280

that by and large the land types are the same, and where you have the some topography you are going to have roughly the same surface drainage characteristics, and where you have alluvial valley floors and terraces, you are going to have the same subsurface drainage characteristics.

Now, those two particular land forms are important because those are the areas in which HKM has classified the land as arable on the Wind River Indian Reservation. There are other similarities between the work done by HKM to classify land on the Crow Reservation and to classify land on the Wind River Reservation. First is the simple fact that both studies were performed by HKM, the same engineering firm in Billings, Montana. Both studies were performed under contract with the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The purpose of both the studies was to define an arable land base on each reservation from which an irrigable land base or the amount of practicably irrigable acres could be developed.

The ultimate purpose of both studies was

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

5 5 5

4

3-4

9

Q-wi

on which to claim a certain quantity of reserved water rights for general stream adjudication which is going on in Montana precisely like it is here, except it's in a different procedural stage.

There are other physical similarities
between the two reservations. The Crow, like
the Wind River Reservation, lies in the Big
Horn River drainage, and geographically the
Indian Reservation, the closest to the Wind
River Reservation is the Crow Reservation.
So I think it's pretty clear simply from the
facts in the record that the reservations
are remarkably similar and that the land
classification programs were done for the
same purpose by the same people on these
reservations.

The United States in their brief in opposition to our motion to compeliraised a number of remarkable theories as to why they shouldn't be required to produce the land classification standards and reports; they raised the trial preparation argument, this stuff was prepared in anticipation of

trial; they say that the land classification reports somehow contain attorneys' mental impressions; they say it's the work product of attorneys; they claim the attorney-client privilege, and just so that they get everything else in, they claim something called basic fairness, which I've yet to see cited anywhere in the Rules of Civil Procedure concerning whether or not documents are discoverable.

Now, each of these same privileges, absolute privileges, partial privileges, could be claimed with respect to land classification standards in a case where there are no distinctions, except procedurally this case is a little bit further along than the general stream adjudication cases in Montana. The trial preparation presumably would apply to the land classification standards in this case, which the United States turned over to the State of Wyoming in depositions almost a year ago without raising any privilege whatsoever. They claimed that the land classification standards somehow contained attorney's mental impressions and they cite a case called

4-0

409 WEST 24TH STREET

CHEYENNE, WY 82001

(307) 635 6280

Duplan Corporation versus Moulinage et Retorderie de Chavanoz, several French words which I will give the reporter later. But the very first sentence of that opinion demonstrates it's inapplicability to this case, and I will quote the first sentence by a certain Judge Widener, "This case presents the question whether an attorney's opinion work product material developed in prior terminated litagation may properly become the subject of discovery in connection with subsequent litagation," close quotes.

Now, that doesn't apply for several reasons. First of all, the Montana litagation has not been terminated. The Montana litagation is ongoing. It's procedurally not as far advanced, as I have already pointed out. However, that case will more than likely go to trial at some point. I suppose the United States will argue they don't have to produce the land classification standards to the Crow general stream adjuctation and that will be for Montana to decide whether they have to produce them here.

But more interesting is the United States' suggestion that the land classification work done

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

-

1

175

*

fact

impressions. It's as if they're suggesting that the attorneys for the Bureau of Indian Affairs or the Department of Justice have somehow interfered with the free exercise of professional judgment by HKM in deciding what land classification standards to adopt and how to apply those standards to the data they develop in the field. I don't think that is the case. I think Your Honor has seen enough of HKM's work to know they are not going to permit lawyers from the Department of Justice to tell them how to do their soil studies.

The third objection the United States raises is the Work Product Doctrine. As the Court is well aware and as the Rules of Civil Procedure are explicit on the point, the work product doctrine applies to a work product generated by lawyers. I'm not aware HKM has any lawyers working for them writing land classification reports.

I think that this one was just thrown in to make the list complete. There is no showing at all the land classification reports developed by HKM contain any work product, and I don't think the Court can rely on a mere assertion of that by

(B) (B) (B)

TO TO

A Const

discovery. We could all say that everything is an attorney work product because we talk to our experts about what they do, we obtain information from them, and they make suggestions, too. That does not insulate experts' work from discovery.

The last objection the United States raises is the attorney-client privilege. I would simply point out to the Court that if the attorney-client privilege applies to land classification standards in the Crow case, it would apply those standards in this case. They didn't claim the privilege. The facts behind them and how the standards are developed are practically identical. Therefore, I think the Court can dismiss the attorney-client privilege claim as not applying, as well.

Finally, the United States argues it's basically unfair for them to be required to turn over the Crow standards in this case. I would suggest to the Court it's not at all basically unfair to require the United States to be consistent in the policies and the factual theories under which they pursue the adjudication of their reserved rights at claims throughout the western states.

4 4 4

4

-

4

4-3

The final point that the United States makes somewhat surprised me when I was reading through their brief, and the point appears on page 7 of

5

4

THE SPECIAL MASTER: The conclusion?

7

6

•

8

11

10

12

13

14

16

15

17

19

18

20

21

22

24

23

44

MR. MERRILL: I'm sorry, it's page 6, Your Honor. In the second full paragraph they are discussing whether copies of the preliminary data that we have requested may or may not be ordered to be produced in Montana and suggest a court order for this material would have to be sought after and obtained in Montana before the material is disclosed. Now, I don't know

the brief. I believe it's page 7.

if you ordered them to produce this material they are going to defy that: order, but they are clearly a party in this case and the Court has personal jurisdiction over the United States, the Court also has continuing jurisdiction over

whether the Department of Justice is suggesting

the various experts for HKM who have testified in this case, and I believe that if the Court does make such an order compelling the United States

or HKM to produce standards, that being within the jurisdiction of this court, they re bound

to follow such an order.

409 West 24th Street

CHEYENNE, WY 82001

1307) 635 8280

THE SPECIAL MASTER: I can't see where they may find themselves having to interplead, so to speak, for some direction from the courts because if they comply here, they are in contempt up there, and vice versa.

MR. MERRILL: Your Honor, I'm not aware that there is any order outstanding in Montana that prohibits them.

if I were a Crow counsel and something like
this were requested of information of my client's
reservation to be used in another case, I would
object very strenuously if it be used any other
place than the case in which it's being used.

You have made your demands and you have had your refusals from HKM people?

MR. MERRILL: And we have been refused by the Department of Justice. We felt it more proper to make the request directly to the attorneys and not to the experts for the other side. It seems to me the real issue that is brought up by the Motion to Compel is whether the Court is going to accept the land classification work that HKM has done just on its own. And perhaps an analogy would help to illustrate

4-3

-- C--

CHEVENNE, WY 82001

(307) 635 8280

the point. Let's say that you are running a professional business, a lawyer's office, a doctor's office, an accounting business of some sort, and you are looking for somebody who will work for you and who will do professional quality work. And applicant comes to you and says, "I can do the job, I do good work," and you say, "Well, why should I believe that?" And they throw their resume across to you and you look at their resume and it says these are the kinds of work that I have done in the past. I've done similar work for other people, and here are some publications I have written as a result of doing that work. And you say, "Fine, that looks great. I would like to see a copy of that report that you have listed on page 3 of your resume and talk to some people about your work."

THE SPECIAL MASTER: You are telling me that is analogous to this situation?

MR. MERRILL: I believe so because if the applicant then says, "No, you cannot see the report and you cannot talk to the people I did the work for," you are going to have to take it on faith, and at best you are going to be suspicious of what is going on.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

55555555

3

- C

-

-

Why is it they will not disclose the results of that work so you have some idea of the consistency of the work that they do?

I think that the analogous situation holds in this case. Why shouldn't the United States be required to disclose the land classification standards that they have used on the Crow Reservation? Why shouldn't the Court have other land classification programs with which to compare and evaluate the reasons.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: It just strikes me it simply doesn't have a great deal of bearing upon the issues before me in this case, and again, I said if you can show some relationship in the nature of the litagation, although this is in Federal Court in Montana and in State Court here, the nature of the similarities in the terrain features you describe, and you stated there were some of those, it might warrant a look at their work up there. But I still, I guess, I stated in my last order, am sort of putting the burden of proceeding on you in this matter to get you to change my mind, so go ahead with your argument.

MR. MERRILL: I understand you are, Your Honor.

	I would point out the difference in Courts, if
2	I'm not mistaken, and perhaps Tom knows more
3	bout this, the case in Montana, the low-lying
4	canal case is a general stream adjudication
5	case which was dismissed out of Federal Court
6	for lack of jurisdiction, and that dismissal
7	has been appealed to the United States Court
8	of Appeals for the 9th Circuit. There are
9	also pending in the Montana State Courts various
0	general stream adjudications which are being
1	held in abeyance right now to give everyone
2	time to get their work products together.
3	THE SPECIAL MASTER: That's like the same
4	concept we had here in this case?
5	MR. MERRILL: Very similar, Your Honor, in
	1

MR. MERRILL: Very similar, Your Honor, in that this case was originally removed to the Federal-District Court, who then remanded it back to Judge Joffe.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: I'm glad to know we are ahead of somebody on our time table in those matters.

MR, MERRILL: That's essentially my argument, Your Honor. I understand the United

States is going to put on testimony in opposition to the motion, if necessary, and I may need

1307/635 8280

-

はよ

l	
1	to make a few more points, depending on what i
2	brought out in the testimony.
3	THE SPECIAL MASTER: Sure, sure.
4	MR. MERRILL: Thank you.
5	THE SPECIAL MASTER: Mr. Echohawk?
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	* * * *
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

4

4

4

4-5

4-3

-4-0

MR. ECHOHAWK: May it please the Court,
Your Honor, Mr. Merrill has started his
argument as, of course, he started his brief,
saying the Reservations are similar. The
United States addressed that point in its
brief saying that the Crow standards in this
case are irrelevant. We have also cited
similar passages of testimony from Mr. Waples
and Mr. Toedter. Certainly Mr. Waples says
where the Reservations are similar the soils
would be similar, where they're not, they're
not. But I mean you could say that about
anywhere in the United States.

Should the Master require the United

States to put on testimony it can put on

testimony from Mr. Waples, more detailed, and

Mr. Kersich, if necessary, to show the

relationship overall between the two Reservations.

We're talking very general on Mr. Waples'
voir dire as to the two Reservations. I think
if you want to get real specific as to the
land classification standards and the derivation
of such for the Wind River Reservation as
opposed to the Crow Reservation, I think that
it will be made quite clear that in doing land

The state of the s

Married World

A COM

-

classification work you develop site specific standards. I believe that we had testimony from Mr. Kersich on the development of how you draw some things in the area, in which he testified that he used the Bureau of Reclamation studies, I think from Muddy Ridge, around the area, to develop their standards for this case.

'HKM did similar things in the Crow case in that area. There are two different derivations. Certainly topography may be similar, but the topography may be similar in Denver. Just because somebody does land classification work in Denver doesn't mean it can apply to the Wind River Reservation.

The United States has complied with

Wyoming's request to produce land classification

work done by the Bureau of Reclamation upon

which HKM relied, and that information is

being generated and produced right now. That

certainly is relevant because HKM did rely on

that in this area within the Reservation.

We're turning that over, the United States has

no objection to that.

But it's just totally irrelevant to draw on land classification standards or land

CHEATING AT STOLET

・1071 もけち もをおり

classification work done on another Reservation in another state. And if the Master wishes, the United States can put on such testimony.

In relation to the other arguments raised by the State of Wyoming in opposition to the points discussed by the United States, as regards to privilege, Mr. Merrill calls those remarks remarkable. The United States has cited numerous cases in its briefs, and I direct the Court's attention to Breedlove versus Beech Aircraft Corporation case, 57 Federal Rules Decisions, 1972.

In that case, that case dealt specifically with reports prepared by experts for the attorneys in pursuit of the litigation.

Again, Your Honor, the United States can put on such testimony to show that the land classification reports, there are several drafts of those reports, were prepared directly at the request of the attorneys for the United States Department of Justice.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Did they deal with fatalities or crashes from similar aircraft in different lawsuits?

MR. ECHOHAWK: Dealt with the crash of --

direction 24 to 53 metrical contractions and the second contractions and the second contractions and the second contractions are second contractions.

FRONTIER REPORTING SERVICE

CASPER WY 82601 SELECTION OF THE SELECTI

in that lawsuit, it was the attorneys for

Beech, asked their experts to prepare infor
mation relating directly to that case. I

think that is correct, Your Honor.

Your Honor, the main point, which is of the utmost importance to the United States is that the State of Wyoming, through this case, is attempting to get a work product generated in preparation of trial in another case that has not yet gone to trial.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Are you saying that the South Dakota case has a bearing on this too?

MR. ECHOHAWK: Yes, this has a bearing on all general adjudicated cases that the United States is pursuing water rights in. There are many cases in Montana, Arizona, South Dakota, they're all in the preparation phase. As the Court is well aware, I believe Mr. White is the attorney for the State of South Dakota. Similar reports and similar documents will be prepared in anticipation of trial in that case. It's of the utmost importance to the United States that the information prepared in preparation of trial in its preliminary stages

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

400

A. ...

ST.

-5-3

-3-3

not be discovered in other cases. I mean this is certainly a very convenient tool for Mr.

White to get at not only the information in the Wyoming — in the Montana cases, but also in the South Dakota cases and for the other attorneys to create a lawsuit in one situation to get at documents that may or may not be discoverable in another lawsuit.

The work product point raised in Rule 26B3 is admittedly a qualified privilege, but Wyoming, in order to overcome that qualified privilege must state, must show a substantial need for those documents in the preparation of its case in chief. Mr. Merrill fails to address that point.

We've had -- We've seen time and time again Wyoming's attempt to get at cross-examination of other work as how that relates to HKM's land classification work here. Specifically they've used Bureau of Reclamation work around the area to cross-examine HKM and even Dr. Mesghinna yesterday.

We still fail to see how Wyoming need the Crow information to put on its case in chief, in this particular item. And Wyoming

undue hardship, to obtain the substantial
equivalent, the materials by other means. If
Wyoming feels that the Crow Reservation is so
absolutely essential to this case and they
want land classification information from the
Crow Reservation, Your Honor, as I pointed out
in my brief, they can make a request to enter
the Crow Reservation and do the land classification
program there.

Wyoming has absolutely failed to address and failed to meet the required test to overcome the qualified privilege contained in Rule 26B3.

In relation to the attorney work product or mental impressions, the United States is also prepared to present testimony as to the -- how those particular land classification reports were prepared to draft copies. Those reports are somewhat similar in format to the land classification reports present in this case. They are the preliminary early versions pre- pared at the direction of the attorney to help the attorney, you know, prepare for his case. And in that process, there is great interchange

4

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

back and forth between the attorneys and the experts. And contained within that, Your Honor, by its very nature, are the mental processes of the attorneys.

Related to the other arguments, Your Honor, is --

THE SPECIAL MASTER: You want a glass of water?

MR. ECHOHAWK: Yes, if I could.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Here you are.

MR. ECHOHAWK: Thank you. The other argument raised by the United States is that this information is also protected by the attorney/client privilege. In this situation the Justice Department is in fact the lawyers for the Department of Interior and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. This information was prepared in contract, through a contract with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, our client, and as such, the relationship back and forth between the Department of Interior and the Justice Department is in fact the same as any other attorney/client privilege. And the information prepared back and forth in anticipation of litigation and through our

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

client's agent, which would be HKM, that information is of a confidential nature while we're preparing our case. Once the case is prepared and ready to go to trial, Your Honor, the documents are then usually, we usually turn those documents over through discovery and the open interchange, hopefully of some resolution before trial.

And finally, again, Your Honor, the -just to recap, the United States feels it is vitally important to keep trial preparation work that is protected by Rule 26B3, to keep that information in fact in our other lawsuits that have not yet gone to trial. In my brief, I cited several cases, that I prepared, that regarded documents prepared for trial in cases that had already gone to trial and closed and even those documents were protected. It seems that the documents prepared for trial that have not yet gone through the trial stage and has yet not even gone to discovery stage should even receive more protection than trials that have since been closed.

I.said if the Court requires, I would also

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

4

I have my witnesses available should testimony be required. Thank you.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: All right. Thank
you, Mr. Echohawk. Do you wish to surrebut for
a few minutes, Mr. Merrill?

MR. MERRILL: If I could, Your Honor.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: All right.

MR. MERRILL: I would first like to point out to the Court that the state of the record to this motion, I already quoted extensively from the testimony that shows the similarities, and I'm sure the Court has decided one way or another on what you think between the similarities of the two Reservations, through the Government's own witnesses. It's pretty clear there are similar land forms with similar characteristics, particularly drainage ability, which we're very interested in for an arable land base in both cases.

Mr. Echohawk talks about the qualified privilege under Rule 26B3, and that the State has not made any showing of substantial need for those materials. I would simply point out to the Court a way in which we might use the materials. We might have one of

T

8 Ju

5

4

10

1

45

4

A CONTRACTOR

4

4

W J

4

473

-3

4-3

23

24

25

201 MOAG 7 B (1%)

1)520 11 1

A Abel B. Park Rev.

the experts for the United States on the witness stand and say, "Mr. Expert, isn't it true that you've done land classification work on other Reservations?" "Yes, I have." "Well, isn't it true that in doing land classification work on other Reservations, the two Reservations have very similar land types?" "Yeah, in some places they do." "Well, isn't it true that in classifying the land as arable on the two different 10 Reservations you used very different land 11 classification standards?" "Well, yeah, I did." 12 13 "Isn't it true that one of the standards 14 that's different is the standard for X?" 15 "Yes, that's true," 16 "Well, why is it that one Reservation you 17 you used X and on another Reservation you 18 used 3X?" 19 That's part of the information that we could use in developing cross-examination of 20 the federal experts, not only the soil scientists, but the engineers and the economists 22 who are also supposed to have relied on these

information developed under them. And I would

land classification standards and the

All A Ething of the Page 33.

-

-

-

. • 3

-

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

particular set of standards was chosen as opposed to another set of standards or varience or various versions in preliminary drafts might be of great interest to the Court as well as to counsel. I think thus there is a substantial need for Wyoming to have access to those documents to prepare our cross-examination as well as our case in chief, in which we might point out the disparities in the land classification work.

I think it's pretty clear to the Court from the attitude that the United States has taken with respect to discovery in this case, that we cannot get the information elsewhere. Mr. Rogers for the Crow Tribe has already asserted a variety of privileges on their behalf, that the Crow Tribe would not turn over these standards nor would we be permitted to perform our own land classification work on their lands. We have trouble enough getting on the Wind River Reservation in this case.

The final point is the attorney/client privilege, which Mr. Echohawk says somehow

1	evaporates once everyone's reached final
2	conclusions, that's simply not the case in
3	the law, and that's simply not how this case
4	has been prepared and tried. The United
5	States, the Indian Tribes and the State of
6	Wyoming have all exchanged preliminary
7	information through depositions, through
8	answers to interrogatories, through requests
9	for production, and in no case up until now
10	has the United States claimed that we will
11	we're not quite done with that, so there's
12	this attorney/client privilege that attaches,
13	once we're done we'll let you know and turn
14	it over. What we're playing is a whole new
15	ballgame with respect to discovery that's very
16	different from the rules that we have all been
17	playing by for the past couple of years. Thank
18	you, Your Honor.
19	
20	
21	
22	* * *
23	
24	

MR. MERRILL: Thank you, Your Honor.

~

S J

المناق

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Thank you very much. I want to compliment both of you on your presentation on this motion and your vigor and your enthusiasm and determination in your arguments. I am ready to make a ruling, and I don't have to have any submission of any further briefs for it.

thing in your arguments or in the papers submitted in support thereof to change my mind. I think if the ---I think the strongest duty that is before us is to assure that we don't open up a can of worms that spills off into four and five and six different lawsuits while we add another interminable area of delay and postponement and continuation of litigation while we assert costs of duties on different reservations.

And I may or may not agree with some of the bases that are cited for me in the Unites States' response, but I still don't feel that this Court has any business compelling the production of HKM's or anybody else's materials from some other reservation.

We made some qualifications on this the first time around, but I believe that there are still

STORES OF THE STORES

no bases for me complying with that motion that the land classification work on the Crow Reservation be. produced in this lawsuit. I think this lawsuit has determined and the quantification of waters to be 4 made and the reserved doctrine to the Wind River Indian Reservation should depend upon that testimony which is clearly acceptable and which has not been refuted and which has been measured and clipped and distilled, refined properly into what is left in the way of practicably irrigable acreage. There 10 will be a lot of other matters that should affect 11 it, but I doubt very much if comparisons of the land 12 classifications of the same client on two different 13 reservations would have that much bearing on this 14 case. So I'm going to rule that way. If you want 15 to prepare an order, you can; I'll sign it. If 16 you don't, we will let the record speak for itself. 17 Mr. White, are you ready to proceed with cross-18 examination of Dr. Mesghinna? 19 MR. WHITE: Yes, sir, I am. 20

THE SPECIAL MASTER: All right. Dr. Mesghinna, will you take the stand, please?

MR. MERRILL: Your Honor, before Mr. White proceeds, there is another matter that I forgot to bring up. We have obtained another copy of the .

397x 635 626 1

21

22

23

24

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	7
7	
8 ,	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	BÄ
21	Q.
22	<u> </u>

23

24

25

in Denver. That copy is thicker because it also contains the HKM computer program listing about which the United States expressed concern yesterday. So the HKM listings are also included with that copy, and I would advise the Court we are working to get the rest of these back, as well.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: We appreciate that very much. We threw these out yesterday. Do you want this copy now?

MR. MERRILL: I would appreciate the Court disposing of that copy.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: This has the notes on it like yesterday or --

MR. MERRILL: It may or may not. I'm not sure.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: We will dispose of them summarily.

MR. MERRILL: Thank you, Your Honor.

CROSS-EXAMINATION (RESUMED)

BY MR. WHITE:

Dr. Mesghinna, isn't it true you had no role in developing the land classification standards which were used for the classification of the HKM arable land base?

mesghinna - cross - white

1	A.	Could you say the question again, please?
		Isn't it true that you played no role in the develop-
2	Q	
3		ment of the land classification standards which were
4		used in the development of the HKM arable land base?
5	A.	Yeah, I did not play at all.
6	Q.	Isn't it true you played no role in developing that
7		land base by the application of those standards?
8 ,		THE SPECIAL MASTER: He has answered that. He
9		said, "I played no role."
10		MR. WHITE: The first question was respect to
11		the creation of the standards, Your Honor. The
12		second question was with respect to the application
13		of the standards in developing the land base.
14		THE SPECIAL MASTER: Did you play a role when
15		those standards were applied to this Reservation?
16		THE WITNESS: Well, I have seen what I have
17		seendand observed what HKM has been doing, for example,
18		in taking some tests, soil classification tests, and
19		so on in the field.
20	Q.	(By Mr. White) Did you participate in the decision
21		to classify any parcel of land as arable or nonarable?
22	A.	No, I did not participate in that respect except what
23		I have seen was a good and proper way of doing it.
24	Q	Okay, you previous testified that hand-move sprinklers
25	mac	ahinna - cross - white

1		would be used for corn; is that correct?
2	A.	Yes.
3	Q.	That would mean that there would be no hand-move
4		sprinklers used for these fields at elevations
5		greater than 5900 feet; is that correct?
6	A.	There is a possibility where hand-move sprinklers
7		will be used in elevations higher than 5900.
8 ,	Q.	Could you describe that possibility?
9	A.	The possibility that in areas where we have less
10		than 40 acres of land we generally have used hand-
11		move sprinklers.
12	Q	So if you were to describe a field having less than
13		40 acres in it, that would be a hand-move sprinkler
14		field?
15		THE SPECIAL MASTER: No, he said there would
16		be a possibility it could be.
17		THE WITNESS: Let me answer it, sir. In
18		generaly, you see, our criteria is our criteria
19		is, in general, less than 40 acres hand-move, but
20		we have also some acreages more than 40 acres
21		which are hand-move.
22	Q.	(By Mr. White) Okay. Is it true that if you have
23		40 acres or smaller in a field, that's going to be
24		hand-move?
25	mes	ghinna - cross - white

1	A.	That's going to be hand-move.
2	Q.	And some of the fields that are greater than 40
3		acres will also be hand-move; is that correct?
4	A.	A few of those will be hand-move.
5		MR. WHITE: Your Honor, could I close the door
6		behind him. When someone walks by, I can't hear
7		him.
8	\ '	THE SPECIAL MASTER: I'll get it.
9	Q.	(By Mr. White) Which fields, if you know, larger
10		than 40 acres and above 5900 feet in elevation have
11		you designed hand-move sprinklers for?
12	A.	Which fields?
13	Q. A.	Yes.
14	A.	I have said those fields which are less than 40
15		acres.
16	Q.	I'm sorry, I thought you said that in some cases
17		fields larger than 40 acres. No, no
18	A.	No, no, in some cases. That is in some cases.
19	Q.	I'm asking you about those some cases. Which fields
20		are those?
21	A.	Okay. In areas of elevation greater than 5900, I
22		don't believe we have any hand-move greater than
23		40 acres.
24	Q	Okay. Now, let's turn to the fields that are at
25	mes	ghinna - cross - white

- elevations less than 5900.
- 2 A. Yes.
- Q Is it true there that all fields 40 acres and smaller use hand-move sprinklers?
- 5 A. Yes, sir.

The state of the s

- 6 Q At elevations less than 5900 --
- 7 A. Okay.
- 8 Q -- are there some fields larger than 40 acres you
 9 use hand-move?
- 10 A. Let me explain to you the whole process.
- 11 Q Okay.
- Above 5900 there is no corn, as we have said, so we are not worried about having 12 percent of our sprinklers to be hand-move. So I think we have understood each other on that one. But the complication comes when you are below 5900. When you are
- below 5900, first of all, all fields which are less

than 40 acres are hand-move.

ł

Q.

18

19

- 20 A. However, in order to make it 12 percent hand-move,
- we have to add certain percentage from the side-roll
- 22 to hand-move.

Okay.

- 23 Q What percentage is that, Wold?
- 24 A. I can give you it.
- 25 mesghinna cross white

1	Q.	Thank you.
2	A.	I have it in front of me. Let me go one by one for
3		each unit.
4	Q.	All right.
5	A.	That will make things easier.
6		In South Crowheart there is 9 percent of the
7		area about 9 percent of the area will be acreage
8 ,		less than 40 acres, meaning fields less than 40 acres
9		So these are all hand-move.
10	Ø.	Okay. Is South Crowheart totally below 5900 feet?
11	A.	Oh, yes, yes. Let's go to Arapahoe. In Arapahoe
12		we have 8 percent of the fields are less than 40
13		acres, so we have hand-move in here. In Riverton
14		East we have 7 percent less than 40 acres, so this
15		is all hand-move. In Big Horn Flats we have 6 acres
16		of the land of the fields less than 40 acres.
17	Q.	You said 6 acres?
18		THE SPECIAL MASTER: Six percent?
19		THE WITNESS: Yes, 6 percent. Six percent less
20	!	than 40 acres. Now, I didn't say about North Crow-
21		heart. North Crowheart, about 9 percent.
22	Q	(By Mr.White) Let me interrupt you for just a
23		minute, Wold. Are all these values you are giving
24		us now for areas less than 5900, or does it include

mesghinna - cross - white

1		4816
1		the entire project?
2	A.	You see, the problem when we talk of North Crowheart
3	ri.	
Ì		and Big Horn Flats, they touch both areas, you see.
4		Let's clear the first three.
5	Q.	Okay.
6	A.	Okay, South Crowheart, Arapahoe, and Riverton East,
7		then we will go to more complex ones.
8		•
9		
10		
11		
10	:	
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		* * * *
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

1	A	(Continued) So in South Crowheart, it means
2		we have to add three percent greater than 40
3		acres to make up that 14 that 12 percent
4	' ' '	of cost. Now, before I go, those three
5	1	percent, their costs and design is for side
6		rolls, which is almost twice the cost of
7		hand moved, so we have no choice but we have
8		to use that cost. Okay. The same thing with
9		all the rest.
10		For Arapahoe we have added four percent
11		of the side rolls, for side rolls we have
12		assumed then as if they are hand moved. And
13		for Riverton East it means we have added five

Now, I think you want me to give you a breakdown in North Crowheart and Big Horn Flats. That will take a short time.

percent of the side rolls to make it 12 per-

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Is that what you want him to do?

MR. WHITE: Yes. The Witness always anticipates where I'm going, it's a nice witness to have on the stand.

(Brief pause.

mesghinna-cross-white /

cent of cost.

24

25

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1		THE WITNESS: I have to go through a long
2		calculation in order to
3	Q	(By Mr. White)) Can you give us approximate
4		numbers?
5	A	Why don't we approximate it the same as overall
6		for the North Crowheart, nine percent it would
7		be. If you want me I will go through it. It
8		will take some time, at least an hour;
9	Q	Why don't you approximate the breakout above
10		and below 5,900. If you're willing to live
11		with that, I am.
12	A	Okay. Let's make it the same percentage, you
13		know, nine percent in
14	Q	In North Crowheart?
15	A	Yes.
16	Q	Nine percent of the fields below 5,900
17	A	And nine percent of the fields above 5,900
18		will be
19	Q	Less than 40 acres?
20	A	Less than 40 acres.
21	Q	How about Big Horn Flats, six and six?
22	A	Big Horn Flats is a very small area in above
23		5,900, only 240 acres in total, I believe,
24		and it is Let me check it.
25	mes	sghinna-cross-white

1		(Brief pause.
2	A	Let's assume Let's take that in Big
3		Horn Flats, there is zero percentage of hand
4	•	move.
5	Q	Above 5,900?
6	A	Above 5,900.
7	Q	In your design work, have you simply applied
8		general percentages or have you actually
9		identified those fields greater than 40 acres
10		which use hand-moved sprinklers?
11	A	No, we did
12	Q	Just general percentage?
13	A	General percëntage. We can identify it if
14		necessary, you know, if it is necessary we
15		can identify them. I mean it's
16	Q	My question was have you?
17	A	Okay, no.
18	Q	Okay.
19	A	We didn't find it necessary.
20	Q	Could you please describe once more, tassling
21		on the corn, how the hand-move sprinklers
22		will be moved?
23		THE SPECIAL MASTER: Would you please ask
24		that question again?
25	mes	ghinna-cross-white

1	Q	(By Mr. White) Could you please describe
2		once more, tassling on the corn, how the
3		hand-moved sprinkler will be moved?
4	A	I wish I brought a sample of pipe of hand
5		move from my office, I had it in my office.
6		There are quick coupling joints that you
7		just pull them out and take them to the next
8		field.
9	Q	So you just walk out in the field and un-
10		couple the pipes and move them to the next
11		location?
12	A	That's what I believe, yeah.
13	Q	That's how you've designed those to be moved?
14	A	Yeah, hand moved is really human, all of it
15		is human, it's labor work.
16	Q	It is fairly labor intensive?
17	A	It is labor, there's no question.
18	Q	With respect to small grains, did you assume
19		that there would be the same net irrigation
20	 	requirements for all small grains? In other
21		words, same irrigation requirement for oats
22		as opposed to barley?
23	A	Yeah, we use the same, the KC factor that
24	•	the crop coefficient factor that you get from
25	mes	ghinna-cross-white

······································		
1		Jensen is the same for small grains. They
2		They haven't come up to subdivide them.
3	Q	Based on your professional experience, isn't
4		it true, however, that small grains have,
5		between one another, different net irrigation
6		requirements?
7	A	I don't think I would dare to say that, Mr.
8		White, because this land, you cannot make a
9		fine tuning on this land, on this work, really,
10		especially on small grains. There could be,
11		but it is not tangible that we can really,
12		you know, differentiate it.
13	Q	Dr. Mesghinna, for the North Crowheart project,
14		how long do you anticipate it will take the
15		completion of the construction of that project
16		and get it into operation?
17		MR. CLEAR: Objection, Your Honor, this
18		was not a subject of his direct examination.
19		THE SPECIAL MASTER: Well, it was what
20		I think is an improper question. What
21		difference does it make
22		MR. WHITE: It has a lot to do with costs.
23		THE SPECIAL MASTER: So does anything else
24		that's extended beyond an anticipated time or
25	mes	ghinna-cross-white

500

5

The second of the control of the con

"一个大学的一个人,我们是我的一个人的一个人的一个人的一个人。" "我们是我们的一个人,我们是我们的一个人的一个人的一个人的一个人的一个人的人的人,我们就是我们的一个人的人们的人们的人们的人们的人们的人们的人们们们们们们们们

extends over projected times, but what difference does that make to the matter here? MR. WHITE: Well, the question of the cost is very much a portion of the determination of practicably irrigable acreage, Your Honor. THE SPECIAL MASTER: I recognize that. MR. WHITE: So, I'm asking him what the anticipated time to construct that project is. THE SPECIAL MASTER: His anticipated time to construct the project, what difference does 10 that make? If the project runs over his time, 11 then I see what costs grrupt, but what 12 difference does it make how much time it takes 13 to build it? 14 MR. WHITE: Well, Your Honor, because --15 THE SPECIAL MASTER: You see my point? 16 My point is if it drags on an unreasonably long 17 time and the time to construct goes over the 18 anticipated work schedule that the engineers 19 project, I can see some costs overrun as a 20 result of that, but that has nothing to do, I think, with their case. 22 MR. WHITE: Well, it goes further --23 THE SPECIAL MASTER: All right, answer the 24

25

question. I think you two have your own thing

1	going anyway. Go ahead, Dr. Mesghinna.
2	THE WITNESS: Mr. White, I think, Mr.
3	Dornbusch would be more qualified to discuss
4	this matter.
5	Q (By Mr. White) Okay. We'll ask him then.
6	Is it true then that you've made,
7	developed no schedule of expenditures for
8	the construction of these projects year by
9	year?
10	A Well, I'd like I Wish you could follow up
11	this question to Mr. Dornbusch.
12	Q I asked whethereyou prepared one.
13	THE SPECIAL MASTER: He's answered that
14	twice for you now, I don't think you're
15	entitled to three cracks at him.
16	He said twice now if you'll ask this of
17	Mr. Dornbusch.
18	MR. WHITE: I don't want to be in a
19	position for Mr. Dornbusch to say Dr. Mesghinna
20	prepared all that work, Your Honor, and we've
21	already had our shot at Dr. Mesghinna. So
22	if your answer is no, we'll just go on.
23	THE WITNESS: The point is we discussed
24	back and forth on this matter, you know, we
25	mesghinna-cross-white

The state of the s

The service of the se

1		discussed back and forth on this matter with
2		Mr. Dornbusch and so. So it seems the final
3		decision is on Mr. Dornbusch. I think he can
4		answer the question, he can elaborate it
5		more and give you whatever information you
6		want on this.
7	Q	(By Mr. White) So Mr. Dornbusch won't have to
8		defer to you, he can answer the question,
9		correct?
10	A	I hope so.
11	Q	Dr. Mesghinna, I think you indicated on cross-
12		examination by the Tribes that there was no
13		drainage problem in the areas covered by your
14		unit; is that correct?
15	A	If those areas are virgin areas, meaning that
16		no irrigation is going on.
17	Q	Without irrigation you don't have a drainage
18		problem, do you?
19	A	Well, not that I know, and from the works that
20		I have seen, I don't remember of any drainage
21		problems present.
22	Q	Dr. Mesghinna, in addition to the design work
23		that we described yesterday for the wasteways,
24		did you do any design work for roads?
25	mes	ghinna-cross-white

Į		
1	A	Design work for roads?
2	Q	Yes.
3	A	How do you mean design?
4	Q	Same level of design that you did on the
5		wasteways.
6	A	As I have discussed it yesterday, we have the
7		embankments; meaning the road itself and this
8		is compacted soil and then I said we have put
9		gravel on top of the road on one side and in
10		some cases it's about 12 feet in width, in some
11		cases it's about 10 feet in width.
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		* * * *
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
	i	

ॐ 6−1	mn-cb			4826
3				
₹		1	Q	(By Mr. White) Did you do a schematic
₹ 5		2		design, did you do cross-sections, did you
		3		material lists?
Ź		4	A	We have typical cross-sections.
3		5	Q	Are you able to identify how many miles of
3		6	×	
3		j		road you had at 12 feet in width and how
3		7		many at 10 feet in width?
*9 • 9		8	A	Yes. If I can go through all my notes and so
·•		9		on, I can.
•		10	Ω	Do you have that preprared in tabular form
•		11		someplace?
*3		12		THE SPECIAL MASTER: I would object. I
~3 ~3		13		think that is going into insignificant,
***		14		unnecessary minute detail of this litigation
**		15		and I forbid it. Make your it's not that
3		16		important for getting on with the work before
~9 ~9		17		us.
- 9		18	Q	(By Mr. White) Did you do any design work
-			~	
		19		such as we have discussed for bridges or road
-9		20		crossings?
>•		21	A	When you say design, you mean
> .		22	Ω	Any schematic cross-sections?
		23	A	In terms of what kind of crossings we have
ھد		24		and so on?
هري		25	mesç	hinna-cross-white
فري				409 WEST 24TH STREET FRONTIER REPORTING SERVICE

i		
1	Q	Yes.
2	A	Yes, as I have said it yesterday. For example,
3		in North Crowheart we have assumed 17
4	i 	crossings.
5	Q	But for those crossings did you develop typical
6		designs?
7	A	The design is meant for estimation, you know,
8		sketches are meant for estimation. We just
9		use these for cost estimations. We are not
10	 - -	really going to give designs and specifications
11		because the level of study does not allow it.
12	Q	I understand. But there are designs you use
13		for cost estimations, is that correct?
14	A	I would call them sketch rather than design.
15	Q	Let's change your word sketch for cross
16		estimation.
17	A	Yes, because without having those sketches
18		there is no way one can determine the necessary
19		quantities of materials.
20	Q	That's right. What parameters did you use
21		in deciding whether or not costs would need be
22		incurred for land level?
23	A	I discussed that yesterday.
24	Q	You told me there was very little required, and
25	mes	ghinna-cross-white

1. 美国大学的中国中国工作人员工工作的基础设施的企业的企业的企业的企业。

•		
1		I want to know what parameters you used to
2		arrive at that conclusion.
3	A	Well, we generally know the topography of
4		the area, and based on the topography, the
5		slopes and so on of those areas, we don't
6		believe there will be leveling as such like
7		what you do in gravity irrigation.
8	Q	But there will be leveling for gullies?
9	A	Well, if you have a small gully
10	Q	For rock outcrops and things like that?
11	A	Well, that is part of the land preparation
12		work, yes.
13	Q	Well, let's turn to land preparation. How
14		did you figure costs associated with land
15		preparation?
16	A	Didn't I say that yesterday?
17	Q	NO.
18	A	I said, Mr. Dornbusch has that cost.
19	Q	Oh, okay. Did you do éketches in order to
20		develop cost estimates for diversion structures?
21		THE SPECIAL MASTER: For what, Mr. White?
22		MR. WHITE: Diversion structures, to
23		take the water out of the rivers for your
24		canals?
25	mes	sghinna-cross-white

1	THE SPECIAL MASTER: I'm with you.
2	Thank you.
3	THE WITNESS: You know, a sketch like
4	cross-sections, a simple cross-section of a
5	spillway.
6	Q Did you do a similar sketch for each canal
7	segment?
8	A I have indicated it, Mr. White, that we have
9	typical sections.
10	Q How many sections did you prepare?
11	A Oh, God knows how many. As much as we think
12	it is necessary, you know. These are just
13	for cost calculations.
14	Q Did you prepare sketches for cost calculations
15	on siphons?
16	A We know the length of our siphons, and I have
17	I think stated it.
18	Q Did you prepare sketches, though?
19	A You don't really need a sketch. What you need
20	is perhaps let me back up an inlet and
21	outlet part where you need riprap.
22	THE SPECIAL MASTER: What is that word,
23	please?
24	MR. WHITE: Riprap, Your Honor.
25	mesghinna-cross-white

1		Muskrat Creek. We have a pipe that goes
2		through that.
3	Q	What is the diameter of that pipe, please?
4	A	I have to go through my notes and find it.
5	Q	Do you know an approximate diameter?
6	A	Well, let's say 24 inches probably, but there
7		is a siphon, a real siphon before that, before
8		the one that I just said.
9	Q	Now, you have got me lost. I thought there was
10		only one siphon in Riverton East on your map.
11		Maybe I didn't see them all.
12	A	Well, the one that I just mentioned when you
13		asked me is towards the end of Riverton East
14		where we claim we don't have any arable lands.
15		However, there is another one.
16	Q	Okay. Tell me about the other one.
17	A	Well, let me try to look on my because I
18		don't want to
19		THE SPECIAL MASTER: Excuse me, what do
20		you want to know about the other one? I don't
21		want you spending all
22		MR. WHITE: The type of pipe and diameter.
23		THE SPECIAL MASTER: Type of pipe and
24		diameter?
25	me	sghinna-cross-white

THE SPECIAL MASTER: In setting your siphons, you are concerned about riprapping? Yes. The reason why we need that is when we Α have the siphon, the siphon is nothing but a pipe. The canal is coming from one side and if there is a big stream or creek, you know, that crosses that, we use a pipe. So when the water comes out from the pipe, from the siphon, we don't want to just throw it out into the canal itself, we want to put riprap material 10 to protect the soil from erosion and so on. 11 And that cost is THE SPECIAL MASTER: 12 the cost of siphoning? 13 14 THE WITNESS: Yes, for siphoning. 15 (By Mr. White) What was the pipe diameter 16 and what type of pipe did you use for your siphon in Riverton East? 17 If you are talking about the siphons, I believe 18 A all our siphons are concrete pipes. 19 Isn't it true that you know have one siphon 20 Q 21 on Riverton East? There is one very small -- I hate to call it A 22 a siphon. There is one which you claimed the 23 day before yesterday where it crosses the 24 mesghinna-cross-white 25

The state of the section of the sect

1		MR. WHITE: Yes.
2	Q	(By Mr. White) Concrete pipe, I assume?
3	A	Yes, it's concrete pipe.
4	Ω	And what diameter?
5	A	Let me try to look. Let's leave the one I
6		said first, the one we said 24 inch, the one
7		I said 24 inch. Let's scrap it out. Let us
8		scrap it out, it's not there, I don't believe.
9		I don't want to take it as a siphon. However,
10		there is a siphon in Kirby Draw, and that is
11		48 inch.
12	Q	Aside from determining the horsepower required,
13	,	did you do any sketches for the purpose of
14		cost estimation on your pumps or pump stations?
15	A	Say it again, please.
16	Q	Aside from making determinations of horse-
17		power required, did you well, strike that
18		and let me ask it this way: Did you make any
19		sketches for cost estimation?
20	; ; ;	THE SPECIAL MASTER: We are starting all
21		over. Did you make any estimations?
22	Q	(By Mr. White) For the purpose of cost
23		estimates associated with pumps or pump stations?
24	A	As you well know, Mr. White, we based our costs
25	mes	ghinna-cross-white

The second distance of the contract of the second s

- 1	•
1	on those figures that we discussed yesterday,
2	and, however, for our understanding, you
3	know, how the pumping plant looks like, of
4	course, we have to put some kind of sketch,
5	typical sketch.
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	* * * *
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

to conclude that further cross-examination on the point of sketches on any of the physical plans would constitute a needless 🤄 consumption of time and is repitious and an unnecessarily brudensome carrying on of these proceedings. If you have something new, new subject matter that you have to move on to, fine and dandy, if not, I think we ought to wind down on this area. MR. WHITE: Is it your order that I cannot 10 further inquire into sketches with which the 11 Witness may have prepared during his --12 THE SPECIAL MASTER: No further inquiry 13 of the horsepowers of the pump stations and 14 panels and matters on which he's already 15 testified or which you already have in your 16

(Brief pause.

Q (By Mr. White) With respect to the distribution pipeline system, did you prepare any cross-sectional sketches?

possession and are still asking him about.

22 A We didn't find it necessary.

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

Q Okay. Aside from any information which you may have already provided us, did you prepare any mesghinna-cross-white

The second secon

1		sketches of for the purpose of estimating
2		cost for your field maintenance pipes and
3		risers?
4	A	Yes, I believe I made a simple sketch. You
5		mean the connection, the connection between our
6		laterals and the field mainline?
7	Q	Yes.
8	A	Yes.
9	Q	Aside from the information which you may have
10		provided us and the information that is
11		already in evidence, have you prepared any
12		sketches for cost estimation purposes of the
13		various components of your irrigation system?
14	A	I don't remember all of them, Mr. White, but
15		I'm sure we've made, you know,
16	Q	For those fields for which you developed drainage
17	:	systems and except for the information which
18		is already in evidence and which you have
19		provided us, have you prepared any sketches for
20		cost estimation purposes of your drainage pipe
21		network?
22	A	You mean as a design?
23	Q	Yes.
24	A	No, except it's the same thing, we cut it down,
25	mes	ghinna-cross-white

1		we cut those things that we get it in different
2		sketches in order to handle them, you know,
3	•	in our files.
4	Q	Same question with respect to drainage Outlet
5	•	ditches.
6	. A	We have a sketch on cross-section. And by the
7	E	way, on the cross-section of subsurface
8		drainage, it is the one that I gave it on the
9		blackboard on my direct testimony.
10	Ω	Okay. Same question with respect to open
11		drain ditches.
12		MR. CLEAR: Your Honor, I fail to see the
13		relevancy.
14		THE SPECIAL MASTER: Just sit down, Mr.
15		Clear, if you don't mind. I'm going to intercede
16		and I'm going to ask you this question: Dr.
17		Mesghinna, in an attempt to complete this phase
18		of the cross-examination on sketches about cost.
19		do you have any sketches that you used in pre-
20		paring your cost figures, any portion of this
21		system that has not already been touched upon
22		either in direct evidence or in cross-examination
23		or in your deposition or that you haven't already
24		told us?about? Do you know of some?

mesghinna-cross-white

1	THE WITNESS: I think Mr. White touched,
2	hit the main points of sketches and so on.
3	THE SPECIAL MASTER: Very well.
4	THE WITNESS: But there might be some
5	more here and there, you just sketch it in
6	order to see What you are doing.
7	THE SPECIAL MASTER: I think that pretty
8	well adds justice
9	THE WITNESS: But the main components you
10	have touched them.
11	THE SPECIAL MASTER: The main what?
12	THE WITNESS: Components.
13	THE SPECIAL MASTER: They have been touched
14	upon?
15	THE WITNESS: Yes, have been mentioned by
16	Mr. White.
17	MR. WHITE: At this time, Your Honor, we
18	would Well, I'll first ask the Witness and
19	then I'll probably have to make a motion.
20	Q (By Mr. White) Dr. Mesghinna, can you provide
21	us with the sketches with which you used as
22	part of your cost estimation work?
23	THE SPECIAL MASTER: Well, now, Mr. White,
24	he just go through saying that you've got
25	mesghinna-cross-white

everything except for various minor matters. He just answered that and said you have those before you. Did you not just do that? THE WITNESS: No, but Mr. White is asking me if I can provide those documents? THE SPECIAL MASTER: Yes. THE WITNESS: You know, providing these documents have no end if we have to go on like 10 this. THE SPECIAL MASTER: We're not going to go 11 on like this, Dr. Mesghinna, and Mr. White 12 knows that too. I have already ruled once that 13 the further cross-examination on this point is 14 a needless consumption of time and is repetitious 15 and unnecessarily burdensome to these proceedings, 16 and Mr. White, I don't want anymore questions on 17 this, and I will appeal upon your professional

and the state of t

MR. WHITE: At this time the State would move for the production by the United States and specifically this Witness, Dr. Mesghinna,

judgment and good sense to abide by my ruling

and to proceed on to some other subject of your

mesghinna-cross-white 25

18

19

20

22

23

24

cross-examination.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of all sketches prepared by the Witness which he used in developing his cost estimate about which he's testified in this matter.

motion, Mr. White, because I think it's argumentative, contentious and disputatious. You have a good portion of these in your possession now. This Witness has said he'd be glad to provide them providing this is not an endless pursuit, which it will be if you're given a free hand. You have proved that now in these proceedings time and again.

Now, your motion is denied, Mr. White, and I appeal to you to return to some basis of reason in your pursuit of information and material, otherwise there is no end in our lifetime to this litigation.

Q (By Mr. White) Dr. Mesghinna, in developing your designs, what analysis, if any, did you make of the future availability and cost of the energy required to operate the energy intensive systems which you've designed?

Our costs on energy are based on 1979 costs.

A Our costs on energy are based on 1979 costs, and we know there might be some shortages in

mesghinna-cross-white

1		
1		the future, however, as soon as the project
2		is designed for several years this thing will
3		come up within the costs and so on. But at
4		any rate, to answer your question simply, I
5		did not analyze the future energy.
6	Q	Cost and availability?
7	A	Yes, but one thing.
8	Q	Excuse me, Dr. Mesghinna.
9		In sorry, Wold, thank you very much.
10	A	Our discussions with the power people in
11	!	Riverton, Riverton Power, they have told us
12		if they if we tell them that in advance
13		that we are going to have this much energy,
14		we're going to demand this much energy, as soon
15		as they have some cross connections, I think
16		with other power plants, they will provide
17		to us as long as we tell them in advance.
18		
19		
20		
21		* * * *
22		
23		
24	•	

25

and the second s

the former than the transfer of the first of the

Q	this much energy.
Q	this much energy.
Q	
	,
	Do you recall the person with whom you spoke at
	Riverton Power?
A	I can try to find the name.
	THE SPECIAL MASTER: I will ask that is not
	necessary. That's got nothing to do with what we
	are doing here. He inquired of Riverton and he
	got the answer in the record. You don't need to
	give us the name of the person with whom you talked
	to at Riverton Power or REA.
Q.	(By Mr. White) Dr. Mesghinna, you told us either
	yesterday morning or the day before yesterday or
	yesterday afternoon that you had the number of acres
	and the field dimensions for each of your fields in
	tabular form so it wouldn't be necessary to go
	through those one by one. Do you have those with
	you now?
A.	Yes, I have them, but, Mr. White, I want to make it
	clear on this thing. Those things are not really
	true dimensions in a sense because when you supply
	to the computer, you supply length and width so that
	it will determine the area. Some of the fields, as
	Q.

mesghinna - cross - white

1		
1		you know, are triangular, not all rectangular in
2		shape and so on. So they give you the acreage. If
3		you multiply those numbers, they give you the acre-
4		age, but they may not be necessarily rectangular in
5		shape and exact dimensions, but we have those.
6	Q.	Could I have them, please, and we will just mark
7		them?
8	A.	Do you want to see them?
9		(The witness hands the documents
10	· ·	(to Mr. White.
11	A.	This (indicating) is No. 1 field.
12		THE SPECIAL MASTER: Speak right up, please,
13		Dr. Mesghinna.
14		THE WITNESS: I'm showing Mr. White the newly
15		classified lands or the future lands of Riverton
16		East Unit, and in the first column it shows field
17		number, and then the widths and the lengths which
18		Mr. White asked and also the acreage that he asked
19		is also shown on another column.
20		MR. WHITE: Okay, Your Honor, I would like to,
21		instead of going through this one by one or making
22		hand copies, I would like to be able to make just
23		copies of these particular pages that he has the
24		tabulations made of, and I think it will save us a

mesghinna - cross - white

l l	
1	lot of time.
2	THE SPECIAL MASTER: How many pages are there,
3	are there four or five?
4	THE WITNESS: This unit is three, and the North
5	Crowheart is probably about fifteen. About 20, 25
6	pages.
7	THE SPECIAL MASTER: Do you desire to make
8	copies of those?
9	MR. WHITE: Yes, sir.
10	THE SPECIAL MASTER: You are sure they are
11	necessary to your case, you have to have them to do
12	a competent job in this case, or is this more
13	MR. WHITE: Well, Your Honor, everything that
14	I have asked for has been necessary to do a compe-
15	tent job.
16	THE SPECIAL MASTER: I have had serious doubts
17	about that, and I think the record will reveal that.
18	You are making demands of these 20 or 25 copies of
19	work papers?
20	MR. WHITE: Yes, sir.
21	THE SPECIAL MASTER: And to get the dimension
22	of each field?
23	MR. WHITE: And the acreages.
24	THE SPECIAL MASTER: Any objections to that?
25	MR. CLEAR: I have no objection if Dr.

Mesghinna has no objection, Your Honor. They are his papers. I think for the sake of decreas-THE WITNESS: ing the argument, let's do it. THE SPECIAL MASTER: If you will remove that --MR. WHITE: We can have that done while we are putting in other exhibits, Your Honor. THE SPECIAL MASTER: Why don't you see about it after the proceedings. I'm sure you can work that out. 10 MR. WHITE: I was going to suggest if Wold 11 could take them out at this time, we could have 12 somebody doing the copying and we would have them 13 available within the next hour. Let me get some 14 paperclips so we keep them straight. 15 (Off-the-record discussion. 16 THE SPECIAL MASTER: I was going to suggest 17 by answer to thoughtfulness which might be exerted 18 by some of us accommodating witnesses to catch 19 their planes and so on, if Dr. Mesghinna copies 20 these himself when he gets back to his office and 21 mails them to you, you can save yourself the time 22 you are now utilizing in searching for them. 23 that be acceptable, Mr. White? 24

25

MR. WHITE:

That would be all right, Your

The second of th

1	Honor, but he's almost done now.
2	THE WITNESS: We are almost done.
3	THE SPECIAL MASTER: Sure.
4 .	MR. WHITE: Off the record.
5	(Off-the-record.
6	THE SPECIAL MASTER: I was under the impres-
7	sion the total constituted about 20 pages.
8	THE WITNESS: That was a mistake on my own
9	estimate.
10	THE SPECIAL MASTER: Well, are you about
11	finished with them now?
12	THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm almost finished. This
13	is the last one. That's it. Besides what you asked
14	for, there is some more information there.
15	MR. WHITE: I see there is water-holding
16	capacity and intake rate.
17	THE WITNESS: Yeah.
18	MR. WHITE: Excuse me a minute, Your Honor,
19	and I'll get them off to the Xerox.
20	THE WITNESS: These things that I give you
21	are, you know, rough by nature and they may not
22	constitute the finals. They are where we made
23	the calculations.
24	
25	* * * *

1	Q	(By Mr. White) Dr. Mesghinna, I hand you what's
2		been marked for identification as Plaintiff's
3		Exhibit FM-5-A. Is that the copy, is that a
4		copy of the percentage of possible sunshine and
5		a document which you received from HKM and
6		provided a sample of the type of information
7		upon which you based your analysis?
8	A	Yes, this is of the same sample, this is not the
9		exact one that I used, may not be the exact one
10		that I used.
11		MR. WHITE: At this time, Your Honor
12		Well, I've save the offer till the end.
13	Ω	(By Mr. White) Dr. Mesghinna, isn't it true that
14		you had not furnished us this type of documenta-
15		tion for the calculation which you actually made
16		in this case?
17	A	I did not I gave you the average values that
18		I used.
19	Ω	Total average?
20	A	Total average, yeah.
21	Q	Dr. Mesghinna, I'm handing you now a package of
22		deposition exhibits which are also marked as
23		Trial Exhibits in the one hundred series, FM-100
24		series, beginning with FM-100. Would you please
25	mes	ghinna-cross-white

1		go through those exhibits, indicate for the record
2		what each of them are by trial exhibit number,
3		that's the yellow sticker in the lower right
4	: :	hand corner, and reaffirm that those constitute
5		facts, data, formula, calculations, interim
6		conclusions or whatever, which you use in your
7		analysis?
8	A	First of all, there are changes that have been
9		made on these things, you know.
10		THE SPECIAL MASTER: First of all what; sir?
11		THE WITNESS: After the deposition was taken,
		I think this was in June, 1980, there has been
12		several changes that have been made. These are
13		not final products, but
14 15	Q	(By Mr. White) If I hand you a red pen, can you
		indicate the changes?
16	A	I have indicated those changes, the first changes
17		into my second deposition.
18		THE SPECIAL MASTER: How many depositions
19		did you give on this material that's now being
20		put in your hands, two depositions?
21		THE WITNESS: Yeah, two sets of depositions.
22		THE SPECIAL MASTER: Two sets of depositions.
23		And Mr. White has just now handed you a sheaf of
24		ghinna-cross-white
25	Mea	Antimo-cross_autres

-0

-0

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

25

papers containing how many sheets?

THE WITNESS: Let's say a pack of sheets.

The first of the f

THE SPECIAL MASTER: And these are documents that you worked with during the depositions?

THE WITNESS: Yes. These are documents that I gave, during my deposition.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: I see. And he now wishes for you to see if these contain the materials you worked with in coming to your conclusions on the -- about which you testified in this case? Is that what you want to know, Mr. White?

MR. WHITE: Yes, Your Honor.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: I'm going to rule that's inadmissible and improper cross examination unless it can be specifically related to what you testified to on direct examination. This goes beyond the scope of the direct examination and deals with the materials during the depositions which is not this Cort's business. You may hand those back, Mr. Mesghinna to Mr. White.

(By Mr. White) Well, let me hand them back to you,

Dr. Mesghinna, and ask you the question: Isn't

it true that this material is related to your direct

testimony in this case?

mesghinna-cross-white

-3

~3

-3

-3

A It has some relationships, but some of it I have, you know, left it out, I have changed it, some of it I have retained it.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Mr. White, don't tempt the Court. Please make your offer of proof and let's proceed with the trial. ""I've ruled and I would appreciate your cooperation in abiding in my ruling, I will be grateful to you for it.

MR. WHITE: Your Honor, the State would make the following offer of proof, but if asked, Dr. Mesghinna would testify -- or if the State were allowed to ask Dr. Mesghinna, he would testify that the exhibits which have been marked for identification as Plaintiff's Exhibit Wind River Reservation, FM -- that should be FM-100, FM-101, FM-102, FM-103, FM-104, FM-105, FM-106, FM-107, FM-108, FM-109, FM-110, FM-111, FM-112, FM-113, FM-114, FM-115, FM-116, FM-117, FM-119, FM-120, FM-121, FM-122, FM-123, FM-124, FM-125, FM-126, FM-127, FM-128, FM-129 and FM-118 which I skipped, constitute the facts and data relied upon by Dr. Mesghinna, calculations made by Dr. Mesghinna, interim calculations made by Dr. Mesghinna, assumptions made by Dr. Mesghinna

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

mesghinna-cross-white

409 WEST 24TH STREET

CHEYENNE, WY 82001

(307) 635 8289

and other facts and data upon which Dr. Mesghinna based the opinion which he testified to during his direct examination in this matter.

It may well be that Dr. Mesghinna has made changes since the time of his deposition in those facts, data and calculations or interim conclusions or assumptions. Without the opportunity, however, to ask Dr. Mesghinna about those changes and amendments, if any, or depletions, the State makes the offer of proof as if these are in fact the facts, data, assumptions and interim conclusions, calculations and formula upon which Dr. Mesghinna based his opinion.

accurately restates your offer, but that's besides -- I don't wish to question it. You could have, Mr. White, had you wanted to, bring out some of these differences between those exhibits, material contained in the direct testimony, you could have done so, you chose not to do that.

Instead you chose to drop them on Dr. Mesghinna, the witness and have him take an abundance of time to go through each one and do in an hour what might have been done in five minutes, and this is

mesghinna-corss-white

the reason, another one of the reasons that I think supports my rule and that was an improper procedure on your part. MR. WHITE: I think the record speaks for itself. THE SPECIAL MASTER: It does indeed, it does indeed fortunately. (By Mr. White) Dr. Mesghinna, I hand you another set of exhibits which has been marked for identification as Plaintiff's Exhibits 200 through 210, 10 which is information which you provided us in 11 response to the ?minth discovery request. Would 12 you please look at each one of those documents, 13 indicate that those documents, whether or not 14 those documents constitute facts, data, assumptions, 15 calculations, formulas --16 THE SPECIAL MASTER: I'm taking exception 17 to your question, Mr. White, and I would like 18 you to say to the witness, if you would, "What 19 do these contain," and let the witness tell us 20 what they contain. I believe that's a proper 21 procedure for discerning facts and matters in 22 the fact finding world, in fairness. 23

the state of the s

examine Exhibits FM-200 through 210 --THE SPECIAL MASTER: You have numbered them. Would you please examine exhibits, just hand them to him and tell us what they contain. Is that agreeable, Mr. White? MR. WHITE: That's fine, Your Honor. THE WITNESS: Okay. The first set contains soil log profiles. That includes the texture of the soil, the depth and water holding capacities, including township, range, section and location of 10 the boring. That is FM-200. 11 The next one is FM-201. It contains pump 12 station number, number of laterals, cost of 13 laterals per acre, pump station, number of laterals 14 and cost of laterals per acre for all the units, 15 I believe. 16 The second --17 (By Mr. White) Did you identify that one by Q 18 exhibit number? 19 Yeah, I said 201. A 20 The third exhibit is WRIR FM-202, which is 21 pump station summary and the pump station summary 22 gives pump station number acreage and seasonal 23 pumping hours, I believe for each unit. 24

mesghinna-cross-white

	4854
1	THE SPECIAL MASTER: Meaning what for that unit?
2	I didn't hear that word.
3	THE WITNESS: Pumping hours.
4	THE SPECIAL MASTER: Hours?
5	THE WITNESS: Yeah, the last column was
6	pumping hours.
7	The next set includes is WRIR FM-203 and
8	it has the canal reach and the flows, the net
9	flows, rather, for May, June, July, August,
10	September and maximum Q, meaning maximum dis-
11	charge, and length of each reach and the C
12	values of each reach.
13	The next set contains is WRIR FM-204,
14	and it shows, it gives the canal hydraulic
15	properties that would include the reach number; the slope,
16	the free board, the bottom wheels of the canal,
17	the depth of water in the canal for each unit.
18	The next exhibit is WRIR FM-205. It shows
19	the private trust lands, meaning the historic
20	lands, drainage name, climatic zone and acreage.
21	However, I would like to point out on this one,
22	this one is part of the historic lands which I
23	did not testify.
24	THE SPECIAL MASTER: Which you did not what?

mesghinna-cross-white

1		THE WITNESS: Which I have not testified.
2		THE SPECIAL MASTER: About which you have not
3		testified?
4		THE WITNESS: Yes.
5	Q	(By Mr. White) Which portion is that?
6	A	FM-205.
7	}	The whole thing applies to which you've not
8		testified?
9		Yes. Well, I mean in my deposition.
10 11	Q	I understand, but on the stand here?
11	A	On the stand here I didn't.
12		The next exhibit is WRIR FM-206. These are
13		historic lands, acreages and percentages of
14		climatic zone of each of the units, which are
15		Johnstown unit, Ray unit, Coolidge unit, sub-
16		agency and a left-hand unit, and upper wind
17		unit.
18	Q	Wold, with respect to that exhibit, is it
19		Did you rely on this at all for your future
20		land analysis which you testified on direct?
21	A	No, I didn't.
22 23	Q	Okay, thank you.
23	A	The next one is the WRIR FM-207, and it is, this
24		sheet of paper shows the pipe ratio ranges.
25	mesg	hinna-cross-white

The next one is WRIR FM-208, and this one, I believe contains the cost estimates for open drains and outlet ditches by unit for all the units. I don't have to mention it, I guess. The next exhibit is WRIR FM-209, and it shows costs for open drains and outlet ditches were estimated, using a cost of one dollar for excavated cubic yard, and it also continues reading that cost for subsurface drains or estimated from one abstract of bids by the U.S. 10 Bureau of Reclamation for the following areas. 11 It mentions the areas, if you want me --12 No, you just need to describe the exhibit. The 13 idea, Wold, is that somebody can look at the 14 exhibit and connect it with the number. 15 16 17 18 19 20 22 23 24

mesghinna-cross-white

1	THE WITNESS: The next exhibit is WRIR
. 2	FM-210, and this exhibit shows the length
3	of each size of the drain line used by unit,
4	for each unit for six-inch pipes, eight-inch
· 5	pipes and ten-inch pipes, including I
6	mean, the lengths.
7	MR. WHITE: Your Honor, with the consent
	of Court and Counsel, I would withdraw at
9	this time FM-205 and 206, which have to do
10	with historic lands, and which we would Offer
11	when we get around to historic lands.
12	THE SPECIAL MASTER: Very well.
13	MR. WHITE: I can leave them with the
14	Court, if you like.
15	THE SPECIAL MASTER: Very well. No.
16	What numbers did you just take out, 200 what?
) }	MR. WHITE: Five and six, I believe,
7 5	
19	THE SPECIAL MASTER: All right. All
20	righty.
3 21	Q (By Mr. White) Dr. Mesghinna, do you recall
3 22	that on approximately April 21, 1981, Henry
4 2 3	Sostrom visited you in your San Francisco
£ . 24	office to obtain certain documents?
· ·	magghinne-cross-white
-71	

1	A	(Witness nodding head in the affirmative)
2	Q	I hand you what has been marked as Exhibits,
3		Plaintiff's Exhibits FM-301 and 300 and ask
4		you if you would please identify those.
5	A	Exhibit WRIR FM-300 contains the layout of
6		pipelines with respect to the fields and the
7		pump stations I believe for all the units.
8		In some cases also it has some calculations
9		in it of pipeline network design.
10		The next exhibit, which is WRIR FM-301,
11		was not part of the documents that was
12		supposed to be xeroxed and handed to the
13		State people. It was through discussion with
14		Mr. Sostrom that by that the C values
15		I informed him that the C values could also
16		be found in other handbooks, there could be
17		also several handbooks, one of which was this
18		one.
19	Ω	Well, this is an excerpt from a hydroelectric
20		handbook?
21	A	Yes.
22	Q	In which certain C values are given?
23	A	Yes, so I don't think this one should be
24		entered as an exhibit.
25	mes	ghinna-cross-white

·	
1	Q Are these the C values which you used?
2	A No. No, I have sent this in order to what
3	do you call
4	THE SPECIAL MASTER: Evaluate?
5	THE WITNESS: Evaluate, to see where I
6	arrange and so on. It helped to make my
7	evaluation, but
8	MR. WHITE: Your Honor, we would with-
9	draw 301.
10	Q (By Mr. White) Dr. Mesghinna, you may recall
11	that on Friday, April 24th, you provided some
12	information to the State, and I hand you what
13	has been marked as FM-400 and ask you to
14	identify that.
15	A Okay. WRIR FM-400 consists of pipe costs
16	of each of the units by columns having pump
17	number, cost of the pumping plant, acreage
18	served by that pumping plant, and following
19	the pipe costs for each of the units there
20	are the pumping stations summary of each unit
21	by columns having pump station number, acreage,
22	pump lift in feet, number of pumps in a station
23	in gallons per minute, meaning discharge in
24	gallons per minute. The next column, discharge
25	mesghinna-cross-white

1		of Q maximum in cubic feet per second, pump
2	:	station costs in dollars, horsepower for that
3		pump station, climatic zone for that pump
4	.	station, seasonal pumping hours for that pump
5		station, pumping costs which is energy costs
6		for that pump station. I believe they continue
7		like this first with the pipeline cost
8		summary, followed by pumping station summary
9		for each unit.
10	Q	Dr. Mesghinna, I hand you a set of blueline
11		plates which have been marked for identification
12		as FM-401 through 407, and ask you whether
13		or not these are the plates
1'4		MR. CLEAR: Didn't we have these identified
15		already? We talked about them on the first
16		day of your cross.
17		MR. WHITE: No.
18		MR. CLEAR: These are different?
19	Q	(By Mr. White) Those are the plates which you
20	 	also provided to the State during or at the
21	† 	end of your direct examination on April 24th,
22		which show field numbers, hole locations, other
23		types of data?
24	A	Yes, yes. Mr. White mentioned these are the
25	mee	ahinna-cross-white

1		plates that show the pumping plant numbers in
2		each of the units, the soil characteristics
3		such as water holding capacity, intake rate,
4	: :	etcetera, and the field numbers and so on
5	 	for each of the units, It starts with W
6	Q	It should be FM-401 through 407. They may not
7		be in order.
8	A	I don't see 401. Oh, yes, here.
9	Q	I think it was used to wrap them since it was
10		larger. It should be
11	A	Okay. Let me read them: FM-401, FM-402, FM-403,
12		FM-404, FM-405, FM-406, and FM-407.
13	Q	Dr. Mesghinna, do you remember providing
14		certain information over the telephone by
15		agreement of counsel to Dr. Mesghinna
16		excuse me, to Henry Sostrom on April 30, 1981?
17	A	Yes, I remember that.
18	Q	I hand you what has been marked for identification
19		as FM-500 and ask you whether or not FM-500
20	; 	accurately sets forth the information which
21		you provided to Mr. Sostrom?
22	A	The only thing that I can say at this stage
23		is I have to go through my file as to check
24		each and every number, and let's hope that
25	mes	ghinna-cross-white

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

we might have a flip in telephone conversations or something like that, but if there is any miscalculation or addition problem or something else, I'm sure he would call me and ask me about it. But it is FM-500.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: With those qualifications you were, in fact, saying this was his memorandum of your conversation, you are not sure it purports to be the truth of your conversation?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: I understand.

MR. WHITE: Your Honor, I think in light of the Witness' statement, I will withdraw FM-500 and put it on through Mr. Sostrom in our case in chief.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Or ask this Witness to come up with his own memorandum when he gets back and bring it in later, either way.

MR. WHITE: I think what happened, Your
Honor, they talked on the telephone, they
created a chart that was common to all of them
and Dr. Mesghinna would look in his records
and give Henry a value for each blank in the
mesghinna-cross-white

13071 635 8280

"我们就是我们的自己的。""我们的人,我们就是一个人的人。""我们的人,我们就是一个人的人的人。""我们的人的人,我们就是一个人的人,我们就是一个人的人,我们就

1	chart, and what Wold would have to do is go
2	back and look in his records in each location,
3	and it would just be a lot easier for every-
4	body to have Henry testify to that.
5	THE SPECIAL MASTER: Very well.
6	MR. WHITE: If I could have about three
7	minutes, Your Honor, I have acreage sheets
8	back and I need to mark them and I'll return
9	the originals to Dr. Mesghinna at this time.
10	THE SPECIAL MASTER: These you will
11	probably want to introduce when you have
12	completed all your exhibits, all your FM series?
13	MR. WHITE: Yes, when I'm done I will
14	offer those for a particular purpose.
15	Here are your materials, Wold. Do you
16	want to check to make sure we have them right?
17	THE SPECIAL MASTER: What was that?
18	Speak up, please.
19	MR. WHITE: I said here are your materials,
20	Wold, do you want to check to make sure we
21	have them right.
22	THE SPECIAL MASTER: Off the record, please.
23	Off-the-record discussion.
24	
25	mesghinna-cross-white

1		THE SPECIAL MASTER: We'll go back on the
2		record then with that.
3	Q	(By Mr. White) I'm going to ask you, Dr. Mesghinna
4	 	a question about the 600 series of exhibits. I
5		appreciate you waiting to answer till your counsel
6		has copies of them in front of them.
7		Dr. Mesghinna, I hand you what has been
8		marked for identification as Plaintiff's Exhibits
9		WRIR FM-600, 601, 602, 603 and 604, and ask you
10		to identify those.
11		You guys have them?
12		MR. CLEAR: Yes.
13	Ω	(By Mr. White) Go ahead and answer, please.
14	A	WRIR FM-600 is the newly classified lands, meaning
15		the future lands of Riverton East Unit that shows
16		by climatic zone of the field number, field width,
17		field length, water holding capacity, in-take data,
18		acreages, pump number, wheel move or hand move.
19		WRIR FM-601 shows the same materials that
20		I just mentioned for Riverton East for Arapahoe.
21	} 	The next material The next exhibit is
22		WRIR FM-603, it shows
23		THE SPECIAL MASTER: You go from 601 to 603?
24		MR. WHITE: I think he did 602, Your Honor.
25	mes	ghinna-cross-white

···	
1	THE SPECIAL MASTER: 602 was Arapahoe?
2	THE WITNESS: 601 was Let me start. 600
3	was the Riverton East, 601 was Arapahoe, 603 is
4	South Crowheart unit, 604 is North Crowheart
5	unit, but I don't see
6	Q (By Mr. White) You skipped it.
7	A 602 is Big Horn Flats unit.
8	THE SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.
9	(Brief pause.
10	MR. WHITE: Your Honor, at this time the
11	State would offer the following WRIR FM series
12	exhibits for the indicated purposes: One, two,
13	three, four I need to start again, Your
14	Honor. One and two for the purposes of showing
15	the facts and data, calculations and assumptions
16	THE SPECIAL MASTER: All right.
17	MR. WHITE: that were relied on by Dr.
18	Mesghinna.
19	Three and four for impeachment purposes.
20	THE SPECIAL MASTER: Three, we will identify
21	as a communication of HKM Associates dealing
22	with criteria for selection project study areas.
23	Is that the heading?
24	MR. WHITE: And four is the BIA plan for
25	mesghinna-cross-white

1	completion of Wind River Irrigation Project.
2	THE SPECIAL MASTER: Dated June, 1968, all
3	
	right.
4	MR. WHITE: FM-5-A for illustrative pur-
5	poses.
6	THE SPECIAL MASTER: 5-A, I don't have,
7	Mr. White.
8	MR. WHITE: That's the one I did first
9	this morning, Your Honor.
10	THE SPECIAL MASTER: I don't have a copy,
11	it was the one like he used but not the one he
12	used?
13	MR. WHITE: Yes, sir, that's why
14	THE SPECIAL MASTER: All right, I'll just
15	make a note of it on 5.
16	THE WITNESS: I think it's down there.
17	THE SPECIAL MASTER: I don't need it, Mr.
18	White.
19	THE WITNESS: Here it is No.
20	MR. WHITE: That's the original.
21	THE SPECIAL MASTER: I don't need it, I'll
	make a note of it.
22	MR. WHITE: FM-5, 6, 8, 9
23	THE SPECIAL MASTER: 9 will be identified as
24	mesghinna-cross-white
25	Webdittilia-cross wires

-	•
1	an excerpt dealing with canals and laterals for
2	BIR publication?
3	MR. WHITE: Except from BIR manual concerning
4	canals, concerning the lining policy, I'm not sure.
5	10 I need to back up. FM-5 and 6 are
6	offered to show facts, data, conclusions and
7	assumptions upon which No, sorry again.
8	5, 6, 8, 9, 10 and 15 are offered for im-
9	peachment purposes. Although I originally offered
10	FM-2 as I previously indicated during cross examina-
11	tion, FM's 2 withdrawn and the offer is instead of,
12	FM-2 replacement.
13	THE SPECIAL MASTER: How will you designate
14	the FM-2 replacement?
15	MR. WHITE: That's what it has on the exhibit
16	sticker, FM-2 replacement.
17	THE SPECIAL MASTER: We have not seen a copy
18	of that.
19	MR. WHITE: Yes, sir, I handed it to you
20	yesterday, it should be around here.
21	THE SPECIAL MASTER: Does anyone have an
22	extra copy of FM÷2 replacement, please?
23	Oh, that was the instructions to destroy.
24	MR. WHITE: No.
25	mesghinna-cross-white

ľ	
1	MR. CLEAR: There are two pages, the print-
2	out chart.
3	MR. WHITE: They're pages
4	THE SPECIAL MASTER: All right, we have it
5	at the office, thank you.
6	(Off the record discussion.
7	(Brief pause.
8	MR. PERRY: Your Honor, it might be helpful
9	if Mr. White provided a description of each
10	exhibit as he went along.
11	THE SPECIAL MASTER: We'll try to see that
12	there's something, either I'll try to announce
13	it or he will or Leo for two reasons: one, so
14	you know what the exhibit was and two, so you
15	know how to find it in the index as it will be
16	labeled in the index with the report. You'll
17	be looking for it when you all get ready to
18	appeal.
19	MR. WHITE: Okay. Beginning with FM-200,
20	the following exhibits are offered for the pur-
21	pose of showing facts, data, conclusions or
22	facts, data, calculations or assumptions upon
23	which Dr. Mesghinna based his opinion, and
24	these are all those copies which have been

mesghinna-cross-white

ı	
1	THE SPECIAL MASTER: 201 through 210 except
2	for 205 and 206, is that stated accurately?
3	MR. WHITE: Yes, sir, 201 through 204 and
4	207
5	THE SPECIAL MASTER: through 210?
6	MR. WHITE: Yes, sir.
7	THE SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.
8	MR. WHITE: I'm sorry, I've neglected to
9	say 200 as well as 201 through 210. It should
10	start with 200.
11	THE SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	* * *
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

mesghinna-cross-white

والمسرة

1	MR. WHITE: FM-300, same purpose; FM-400,
2	401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407.
3	THE SPECIAL MASTER: For the same purpose?
4	MR. WHITE: Same purpose, Your Honor.
5	THE SPECIAL MASTER: All right.
6	MR. WHITE: Six hundred, 601, 602, 603, 604,
7	same purpose.
8	THE SPECIAL MASTER: You failed to
9	identify those as to their content.
10	MR. WHITE: I'm sorry, Your Honor.
11	THE SPECIAL MASTER: We should on the
12	600 serieë, anyway.
13	MR. WHITE: The 600 series are the future
14	lands tables showing acreages for the five
15	projects.
16	THE SPECIAL MASTER: With respect to
17	units?
18	MR. WHITE:. Yes, sir, five units.
19	I believe that FM-1249 through FM-1255
20	have already been admitted for illustrative
21	purposes, and we now offer
22	THE SPECIAL MASTER: They were what, a
23	brief description?
24	MR. WHITE: Those were the plates with
25	mesghinna-cross-white

The second of th

- 1	
1	Dr. Mesghinna's field numbers added.
2	THE SPECIAL MASTER: They're 1249
3	through 1255?
4	MR. WHITE: Yes, sir. We also offer for
5	illustrative purposes FM-1249-A through
6	1255-A.
7	THE SPECIAL MASTER: Do you have those?
8	And their brief description?
9	MR. WHITE: Those are parallel maps with
10	further annotations, Your Honor. That's all
11	the offers I have at this time.
12	THE SPECIAL MASTER: All right. If there
13	is not request to voir dire these exhibits,
14	and I presume there probably are not or they
15	would have been made as each were identified,
16	I will proceed to admit them into evidence.
17	MR. CLEAR: Your Honor, the only
18	objection I have is to three and four, which
19	were offered for impeachment purposes, which
20	I believe the Witness said he had never seen
21	before. Five and six were again offered for
22	impeachment purposes and were again not
23	identified by the Witness other than saying it's
24	a form he's familiar with. I think there is a
	•

25

lack of foundation on those exhibits, too,

	
1	Your Honor.
2	THE SPECIAL MASTER: Mr. Echohawk?
3	MR. ECHOHAWK: I join in Mr. Clear's
4	objection.
5	THE SPECIAL MASTER: All right, fine.
6	Mr. Perry?
7	MR. PERRY: No additional objections.
8	THE SPECIAL MASTER: All right. There
9	will be no need to counter that. I have looked
10	over those and they will be admitted for the
11	purposes for what may be developed. I'm going
12	to move, therefore, the exhibits just offered
13	by Mr. White, beginning with Plaintiff's
14	Exhibits WRIR FM-1 and concluding with Plaintiff's
15	Exhibits WRIR FM-1255-A, be and they are all
16	hereby admitted into evidence.
17	(Whereupon Plaintiff's
18	(Exhibits WRIR FM-1 (through FM-1255-A are
19	(hereby admitted into (evidence.
20	MR. WHITE: Thank you, Your Honor.
21	Q (By Mr. White) Dr. Mesghinna, what type of
22	study for these future lands were you instructed
23	to do?
24	A What type of studies?
25	mesghinna-cross-white
	1

·····		
1	Q	Yes, sir.
2	A	As I have indicated it in my direct testimony,
3		I'll briefly say it, crop water requirements,
4		determination of diversion requirements, design
5	 	of the irrigation system and design of the
6		drainage system and costs.
7	Q	Is there additional work which would have to
8		be done, engineering work that would have to
9		be done, prior to the construction or the
10		initiation of construction of these projects?
11	A	I beleive there is what they call a design
12		and specification study, and that has to be
13		done, yes, in order to give the specifications,
14		you know. In fact, if you see it in my cost
15		calcualtions, I have included that cost,
16		engineering and calculations.
17	Q	Are you familiar with the various levels of
18		study by the Bureau of Reclamation such as
19		reconnaissance, feasibility and final complete
20	{	design?
21	A	Well, these levels of study have different
22		meanings for different people in differnt
23	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	organizations, but I am familiar with that
24		Bureau definition.
25	mes	ghinna-cross-white

<u> </u>		**************************************
1	Q	Using the Bureau definitions, what level of
2		study have you made with respect to the
3		five units involved in your direct examination?
4	A	It would be very hard to characterize at what
5		level it is because, you know although I
6		know from the outset what the Bureau's
7		standards are, you know, I don't know them in
8		detail to say this is this, you know, a certain
9		level of study goes from this point to this
10		point. There are many things, many guidelines
11		in each of these studies. So it would be in-
12		appropriate for me to say this level of study
13		is this, but just for if you want me to
14		approximate it
15	Q	Certainly. Please go ahead. Did you say you
16		could approximate it?
17		THE SPECIAL MASTER: It would be
18		inappropriate.
19		THE WITNESS: It would be inappropriate,
20		but if you push me towards to say something,
21		you know, I have personal opinion to what
22		level it may be, you know.
23	Q	Well, if it's inappropriate, I won't push you.
24		MR. WHITE: And I have no further questions
25	mes	ghinna-cross-white

····	
1	of Dr. Mesghinna at this time, Your Honor.
2	Before sitting down, though, I would like to
3	make the standard motion to strike on the
4	basis of lack of foundation for the opinions
5	expressed by Dr. Mesghinna.
6	THE SPECIAL MASTER: All of them, the
7	entire cross-examination?
8	MR. WHITE: No, his entire direct
9	testimony, his opinion with respect to the
10	projects for lack of foundation shown during
11	cross-examination with respect to such things
12	as the identifications of irrigable land base,
13	the source of information on percentage of
14	sunlight, things like that, Your Honor.
15	THE SPECIAL MASTER: I'm restrained to
16	overrule the motion.
17	MR. WHITE: Thank you, Your Honor.
18	THE SPECIAL MASTER: All right. I thank
19	you, Mr. White, for concluding your cross-
20	examination on this difficult matter, complex
21	matter.
22	Is there any redirect?
23	MR. CLEAR: Yes, Your Honor, but I think
24	we could if we could have a ten minute
25	break now

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Do you want a ten minute break now and come back or do you want to have lunch and come back at 1:30? MR. CLEAR: I think it's up to what Wold wants to do is fine with me. THE SPECIAL MASTER: We will be glad to accomodate you, Doctor. Tell us what your plane connections are. MR. ECHOHAWK: The plane is two o'clock. MR. WHITE: Your Honor, I would like to 10 suggest if there's going to be redirect, there 11 might be additional recross, and let's get it 12 out of the way so Dr. Mesghinna --13 THE SPECIAL MASTER: I appreciate that, 14 but you are the same gentleman that said to 15 me if you're here at nine o'clock I'll begin 16 cross right on the dot, and you came around 17 ten. I just had to say that, and I'm sorry 18 I did, but that's one of the reasons I might 19 have been a little bit petulant this morning, 20 just in case you detected it. MR. WHITE: I didn't detect a thing, Your 22 I would like to say by explanation Honor. 23 that my assumption was I believe our discussion 24

25

was yesterday the motion hearing would start

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Okay, a five minute

MR. CLEAR: Or five minutes.

break we will take.

24

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

mesghinna - redirect - clear

24

1		do we do this? WRIR C
2		THE SPECIAL MASTER: Wind River Indian Reser-
3		vation C, whatever number.
4		Off the record, please.
5		(Off-the-record discussion.
6		THE SPECIAL MASTER: All right, Mr. Clear.
7		MR. WHITE: With permission of the Court, can
8		I stand over here so I can see these while the wit-
9		ness is testifying about them?
10	Q.	(By Mr. Clear) Dr. Mesghinna, I hand you U.S. Exhi-
11		bit WRIR C-265 and 264. Can you identify these,
12		please?
13	A.	Yeah, U.S. Exhibit WRIR C-264 is the Wind River
14		Indian Reservation land classification at location
15		Township 2 North, Range 6 East.
16	Q.	And the other one?
17	A.	And the next one is U.S. Exhibit WRIR C-265. It is
18	• !	the Wind River Indian Reservation land classification
19		at location Township 2 North, Range 5 East.
20	; } Q .	Have you ever seen those two documents before?
21	A.	Yes, I have seen those documents before.
22	· Q.	Where have you seen them?
23	A.	In San Francisco, California.
24	Q.	Have you utilized those documents at all?
25	mes	sghinna - redirect - clear

TO A SAME AND A THE SOURCE OF THE SAME AND A SAME AND A

بسن

- Yeah, we have utilized them. 2 Who did you receive them from? Q. 3 From HKM Associates. A. 4 How did you utilize them? Q. Well, we took the soil characteristics from these 5 A. areas, from both of these locations that I just 6 mentioned, and we laid our system, on-farm system design, and we put the rest of the irrigation system design and drainage, and those are drainage. And did you use those to -- when you laid out your Q 10 farms on what you thought to be arable lands? Did 11 you use those to determine what the arable lands 12 were? 13 Yes, these, we used these, both of these, of course, A. 14 in the rest of all the Wind River Indian Reservation 15 project that we discussed the last few days to deter-16 mine the boundaries of our fields and to determine 17 also the soil characteristics of the different 18 soils which we used as an input for our system 19 design work and drainage work. 20 Now, I'd like you to compare those exhibits to --21 Exhibit C-264 and C-265 with Plaintiff's Exhibit 22
- 25 mesghinna redirect clear

23

24

1255-A, and I want you to tell me if you can tell

whether certain fields on 1255-A are found on

6 9 9

E-

1

2

_

_

7

8

9

10

12

11

13

15

14

16

17

19

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

arable lands as indicated on C-264 or 265?

MR. WHITE: Your Honor, I may be able to make the question unnecessary if the State is willing to stipulate that the arable land base shown on Dr. Mesghinna's exhibits, including those as shown on FM-1255-A is the arable land base received from HKM, we've got no quarrel with that. I believe him when he tells me that.

The whole point of that cross-examination was that that may not be the same arable land base that HKM testified about; and if the purpose is to show that he relied on HKM's arable land base through September of 1980, we'll stipulate to that.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Is that the purpose of your offer?

MR. CLEAR: Well, it was part of my purpose,
Your Honor. What I'm attempting to do is show that
these are the maps that he relied on and that there
is in the record evidence introduced by HKM that
these lands are the arable land base, and I'm going
to do that now.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: All right, sir.

(By Mr. Clear) Dr. Mesghinna, I'm handing you what's in evidence as U.S. Exhibit WRIR C-148-17,

mesghinna - redirect - clear

1		and U.S. Exhibit WRIR C-148-18.
2	A.	The first exhibit, which is U.S. Exhibit WRIR
3		C-148-17, and the second one, it is in the it is
4		in Township 2 North and Range 6 East.
5		And the second exhibit is the United States
6		Exhibit WRIR C-148-18, and it is in Township 2 North,
7		5 East. And these two aerial photos correspond to
8		those exhibits that I just mentioned, which are U.S.
9		Exhibit WRIR C-264 and U.S. Exhibit WRIR C-265.
10	Q.	And you have looked at these, 148-18 and 148-17,
11		you looked at those before your testimony today;
12		is that correct?
13	A.	Yeah, I have seen this before. They are the same
14		as this.
15	Q.	The photographs will show the same arable land base
16		as these?
17	A.	Um-hum.
18	Q.	As 264 and 265?
19	A.	Yes.
20	1	MR. CLEAR: Just a minute, Your Honor,
21		(Brief pause.
22	Q	(By Mr.: Clear) The lands indicated on 264 and 265
23		are lands included in your total, 84,000-acre total?
24	<u>†</u> ((MR. WHITE: Objection, Your Honor; what
25	mes	ghinna - redirect - clear

1	84,000-acre total?
2	THE SPECIAL MASTER: I think he wishes to
3	strike that.
4	MR. CLEAR: I think we'll omit that, Your
5	Honor.
6	I have no further redirect, Your Honor.
7	THE SPECIAL MASTER: Okay, Mr. White.
8	MR. WHITE: Short recross, Your Honor.
9	THE SPECIAL MASTER: On recross, on the sub-
10	ject matter of these formats.
11	MR. WHITE: Yes, sir.
12	(Brief pause.
13	MR. CLEAR: Your Honor, I misspoke myself.
14	I'd just like to introduce WRIR C-264 and WRIR
15	C-265 into evidence.
16	MR. WHITE: Could I voir dire those, Your
17	Honor.
18	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION
19	BY MR. WHITE:
20	Q Dr. Mesghinna, with respect to C-264 and 265, are
21	these part of the arable land base materials which
22	you received from HKM prior to and including Septem-
23	ber, 1980, or are these documents which you've re-
24	ceived since then?

25

mesghinna - voir dire - white

1	A,	I can't exactly pinpoint the timing, but it is about
2		that time that we have received this.
3	Q.	Dr. Mesghinna, there are a number of handwritten
4		notes on these exhibits. Are those all in your
5		handwriting?
6	A.	No, I don't believe these are my handwriting.
7	Ω	Okay.
8		
9	,	
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		* * * *
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

THE WITNESS: It could be our people's

handwriting, I mean, people who work with me,

their handwriting.

MR. WHITE: Your Honor, if these exhibit

MR. WHITE: Your Honor, if these exhibits are offered for the truth of their contents, we would object for lack of foundation. On the other hand, if they are offered for the purpose of showing the facts and data upon which Dr. Mesghinna assumes the arable land base to be as it is shown on his exhibits, and if the offer excluded the handwritten notes on the exhibits which Dr. Mesghinna is unable to identify, then the State would have no objection.

THE SPECIAL MASTER: Well, we have overruled the objection you would make if they
were to be admitted on the truth of their
contents, so I will admit them into evidence
for whatever probative value they may have.

RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. WHITE:

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

- Now, Dr. Mesghinna, I would like you to compare --MR. WHITE: This is recross, Your Honor.
- Q (By Mr. White) Dr. Mesghinna, I would like you to compare U.S. Exhibit C-264 and Exhibit C-265

25 mesghinna-recross-white

1		with the exhibits I have here before you,
2		C-50 and 51, which represent Mr. Kersich's
3		opinion as to the arable lands for sprinkler
4		and gravity irrigation, and which have been
5		admitted in evidence, and ask you whether all
6		of the arable lands shown on or lands shown
7		to be arable on C-254 I mean, 264 and 265
8		are shown to be arable on Exhibits C-50 and 51.
9	A	Not all those shown in Exhibit C-264
10		shown in C-264 are included on the C-51 and
11		C-50. However, there are some areas which are
12		included in here (indicating) I mean, in
13		C-51 and C-50 which show also in here that
14		were struck out last time.
15		MR. WHITE: I have no further questions,
16		Your Honor.
17		THE SPECIAL MASTER: Thank you. All
18		right, what is the status of dismissal for
19		this witness?
20		MR. WHITE: Well, the State of Wyoming,
21		as usual, reserves the right to recall him
22		as its own witness at such time as we want
23		to serve him, Your Honor.
24	! ! 	THE COURT: All right. We thank you very

mesghinna-recross-white

1	much for the several weeks you have been with
2	us and look forward to seeing you again in
3	the trial.
4	MR. CLEAR: He is going to be back sooner
5	than that, Your Honor.
6	THE SPECIAL MASTER: Perhaps sooner that
7	that. Why don't we go to lunch and come back
8	to this Courtroom at two o'clock.
9	MR. WHITE: Your Honor, before we recess
10	is your next witness Mr. Dornbusch?
11	MR. CLEAR: Yes.
12	MR. WHITE: He doesn't happen to be my
13	witness the way we worked it out, Your Honor.
14	I wonder if I might be excused for the rest
15	of the week so I can go see my family.
16	THE SPECIAL MASTER: Certainly. You are
17	lucky.
18	I don't know which courtroom we will be
19	in. We are going to be over there tomorrow,
20	we know, so we might as well move our stuff
21	when we get back over here. If you get back
22	over there, you can move your stuff back to
23	the other courtroom. We will reconvene at tw
24	o'clock in the other courtroom.

and the state of t